

MAGNITUDES, SCALABLE MONOIDS AND QUANTITY SPACES

DAN JONSSON

ABSTRACT. In ancient Greek mathematics, magnitudes such as lengths were strictly distinguished from numbers. In modern quantity calculus, a distinction is made between quantities and scalars that serve as measures of quantities. It can be argued that quantities should play a more prominent, independent role in modern mathematics, as magnitudes earlier.

The introduction includes a sketch of the development and structure of the pre-modern theory of magnitudes and numbers. Then, a scalable monoid over a ring is defined and its basic properties are described. Congruence relations on scalable monoids, direct and tensor products of scalable monoids, subalgebras and homomorphic images of scalable monoids, and unit elements of scalable monoids are also defined and analyzed.

A quantity space is defined as a commutative scalable monoid over a field, admitting a finite basis similar to a basis for a free abelian group. The mathematical theory of quantity spaces forms the basis of a rigorous quantity calculus and is developed with a view to applications in metrology and foundations of physics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Equations such as $E = \frac{mv^2}{2}$ or $\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \kappa \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2}$, used to express physical laws, describe relationships between scalars, commonly real numbers. An alternative interpretation is possible, however. Since the scalars assigned to the variables in these equations are numerical measures of certain quantities, the equations express relationships between these quantities as well. For example, $E = \frac{mv^2}{2}$ can also be interpreted as describing a relation between an energy E , a mass m and a velocity v – three underlying physical quantities, whose existence and properties do not depend on scalars used to represent them. With this interpretation, though, $\frac{mv^2}{2}$ and similar expressions will have meaning only if operations on quantities, corresponding to operations on numbers, are defined. In other words, an appropriate way of calculating with quantities, a *quantity calculus*, needs to be available.

In a useful survey [2], de Boer described the development of quantity calculus until the late 20th century, starting with Maxwell's [20] concept of a physical quantity q comprised of a unit quantity $[q]$ of the same kind as q and a scalar $\{q\}$ which is the measure of q relative to $[q]$, so that we can write $q = \{q\}[q]$. Like Lodge [18], in a seminal article in *Nature* 1888, and Wallot [26], in an influential article in *Handbuch der Physik* 1926, de Boer argued, however, that the physical quantity should be seen as a primitive notion: ontologically, the quantity precedes the numerical measure used to describe it, and the assignment $q = \{q\}[q]$ does not work as a definition of a quantity (see also [13, pp. 1–2]).

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 20-02, 20M32, 20N99; Secondary 20-03.

Actually, the roots of quantity calculus go far deeper in the history of mathematics than to Wallot, Lodge, Maxwell or even other scientists of the modern era, such as Fourier [8]; its origins can be traced back to ancient Greek geometry and arithmetic, as codified in Euclid's *Elements* [5].

Of fundamental importance in the *Elements* is the distinction between *numbers* (*multitudes*) and *magnitudes*. The notion of a number (*arithmos*) is based on that of a "unit" or "monad" (*monas*); a number is "a multitude composed of units". Thus, a number is essentially a positive integer. (A collection of units containing just one unit was not, in principle, considered to be a multitude of units in Greek arithmetic, so 1 was not, strictly speaking, a number.) Numbers can be compared, added and multiplied, and a smaller number can be subtracted from a larger one, but the ratio of two numbers m, n is not itself a number but just a pair $m : n$ expressing relative size. (The ratio of integers is not necessarily an integer.) Ratios can, however, be compared; $m : n = m' : n'$ means that $mn' = nm'$. A bigger number m is said to be "measured" by a smaller number k if $m = rk$ for some number r ; a prime number is a number that is not measured by any other number (or measured only by 1), and m, n are relatively prime when there is no number (except 1) measuring both.

Magnitudes (*megethos*), on the other hand, are phenomena such as lengths, areas, volumes or times. Unlike numbers, magnitudes are of different kinds, and while the magnitudes of a particular kind correspond loosely to numbers, making measurement of magnitudes possible, the magnitudes form a continuum, and there are no distinguished "unit magnitudes". In Greek mathematics, magnitudes of the same kind can be compared and added, and a smaller magnitude can be subtracted from a larger one of the same kind, but magnitudes cannot, in general, be multiplied or divided. One can form the ratio of two magnitudes of the same kind, p and q , but this is not a magnitude but just a pair $p : q$ expressing relative size. A greater magnitude q is said to be measured by a smaller magnitude u if there is a number n such that q is equal to u taken n times; we may write this as $q = n \times u$ here.

Remarkably, the first three propositions about magnitudes proved by Euclid in the *Elements* are, in the notation used here,

$$\begin{aligned} n \times (u_1 \dot{+} \cdots \dot{+} u_k) &= n \times u_1 \dot{+} \cdots \dot{+} n \times u_k, \\ (n_1 + \cdots + n_k) \times u &= n_1 \times u \dot{+} \cdots \dot{+} n_k \times u, \quad m \times (n \times u) = (mn) \times u, \end{aligned}$$

where m, n, n_1, \dots, n_k are numbers (*arithmoi*), u is a magnitude, u_1, \dots, u_k are magnitudes of the same kind, $\dot{+}$ denotes the sum of magnitudes of the same kind, and \times denotes the product of a number and a magnitude. As shown in Section 2.6, these identities are fundamental in modern quantity calculus as well.

