Script 7

The Field Axioms

7.1 Journal

1/28: **Definition 7.1.** A **binary operation** on a set X is a function

$$f : X \times X \to X$$

We say that f is **associative** if

$$f(f(x, y), z) = f(x, f(y, z)) \quad \text{for all } x, y, z \in X$$

We say that f is **commutative** if

$$f(x, y) = f(y, x) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X$$

An **identity element** of a binary operation f is an element $e \in X$ such that

$$f(x, e) = f(e, x) = x \quad \text{for all } x \in X$$

Remark 7.2. Frequently, we denote a binary operation differently. If $* : X \times X \to X$ is the binary operation, we often write $a * b$ in place of $*(a, b)$. We sometimes indicate this same operation by writing $(a, b) \mapsto a * b$.

Exercise 7.3. Rewrite Definition 7.1 using the notation of Remark 7.2.

Answer. A **binary operation** on a set X is a function

$$* : X \times X \to X$$

We say that $*$ is **associative** if

$$(x * y) * z = x * (y * z) \quad \text{for all } x, y, z \in X$$

We say that $*$ is **commutative** if

$$x * y = y * x \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X$$

An **identity element** of a binary operation $*$ is an element $e \in X$ such that

$$x * e = e * x = x \quad \text{for all } x \in X$$

□

Examples 7.4.

1. *The function $+ : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ which sends a pair of integers (m, n) to $+(m, n) = m + n$ is a binary operation on the integers, called addition. Addition is associative, commutative, and has identity element 0.*

2. *The maximum of m and n, denoted $\max(m,n)$, is an associative and commutative binary operation on $\mathbb{Z}$. Is there an identity element for $\max$?*

   Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists an identity element e for max. But $\max(e-1,e) = e \neq e-1$, a contradiction. Therefore, no identity element exists for max. $\square$

3. *Let $\wp(Y)$ be the power set of a set Y. Recall that the power set consists of all subsets of Y. Then the intersection of sets, $(A,B) \mapsto A \cap B$, defines an associative and commutative binary operation on $\wp(Y)$. Is there an identity element for $\cap$?*

   Proof. Clearly, $Y \in \wp(Y)$. By Script 1, $Y \cap A = A \cap Y = A$ where $A \subset Y$. Therefore, Y is an identity element for $\cap$. $\square$

Exercise 7.5. Find a binary operation on a set that is not commutative. Find a binary operation on a set that is not associative.

Proof. We will prove that the subtraction operation on the integers ($- : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$) is not commutative or associative. To prove that it's not commutative, Definition 7.1 tells us that it will suffice to show that $x - y \neq y - x$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $2-1=1$ but $1-2=-1$, we can see that $1, 2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ clearly meet this requirement. To prove that it's not associative, Definition 7.1 tells us that it will suffice to show that $(x-y)-z \neq x-(y-z)$ for some $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $(3-2)-1=0$ but $3-(2-1)=2$, we can see that $1, 2, 3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ clearly meet this requirement. $\square$

Exercise 7.6. Let X be a finite set, and let $Y = \{f : X \to X \mid f \text{ is bijective}\}$. Consider the binary operation of composition of functions, denoted $\circ : Y \times Y \to Y$ and defined by $(f \circ g)(x) = f(g(x))$ as seen in Definition 1.25. Decide whether or not composition is commutative and/or associative and whether or not it has an identity.

Proof. To prove that composition is not commutative, Definition 7.1 tells us that it will suffice to find a finite set X paired with two bijections in Y that do not commute. Let $X = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and consider the bijections $f : X \to X$ (defined by $f(1) = 2$, $f(2) = 3$, $f(3) = 1$) and $g : X \to X$ (defined by $g(1) = 1$, $g(2) = 3$, $g(3) = 2$). In this case, $f \circ g$ would be defined by $f(g(1)) = 2$, $f(g(2)) = 1$, and $f(g(3)) = 3$, but $g \circ f$ would be defined by $g(f(1)) = 3$, $g(f(2)) = 2$, and $g(f(3)) = 1$.

