

spondence when we select upon the straight line a definite origin or zero-point O and a definite unit of length for the measurement of segments. With the aid of the latter to every rational number a a corresponding length can be constructed and if we lay this off upon the straight line to the right or left of O according as a is positive or negative, we obtain a definite end-point p , which may be regarded as the point corresponding to the number a ; to the rational number zero corresponds the point O . In this way to every rational number a , *i.e.*, to every individual in R , corresponds one and only one point p , *i.e.*, an individual in L . To the two numbers a , b respectively correspond the two points p , q , and if $a > b$, then p lies to the right of q . To the laws I, II, III of the previous Section correspond completely the laws I, II, III of the present.

III CONTINUITY OF THE STRAIGHT LINE

Of the greatest importance, however, is the fact that in the straight line L there are infinitely many points which correspond to no rational number. If the point p corresponds to the rational number a , then, as is well known, the length Op is commensurable with the invariable unit of measure used in the construction, *i.e.*, there exists a third length, a so-called common measure, of which these two lengths are integral multiples. But the ancient Greeks already knew and had demonstrated that there are lengths incommensurable with a given unit of length, *e.g.*, the diagonal of the square whose side is the unit of length. If we lay off such a length from point O upon the line we obtain an end-point which corresponds to no rational number. Since further it can be easily shown that there are infinitely many lengths which are incommensurable with the unit of length, we may affirm: the straight line L is infinitely richer in point-individuals than the do-

main R of rational numbers in number-individuals.

If now, as is our desire, we try to follow up arithmetically all phenomena in the straight line, the domain of rational numbers is insufficient and it becomes absolutely necessary that the instrument R constructed by the creation of the rational numbers be essentially improved by the creation of new numbers such that the domain of numbers shall gain the same completeness, or as we may say at once, the same *continuity*, as the straight line.

The previous considerations are so familiar and well known to all that many will regard their repetition quite superfluous. Still I regarded this recapitulation as necessary to prepare properly for the main question. For, the way in which the irrational numbers are usually introduced is based directly upon the conception of extensive magnitudes—which itself is nowhere carefully defined—and explains numbers as the result of measuring such a magnitude by another of the same kind.³ Instead of this I demand that arithmetic shall be developed out of itself.

That such comparison with non-arithmetic notions have furnished the immediate occasion for the extension of the number-concept may, in a general way, be granted (though this was certainly not the case in the introduction of complex numbers); but this surely is no sufficient ground for introducing these foreign notions into arithmetic, the science of numbers. Just as negative and fractional rational numbers are formed by a new creation, and as the laws of operating with these numbers must and can be reduced to the laws of operating with positive integers, so we must endeavor completely to define irrational numbers by means of the rational numbers alone. The question only remains how to do this.

The above comparison of the domain R of rational numbers with a straight line has led to the recognition of the

istence of gaps, of a certain incompleteness or discontinuity of the former, while we ascribe to the straight line completeness, absence of gaps, or continuity. In what then does this continuity consist? Everything must depend on the answer to this question, and only through it shall we obtain a scientific basis for the investigation of all continuous domains. By vague remarks upon the unbroken connection in the smallest parts obviously nothing is gained; the problem is to indicate a precise characteristic of continuity that can serve as the basis for valid deductions. For a long time I pondered over this in vain, but finally I found what I was seeking. This discovery will, perhaps, be differently estimated by different people; the majority may find its substance very commonplace. It consists of the following. In the preceding section attention was called to the fact that every point p of the straight line produces a separation of the same into two portions such that every point of one portion lies to the left of every point of the other. I find the essence of continuity in the converse, *i.e.*, in the following principle:

"If all points of the straight line fall into two classes such that every point of the first class lies to the left of every point of the second class, then there exists one and only one point which separates this division of all points into two classes, this severing of the straight line into two portions."