If p and q are magnitudes of the same kind, and there is some magnitude u of this kind and some numbers m, n such that $p = m \times u$ and $q = n \times u$, then p and q are said to be "commensurable". The ratio of magnitudes $p : q$ can then be represented by the ratio of numbers $m : n$. (It is natural to assume that this representation of $p : q$ is unique.) However, magnitudes may also be "relatively prime"; it may happen that $p : q$ cannot be expressed as $m : n$ for any numbers m, n because there are no m, n, u such that $p = m \times u$ and $q = n \times u$. In view of the Pythagorean philosophical conviction of the primacy of numbers, the discovery of examples of such "incommensurable" magnitudes created a deep crisis in early Greek mathematics [12], a crisis that also affected the foundations of geometry.

If ratios of *arithmoi* do not always suffice to represent ratios of magnitudes, it seems that it would not always be possible to express in terms of *arithmoi* the fact that two ratios of magnitudes are equal, as are the ratios of the lengths of corresponding sides of similar triangles. This difficulty was resolved by Eudoxos, who realized that a "proportion", that is, a relation among magnitudes of the form " p is to q as p' is to q' ", conveniently denoted $p : q :: p' : q'$, can be defined numerically even if there is no pair of ratios of *arithmoi* $m : n$ and $m' : n'$ corresponding to $p : q$ and $p' : q'$, respectively, so that $p : q :: p' : q'$ cannot be inferred from $m : n = m' : n'$. Specifically, as described in Book V of the *Elements*, Eudoxos invented an ingenious indirect way of determining if $p : q :: p' : q'$ in terms of nothing but *arithmoi* by means of a construction similar to the Dedekind cut [12]. Using modern terminology, one can say that Eudoxos defined an equivalence relation $::$ between pairs of magnitudes of the same kind in terms of positive integers, and as a consequence it became possible to conceptualize in terms of *arithmoi* not only ratios of magnitudes corresponding to rational numbers but also ratios of magnitudes corresponding to irrational numbers. Eudoxos thus reconciled the continuum of magnitudes with the discrete *arithmoi*, but in retrospect this feat reduced the incentive to rethink the Greek notion of number, to generalize the *arithmoi*.

To summarize, Greek mathematicians used two notions of muchness, and built a theoretical system around each notion. These systems were connected by relationships of the form $q = n \times u$, where q is a magnitude, n a number and u a magnitude of the same kind as q , foreboding from the distant past Maxwell's conceptualization of a physical quantity, although Euclid did not define magnitudes in terms of units and numbers.

The modern theory of numbers dramatically extends the theory of numbers in the *Elements*. Many types of numbers other than positive integers have been added, and the notion of a number as an element of an algebraic system has come to the forefront. The modern notion of number was not developed by a straight-forward extension of the concept of *arithmos*, however; the initial development of the new notion of number during the Renaissance was strongly inspired by the ancient theory of magnitudes.

The beginning of the Renaissance saw renewed interest in the classical Greek theories of magnitudes and numbers as known from Euclid's *Elements*, but later these two notions gradually fused into that of a real number. Malet [19] remarks:

As far as we know, not only was the neat and consistent separation between the Euclidean notions of numbers and magnitudes preserved in Latin medieval translations [...], but these notions were still regularly taught in the major schools of Western Europe in the second half of the 15th century. By the second half of the 17th century, however, the distinction between the classical notions of (natural) numbers and continuous geometrical magnitudes was largely gone, as were the notions themselves. [pp. 64–65]

The force driving this transformation was the need for a continuum of numbers as a basis for computation; the discrete *arithmoi* were not sufficient. As magnitudes of the same kind form a continuum, the idea emerged that numbers should be regarded as an aspect of magnitudes. "Number is to magnitude as wetness is to water" said Stevin in *L'Arithmétique* [25], published 1585, and defined a number as "that by which one can tell the quantity of anything" (cela, par lequel s'explique la quantité de chascune chose) [Definition II]. Thus, numbers were seen to form a continuum by virtue of their intimate association with magnitudes.

Stevin's definition of a number is rather vague, and it is difficult to see how a magnitude can be associated with a definite number, considering that the numerical measure of a magnitude depends on a choice of a unit magnitude. The notion of number was, however, refined during the 17th century. In *La Geometrie* [3], where Descartes laid the groundwork for analytic geometry, he implicitly identified numbers with *ratios* of two magnitudes, namely lengths of line segments, one of which was considered to have unit length, and in *Universal Arithmetick* [21] Newton, who had studied both Euclid and Descartes, defined a number as follows:

By *Number* we mean, not so much a Multitude of Unities, as the abstracted *Ratio* of any Quantity, to another Quantity of the same Kind, which we take for Unity. [p. 2]

By assigning the number 1 to a unit quantity, the representation of quantities by numbers is normalized, addressing a problem with Stevin's definition. Also, a ratio of quantities of the same kind is a "dimensionless" quantity. Systems of such quantities contain a canonical unit quantity **1**, and addition, subtraction, multiplication and division of dimensionless quantities yield dimensionless quantities. Hence, a number and the corresponding dimensionless quantity are quite similar, though Newton hints at a difference by calling numbers "abstracted" ratios of quantities.

Magnitudes, or "dimensionful" quantities, were thus needed only as a scaffolding for the new notion of numbers, and when this notion had been established its origins fell into oblivion and magnitudes fell out of fashion. The tradition from Euclid faded away, but the idea that numbers specify quantities relative to other quantities remained, as in [6]. A new theory of quantities originated from this idea.

While the Greek theory of magnitudes derived from geometry, the new theory of quantities found applications in mathematical physics, a branch of science that emerged in the 18th century. In *The Analytic Theory of Heat* [9], published in 1822, Fourier explains how physical quantities relate to the numbers in his equations:

In order to measure these quantities and express them numerically, they must be compared with different kinds of units, five in number, namely, the unit of length, the unit of time, that of temperature, that of weight, and finally the unit which serves to measure quantities of heat. [pp. 126–127]

We recognize here the ideas that there are quantities of different kinds and that the number associated with a quantity depends on the choice of a unit quantity of the same kind.