To prove that composition is associative, Definition 7.1 tells us that it will suffice to show that $((f \circ g) \circ h)(x) = (f \circ (g \circ h))(x)$. We may do this with the following algebra.

$$\begin{aligned}
((f \circ g) \circ h)(x) &= (f \circ g)(h(x)) \\
&= f(g(h(x))) \\
&= f((g \circ h)(x)) \\
&= (f \circ (g \circ h))(x)
\end{aligned}$$

With respect to any finite set X, there will always be a bijection $i : X \to X$ defined by $i(x) = x$. To prove that i is an identity element, Definition 7.1 tells us that it will suffice to show that for all $f \in Y$, $f \circ i = i \circ f = f$. We may do this with the following algebra.

$$\begin{aligned}
(f \circ i)(x) &= f(i(x)) \\
&= f(x) \\
&= i(f(x)) \\
&= (i \circ f)(x)
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Theorem 7.7. *Identity elements are unique. That is, suppose that f is a binary operation on a set X that has two identity elements e and e'. Then $e = e'$.*

Proof. Let $f : X \times X \to X$ be a binary operation on a set X with two identity elements e, e'. By Definition 7.1, we know that $f(e, e') = e$ and $f(e, e') = e'$. Since f is a well-defined function by definition, it must be that $e = f(e, e') = e'$. $\square$

Definition 7.8. A **field** is a set F with two binary operations on F called addition, denoted $+$, and multiplication, denoted $\cdot$, satisfying the following **field axioms**:

FA1 (Commutativity of Addition) For all $x, y \in F$, $x + y = y + x$.

FA2 (Associativity of Addition) For all $x, y, z \in F$, $(x + y) + z = x + (y + z)$.

FA3 (Additive Identity) There exists an element $0 \in F$ such that $x + 0 = 0 + x = x$ for all $x \in F$.

FA4 (Additive Inverses) For any $x \in F$, there exists $y \in F$ such that $x + y = y + x = 0$, called an additive inverse of x.

FA5 (Commutativity of Multiplication) For all $x, y \in F$, $x \cdot y = y \cdot x$.

FA6 (Associativity of Multiplication) For all $x, y, z \in F$, $(x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z)$.

FA7 (Multiplicative Identity) There exists an element $1 \in F$ such that $x \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot x = x$ for all $x \in F$.

FA8 (Multiplicative Inverses) For any $x \in F$ such that $x \neq 0$, there exists $y \in F$ such that $x \cdot y = y \cdot x = 1$, called a multiplicative inverse of x.

FA9 (Distributivity of Multiplication over Addition) For all $x, y, z \in F$, $x \cdot (y + z) = x \cdot y + x \cdot z$.

FA10 (Distinct Additive and Multiplicative Identities) $1 \neq 0$.

Exercise 7.9. Consider the set $\mathbb{F}_2 = \{0, 1\}$, and define binary operations $+$ and $\cdot$ on $\mathbb{F}_2$ by

$$\begin{array}{cccc} 0+0=0 & 0+1=1 & 1+0=1 & 1+1=0 \\ 0\cdot 0=0 & 0\cdot 1=0 & 1\cdot 0=0 & 1\cdot 1=1 \end{array}$$

Show that $\mathbb{F}_2$ is a field.

Proof. To prove that $\mathbb{F}_2$ obeys FA1 from Definition 7.8, it will suffice to show that $0+0 = 0+0$, $0+1 = 1+0$, and $1+1 = 1+1$. The first and third of these are evidently true. For the second, we have $0+1 = 1 = 1+0$, so it is good, too.

To prove that $\mathbb{F}_2$ obeys FA2 from Definition 7.8, the following casework will suffice.

$$\begin{array}{ll} (0+0)+0 = 0 = 0+(0+0) & (0+0)+1 = 1 = 0+(0+1) \\ (0+1)+0 = 1 = 0+(1+0) & (1+0)+0 = 1 = 1+(0+0) \\ (0+1)+1 = 0 = 0+(1+1) & (1+1)+0 = 0 = 1+(1+0) \\ (1+0)+1 = 0 = 1+(0+1) & (1+1)+1 = 1 = 1+(1+1) \end{array}$$

To prove that $\mathbb{F}_2$ obeys FA3 from Definition 7.8, it will suffice to find an element $0 \in \mathbb{F}_2$ such that $x + 0 = 0 + x = x$. Since $0 + 0 = 0$, $1 + 0 = 0$, and with commutativity, it is clear that 0 is an additive identity in $\mathbb{F}_2$.

