

\mathbb{R} is a complete ordered field including two special elements 0, 1 (zero, one) with +, \cdot (addition, multiplication), and order

$x \leq y \iff x < y \text{ or } x = y$, strictly smaller or equal
 i.e. $x < y \iff x \leq y \text{ and } x \neq y$.
 SATISFYING the following "axioms" I, II, and III:

I (field axiom):

- (i) $(x+y)+z = x+(y+z)$ for all x, y, z in \mathbb{R} (i.e. $\forall x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$);
- (ii) $x+0 = 0+x = x$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (iii) $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \exists (-x) \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $x+(-x) = (-x)+x = 0$;
- (iv) $x+y = y+x$, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (v) $0 \neq 1$;
- (vi) $(xy)z = x(yz)$ $\forall x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$ (here and throughout xy means $x \cdot y$).
- (vii) $x \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot x = x$ $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (viii) $\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \exists x^{-1} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ s.t. $x x^{-1} = x^{-1} x = 1$;
- (ix) $xy = yx$ $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (x) $x(y+z) = xy + xz$ & $(y+z)x = yx + zx$ $\forall x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$.

II. Order-field axiom

II.1) trichotomy property: $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, exactly one and only one of the following cases will

happen: ① $x < y$,

② $x = y$

③ $y < x$ (i.e. $x > y$)

(so $x \leq y, y \leq x \implies x = y$; why? — Exercise!)

(N-I) $X = \{0\}$ satisfies I except (v).

Apart from \mathbb{R} , there are many other systems satisfying Axiom I, e.g.,

\mathbb{Q} (of rational numbers), satisfies I, II.

(N-I & II). With $+$ & \times defined below for $\{0, 1\}$ ($0 \neq 1$) it is not possible to define an order $<$ satisfying all I & II.

$0 + 1 \equiv 1 + 0 \equiv 1$,
 $1 + 1 = 0$. ($0 \cdot 0 = 0, 0 \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot 0 = 0, 1 \cdot 1 = 1$)

equivalently $\{0, 1\}$ to be defined as $\mathbb{Z}/\text{mod. } 2$.

$x \sim y$ iff $x - y$ divisible by 2

($x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$, integers)

Then $\{0, 1\}$ ($= \mathbb{Z}/\text{mod. } 2$) does Not satisfy II (should $1 < 0$ then $0 = 1 + 1 < 0 + 1 = 1$ leads a contradiction; therefore $1 > 0$ (as $1 \neq 0$,

& make use of the trichotomy property)

However $1 > 0$ also leads a contradiction in the system $\{0, 1\}$ because of the translation property.

Note

1. Uniqueness in (ii), (iii), (vii), (viii), e.g. for (viii):

Suppose $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $x^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x' \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t.

$$x x' = x^{-1} x = 1 \quad \neq$$

$$x x' = x' x = 1$$

Then

$$x^{-1} = 1 \cdot x^{-1} = (x' x) x^{-1} = x' \cdot 1 = x'$$

II.2) Transitive : $x < y, y < z \Rightarrow x < z$

II.3) compatible w.r.t. $+$

\wedge w.r.t. positive multiplication, i.e.

$$x < y \Rightarrow x + z < y + z \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R} \quad (\text{"translation invariant"})$$

$$x < y \wedge 0 < \lambda \Rightarrow \lambda x < \lambda y$$

III Order-Complete axiom :

If A is a nonempty subset of \mathbb{R} and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a \leq \lambda \quad \forall a \in A$ (i.e. λ is an upper bound of A) then there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ the smallest upper bound of A , i.e.

① λ_0 is an upper bound of A : $a \leq \lambda_0 \quad \forall a \in A$,

② $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ whenever λ is an upper bound of A .

Note. ② can be stated equivalently as

②* If $\lambda < \lambda_0$ then $\exists a \in A$ s.t. $a > \lambda$.

(i) - (iv) can be summarized as

$(\mathbb{R}, +)$ is a commutative (Abelian) group.

(vi) - (ix) equivalent to saying that

$(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \cdot)$ is a commutative group

(i) - (x) can be stated as \mathbb{R} is a field

I & II together means that \mathbb{R} is
an ordered field.

Remark. The property $1 \cdot 0 = 0$ can
be proved by the other properties of \mathbb{R} :

$$1 \cdot 0 = 1 \cdot (0 + 0) = 1 \cdot 0 + 1 \cdot 0$$

and so $1 \cdot 0 = 0$ (by adding the
"inverse" (w.r.t $+$) $-(1 \cdot 0)$ of $(1 \cdot 0)$)

Notes & Ex. (not yet need III)

1. Uniqueness

2. Usual "Cancellation Laws" hold (in \mathbb{R} :)
only need I

$$x+z = y+z \Rightarrow x=y$$

$$xz = yz, z \neq 0 \Rightarrow x=y$$

3. $(-1)x = -x$ (\because LHS has the property
 $(-1)x+x = (-1+1)x = 0 \cdot x = 0$
- now apply the uniqueness
of 'additive inverse'