Using the modern notion of, for example, a real number, we can generalize relationships of the form $q = n \times u$, where n is an *arithmos* and u is a magnitude that measures (divides) q , to relationships of the form $q = \mu \cdot u$, where u is a freely chosen unit quantity of the same kind as q , and μ is the measure of q relative to u , a number specifying the size of q compared to u . If $q = \mu \cdot u$ then μ is determined by q and u , and we may write $\mu = f(q, u)$ as $\mu = q/u$.

Fourier realized that the measure of a quantity may be defined in terms of measures of other quantities, in turn dependent on the units for these quantities. For example, the measure of a velocity depends on a unit of length u_ℓ and a unit of time u_t since a velocity is defined in terms of a length and a time, and the measure of an area indirectly depends on a unit of length u_ℓ .

Formally, let the measure μ_v of a velocity v relative to u_v be given by $\mu_v = F(\mu_\ell, \mu_t) = F(\ell/u_\ell, t/u_t)$, where $F(x, y) = xy^{-1}$, and let the measure μ_a of the

area a of a rectangle relative to u_a be given by $\mu_a = G(\mu_\ell, \mu_w) = G(\ell/u_\ell, w/u_\ell)$, where $G(x, y) = xy$. Generalizing the magnitude identity $m \times (n \times u) = mn \times u$, we have $M \cdot (N \cdot u) = MN \cdot u$ for any real numbers M, N . Thus, if $q = \mu \cdot u$ and $M \neq 0$ then $q = M\mu \cdot (M^{-1} \cdot u)$, so $M\mu = q/(M^{-1} \cdot u)$, so it follows from the definitions of F and G that, for any non-zero numbers L, T ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu'_v &= F(\ell/(L^{-1} \cdot u_\ell), t/(T^{-1} \cdot u_t)) = F(L\mu_\ell, T\mu_t) = LT^{-1}F(\mu_\ell, \mu_t) = LT^{-1}\mu_v, \\ \mu'_a &= G(\ell/(L^{-1} \cdot u_\ell), w/(L^{-1} \cdot u_\ell)) = G(L\mu_\ell, L\mu_w) = L^2G(\mu_\ell, \mu_w) = L^2\mu_a.\end{aligned}$$

The two equations show how the measures μ_v and μ_a are affected by a change of the units u_ℓ and u_t . Reasoning similarly [9, pp. 128–130], Fourier pointed out that quantity terms can be equal or combined by addition or subtraction only if they agree with respect to each *exposant de dimension*, having identical patterns of exponents in expressions such as LT^{-1} , LT^{-2} or L^2 , since otherwise the validity of numerical equations corresponding to quantity equations would depend on an arbitrary choice of units. He thus introduced the principle of dimensional homogeneity for equations that relate quantities.

Note that if $q = \mu \cdot u$ then $M \cdot q = M \cdot (\mu \cdot u) = M\mu \cdot u$, so $(M \cdot q)/u = M\mu = M(q/u)$. Thus, in a sense turning Fourier's argument around, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu'_v &= F((L \cdot \ell)/u_\ell, (T \cdot t)/u_t) = F(L(\ell/u_\ell), T(t/u_t)) = LT^{-1}F(\ell/u_\ell, t/u_t) = LT^{-1}\mu_v, \\ \mu'_a &= G((L \cdot \ell)/u_\ell, (L \cdot w)/u_\ell) = G(L(\ell/u_\ell), L(w/u_\ell)) = L^2G(\ell/u_\ell, w/u_\ell) = L^2\mu_a.\end{aligned}$$

For any fixed units u_ℓ and u_t , we can express this as

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(L \cdot \ell, T \cdot t) &= LT^{-1}\Phi(\ell, t), \\ \Gamma(L \cdot \ell, L \cdot w) &= L^2\Gamma(\ell, w),\end{aligned}$$

where Φ and Γ are the quantity-valued functions given by $\Phi(\ell, t) = F(\ell/u_\ell, t/u_t) \cdot u_v$ and $\Gamma(\ell, w) = G(\ell/u_\ell, w/u_\ell) \cdot u_a$, respectively; note that the units for velocity and area are fixed since they depend on the fixed units for length and time.

The bilinearity properties of Φ and Γ suggest that we write $\Phi(\ell, t)$ as $\alpha \ell t^{-1}$ and $\Gamma(\ell, w)$ as $\beta \ell w$, where α and β are numerical constants. Generalizing this heuristic argument, we may introduce the idea that quantities of the same or different kinds can be multiplied and divided, suggesting that we can form arbitrary expressions of the form $\mu \prod_{i=1}^n q_i^{k_i}$, where μ is any number, q_i are quantities and k_i are integers, thus coming close to the quantity calculus set out below. Note, however, that Fourier did not actually define multiplication or division of quantities as such. This came later, with Lodge [18], Wallot [26] and others.

In retrospect, one may say that Fourier reinvented magnitudes as protoquantities and extended the range of applications. While multiplication and division of measures of quantities sufficed for Fourier, he made a clear distinction between a quantity and its measure relative to a unit, this measure being a real number rather than an *arithmos*, he distinguished different kinds of quantities, and he considered new kinds of quantities such as temperatures and amounts of heat. Essential elements of a modern quantity calculus treating general quantities as mathematical objects as real as numbers were thus recognized early in the 19th century. Subsequent progress in this area of mathematics has not been fast and straight-forward, however, and in his survey from 1994 de Boer noted that the modern theory of quantities had not yet met its Euclid; he concluded that "a satisfactory axiomatic foundation for the quantity calculus" had not yet been formulated [2].