To prove that $\mathbb{F}_2$ obeys FA4 from Definition 7.8, it will suffice to show that for all $x \in \mathbb{F}_2$, there exists a $y \in \mathbb{F}_2$ such that $x + y = y + x = 0$. For 0, this object is 0 (since $0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0$), and for 1, this object is 1 (since $1 + 1 = 1 + 1 = 0$).

To prove that $\mathbb{F}_2$ obeys FA5 from Definition 7.8, it will suffice to show that $0 \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot 0$, $0 \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot 0$, and $1 \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot 1$. The first and third of these are evidently true. For the second, we have $0 \cdot 1 = 0 = 1 \cdot 0$, so it is good, too.

To prove that $\mathbb{F}_2$ obeys FA6 from Definition 7.8, the following casework will suffice.

$$\begin{array}{ll} (0\cdot 0)\cdot 0 = 0 = 0\cdot(0\cdot 0) & (0\cdot 0)\cdot 1 = 0 = 0\cdot(0\cdot 1) \\ (0\cdot 1)\cdot 0 = 0 = 0\cdot(1\cdot 0) & (1\cdot 0)\cdot 0 = 0 = 1\cdot(0\cdot 0) \\ (0\cdot 1)\cdot 1 = 0 = 0\cdot(1\cdot 1) & (1\cdot 1)\cdot 0 = 0 = 1\cdot(1\cdot 0) \\ (1\cdot 0)\cdot 1 = 0 = 1\cdot(0\cdot 1) & (1\cdot 1)\cdot 1 = 1 = 1\cdot(1\cdot 1) \end{array}$$

To prove that $\mathbb{F}_2$ obeys FA7 from Definition 7.8, it will suffice to find an element $1 \in \mathbb{F}_2$ such that $x \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot x = x$. Since $0 \cdot 1 = 0$, $1 \cdot 1 = 1$, and with commutativity, it is clear that 1 is a multiplicative identity in $\mathbb{F}_2$.

To prove that $\mathbb{F}_2$ obeys FA8 from Definition 7.8, it will suffice to show that for all $x \in \mathbb{F}_2$ such that $x \neq 0$, there exists a $y \in \mathbb{F}_2$ such that $x \cdot y = y \cdot x = 1$. For 1, this object is 1 (since $1 \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot 1 = 1$).

To prove that $\mathbb{F}_2$ obeys FA9 from Definition 7.8, the following casework will suffice.

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \cdot (0+0) &= 0 = 0 \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 0 & \qquad 0 \cdot (0+1) &= 0 = 0 \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 1 \\
0 \cdot (1+0) &= 0 = 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 0 & \qquad 1 \cdot (0+0) &= 0 = 1 \cdot 0 + 1 \cdot 0 \\
0 \cdot (1+1) &= 0 = 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 & \qquad 1 \cdot (1+0) &= 1 = 1 \cdot 1 + 1 \cdot 0 \\
1 \cdot (0+1) &= 1 = 1 \cdot 0 + 1 \cdot 1 & \qquad 1 \cdot (1+1) &= 0 = 1 \cdot 1 + 1 \cdot 1
\end{aligned}$$

To prove that $\mathbb{F}_2$ obeys FA10 from Definition 7.8, it will suffice to show that $0 \neq 1$. Clearly this is true. ☐

Theorem 7.10. *Suppose that F is a field. Then additive inverses are unique. This means: Let $x \in F$. If $y, y' \in F$ satisfy $x + y = 0$ and $x + y' = 0$, then $y = y'$.*

Proof. Let $x, y, y' \in F$ be such that $x + y = 0$ and $x + y' = 0$. From Definition 7.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
y' + (x+y) &= (y'+x) + y && \text{FA2} \\
y' + 0 &= 0 + y && \text{FA4} \\
y' &= y && \text{FA3}
\end{aligned}$$

☐

We usually write $-x$ for the additive inverse of x.

