Math 230 D **Fall 2015**
The Definition of $\mathbb{Z}$ **Drew Armstrong**

Here's a joke definition of the integers:

$$\mathbb{Z} := \{\ldots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \ldots\}.$$

We all "know" the basic properties of this set because we've been fooling around with it since childhood. But if we want to **prove** anything about $\mathbb{Z}$ (and we do) then we need a formal definition. First I'll give a friendly definition. This just states everything we already "know" in formal language. As you see, it's a bit long. Afterwards I'll give a more efficient (but much more subtle) definition of $\mathbb{Z}$.

Friendly Definition

Let $\mathbb{Z}$ be a set equipped with

- an equivalence relation "$=$" defined by
  - $\forall\, a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a = a$ (reflexive)
  - $\forall\, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(a = b) \Rightarrow (b = a)$ (symmetric)
  - $\forall\, a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(a = b \;\wedge\; b = c) \Rightarrow (a = c)$ (transitive),
- a total ordering "$\leq$" defined by
  - $\forall\, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(a \leq b \;\wedge\; b \leq a) \Rightarrow (a = b)$ (antisymmetric)
  - $\forall\, a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(a \leq b \;\wedge\; b \leq c) \Rightarrow (a \leq c)$ (transitive)
  - $\forall\, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(a \leq b \;\vee\; b \leq a)$ (total)
- and two binary operations
  - $\forall\, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\exists\, a + b \in \mathbb{Z}$ (addition)
  - $\forall\, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\exists\, ab \in \mathbb{Z}$ (multiplication)

which satisfy the following properties:

Axioms of Addition.

(A1) $\forall\, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a + b = b + a$ (commutative)
(A2) $\forall\, a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a + (b + c) = (a + b) + c$ (associative)
(A3) $\exists\, 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 + a = a$ (additive identity exists)
(A4) $\forall\, a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\exists\, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a + b = 0$ (additive inverses exist)

These four properties tell us that $\mathbb{Z}$ is an additive group. It has a special element called 0 that acts as an "identity element" for addition, and every integer a has an "additive inverse", which we will call $-a$.

Axioms of Multiplication.

(M1) $\forall\, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $ab = ba$ (commutative)
(M2) $\forall\, a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a(bc) = (ab)c$ (associative)
(M3) $\exists\, 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}, \forall\, a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1a = a$ (multiplicative identity exists)

Notice that elements of $\mathbb{Z}$ do **not** have "multiplicative inverses". That is, we can't divide in $\mathbb{Z}$. So $\mathbb{Z}$ is not quite a group under multiplication. We also need to say how addition and multiplication behave together.

Axiom of Distribution.

(D) $\forall\, a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a(b + c) = ab + ac$

We can paraphrase these first eight properties by saying that $\mathbb{Z}$ is a (commutative) ring. Next we will describe how arithmetic and order interact.

Axioms of Order.

(O1) $\forall\, a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(a \leq b) \Rightarrow (a + c \leq b + c)$
(O2) $\forall\, a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(a \leq b \;\wedge\; 0 \leq c) \Rightarrow (ac \leq bc)$
(O3) $0 < 1$ (this means that $0 \leq 1 \;\wedge\; 0 \neq 1$)

These first eleven properties tell us that $\mathbb{Z}$ is an ordered ring. However, we have not yet defined $\mathbb{Z}$ because there are other ordered rings, for example the real numbers $\mathbb{R}$. To distinguish $\mathbb{Z}$ among the ordered rings we need one final axiom. This last axiom is **not obvious** and it took a long time for people to realize that it is an axiom and not a theorem.

The Well-Ordering Axiom.

Let $\mathbb{N} = \{a \in \mathbb{Z} : 1 \leq a\}$ denote the set of natural numbers. Then every nonempty subset of $\mathbb{N}$ has a smallest element. Formally, let $\wp(\mathbb{N})_{\neq\emptyset}$ be the **set** of nonempty subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. Then we have

(WO) $\forall\, X \in \wp(\mathbb{N})_{\neq\emptyset}$, $\exists\, a \in X$, $\forall\, b \in X$, $a \leq b$

This axiom is also known as the principle of induction; we will use it a lot. Thus endeth the friendly definition.

Subtle Definition

The above definition is friendly and practical. **But it is quite long!** You might ask whether we can define $\mathbb{Z}$ using fewer axioms; the answer is “Yes”. The most efficient definition of $\mathbb{Z}$ is due to Giuseppe Peano (1858–1932). His definition is efficient, but it no longer looks much like the integers.

Peano’s Axioms. Let $\mathbb{N}$ be a set equipped with an equivalence relation “=” and a unary “successor” operation $S : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, satisfying the following four axioms:

(P1) $1 \in \mathbb{N}$ (1 is in $\mathbb{N}$)
(P2) $\forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $S(n) \neq 1$ (1 is not the successor of any natural number)
(P3) $\forall\, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(S(m) = S(n)) \Rightarrow (m = n)$ (S is an injective function)
(P4) (The induction principle) **If** a set $K \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ of natural numbers satisfies
- $1 \in K$, and
- $\forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(n \in K) \Rightarrow (S(n) \in K)$,

then $K = \mathbb{N}$.

With a lot of work, one can use $\mathbb{N}$ and S to define a set $\mathbb{Z}$ with addition, multiplication, a total ordering, etc., and show that it has the desired properties. Good luck to you. I’ll stick with the friendly definition.