Gowers [10] points out that many mathematical objects are not defined directly by describing their essential properties, but indirectly by *construction-definitions*, specifying constructions that can be shown to have these properties. For example, an ordered pair (x, y) may be defined by a construction-definition as a set $\{x, \{y\}\}$; it can be shown that this construction has the required properties, namely that $(x, y) = (x', y')$ if and only if $x = x'$ and $y = y'$. Many contemporary formalizations of the notion of a quantity use definitions relying on constructions, often defining quantities in terms of scalar-unit pairs or some similar construction, in the tradition from Maxwell. (See the survey in [14] and the references therein for some specifics.) However, this is rather like defining a vector as a coordinates-basis pair rather than as an element of a vector space, the modern definition.

Although magnitudes are illustrated by line segments in the *Elements*, the notion of a magnitude is abstract and general. Remarkably, Euclid, following Eudoxos, dealt with this notion in a very modern way. While Euclid carefully defined other important objects such as points, lines and numbers in terms of inherent properties, there is no statement about what a magnitude "is". Instead, magnitudes are characterized by how they relate to other magnitudes through their roles in a system of magnitudes, to paraphrase Gowers [11].

In the same spirit, that of modern algebra, quantities are defined in this article simply as elements of a *quantity space*. Thus, the focus is moved from individual quantities and operations on them to the systems to which the quantities belong, meaning that the notion of quantity calculus will give way to that of a quantity space. This article elaborates on the notion of a quantity space introduced in [13, 14], related to previous research as sketched in [14].

In the conceptual framework of universal algebra, a quantity space is just a special *scalable monoid* $(X, *, (\omega_\lambda)_{\lambda \in R}, 1_X)$, where X is the underlying set of the algebra, $(X, *, 1_X)$ is a monoid, R is a fixed ring and every ω_λ is unary operation on X . Writing $*(x, y)$ as xy and denoting $\omega_\lambda(x)$ by $\lambda \cdot x$, we have $1 \cdot x = x$, $\lambda \cdot (\kappa \cdot x) = \lambda\kappa \cdot x$ and $\lambda \cdot xy = (\lambda \cdot x)y = x(\lambda \cdot y)$ for all $\lambda \in R$, $x, y \in X$.

A scalable monoid X is partitioned into *commensurability classes*, which are equivalence classes with respect to the relation \sim defined by $x \sim y$ if and only if $\alpha \cdot x = \beta \cdot y$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in R$. There is no global operation $(x, y) \mapsto x + y$ defined on X , but within each commensurability class that contains a unit element addition of its elements is induced by the addition in R , and multiplication of commensurability classes is induced by the multiplication of elements of X .

Quantity spaces are to scalable monoids as vector spaces are to modules. Specifically, a quantity space Q is a commutative scalable monoid over a field, such that there exists a finite basis for Q , similar to a basis for a free abelian group. As noted, quantities are just elements of quantity spaces, and dimensions are commensurability classes in quantity spaces.

The remainder of this article is divided into two main sections, namely Section 2 which deals with scalable monoids and Section 3 where scalable monoids are specialized to quantity spaces.

2. SCALABLE MONOIDS

A scalable monoid is a monoid whose elements can be multiplied by elements of a ring, and where multiplication in the monoid, multiplication in the ring, and multiplication of monoid elements by ring elements are interconnected operations.

Scalable monoids are formally defined and compared to rings and modules in Section 2.1, and some basic facts about them are presented in Section 2.2. Sections 2.3 and 2.5 are concerned with congruences on scalable monoids and related notions such as commensurability classes, homomorphisms and quotient algebras, while direct and tensor products of scalable monoids are defined in Section 2.4. Scalable monoids with unit elements are investigated in Sections 2.6 and 2.7. In particular, addition of elements in the same commensurability class is defined, and coherent systems of unit elements are discussed.

2.1. Mathematical background, main definition and simple examples. A unital associative algebra X over a (unital, associative but not necessarily commutative) ring R can be defined as a set, also denoted X , with three operations:

- (1) *addition* of elements of X , a binary operation $+$: $(x, y) \mapsto x + y$ on X such that X equipped with $+$ is an abelian group;
- (2) *multiplication* of elements of X , a binary operation $*$: $(x, y) \mapsto xy$ on X such that X equipped with $*$ is a monoid;
- (3) *scalar multiplication* of elements of X by elements of R , a monoid action $(\alpha, x) \mapsto \alpha \cdot x$ where the multiplicative monoid of R acts on X so that $1 \cdot x = x$ and $\alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot x) = \alpha\beta \cdot x$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in R$ and $x \in X$.

There are identities specifying a link between each pair of operations:

- (a) addition and multiplication of elements of X are linked by the distributive laws $x(y + z) = xy + xz$ and $(x + y)z = xz + yz$;
- (b) addition of elements of X or R and scalar multiplication of elements of X by elements of R are linked by the distributive laws $\alpha \cdot (x + y) = \alpha \cdot x + \alpha \cdot y$ and $(\alpha + \beta) \cdot x = \alpha \cdot x + \beta \cdot x$;
- (c) multiplication of elements of X and scalar multiplication of elements of X by elements of R are linked by the bilinearity laws $\alpha \cdot xy = (\alpha \cdot x)y$ and $\alpha \cdot xy = x(\alpha \cdot y)$.