Corollary 7.11. *If $x \in F$, then $-(-x) = x$.*

Proof. Let $x \in F$. Then by consecutive applications of FA4 from Definition 7.8, $-x + (-(-x)) = 0$ and $-x + x = 0$. Therefore, by Theorem 7.10, we have that $-(-x) = x$. ☐

Theorem 7.12. *Let F be a field, and let $a, b, c \in F$. If $a + b = a + c$, then $b = c$.*

Proof. Let $a, b, c \in F$ be such that $a + b = a + c$. By FA4 from Definition 7.8, there exists $-a \in F$ such that $-a + a = a + (-a) = 0$. Having established that $-a$ exists, we can prove from Definition 7.8 that

$$\begin{aligned}
-a + (a+b) &= -a + (a+c) \\
(-a+a) + b &= (-a+a) + c && \text{FA2} \\
0 + b &= 0 + c && \text{FA4} \\
b &= c && \text{FA3}
\end{aligned}$$

☐

Theorem 7.13. *Let F be a field. If $a \in F$, then $a \cdot 0 = 0$.*

Proof. Let $a \in F$. From Definition 7.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= a \cdot 1 && \text{FA7} \\
&= a \cdot (1+0) && \text{FA3} \\
&= a \cdot 1 + a \cdot 0 && \text{FA9} \\
&= a + a \cdot 0 && \text{FA7} \\
0 &= a \cdot 0 && \text{Theorem 7.12}
\end{aligned}$$

☐

2/2: **Theorem 7.14.** *Suppose that F is a field. Then multiplicative inverses are unique. This means: Let $x \in F$. If $y, y' \in F$ satisfy $x \cdot y = 1$ and $x \cdot y' = 1$, then $y = y'$.*

Proof. Let $x, y, y' \in F$ be such that $x \cdot y = 1$ and $x \cdot y' = 1$. From Definition 7.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (y \cdot x) \cdot y' &= y \cdot (x \cdot y') && \text{FA6} \\ 1 \cdot y' &= y \cdot 1 && \text{FA8} \\ y' &= y && \text{FA7} \end{aligned}$$

□

We usually write x^{-1} or $\frac{1}{x}$ for the multiplicative inverse of x.

Corollary 7.15. *If $x \in F$ and $x \neq 0$, then $(x^{-1})^{-1} = x$.*

Proof. Let $x \in F \setminus \{0\}$. Then by FA8 from Definition 7.8, there exists $x^{-1} \in F$ such that $x \cdot x^{-1} = x^{-1} \cdot x = 1$. It follows from Theorem 7.13 that $x^{-1} \neq 0$ (if $x^{-1} = 0$, then Theorem 7.13 would imply that $x \cdot x^{-1} = 0$, a contradiction). Thus, by FA8 from Definition 7.8 again, there exists $(x^{-1})^{-1} \in F$ such that $x^{-1} \cdot (x^{-1})^{-1} = (x^{-1})^{-1} \cdot x^{-1} = 1$. Having established that $(x^{-1})^{-1}$ exists, $x^{-1} \cdot (x^{-1})^{-1} = 1$, and $x^{-1} \cdot x = 1$, we have by Theorem 7.14 that $(x^{-1})^{-1} = x$. □

Theorem 7.16. *Let F be a field, and let $a, b, c \in F$. If $a \cdot b = a \cdot c$ and $a \neq 0$, then $b = c$.*

Proof. Let $a, b, c \in F$ be such that $a \cdot b = a \cdot c$ and $a \neq 0$. By FA8 from Definition 7.8, there exists $a^{-1} \in F$ such that $a \cdot a^{-1} = a^{-1} \cdot a = 1$. Having established that a^{-1} exists, we can prove from Definition 7.8 that

$$\begin{aligned} a^{-1} \cdot (a \cdot b) &= a^{-1} \cdot (a \cdot c) && \\ (a^{-1} \cdot a) \cdot b &= (a^{-1} \cdot a) \cdot c && \text{FA6} \\ 1 \cdot b &= 1 \cdot c && \text{FA8} \\ b &= c && \text{FA7} \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 7.17. *Let F be a field, and let $a, b \in F$. If $a \cdot b = 0$, then $a = 0$ or $b = 0$.*

Proof. Let $a, b \in F$ be such that $a \cdot b = 0$, and suppose for the sake of contradiction that $a \neq 0$ and $b \neq 0$. It follows from the supposition by consecutive applications of FA8 from Definition 7.8 that a^{-1} and b^{-1} exist. Thus, from Definition 7.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= 1 \cdot 1 && \text{FA7} \\ &= (a \cdot a^{-1}) \cdot (b \cdot b^{-1}) && \text{FA8} \\ &= (a \cdot b) \cdot (a^{-1} \cdot b^{-1}) && \text{FA6 and FA7} \\ &= 0 \cdot (a^{-1} \cdot b^{-1}) && \text{Substitution} \\ &= 0 && \text{Theorem 7.13} \end{aligned}$$