As already said I think I shall not err in assuming that every one will at once admit the truth of this statement; the majority of my readers will be very disappointed in learning that by a commonplace remark the secret of continuity is to be revealed. To this I am glad if every one finds the above principle so obvious and so elementary with his own ideas of a line; that I am utterly unable to adduce any proof of its correctness, nor has any one been able to do so. The assumption of this principle is nothing else than an

axiom by which we attribute to the line its continuity, by which we find continuity in the line. If space has at all a real existence it is not necessary for it to be continuous; many of its properties would remain the same even were it discontinuous. And if we knew for certain that space was discontinuous there would be nothing to prevent us, in case we so desired, from filling up its gaps, in thought, and thus making it continuous; this filling up would consist in a creation of new point-individuals and would have to be effected in accordance with the above principle.

IV CREATION OF IRRATIONAL NUMBERS

From the last remarks it is sufficiently obvious how the discontinuous domain R of rational numbers may be rendered complete so as to form a continuous domain. In Section I it was pointed out that every rational number a effects a separation of the system R into two classes such that every number a_1 of the first class A_1 is less than every number a_2 of the second class A_2 ; the number a is either the greatest number of the class A_1 , or the least number of the class A_2 . If now any separation of the system R into two classes A_1 , A_2 , is given which possesses only this characteristic property that every number a_1 in A_1 is less than every number a_2 in A_2 , then for brevity we shall call such a separation a *cut* [Schnitt] and designate it by (A_1, A_2) . We can then say that every rational number a produces one cut or, strictly speaking, two cuts, which, however, we shall not look upon as essentially different; this cut possesses, besides, the property that either among the numbers of the first class there exists a greatest or among the numbers of the second class a least number. And conversely, if a cut possesses this property, then it is produced by this greatest or least rational number.

But it is easy to show that there exist

infinitely many cuts not produced by rational numbers. The following example suggests itself most readily.

Let D be a positive integer but not the square of an integer, then there exists a positive integer λ such that

$$\lambda^2 < D < (\lambda + 1)^2.$$

If we assign to the second class A_2 , every positive rational number a_2 whose square is $> D$, to the first class A_1 , all other rational numbers a_1 , this separation forms a cut (A_1, A_2) , i.e., every number a_1 is less than every number a_2 . For if $a_1 = 0$, or is negative, then on that ground a_1 is less than any number a_2 , because, by definition, this last is positive; if a_1 is positive, then its square $\leq D$, and hence a_1 is less than any positive number a_2 whose square is $> D$.

But this cut is produced by no rational number. To demonstrate this it must be shown first of all that there exists no rational number whose square = D . Although this is known from the first elements of the theory of numbers, still the following indirect proof may find place here. If there exists a rational number whose square = D , then there exist two positive integers, t, u , that satisfy the equation

$$t^2 - Du^2 = 0,$$

and we may assume that u is the least positive integer possessing the property that its square, by multiplication by D , may be converted into the square of an integer t . Since evidently

$$\lambda u < t < (\lambda + 1)u,$$

the number $u' = t - \lambda u$ is a positive integer certainly less than u . If further we put

$$t' = Du - \lambda t,$$

t' is likewise a positive integer, and we have

$$t'^2 - Du'^2 = (\lambda^2 - D)(t^2 - Du^2) = 0,$$

which is contrary to the assumption respecting u .

Hence the square of every rational number x is either $< D$ or $> D$. From this it easily follows that there is neither in the class A_1 a greatest, nor in the class A_2 a least number. For if we put

$$y = \frac{x(x^2 + 3D)}{3x^2 + D},$$

we have

$$y - x = \frac{2x(D - x^2)}{3x^2 + D}$$

and

$$y^2 - D = \frac{(x^2 - D)^3}{(3x^2 + D)^2}$$

If in this we assume x to be a positive number from the class A_1 , then $x^2 < D$, and hence $y > x$ and $y^2 < D$. Therefore y likewise belongs to the class A_1 . But if we assume x to be a number from the class A_2 , then $x^2 > D$, and hence $y < x$, $y > 0$, and $y^2 > D$. Therefore y likewise belongs to the class A_2 . This cut is therefore produced by no rational number.