Related algebraic structures can be obtained from unital associative algebras by removing one of the operations (1) – (3) and hence the links between the removed operation and the two others. Two cases are very familiar: a ring has only addition and multiplication of elements of X , linked as described in (a), and a (left) module has only addition of elements of X and scalar multiplication of elements of X by elements of R , linked as described in (b). The question arises whether it would be meaningful and useful to define an “algebra without an additive group”, with only multiplication of elements of X and scalar multiplication of elements of X by elements of R , linked as described in (c).

The answer is affirmative. It turns out that this notion, a “scalable monoid”, formally related to rings and in particular modules, makes sense mathematically and is remarkably well suited for modeling systems of quantities. The ancient *arithmos-megethos* pair of notions receives a modern interpretation: while numbers can be formalized as elements of rings, typically fields, quantities can be formalized as elements of scalable monoids, specifically quantity spaces.

Definition 2.1. Let R be a (unital, associative) ring. A *scalable monoid over R* is a monoid X equipped with a *scaling action*

$$\omega : R \times X \rightarrow X, \quad (\alpha, x) \mapsto \alpha \cdot x,$$

such that we have

- (1) $1 \cdot x = x$,
- (2) $\alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot x) = \alpha\beta \cdot x$,
- (3) $\alpha \cdot xy = (\alpha \cdot x)y = x(\alpha \cdot y)$.

We denote the identity element of X by 1_X , and set $x^0 = 1_X$ for any $x \in X$. An *invertible* element of a scalable monoid X is an element $x \in X$ that has a (necessarily unique) *inverse* $x^{-1} \in X$ such that $xx^{-1} = x^{-1}x = 1_X$.

It is easy to verify that the *trivial scaling action* of a ring R on a monoid X defined by $\lambda \cdot x = x$ for all $\lambda \in R$ and $x \in X$ is indeed a scaling action according to Definition 2.1. We call a monoid equipped with a trivial scaling action a *trivially scalable* monoid. A scalable monoid of this kind is essentially just a monoid, since the operation $(\lambda, x) \mapsto \lambda \cdot x$ can be disregarded in this case.

Example 2.2. A *trivial* scalable monoid is a trivial monoid $\{1_X\}$ with a trivial scaling action.

Example 2.3. Let $M(n)$ be the multiplicative monoid of all $n \times n$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{R} . Then $M(n)$ is a scalable monoid over the corresponding matrix ring $R(n)$, with the scaling action defined by $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{X} = (\det \mathbf{A})\mathbf{X}$.

Example 2.4. Let $R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]$ denote the set of all monomials of the form

$$\lambda x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n},$$

where R is a commutative ring, $\lambda \in R$, x_1, \dots, x_n are uninterpreted symbols and k_1, \dots, k_n are non-negative integers. We can define the operations $(s, t) \mapsto st$, $(\alpha, t) \mapsto \alpha \cdot t$ and $() \mapsto 1_{R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]}$ on $R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha x_1^{j_1} \dots x_n^{j_n}) (\beta x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n}) &= (\alpha\beta) x_1^{(j_1+k_1)} \dots x_n^{(j_n+k_n)}, \\ \alpha \cdot \lambda x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n} &= (\alpha\lambda) x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n}, \\ 1_{R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]} &= 1 x_1^0 \dots x_n^0. \end{aligned}$$

$R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]$ equipped with these operations is a commutative scalable monoid over R .

Recall that the set \mathfrak{M} of all terms of the form $x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n}$, where x_1, \dots, x_n are uninterpreted symbols and k_1, \dots, k_n are non-negative integers, with operations defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1^{j_1} \dots x_n^{j_n}) (x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n}) &= x_1^{(j_1+k_1)} \dots x_n^{(j_n+k_n)}, \\ 1_{\mathfrak{M}} &= x_1^0 \dots x_n^0, \end{aligned}$$

is a finitely generated free commutative monoid. The construction in Example 2.4 similarly represents a commutative *scalable* monoid that is finitely generated free in a sense discussed further in Section 3.1.

2.2. Some basic facts about scalable monoids. A not necessarily commutative scalable monoid over a not necessarily commutative ring nevertheless exhibits certain commutativity properties as described in the following useful lemma:

Lemma 2.5. *Let X be a scalable monoid over R . For any $x, y \in X$ and $\alpha, \beta \in R$ we have*

$$(\alpha \cdot x)(\beta \cdot y) = \alpha\beta \cdot xy, \quad \alpha\beta \cdot x = \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot x) = \beta \cdot (\alpha \cdot x) = \beta\alpha \cdot x.$$

Proof. By Definition 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha \cdot x)(\beta \cdot y) &= \alpha \cdot x(\beta \cdot y) = \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot xy) = \alpha\beta \cdot xy, \\ \alpha\beta \cdot x &= \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot x) = \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot 1_X x) = \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot 1_X)x = (\beta \cdot 1_X)(\alpha \cdot x) \\ &= \beta\alpha \cdot 1_X x = \beta\alpha \cdot x = \beta \cdot (\alpha \cdot x), \end{aligned}$$

where the first identity is used in the proof of the second. \square

For the scalable monoid in Example 2.3, the second identity in Lemma 2.5 means that $(\det \mathbf{A})(\det \mathbf{B})\mathbf{X} = (\det \mathbf{AB})\mathbf{X} = (\det \mathbf{BA})\mathbf{X} = (\det \mathbf{B})(\det \mathbf{A})\mathbf{X}$.