But this contradicts FA10 from Definition 7.8. □

Lemma 7.18. *Let F be a field. If $a \in F$, then $-a = (-1)a$.*

Proof. Let $a \in F$. From Definition 7.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= 0 \cdot a && \text{Theorem 7.13} \\ a + (-a) &= (1 + (-1)) \cdot a && \text{FA4} \\ a + (-a) &= 1 \cdot a + (-1) \cdot a && \text{FA9} \\ a + (-a) &= a + (-1)a && \text{FA7} \\ -a &= (-1)a && \text{Theorem 7.12} \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7.19. *Let F be a field. If $a, b \in F$, then $a \cdot (-b) = -(a \cdot b) = (-a) \cdot b$.*

Proof. Let $a, b \in F$. From Definition 7.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a \cdot (-b) &= a \cdot ((-1) \cdot b) && \text{Lemma 7.18}\\
&= a \cdot (b \cdot (-1)) && \text{FA5}\\
&= (a \cdot b) \cdot (-1) && \text{FA6}\\
&= (-1) \cdot (a \cdot b) && \text{FA5}\\
&\boxed{= -(a \cdot b)} && \text{Lemma 7.18}\\
&= (-1) \cdot (a \cdot b) && \text{Lemma 7.18}\\
&= ((-1) \cdot a) \cdot b && \text{FA6}\\
&\boxed{= (-a) \cdot b} && \text{Lemma 7.18}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7.20. *Let F be a field. If $a, b \in F$, then $a \cdot b = (-a) \cdot (-b)$.*

Proof. Let $a, b \in F$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(-a) \cdot (-b) &= -(-a) \cdot b && \text{Lemma 7.19}\\
&= a \cdot b && \text{Corollary 7.11}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 7.21. An **ordered field** is a field F equipped with an ordering $<$ (satisfying Definition 3.1) such that also:

(a) Addition respects the ordering: if $x < y$, then $x + z < y + z$ for all $z \in F$.

(b) Multiplication respects the ordering: if $0 < x$ and $0 < y$, then $0 < x \cdot y$.

Definition 7.22. Suppose F is an ordered field and $x \in F$. If $0 < x$, we say that x is **positive**. If $x < 0$, we say that x is **negative**.

Lemma 7.23. *Let F be an ordered field, and let $x \in F$. If $0 < x$, then $-x < 0$. Similarly, if $x < 0$, then $0 < -x$.*

Proof. Let $x \in F$ be such that $0 < x$. Then by Definition 7.21a, $0 + (-x) < x + (-x)$. Consequently, from Definition 7.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-x &< x + (-x) && \text{FA3}\\
-x &< 0 && \text{FA4}
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is symmetric if $x < 0$. □