In this property that not all cuts are produced by rational numbers consists the incompleteness or discontinuity of the domain R of all rational numbers.

Whenever, then, we have to do with a cut (A_1, A_2) produced by no rational number, we create a new, an irrational number α , which we regard as completely defined by this cut (A_1, A_2) ; we shall say that the number α corresponds to this cut, or that it produces this cut. From now on, therefore, to every definite cut there corresponds a definite rational or irrational number, and we regard two numbers as different or unequal always and only when they correspond to essentially different cuts.

In order to obtain a basis for the orderly arrangement of all real, i.e., of all rational and irrational numbers we must investigate the relation between any two cuts (A_1, A_2) and (B_1, B_2) produced by any two numbers α and β . Obviously a cut (A_1, A_2) is given completely when one of the two classes, e.g., the first, is known, because the second, A_2 , consists

of all rational numbers not contained in A_1 , and the characteristic property of such a first class lies in this: that if the number a_1 is contained in it, it also contains all numbers less than a_1 . If now we compare two such first classes A_1, B_1 with each other, it may happen

1. That they are perfectly identical, i.e., that every number contained in A_1 is also contained in B_1 , and that every number contained in B_1 is also contained in A_1 . In this case A_2 is necessarily identical with B_2 , and the two cuts are perfectly identical, which we denote in symbols by $\alpha = \beta$ or $\beta = \alpha$.

But if the two classes, A_1, B_1 are not identical, then there exists in the one, e.g., in A_1 , a number $a'_1 = b'_2$ not contained in the other B_1 and consequently found in B_2 ; hence all numbers b_1 contained in B_1 are certainly less than this number $a'_1 = b'_2$ and therefore all numbers b_1 are contained in A_1 .

2. If now this number a'_1 is the only one in A_1 that is not contained in B_1 , then is every other number a_1 contained in A_1 also contained in B_1 and is consequently $< a'_1$, i.e., a'_1 is the greatest among all the numbers a_1 , hence the cut (A_1, A_2) is produced by the rational number $\alpha = a'_1 = b'_2$. Concerning the other cut (B_1, B_2) we know already that all numbers b_1 in B_1 are also contained in A_1 and are less than the number $a'_1 = b'_2$, which is contained in B_2 ; every other number b_2 contained in B_2 must, however, be greater than b'_2 , for otherwise it would be less than a'_1 , therefore contained in A_1 and hence in B_1 ; hence b'_2 is the least among all numbers contained in B_2 , and consequently the cut (B_1, B_2) is produced by the same rational number $\beta = b'_2 = a'_1 = \alpha$. The two cuts are then only unessentially different.

3. If, however, there exist in A_1 at least two different numbers $a'_1 = b'_2$ and $a''_1 = b''_2$, which are not contained in B_1 , then there exist infinitely many of them, because all the infinitely many numbers lying between a'_1 and a''_1 are contained in A_1 (Section I, II)

but not in B_1 . In this case we say that the numbers α and β corresponding to these two essentially different cuts (A_1, A_2) and (B_1, B_2) are different, and further that α is greater than β , that β is less than α , which we express in symbols by $\alpha > \beta$ as well as $\beta < \alpha$. It is to be noticed that this definition coincides completely with the one given earlier, when α, β are rational.

The remaining possible cases are these:

4. If there exists in B_1 one and only one number $b'_1 = a'_2$, that is not contained in A_1 , then the two cuts (A_1, A_2) and (B_1, B_2) are only unessentially different and they are produced by one and the same rational number $\alpha = a'_2 = b'_1 = \beta$.

5. But if there are in B_1 at least two numbers which are not contained in A_1 , then $\beta > \alpha, \alpha < \beta$.

As this exhausts the possible cases, it follows that of two different numbers one is necessarily the greater, the other the less, which gives two possibilities. A third case is impossible. This was indeed involved in the use of the comparative (greater, less) to designate the relation between α, β ; but this use has only now been justified. In just such investigations one needs to exercise the greatest care so that even with the best intention to be honest he shall not, through a hasty choice of expressions borrowed from other notions already developed, allow himself to be led into the use of inadmissible transfers from one domain to the other.

