

Thm $x \neq y \Rightarrow y \leq x$

(Proof): $x \neq y \Leftrightarrow \left(\exists x_L \in X_L : y \leq x_L \right) \vee \left(\exists y_R \in Y_R : y_R \leq x \right)$

(* 1)

(* 2)

If (* 1) holds, $y \leq x_L \leq x$

If (* 2) holds, $\exists y \leq y_R \leq x$

Coro $x < y \Leftrightarrow y \neq x$

(Proof): $x < y \Leftrightarrow x \leq y \wedge y \neq x$, by def. of " $<$ "

Since " $y \neq x \Rightarrow \exists x \leq y$ ", then $x < y \Leftrightarrow y \neq x$

Thm $x < y \wedge y < z \Rightarrow x < z$

(Proof): Suppose not, i.e.: $x < y \wedge y < z \wedge \cancel{x < z} \quad (+)$

$\Leftrightarrow y \neq x \wedge \underbrace{z \neq y}_{(* 1)} \wedge \underbrace{z \leq x}_{(* 2)}$

By the transitive law, $y \neq x \Rightarrow \cancel{y \neq s \vee s \neq x}$
~~for all $s \in S$~~

$\Rightarrow y \neq z \vee \cancel{z \neq x}$

Contradict (* 2)

Contradict (* 1)

Therefore, (+) is wrong. \Rightarrow the thm holds □

I^{thm} For any $x = \{x_L | x_R\} \in S$, we can remove any member of x_L except the largest number without changing the value of x . Similarly, we can remove any member of x_R except the smallest without changing the value of x .

(Proof): Assume that $x = \{x_1, x_2, \dots | x_R\}$ and that $x_1 < x_2$.

① W.T.S.: $\{x_1, x_2, \dots | x_R\} = \{x_2, \dots | x_R\}$

\Updownarrow

$$\{x_1, x_2, \dots | x_R\} \leq \{x_2, \dots | x_R\} \quad \wedge \quad \{x_2, \dots | x_R\} \leq \{x_1, x_2, \dots | x_R\}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(i)} \quad \neg \exists a \in \{x_1, x_2, \dots\} : \{x_2, \dots | x_R\} \leq a \quad \wedge \\ \text{(ii)} \quad \neg \exists b \in \{x_R\} : b \leq \{x_1, x_2, \dots | x_R\} \quad \wedge \\ \text{(iii)} \quad \neg \exists a' \in \{x_2, \dots\} : \{x_1, x_2, \dots | x_R\} \leq a' \quad \wedge \\ \text{(iv)} \quad \neg \exists b' \in x_R : b' \leq \{x_2, \dots | x_R\} \end{array} \right.$$

For (i), $\forall a \in \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$, $a \neq x_1 \vee a \in \{x_2, \dots\}$

$$\Rightarrow a < x_2 \in \{x_2, \dots\} = \{x_2, \dots | x_R\}_L \vee a \in \{x_2, \dots\} = \{x_2, \dots | x_R\}_R$$

$$\Rightarrow a < x_2 < \{x_2, \dots | x_R\} \quad \vee \quad a < \{x_2, \dots | x_R\}$$

$$\Rightarrow a < \{x_2, \dots | x_R\} \Rightarrow \text{(i) holds}$$

For (ii) (iii) (iv), they follow immediately from the previous thm: $A < \{A | B\} < B$ \square

Conv. If A has a largest member a, then $\{A|B\} = \{a|B\}$

Similarly, if B has a smallest member b, then $\{A|B\} = \{A|b\}$

Thm If $x = \{\bar{x}_L | \bar{x}_R\} \in S$ is greater than all members of A & less than all members of B, then $x = \{\bar{x}_L, A | \bar{x}_R, B\}$
In other words, $A < x < B \Rightarrow x = \{\bar{x}_L, A | \bar{x}_R, B\}$

(Proof): W.T.S: $x < \{\bar{x}_L, A | \bar{x}_R, B\} \wedge \{\bar{x}_L, A | \bar{x}_R, B\} < x$

$$\Leftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(i)} \quad \neg \exists x_L \in \bar{x}_L : \{\bar{x}_L, A | \bar{x}_R, B\} \leq x_L \quad \wedge \\ \text{(ii)} \quad \neg \exists \beta \in \bar{x}_R \cup B : \beta \leq x \quad \wedge \\ \text{(iii)} \quad \neg \exists \alpha \in \bar{x}_L \cup A : x \leq \alpha \quad \wedge \\ \text{(iv)} \quad \neg \exists x_R \in \bar{x}_R : x_R \leq \{\bar{x}_L, A | \bar{x}_R, B\}. \end{array} \right.$$

(i) & (iv) holds following from the previous thm: $A < \{A|B\} < B$

(ii) & (iii) holds following from the previous thm: $A < \{A|B\} < B$

and the def. of A, B in the statement (hypothesis) of

the thm

□

Thm If, after day m, the following different surreal numbers exist: $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_n$,

then all new numbers born on day $m+1$ can be represented by: $\{x_1\}, \{x_1 | x_2\}, \{x_2 | x_3\}, \dots, \{x_{n-1} | x_n\}, \{x_n\}$

(Proof): W.T.S.:

- ① $\{x_i\}$ and $\{x_n\}$ give values not known on day m .
- ② $\{x_i | x_j\}$ gives a value not known on day m if $i+1=j$.
- ③ $\{x_i | x_j\}$ gives a value already known on day m if $i+1 \neq j$

①:

$\{x_i\} < x_i$, where x_i was the smallest surreal number born on day m , so $\{x_i\}$ must represent a new value. Similarly, for $\{x_n\}$.

②:

$x_i < \{x_i | x_{i+1}\} < x_{i+1}$. Since at day m , we knew no ~~surreal~~ number ~~is~~ between x_i and x_{i+1} , then we see $\{x_i | x_{i+1}\}$ gives a new value.

③: Suppose that $i+1 < j$

Claim: $\{x_i | x_j\} = x_k$ where x_k satisfies:
 x_k satisfies:
 $x_k \text{. birthday} = \min \{x_{i+1}. \text{birthday}, \dots, x_{j-1}. \text{birthday}\}$

Proof of claim:

The parents of x_k must either be less than x_{i+1} or greater than x_{j-1} . Hence, $(\bar{x}_k)_L \leq x_i \wedge x_j \leq (\bar{x}_k)_R$

$$\Rightarrow (\bar{x}_k)_L \leq x_i < \{x_i | x_j\} < x_j \leq (\bar{x}_k)_R$$

$$\Rightarrow \{x_i | x_j\} = \{x_i, (\bar{x}_k)_L \mid x_j, (\bar{x}_k)_R\} \quad — (*1)$$

$$x_i < \{(X_k)_L \mid (X_k)_R\} < x_j \Rightarrow x_k = \{(X_n)_L \mid (X_n)_R\} = \{x_i, (X_k)_L \mid x_j, (X_k)_R\}$$

$$\xrightarrow{(*1)} x_k = \{x_i \mid x_j\}$$

Therefore, the claim holds. \square

(Coro) If x is the oldest surreal number between a and b ,

then $\{a \mid b\} = x$

(Proof): Directly follow from the ~~old~~ claim above \square