Lemma 7.24. *Let F be an ordered field, and let $x, y, z \in F$.*

(*a*) *If $x > 0$ and $y < z$, then $x \cdot y < x \cdot z$.*

(*b*) *If $x < 0$ and $y < z$, then $x \cdot z < x \cdot y$.*

Proof of a. Let $x, y, z \in F$ be such that $x > 0$ and $y < z$. It follows from the latter condition by Definition 7.21a that $y + (-y) < z + (-y)$. Thus, by FA4 from Definition 7.8, we have $0 < z + (-y)$. This combined with the fact that $0 < x$ implies by Definition 7.21b that $0 < x \cdot (z + (-y))$. Consequently, from Definition 7.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< x \cdot z + x \cdot (-y) && \text{FA9} \\ 0 &< x \cdot z + (-(x \cdot y)) && \text{Lemma 7.19} \\ 0 + x \cdot y &< (x \cdot z + (-(x \cdot y))) + x \cdot y && \text{Definition 7.21a} \\ 0 + x \cdot y &< x \cdot z + (-(x \cdot y) + x \cdot y) && \text{FA2} \\ 0 + x \cdot y &< x \cdot z + 0 && \text{FA4} \\ x \cdot y &< x \cdot z && \text{FA3} \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of b. Let $x, y, z \in F$ be such that $x < 0$ and $y < z$. It follows from the former condition by Lemma 7.23 that $0 < -x$. Thus, by Lemma 7.24a, $(-x) \cdot y < (-x) \cdot z$. Consequently, from Definition 7.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -(x \cdot y) &< -(x \cdot z) && \text{Lemma 7.19} \\ -(x \cdot y) + (x \cdot y + x \cdot z) &< -(x \cdot z) + (x \cdot y + x \cdot z) && \text{Definition 7.21a} \\ -(x \cdot y) + (x \cdot y + x \cdot z) &< -(x \cdot z) + (x \cdot z + x \cdot y) && \text{FA1} \\ (-(x \cdot y) + x \cdot y) + x \cdot z &< (-(x \cdot z) + x \cdot z) + x \cdot y && \text{FA2} \\ 0 + x \cdot z &< 0 + x \cdot y && \text{FA4} \\ x \cdot z &< x \cdot y && \text{FA3} \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 7.25. An immediate consequence of this lemma is the fact that if x and y are both positive or both negative, their product is positive.

Lemma 7.26. *Let F be an ordered field, and let $x \in F$. Then $0 \leq x^2$. Moreover, if $x \neq 0$, then $0 < x^2$.*

Proof. We divide into two cases ($x = 0$ and $x \neq 0$). Suppose first that $x = 0$. Then by Theorem 7.13, $0 \leq 0 = 0 \cdot 0 = 0^2 = x^2$, as desired. Now suppose that $x \neq 0$. We divide into two cases again ($x > 0$ and $x < 0$). If $x > 0$, then by Lemma 7.24a, $x > 0$ and $0 < x$ imply that $x \cdot 0 < x \cdot x$, from which it follows by Theorem 7.13 that $0 < x^2$, as desired. On the other hand, if $x < 0$, then by Lemma 7.24b, $x < 0$ and $x < 0$ imply that $x \cdot 0 < x \cdot x$, from which it follows for the same reason as before that $0 < x^2$, as desired. Both cases together prove the first statement, while the second case alone proves the second statement. □

Corollary 7.27. *Let F be an ordered field. Then $0 < 1$.*

Proof. By FA10 from Definition 7.8, $1 \neq 0$. Thus, by Lemma 7.26, $0 < 1^2 = 1$, as desired. □

Theorem 7.28. *If F is an ordered field, then F has no first or last point.*

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that F has a first point a. By Corollary 7.27, we have that $0 < 1$, which implies by Lemma 7.23 that $-1 < 0$. It follows by Definition 7.21a that $-1 + a < 0 + a$. Thus, by FA3 from Definition 7.8, $-1 + a < a$. Since there exists an object in F (namely $-1 + a$) that is less than a, Definition 3.3 tells us that a is not the first point of F, a contradiction.

The proof is symmetric in the other case. □

Theorem 7.29. *The rational numbers $\mathbb{Q}$ form an ordered field.*

Proof. To prove that $\mathbb{Q}$ forms an ordered field, Definition 7.21 tells us that it will suffice to show that $\mathbb{Q}$ forms a field; has an ordering $<$; satisfies $x+z<y+z$ if $x<y$ for all $z\in\mathbb{Q}$; and satisfies $0<x\cdot y$ if $0<x$ and $0<y$. We will take this one constraint at a time.

To show that $\mathbb{Q}$ forms a field, Definition 7.8 tells us that it will suffice to verify that $\mathbb{Q}$ has two binary operations ($+$ and $\cdot$), and satisfies field axioms 1-10. Define $+$ and $\cdot$ as in Definition 2.7. Under these definitions, parts a-i of Theorem 2.10 guarantee that $\mathbb{Q}$ satisfies FA1-FA9, respectively. As to FA10, to verify that $\left[\frac{1}{1}\right]\neq\left[\frac{0}{1}\right]$, Exercise 2.6 tells us that it will suffice to confirm that $(1,1)\nsim(1,0)$. But since $1\cdot 0=0\neq 1=1\cdot 1$, Exercise 2.2e confirms that $(1,1)\nsim(1,0)$, as desired.

$\mathbb{Q}$ has an ordering by Exercise 3.9d, as desired.

