



planetmath.org

Math for the people, by the people.

properties of well-ordered sets

Canonical name	PropertiesOfWellorderedSets
Date of creation	2013-03-22 15:23:42
Last modified on	2013-03-22 15:23:42
Owner	GrafZahl (9234)
Last modified by	GrafZahl (9234)
Numerical id	10
Author	GrafZahl (9234)
Entry type	Theorem
Classification	msc 06A05
Synonym	initial segment
Defines	section

The purpose of this entry is to collect properties of well-ordered sets. We denote all orderings uniformly by \leq . If you are interested in history, have a look at [?].

The following properties are easy to see:

- If A is a totally ordered set such that for every subset $B \subseteq A$ the set of all elements of A strictly greater than the elements of B ,

$$B_{>} := \{a \in A \setminus B \mid b \leq a \text{ for all } b \in B\},$$

is either empty or has a least element, then A is well-ordered.

- Every subset of a well-ordered set is well-ordered.
- If A is well-ordered and B is a poset such that there is a bijective order morphism $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$, then B is well-ordered.

Now we define an important ingredient for understanding the structure of well-ordered sets.

Definition 1 (section). Let A be well-ordered. Then for every $a \in A$ we define the *section* of a :

$$\hat{a} := \{b \in A \mid b \leq a\}.$$

A section is also known as an *initial segment*. We denote the set of all sections of A by \hat{A} . This set is ordered by inclusion.

Theorem 1. *Let A be a well-ordered set. Then the mapping $\hat{\cdot}: A \rightarrow \hat{A}$ defined by $a \mapsto \hat{a}$ is a bijective order morphism. In particular, \hat{A} is well-ordered.*

Proof. Let $a, b \in A$ with $a \leq b$. Then $\hat{a} \subseteq \hat{b}$, so $\hat{\cdot}$ is an order morphism. Now assume that $\hat{a} = \hat{b}$. If a didn't equal b , we would have $b \notin \hat{a}$, leading to a contradiction. Therefore $\hat{\cdot}$ is injective. Now let $C \in \hat{A}$, then there exists a $c \in A$ such that $\hat{c} = C$, so $\hat{\cdot}$ is surjective. \square

Theorem 2. *Let A and B be well-ordered sets and $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$ a bijective order morphism. Then there exists a bijective order morphism $\hat{\varphi}: \hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{B}$ such that for all $a \in A$*

$$\hat{\varphi}(\hat{a}) = \widehat{\varphi(a)}.$$

Proof. Setting $\widehat{\varphi}(\widehat{a}) := \widehat{\varphi(a)}$ is well-defined by Theorem ???. The rest of the theorem follows since $\widehat{\cdot}$ and φ are bijective order morphisms. \square

Theorem 3. *Let A be a well-ordered set and $a \in A$ such that there is an injective order morphism $\varphi: A \rightarrow \widehat{a}$. Then $A = \widehat{a}$.*

Proof. The image of a section of A under φ has a maximal element which in turn defines a smaller section of A . We may therefore define the following two monotonically decreasing sequences of sets:

$$\begin{aligned} B_0 &:= \varphi(\widehat{a}), & A_0 &:= \text{section defined by maximal element of } B_0, \\ B_n &:= \varphi(A_{n-1}), & A_n &:= \text{section defined by maximal element of } B_n. \end{aligned}$$

Now \widehat{A} is well-ordered, so the set defined by the elements of the sequence (A_n) has a minimal element, that is $A_N = A_{N+1}$ and hence $B_N = B_{N+1}$ for some sufficiently large N . Applying φ^{-1} $N+1$ times to the latter equation yields $\widehat{a} = A_0$, that is a is the maximal element of B , and thus of A . \square

Theorem 4. *Let A and B be well-ordered sets. Then there exists at most one bijective order morphism $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi, \psi: A \rightarrow B$ be two bijective order morphisms. Let $a \in A$ and set $b := \varphi(a)$ and $c := \psi(a)$. Then the restrictions $\varphi|_{\widehat{a}}: \widehat{a} \rightarrow \widehat{b}$ and $\psi|_{\widehat{a}}: \widehat{a} \rightarrow \widehat{c}$ are bijective order morphisms, so the restriction of $\psi\varphi^{-1}$ to \widehat{b} is a bijective order morphism to \widehat{c} . Now either $\widehat{b} \subseteq \widehat{c}$ or $\widehat{c} \subseteq \widehat{b}$, so by Theorem ??? $\widehat{b} = \widehat{c}$, hence $b = c$ and thus $\varphi = \psi$. \square

Theorem 5. *Let A and B be well-ordered sets such that for every section $\widehat{a} \in \widehat{A}$ there is a bijective order morphism to a section $\widehat{b} \in \widehat{B}$ and vice-versa, then there is a bijective order morphism $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$.*

Proof. Let $a \in A$ and let $\widehat{b} \in \widehat{B}$ be a section such that there is a bijective order morphism $\psi_a: \widehat{a} \rightarrow \widehat{b}$. By Theorem ??, \widehat{b} is unique, and so is ψ_a by Theorem ???. Defining $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$ by setting $\varphi(a) = b$ gives therefore a well-defined (by Theorem ???) and injective order morphism. But φ is also surjective, since any $b \in B$ maps uniquely to A via $\widehat{b} \rightarrow \widehat{a}$, and back again by φ . \square

Theorem 6. *Let A and B be well-ordered sets. Then there is an injective order morphism $\iota: A \rightarrow B$ or $\iota: B \rightarrow A$. If ι cannot be chosen bijective, then it can at least be chosen such that its image is a section.*

Proof. Let \widehat{A}_0 be the set of sections of A from which there is an injective order morphism to B . If \widehat{A}_0 is the empty set, then B must be empty, since otherwise we could map the least element of A to B . If \widehat{A}_0 is not empty, we may consider the set $A_0 := \cap \widehat{A}_0$. If $A_0 = A$, nothing remains to be shown. Otherwise the set $A \setminus A_0$ is nonempty and hence has a least element $a_0 \in A$. By construction, there is no injective order morphism from \widehat{a}_0 to B , but there is an injective order morphism from $\varphi_a: \widehat{a} \rightarrow B$ for every element $a \in A$ which is strictly smaller than a_0 . Now assume there is an element $b \in B$ such that there is no injective order morphism from $\widehat{b} \rightarrow A$. Then we can similarly construct a least element $b_0 \in B$ for which there is no injective order morphism $\widehat{b}_0 \rightarrow A$. Surely, b_0 is greater than all the elements from the images of the functions φ_a , but then there is a bijective order morphism from \widehat{a}_0 to \widehat{b}_0 by Theorem ?? which is a contradiction. Therefore, all sections of B and B itself map injectively and order-preserving to A . \square

Theorem 7. *Let A be a well-ordered set and $B \subseteq A$ a nonempty subset. Then there is a bijective order morphism from B to one of the sets in $\widehat{A} \cup \{A\}$.*

Proof. The set B is well-ordered with respect to the order induced by A . Assume a bijective order morphism as stated by the theorem does not exist. Then, by virtue of Theorem ??, there is an injective but not surjective order morphism $\iota: A \rightarrow B$ whose image is a section $\widehat{b} \in \widehat{B}$. The element b defines a section in \widehat{A} which is identical to A by Theorem ??. Thus ι is surjective which is a contradiction. \square

References

- [C] G. CANTOR, Beiträge zur Begründung der transfiniten Mengenlehre (Zweiter Artikel), *Math. Ann.* 49, 207–246 (1897).