Since every monoid \mathfrak{M} has a unique identity element $1_{\mathfrak{M}}$, the class of all monoids forms a variety of algebras $(\mathfrak{M}, *, 1_{\mathfrak{m}})$ with a binary operation $*$: $(x, y) \mapsto xy$, a nullary operation $1_{\mathfrak{M}} : () \mapsto 1_{\mathfrak{M}}$ and identities

$$x(yz) = (xy)z, \quad 1_{\mathfrak{M}}x = x = x1_{\mathfrak{M}}.$$

The class of all scalable monoids over a fixed ring R is a variety in addition equipped with a set of unary operations $\{\omega_\lambda \mid \lambda \in R\}$, derived from the scaling action ω in Definition 2.1 by setting $\omega_\lambda(x) = \lambda \cdot x$ for all $\lambda \in R$ and $x \in X$, and with the additional identities

$$\omega_1(x) = x, \quad \omega_\lambda(\omega_\kappa(x)) = \omega_{\lambda\kappa}(x), \quad \omega_\lambda(xy) = \omega_\lambda(x)y = x\omega_\lambda(y) \quad (\lambda, \kappa \in R),$$

corresponding to identities (1) – (3) in Definition 2.1.

A scalable monoid can thus be regarded as a universal algebra

$$(X, *, (\omega_\lambda)_{\lambda \in R}, 1_X)$$

with X as underlying set, here called a *unital R -magma*. The general definitions of subalgebras, homomorphisms and products of algebras in the theory of universal algebras apply. In particular, a subalgebra of a unital R -magma X is a subset Y of X such that $1_X \in Y$ and $xy, \lambda \cdot x \in Y$ for any $x, y \in Y$ and $\lambda \in R$. Also, a homomorphism $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$ of unital R -magmas X and Y is a function such that $\phi(1_X) = 1_Y$ and we have $\phi(xy) = \phi(x)\phi(y)$ and $\phi(\lambda \cdot x) = \lambda \cdot \phi(x)$ for any $x, y \in X$ and $\lambda \in R$.

Recall, furthermore, that varieties are closed under the operations of forming subalgebras, homomorphic images and products since the defining identities are replicated by these operations [1]. Thus, a subalgebra of a scalable monoid over R , a homomorphic image of a scalable monoid over R , and a direct product of scalable monoids over R are all scalable monoids over R . Results related to these and other constructions will be considered in the remainder of Section 2.

2.3. Commensurability classes and canonical quotients. In ancient Greek mathematics, the notions of a sum, difference or ratio of magnitudes did not apply to magnitudes of different kinds, so in particular these could not be commensurable in the Greek (Pythagorean) sense. However, magnitudes of the same kind, for example, two lengths, could nevertheless be incommensurable. In this section, we introduce a seemingly more radical idea: quantities are of the same kind *if and only if* they are commensurable.

Definition 2.6. Given a scalable monoid X over R , let \sim be the relation on X such that $x \sim y$ if and only if $\alpha \cdot x = \beta \cdot y$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in R$. We say that x and y are *commensurable* if and only if $x \sim y$; otherwise x and y are *incommensurable*.

Let $R \cdot x$ denote the set $\{\lambda \cdot x \mid \lambda \in R\}$, that is, the orbit of $x \in X$ for the scaling action $\omega : R \times X \rightarrow X$, and let \approx denote the relation on X such that $x \approx y$ if and only if there is some $t \in X$ such that $x, y \in R \cdot t$. Note that \approx is not an equivalence relation; it is reflexive since $x \in 1 \cdot x$ for all $x \in X$ and symmetric by construction but not transitive, meaning that the orbits for ω may overlap. On the other hand, $x \sim y$ if and only if $(R \cdot x) \cap (R \cdot y) \neq \emptyset$, and this relation is indeed transitive.

Proposition 2.7. *The relation \sim on a scalable monoid X over R is an equivalence relation.*

Proof. The relation \sim is reflexive since $1 \cdot x = 1 \cdot x$ for all $x \in X$, symmetric by construction, and transitive because if $\alpha \cdot x = \beta \cdot y$ and $\gamma \cdot y = \delta \cdot z$ for some $x, y, z \in X$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in R$ then it follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$\gamma \alpha \cdot x = \gamma \cdot (\alpha \cdot x) = \gamma \cdot (\beta \cdot y) = \beta \cdot (\gamma \cdot y) = \beta \cdot (\delta \cdot z) = \beta \delta \cdot z,$$

where $\gamma \alpha, \beta \delta \in R$. □

Definition 2.8. A *commensurability class* or *orbitoid* C is an equivalence class for \sim . The orbitoid that contains x is denoted by $[x]$, and X/\sim denotes the set $\{[x] \mid x \in X\}$.

For example, the commensurability classes of $R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]$ in Example 2.4 are the sets $\{\lambda x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n} \mid \lambda \in R\}$ for fixed non-negative integers k_1, \dots, k_n .

Remark 2.9. Let the group G act on the set X , $(\gamma, x) \mapsto \gamma \cdot x$, and let the relation \sim_G on X be defined by $x \sim_G y$ if and only if $\gamma \cdot x = y$ for some $\gamma \in G$. This is obviously an equivalence relation, and we denote the equivalence class containing x by $[x]_G$. By definition, $[x]_G = G \cdot x$, so orbits in X under a group action $G \times X \rightarrow X$ can be defined by means of \sim_G . Similarly, orbitoids – generalized orbits in X under a monoid action satisfying $\alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot x) = \beta \cdot (\alpha \cdot x)$ – are given by the equivalence relation \sim , defined by $x \sim y$ if and only if $\alpha \cdot x = \beta \cdot y$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in R$. One may say that orbitoids generalize orbits as \sim generalizes \sim_G .