To show that $x+z<y+z$ if $x<y$ for all $z\in\mathbb{Q}$, let $\left[\frac{a}{b}\right],\left[\frac{c}{d}\right],\left[\frac{x}{z}\right]$ be arbitrary elements of $\mathbb{Q}$ with positive denominators (we can choose these WLOG by Exercise 3.9b) and the first two satisfying $\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]<\left[\frac{c}{d}\right]$; we seek to verify that $\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]+\left[\frac{x}{z}\right]<\left[\frac{c}{d}\right]+\left[\frac{x}{z}\right]$. Since $\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]<\left[\frac{c}{d}\right]$, we have by Exercise 3.9c that $ad<bc$. It follows by Script 0 that

$$\begin{gathered}
ad<bc\\
adzz<bczz\\
adzz+bdxz<bczz+bdxz\\
azdz+bxdz<bzcz+bzdx\\
(az+bx)(dz)<(bz)(cz+dx)
\end{gathered}$$

Thus, by Exercise 3.9c, $\left[\frac{az+bx}{bz}\right]<\left[\frac{cz+dx}{dz}\right]$. Therefore, by Definition 2.7, $\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]+\left[\frac{x}{z}\right]<\left[\frac{c}{d}\right]+\left[\frac{x}{z}\right]$, as desired.

To show that $0<x\cdot y$ if $0<x$ and $0<y$, let $\left[\frac{a}{b}\right],\left[\frac{c}{d}\right]$ be arbitrary elements of $\mathbb{Q}$ with positive denominators (which we can choose for the same reason as before) such that $\left[\frac{0}{1}\right]<\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]$ and $\left[\frac{0}{1}\right]<\left[\frac{c}{d}\right]$; we seek to verify that $\left[\frac{0}{1}\right]<\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]\cdot\left[\frac{c}{d}\right]$. Since $\left[\frac{0}{1}\right]<\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]$ and $\left[\frac{0}{1}\right]<\left[\frac{c}{d}\right]$, we have by Exercise 3.9c that $0\cdot b<1\cdot a$ and $0\cdot d<1\cdot c$. It follows by Script 0 that $0\cdot bd<1\cdot ac$. Thus, by Exercise 3.9c, $\left[\frac{0}{1}\right]<\left[\frac{ac}{bd}\right]$. Therefore, by Definition 2.7, $\left[\frac{0}{1}\right]<\left[\frac{a}{b}\right]\cdot\left[\frac{c}{d}\right]$, as desired. $\square$

2/4: **Definition 7.31.** We define $\oplus$ on $\mathbb{R}$ as follows. Let $A,B\in\mathbb{R}$ be Dedekind cuts. Define

$$A\oplus B=\{a+b\mid a\in A\text{ and }b\in B\}$$

Exercise 7.32.

(a) Prove that $A\oplus B$ is a Dedekind cut.

(b) Prove that $\oplus$ is commutative and associative.

(c) Prove that if $A\in\mathbb{R}$, then $A=\mathbf{0}\oplus A$.

Proof of a. To prove that $A\oplus B$ is a Dedekind cut, Definition 6.1 tells us that it will suffice to show that $A\oplus B\neq\emptyset$; $A\oplus B\neq\mathbb{Q}$; if $r\in A\oplus B$ and $s\in\mathbb{Q}$ satisfy $s<r$, then $s\in A\oplus B$; and if $r\in A\oplus B$, then there is some $s\in A\oplus B$ with $s>r$. We will take this one claim at a time.

To show that $A\oplus B\neq\emptyset$, Definition 1.8 tells us that it will suffice to find an element of $A\oplus B$. Since A,B are Dedekind cuts, Definition 6.1 asserts that they are nonempty. Thus, there exist rational numbers $x\in A$ and $y\in B$. Therefore, by the definition of $A\oplus B$, the sum $x+y\in A\oplus B$, as desired.

To show that $A\oplus B\neq\mathbb{Q}$, Definition 1.2 tells us that it will suffice to find an element of $\mathbb{Q}$ that is not an element of $A\oplus B$. For an analogous reason to before, we can choose $x,y\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that $x\notin A$ and $y\notin B$. It follows by Lemma 6.2 and Definition 5.6 that $x\geq a$ for all $a\in A$ and $y\geq b$ for all $b\in B$. Thus, by Script 0, $x+y\geq a+b$ for all $a+b\in A\oplus B$. Consequently, $x+y+1>x+y\geq a+b$ for all $a+b\in A\oplus B$, implying by Definition 3.1 that $x+y+1\neq a+b$ for any $a+b\in A\oplus B$. Therefore, $x+y\notin A\oplus B$, as desired.