4. $(-1)(-1) = 1$ (\because LHS has the property
 $(-1)(-1)+(-1) = ((-1)+1) \cdot (-1) = 0 \cdot (-1) = 0$
 $\therefore (-1)(-1)$ is the additive inverse of -1

$$5. x < y \Leftrightarrow -y < -x \left(\Leftrightarrow 0 < y-x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y+(-x) \right)$$

$(x < y \Rightarrow x+(-x) < y+(-x) \Rightarrow 0 < y+(-x))$.

$$6. 0 < x \text{ \& } 0 < y \Rightarrow 0 < x < x+y$$

$$7. x_i < y_i \text{ (} i=1,2 \text{) } \Rightarrow x_1+x_2 < y_1+y_2$$

8. If $x \neq 0$ then $0 < x^2 (= (-x)^2)$, where
 $x^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \cdot x$. (Proof. Consider two cases,
 $0 < x$ \& $0 < (-x)$ (noting $x \neq 0$, the
assumption).

Natural Numbers & Math. Induction (MI).
(Only use axioms I & II).

Definition. \mathbb{N} is defined to be the smallest subset of \mathbb{R} s.t.

(i) $1 \in \mathbb{N}$

(ii) \mathbb{N} is inductive :

$$x \in \mathbb{N} \Rightarrow x+1 \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Math Induction (MI). Suppose $P(n)$ is a statement for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$P(1)$ is true;

$P(n+1)$ is true whenever $P(n)$ is true.

Then $P(n)$ is true $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{n \in \mathbb{N} : P(n) \text{ is true}\}$.

Then Z is inductive and $1 \in Z$.

Since $Z \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ it follows from the "smallest property" stated in the def of \mathbb{N} that

$Z = \mathbb{N}$ and so $P(n)$ is true $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$

Extended MI. Suppose that

(i)* $P(1)$ is true

(ii)* If $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$P(k)$ is true for all $k = 1, \dots, n$
then $P(n+1)$.

Then $P(n)$ is true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $Q(n)$ denote the combined statement of $P(1), P(2), \dots, P(n)$.

Thus $Q(1)$ is the same as $P(1)$, and

note that $Q(n)$ holds means that

$P(1), P(2), \dots, P(n)$ hold. The

given (i)* and (ii)* can be restated as

(i) $Q(1)$ is true

(ii) $Q(n)$ is true $\Rightarrow Q(n+1)$ is true.

Now apply MI to $Q(n)$.

Cor 1. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a finite set
 (say $\#(X) = n$, i.e. there are $n \in \mathbb{N}$
 many distinct elements in X). Then
 X has a (the) greatest element
 " " " smallest element

Proof. By M.I. (Exercise)

Cor 2. 1 is the smallest element in \mathbb{N}
 and \mathbb{N} is an infinite set (that is, not
 a finite set).

Proof. Let

$$\mathbb{N}_0 = 1 \cup \{n \in \mathbb{N} : 1 < n\}$$

Then, as \mathbb{N}_0 is seen to be inductive
 and contains 1, one has $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N}$ and
 so any $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ is bigger than 1.

For the 2nd assertion, note that any
 $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is smaller than $n+1$ (which is

also in \mathbb{N}), so \mathbb{N} does not have a largest element; and hence \mathbb{N} must not be finite by Cor 1.

Cor 3. Let $2 := 1+1$, $3 := 2+1$ etc. Then

$$1 < 2 < 3 < 4 < \dots$$

(so all distinct) and, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$(n, n+1) \cap \mathbb{N} = \emptyset$, thus informally, $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{N}_1 := \{1\} \cup \{n \in \mathbb{N} : 2 \leq n\}$.

Similar as before $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}_1$ and so $\nexists n \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $1 < n < 2$ (since any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ should be either 1 or $2 \leq n$). Similarly $\mathbb{N}_2 = \mathbb{N}$ where

$$\mathbb{N}_2 := \{1, 2\} \cup \{n \in \mathbb{N} : 3 \leq n\}$$

and so $(2, 3) \cap \mathbb{N} = \emptyset$. In general,

$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ one has $(n, n+1) \cap \mathbb{N} = \emptyset$ (you are invited to check this via extended MI).

Well-Order Principle for \mathbb{N} . Let X be a nonempty set of natural numbers.

(I) If X is finite then it has the smallest and the largest elements.

(II) X has the largest elements if and only if (iff) there exists a natural number n dominating (bigger than or equal to) every members of X . [Hint on Proof: induction over n].

Let Z denote the set of all integers, that is $Z = \{ n: n = 0, \text{ or } n \text{ is a natural number or } -n \text{ is a natural number.} \}$.

Generalised Well-Order Principle for Z . Let X be a nonempty subset of Z .

(I) Let n be a natural number such that $-n < x$ for all x in X (such n does exist in the case when Z is finite).

Then $\{n+x: x \text{ in } X\}$ is a subset of \mathbb{N} .

(II) If X is finite then it has the smallest and the largest elements.

(III) X is finite iff there exist natural numbers n and m such that $-n < x < m$ for all x in X .