Proposition 2.10. *If $x \sim y$ then $\lambda \cdot x \sim y$, $x \sim \lambda \cdot y$ and $\lambda \cdot x \sim \lambda \cdot y$ for all $\lambda \in R$.*

Proof. If $x \sim y$ then $\alpha \cdot x = \beta \cdot y$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in R$, so by Lemma 2.5

$$\alpha \lambda \cdot x = \alpha \cdot (\lambda \cdot x) = \lambda \cdot (\alpha \cdot x) = \lambda \cdot (\beta \cdot y) = \beta \cdot (\lambda \cdot y) = \beta \lambda \cdot y,$$

where $\alpha \lambda, \beta \lambda \in R$. □

Corollary 2.11. *$\lambda \cdot x \sim x$ for all $x \in X$ and $\lambda \in R$.*

It is instructive to compare the present notion of commensurability with the classical one. If $x = \alpha \cdot t$ and $y = \beta \cdot t$ then $\beta \cdot x = \beta \cdot (\alpha \cdot t) = \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot t) = \alpha \cdot y$, so if $x \approx y$ then $x \sim y$. We say that x and y are *strongly commensurable* if and only if $x \approx y$; otherwise, x and y are said to be *weakly incommensurable*.

Incommensurability of magnitudes in the Pythagorean sense obviously corresponds to weak incommensurability, so it is implied by, but does not imply, incommensurability in the present sense. Conversely, we have weakened the classical notion of commensurability here, at the same time making commensurability into an equivalence relation, and the concept of commensurability as defined here corresponds to the intuitive notion of magnitudes of the same kind, or the somewhat fuzzy notion of quantities of the same kind in modern theoretical metrology [28].

Remark 2.12. Note, however, that we are talking about abstract, mathematical quantities of the same kind here. These are abstract representations of concrete or physical quantities that possess concrete properties lost in the abstraction process. Therefore, concrete quantities of different kinds may correspond to abstract quantities of the same kind. For example, a plane angle and a solid angle are physical quantities of different kinds, but abstract quantities of the same kind. These matters are discussed further in [14].

So far, we have regarded \sim as an equivalence relation, but it turns out that more can be said.

Proposition 2.13. *Let X be a scalable monoid over R . The relation \sim is a congruence on X with regard to the operations $(x, y) \mapsto xy$ and $(\lambda, x) \mapsto \lambda \cdot x$.*

Proof. For any $x, x', y, y' \in X$ and $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' \in R$, we have that if $\alpha \cdot x = \alpha' \cdot x'$ and $\beta \cdot y = \beta' \cdot y'$ then $(\alpha \cdot x)(\beta \cdot y) = (\alpha' \cdot x')(\beta' \cdot y')$, so $\alpha\beta \cdot xy = \alpha'\beta' \cdot x'y'$ by Lemma 2.5. This means that if $x \sim x'$ and $y \sim y'$ then $xy \sim x'y'$. Also, if $x \sim x'$ then $\lambda \cdot x \sim \lambda \cdot x'$ for any $\lambda \in R$ by Proposition 2.10. \square

We can thus define a binary operation on X/\sim by setting $[x][y] = [xy]$ (so that if $A, B \in X/\sim$, $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ then $ab \in AB \in X/\sim$). We can also set $\lambda \cdot [x] = [\lambda \cdot x]$ and $1_{X/\sim} = [1_X]$. Given these definitions, X/\sim is a unital R -magma and the surjective function $\phi : X \rightarrow X/\sim$ given by $\phi(x) = [x]$ satisfies the conditions

$$\phi(xy) = \phi(x)\phi(y), \quad \phi(\lambda \cdot x) = \lambda \cdot \phi(x), \quad \phi(1_X) = 1_{X/\sim}.$$

ϕ is thus a homomorphism of scalable monoids. Thus, Proposition 2.13, which is expressed in terms of congruences, leads to Proposition 2.14, expressed in terms of homomorphisms.

Proposition 2.14. *If X is a scalable monoid over R then the quotient space X/\sim is a scalable monoid over R , and the function*

$$\phi : X \rightarrow X/\sim, \quad x \mapsto [x],$$

is a surjective homomorphism of scalable monoids.

We call X/\sim the *canonical quotient* of X .

Proposition 2.15. *If X is a scalable monoid then X/\sim is a trivially scalable monoid.*

Proof. By Corollary 2.11, $\lambda \cdot [x] = [\lambda \cdot x] = [x]$ for all $\lambda \in R, x \in X$. \square

In many situations, it is natural to regard X/\sim as a monoid with operations inherited from X by setting $[x][y] = [xy]$ and $1_{X/\sim} = [1_X]$. For example, it is clear that $R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]/\sim$ is essentially the monoid \mathfrak{M} described in Section 2.1.

2.4. Direct and tensor products of scalable monoids. Consider a unital R -magma

$$(X \times Y, *, (\omega_\lambda)_{\lambda \in R}, 1_{X \times Y})$$

where X and Y are the underlying sets of two scalable monoids over R , $*$ is a binary operation given by $(x_1, y_1)(x_2, y_2) = (x_1x_2, y_1y_2)$, each ω_λ is a unary operation given by $\omega_\lambda(x, y) = \lambda \cdot (x, y) = (\lambda \cdot x, \lambda \cdot y)$, and $1_{X \times Y}$ is a nullary operation given by $1_{X \times Y} = (1_X, 1_Y)$. Straight-forward calculations verify that this unital R -magma,

likewise denoted $X \times Y$, is a scalable monoid over R since the required identities hold. We call $X \times Y$ the *direct product* of X and Y .

The direct product of scalable monoids is a generic product, applicable to any universal algebra. Another kind of product, which exploits the fact that $(\lambda \cdot x)y = \lambda \cdot xy = x(\lambda \cdot y)$ in scalable monoids, namely the *tensor product*, turns out to be more useful in many cases.