To show that if $r\in A\oplus B$ and $s\in\mathbb{Q}$ satisfy $s<r$, then $s\in A\oplus B$, we let $r\in A\oplus B$ and $s\in\mathbb{Q}$ be arbitrary elements of their respective sets that satisfy $s<r$ and seek to verify that $s\in A\oplus B$. Since $r\in A\oplus B$, $r=x+y$ for some $x\in A$ and $y\in B$. Additionally, it follows from the fact that $s<r$ that

$s = r - q = x + y - q$ for some $q \in \mathbb{Q}^+$. Since $y \in B$ and $y - q \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfy $y - q < y$, we have by Definition 6.1b that $y - q \in B$. Therefore, $s = (x) + (y - q)$ is an element of $A \oplus B$, as desired.

To show that if $r \in A \oplus B$, then there is some $s \in A \oplus B$ with $s > r$, we let $r \in A \oplus B$ and seek to find such an s. Since $r \in A \oplus B$, $r = x + y$ for some $x \in A$ and $y \in B$. It follows from the fact that $x \in A$ by Definition 6.1c that there exists a $z \in A$ with $z > x$. Consequently, by Script 0, $z + y > x + y$ is the desired element of $A \oplus B$. □

Proof of b. To prove that $\oplus$ is commutative, Definition 7.1 tells us that it will suffice to show that for all $A, B \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $A \oplus B = B \oplus A$. Let A, B be arbitrary elements of $\mathbb{R}$. Then by Definition 7.31, we clearly have

$$\begin{aligned} A \oplus B &= \{a + b \mid a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\} \\ &= \{b + a \mid b \in B \text{ and } a \in A\} \\ &= B \oplus A \end{aligned}$$

To prove that $\oplus$ is associative, Definition 7.1 tells us that it will suffice to show that for all $A, B, C \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $(A \oplus B) \oplus C = A \oplus (B \oplus C)$. Let A, B, C be arbitrary elements of $\mathbb{R}$. Then by Definition 7.31, we clearly have

$$\begin{aligned} (A \oplus B) \oplus C &= \{a + b \mid a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\} \oplus C \\ &= \{d + c \mid d \in \{a + b \mid a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\} \text{ and } c \in C\} \\ &= \{d + c \mid d = a + b \text{ for some } a \in A \text{ and } b \in B, \text{ and } c \in C\} \\ &= \{a + b + c \mid a \in A \text{ and } b \in B \text{ and } c \in C\} \\ &= \{a + e \mid a \in A, \text{ and } e = b + c \text{ for some } b \in B \text{ and } c \in C\} \\ &= \{a + e \mid c \in C \text{ and } e \in \{b + c \mid b \in B \text{ and } c \in C\}\} \\ &= A \oplus \{b + c \mid b \in B \text{ and } c \in C\} \\ &= A \oplus (B \oplus C) \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of c. To prove that for all $A \in \mathbb{R}$, $A = \mathbf{0} \oplus A$, we will show for an arbitrary $A \in \mathbb{R}$ that every element of A is an element of $\mathbf{0} \oplus A$ and vice versa. Let A be an arbitrary element of $\mathbb{R}$. Suppose first that $x \in A$. Then by Definition 6.1c, there exists $y \in A$ such that $y > x$. Let $z = x - y$. Clearly, $z \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $z < 0$, so we know that $z \in \mathbf{0}$. Additionally, since $x - z = y$, we know that $x - z \in A$. Therefore, since $x = (z) + (x - z)$, we have by Definition 7.31 that $x \in \mathbf{0} \oplus A$. Now suppose that $z \in \mathbf{0} \oplus A$. Then by Definition 7.31, $z = x + y$ for some $x \in \mathbf{0}$ and $y \in A$. Since $x \in \mathbf{0}$, we know that $x < 0$, which means that $y > z$. This combined with the fact that $y \in A$ and $z \in \mathbb{Q}$ implies by Definition 6.1b that $z \in A$. □