

There are quite a number of proofs of the **irrationality of  $\sqrt{2}$**  in the mathematical literature. All of them begin by assuming that the number is rational and then showing, through a series of logical steps, that the assumption leads to a contradiction.

For positive integers  $p$  and  $q$ , putting  $\sqrt{2} = \frac{p}{q}$  leads easily to  $p^2 = 2q^2$ . From that point, the various methods take different and interesting pathways. One of those methods, for example, depends on the fundamental law of arithmetic. The argument is that because  $p^2$  contains an even number of 2s in its unique prime factorisation, it cannot be equal to  $2q^2$  because  $2q^2$  contains an odd number of them.

Another develops a parity argument. Given  $p^2 = 2q^2$  with  $\frac{p}{q}$  in lowest terms, if  $q$  is even, then  $p$  is even, and there is an immediate contradiction because  $\frac{p}{q}$  is already in lowest terms. If  $q$  is odd however, then  $p$  is still even, but then  $p^2 = 2q^2$  becomes  $(2m)^2 = 2(n+1)^2$  and that also leads to a contradiction.

Another type of proof is known as a **proof by infinite descent**. Here are two examples for the same positive integers  $p$  and  $q$ .

### **Proof 1**

From  $p^2 = 2q^2$  it is obvious that  $p > q > 0$ , and, because the right-hand side is clearly even, so also must  $p$  be even. So, for integer  $r$ , let  $p = 2r$  so that  $4r^2 = 2q^2$  simplifying to  $q^2 = 2r^2$  (note that  $p > q > r > 0$ ).

However, this last equation has exactly the same form as the first one. Therefore, repeating the procedure for another integer  $s$  leads to  $r^2 = 2s^2$  with  $p > q > r > s > 0$ . Each time the new integer gets smaller and smaller so that eventually the stock of available integers is exhausted irrespective of the choice of our starting integer  $p$ . It is a descent into an inevitable contradiction.

### **Proof 2**

From  $p^2 = 2q^2$ , subtract  $pq$  from both sides and factorise so that  $p(p - q) = q(2q - p)$  and thus  $\frac{p}{q} = \frac{2q-p}{p-q}$ . Since we know that  $1 < \sqrt{2}$  we can write that  $1 < \frac{p}{q}$  and consequently that  $q < p$ ,  $2q < 2p$  and, subtracting  $p$  from both sides,  $2q - p < p$ . Also, since we know that  $\sqrt{2} < 2$  we can write that  $\frac{p}{q} < 2$  and consequently  $p < 2q$  and thus  $p - q < q$ .

But this implies that there are two distinct but equal rational expressions for  $\sqrt{2}$ , with the new expression, say  $\frac{p_2}{q_2} = \frac{2q-p}{p-q}$  having both  $p_2$  and  $q_2$  respectively less than the numerator and denominator of  $\frac{p}{q}$ .

We could repeat the same procedure for  $\frac{p_2}{q_2}$  to derive a third expression  $\frac{p_3}{q_3}$  for  $\sqrt{2}$  whose numerator and denominator would each be less than those of  $\frac{p_2}{q_2}$ . This process will descend to a contradiction.

*Challenge 13: Prove the irrationality of  $\sqrt{p}$  for all prime  $p$  by using a proof that depends on the fundamental theorem of arithmetic.*