

Integers Defined As Sets

#14 of Gottschalk's Gestalts

A Series Illustrating Innovative Forms
of the Organization & Exposition
of Mathematics
by Walter Gottschalk

Infinite Vistas Press
PVD RI
2000

GG14-1 (15)

© 2000 Walter Gottschalk

500 Angell St #414

Providence RI 02906

permission is granted without charge
to reproduce & distribute this item at cost
for educational purposes; attribution requested;
no warranty of infallibility is posited

GG14-2

□ integers defined as sets

- the von Neumann description of an ordinal as the set of all smaller ordinals

leads to the following recursive definition of the nonnegative integers as sets

- the successor function

on the class of sets to the class of sets

is defined explicitly

as follows

$$n \mapsto n^+ = n \cup \{n\} \quad (n \in \text{set})$$

where n^+ is called the successor of n

and the notation n^+ (read n plus) is suggested by $n + 1$

• the nonnegative integers
are defined as sets
by the following recursive definition

rec def

$$0 = \emptyset$$

$$n^+ = n \cup \{n\} \quad (n \in \text{set var})$$

• more fully

let

$$0 =_{\text{rd}} \text{zero} =_{\text{df}} \emptyset$$

$$1 =_{\text{rd}} \text{one} =_{\text{df}} 0^+ = 0 \cup \{0\} = \{0\} = \{\emptyset\}$$

$$2 =_{\text{rd}} \text{two} =_{\text{df}} 1^+ = 1 \cup \{1\} = \{0, 1\} = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}$$

$$3 =_{\text{rd}} \text{three} =_{\text{df}} 2^+ = 2 \cup \{2\} = \{0, 1, 2\} = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}, \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}\}$$

etc

according to the standard

Indo – Arabic decimal positional notation and terminology;

note that

each nonnegative integer is defined as

the set of all smaller nonnegative integers;

also note that

each nonnegative integer is defined ito

the empty set and the set - builder

which suggests the Latin motto

Omnia ex nihilo. = Everything from nothing.

- this recursive definition of the nonnegative integers as sets may be complemented by the following explicit definition of the negative integers as sets

$-n$
 $=_{rd}$ minus n
 $=_{df}$ $\{n\}$ ($n \in \text{nonzero nonneg int}$)

note that the 'minus sign' here is just a part of the notation; we have not yet defined the unary operation of negation of integers; in case of notational ambiguity, use the elbow \neg here in place of the dash $-$

- we can now construct
the ladder of integers as sets:

etc

$$4 = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$$

$$3 = \{0, 1, 2\}$$

$$2 = \{0, 1\}$$

$$1 = \{0\}$$

$$0 = \emptyset$$

$$-1 = \{1\}$$

$$-2 = \{2\}$$

$$-3 = \{3\}$$

$$-4 = \{4\}$$

etc

• thus we have the following
five basic sets of integers
in which everything is defined as a set:

(1) \mathbb{P}
= 'open cap pe'
= 'pe'
= the set of all positive integers
= the set of positive integers
= the positive integer set
= the positive integers
= $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$

(2) $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$
= 'open cap pe bar'
= 'pe bar'
= the set of all negative integers
= the set of negative integers
= the negative integer set
= the negative integers
= $\{-1, -2, -3, \dots\}$

(3) \mathbb{N}

= 'open cap en'

= 'en'

= the set of all nonnegative integers

= the set of nonnegative integers

= the nonnegative integer set

= the nonnegative integers

= $\{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$

(4) $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$

= 'open cap en bar'

= 'en bar'

= the set of all nonpositive integers

= the set of nonpositive integers

= the nonpositive integer set

= the nonpositive integers

= $\{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}$

(5) \mathbb{Z}

= 'open cap zee'

= 'zee'

= the set of all integers

= the set of integers

= the integer set

= the integers

= $\{\dots, -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$

- note that the 'minus sign' in $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$ are conveniently placed above the letters and not before; as for the 'etymology' of the open capital letters, \mathbb{P} is from positive
 \mathbb{N} is from nonnegative, natural, number
 \mathbb{Z} is from die Zahl (German) = number; the open type style, which is a style seldom appearing in mathematical literature, was adopted for the sake of this particular usage and for immediate recognition; these letters are now in almost universal use with the present meaning

GG14-10

• the relation of order between integers,
the unary operation of absolute value formation for integers, and
the unary operation of negation of integers
are simply and explicitly definable as follows:

• order

$$m < n \Leftrightarrow m \in n$$

$$- m < n \quad (m \neq 0)$$

$$- m < - n \Leftrightarrow n \in m \quad (m \neq 0 \neq n)$$

wh $m, n \in \text{nonneg int}$

• absolute value

$$|n| = n$$

$$|-n| = n \quad (n \neq 0)$$

wh $n \in \text{nonneg int}$

• negation

$$- 0 = 0$$

$$- n = \neg n \quad (n \neq 0)$$

$$- (\neg n) = n \quad (n \neq 0)$$

wh $n \in \text{nonneg int}$

- the customary recursive definitions of addition and multiplication for nonnegative integers are:

rec def of addition for nonnegative integers

$$m + 0 = m$$

$$m + n^+ = (m + n)^+$$

wh $m, n \in \text{nonneg int var}$

rec def of multiplication for nonnegative integers

$$m \cdot 0 = 0$$

$$m \cdot n^+ = (m \cdot n) + m$$

wh $m, n \in \text{nonneg int var}$

- the binary operations of addition and multiplication for integers are definable by cases

eg

$$(-m) + (-n) = -(m + n)$$

&

$$(-m)(-n) = mn$$

wh $m, n \in \text{nonneg int}$

- the binary operation of subtraction for integers is definable explicitly
ito addition and negation for integers

viz

$$m - n = m + (-n)$$

- the partial binary operation of division for integers occupies a special position since division by zero is not defined (nor even sensibly definable) and since two integers (quotient and remainder) result from the operation of division for integers; division for integers is ring division; division for rational numbers, for real numbers, and for complex numbers in which only a single number, the quotient, results is field division

- division for integers

q is the (integer) quotient

and

r is the (nonnegative integer) remainder

for the division of

the dividend m

divided by

the divisor $n \neq 0$

means by definition

$$m = nq + r \quad (0 \leq r < |n|)$$

wh $m, n, q, r \in \text{int}$;

for this definition to be meaningful,

a unique existence theorem for q and r must be proved