If now we consider again somewhat carefully the case $\alpha > \beta$ it is obvious that the less number β , if rational, certainly belongs to the class A_1 ; for since there is in A_1 number $a'_1 = b'_2$ which belongs to the class B_2 , it follows that the number β , whether the greatest number in B_1 or the least in B_2 is certainly $\leq a'_1$, and hence contained in A_1 . Likewise it is obvious from $\alpha > \beta$ that the greater number α , if rational, certainly belongs to the class B_2 , because $\alpha \geq a'_1$. Combining these two consid-

erations we get the following result: If a cut is produced by the number α then any rational number belongs to the class A_1 or to the class A_2 according as it is less or greater than α ; if the number α is itself rational it may belong to either class.

From this we obtain finally the following: If $\alpha > \beta$, i.e., if there are infinitely many numbers in A_1 not contained in B_1 , then there are infinitely many such numbers that at the same time are different from α and from β ; every such rational number c is $< \alpha$, because it is contained in A_1 and at the same time it is $> \beta$ because contained in B_2 .

NOTES

1. *Vorlesungen über Zahlentheorie*, by P. G. Lejeune Dirichlet, 2d ed. § 159.
2. Hence in what follows the so-called "algebraic" greater and less are understood unless the word "absolute" is added.
3. The apparent advantage of the generality of this definition of number disappears as soon as we consider complex numbers. According to my view, on the other hand, the notion of the ratio between two numbers of the same kind can be clearly developed only after the introduction of irrational numbers.

111. From Was sind und was sollen die Zahlen? (1888)*

(Simply Infinite Systems)

RICHARD DEDEKIND

CHAPTER VI

71. Definition. A system N is said to be *simply infinite* when there exists a similar transformation ϕ of N in itself such that N appears as chain (44) of an element not contained in $\phi(N)$. We call this element, which we shall denote in what follows by the symbol 1, the *base-element* of N and say the simply infinite system N is *set in order* [geordnet] by this transformation ϕ . If we retain the earlier convenient symbols for transforms and chains (IV) then the essence of a simply infinite system N consists in the existence of a transformation ϕ of N and an element 1 which satisfy the following conditions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$:

$\alpha. N' \ni N.$

$\beta. N = 1_\alpha.$

$\gamma.$ The element 1 is not contained in N' .

$\delta.$ The transformation ϕ is similar.

Obviously it follows from α, γ, δ that every simply infinite system N is actually an infinite system (64) because it is similar to a proper part N' of itself. . . .

(Definition of a Transformation of the Number-Series by Induction)

CHAPTER IX

126. Theorem of the definition by induction. If there is given an arbitrary (similar or dissimilar) transformation θ of a system Ω in itself, and besides a determinate element ω in Ω , then there exists one and only one transformation

ψ of the number-series N , which satisfies the conditions

- I. $\psi(N) \ni \Omega$
- II. $\psi(1) = \omega$
- III. $\psi(n') = \theta\psi(n)$, where n represents every number.

Proof. Since, if there actually exists such a transformation ψ , there is contained in it by (21) a transformation ψ_n of the system Z_n , which satisfies the conditions I, II, III stated in (125), then because there exists one and only one

such transformation ψ_n must necessarily

$$\psi(n) = \psi_n(n). \quad (n)$$

Since thus ψ is completely determined it follows also that there can exist only one such transformation ψ (see the closing remark in (130)). That conversely the transformation ψ determined by (n) also satisfies our conditions I, II, III, follows easily from (n) with reference to the properties I, II and (p) shown in (125), which was to be proved.

*Source: From Richard Dedekind, *Essays in the Theory of Numbers*, trans. by Wooster Woodruff Berman (1924), 67 and 85-86. This translation is reprinted by permission of the Open Court Publishing Company.