Definition 2.16. Given scalable monoids X and Y over R , let \sim_{\otimes} be the binary relation on $X \times Y$ such that $(x_1, y_1) \sim_{\otimes} (x_2, y_2)$ if and only if $(\alpha \cdot x_1, \beta \cdot y_1) = (\beta \cdot x_2, \alpha \cdot y_2)$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in R$.

Proposition 2.17. *Let X and Y be scalable monoids over R . Then \sim_{\otimes} is an equivalence relation on $X \times Y$.*

Proof. \sim_{\otimes} is reflexive since $(1 \cdot x, 1 \cdot y) = (1 \cdot x, 1 \cdot y)$, and symmetric by construction. If $(\alpha \cdot x_1, \beta \cdot y_1) = (\beta \cdot x_2, \alpha \cdot y_2)$ and $(\gamma \cdot x_2, \delta \cdot y_2) = (\delta \cdot x_3, \gamma \cdot y_3)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma \cdot (\alpha \cdot x_1), \delta \cdot (\beta \cdot y_1)) &= (\gamma \cdot (\beta \cdot x_2), \delta \cdot (\alpha \cdot y_2)), \\ (\beta \cdot (\gamma \cdot x_2), \alpha \cdot (\delta \cdot y_2)) &= (\beta \cdot (\delta \cdot x_3), \alpha \cdot (\gamma \cdot y_3)). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.5, $(\gamma \cdot (\beta \cdot x_2), \delta \cdot (\alpha \cdot y_2)) = (\beta \cdot (\gamma \cdot x_2), \alpha \cdot (\delta \cdot y_2))$, and thus

$$(\gamma \alpha \cdot x_1, \delta \beta \cdot y_1) = (\beta \delta \cdot x_3, \alpha \gamma \cdot y_3) = (\delta \beta \cdot x_3, \gamma \alpha \cdot y_3),$$

where $\gamma \alpha, \delta \beta \in R$, so \sim_{\otimes} is transitive as well. \square

Definition 2.18. Let X and Y be scalable monoids, let $x \otimes y$ denote the equivalence class

$$\{(s, t) \mid (s, t) \sim_{\otimes} (x, y)\},$$

where $x \in X, y \in Y$, and let $X \otimes Y$ denote the set

$$\{x \otimes y \mid x \in X, y \in Y\}.$$

equipped with the operations given by

$$(x_1 \otimes y_1)(x_2 \otimes y_2) = x_1 x_2 \otimes y_1 y_2, \quad \lambda \cdot x \otimes y = (\lambda \cdot x) \otimes y, \quad 1_{X \otimes Y} = 1_X \otimes 1_Y.$$

We call $X \otimes Y$ the *tensor product* of X and Y .

Proposition 2.19. *Let X and Y be scalable monoids over R , $x \in X$ and $y \in X$. Then $(\lambda \cdot x) \otimes y = x \otimes (\lambda \cdot y)$ for every $\lambda \in R$.*

Proof. We have $(1 \cdot (\lambda \cdot x), \lambda \cdot y) = (\lambda \cdot x, 1 \cdot (\lambda \cdot y))$, so $(\lambda \cdot x, y) \sim_{\otimes} (x, \lambda \cdot y)$. \square

Proposition 2.20. *Let X and Y be scalable monoids over R . Then $X \otimes Y$ is a scalable monoid over R .*

Proof. $X \otimes Y$ is a monoid since

$$\begin{aligned} (1_X \otimes 1_Y)(x \otimes y) &= 1_X x \otimes 1_Y y = x \otimes y = x 1_X \otimes y 1_Y = (x \otimes y)(1_X \otimes 1_Y), \\ ((x_1 \otimes y_1)(x_2 \otimes y_2))(x_3 \otimes y_3) &= (x_1 x_2 \otimes y_1 y_2)(x_3 \otimes y_3) = (x_1 x_2) x_3 \otimes (y_1 y_2) y_3 \\ &= x_1 (x_2 x_3) \otimes y_1 (y_2 y_3) = (x_1 \otimes y_1)(x_2 x_3 \otimes y_2 y_3) \\ &= (x_1 \otimes y_1)((x_2 \otimes y_2)(x_3 \otimes y_3)). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$1 \cdot x \otimes y = (1 \cdot x) \otimes y = x \otimes y,$$

$$\alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot x \otimes y) = \alpha \cdot ((\beta \cdot x) \otimes y) = (\alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot x)) \otimes y = (\alpha\beta \cdot x) \otimes y = \alpha\beta \cdot x \otimes y,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \cdot (x_1 \otimes y_1)(x_2 \otimes y_2) &= \lambda \cdot x_1 x_2 \otimes y_1 y_2 = (\lambda \cdot x_1 x_2) \otimes y_1 y_2 = ((\lambda \cdot x_1) x_2) \otimes y_1 y_2 \\ &= ((\lambda \cdot x_1) \otimes y_1)(x_2 \otimes y_2) = (\lambda \cdot x_1 \otimes y_1)(x_2 \otimes y_2), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \cdot (x_1 \otimes y_1)(x_2 \otimes y_2) &= \lambda \cdot x_1 x_2 \otimes y_1 y_2 = x_1 x_2 \otimes (\lambda \cdot y_1 y_2) = x_1 x_2 \otimes (y_1 (\lambda \cdot y_2)) \\ &= (x_1 \otimes y_1)(x_2 \otimes (\lambda \cdot y_2)) = (x_1 \otimes y_1)(\lambda \cdot x_2 \otimes y_2), \end{aligned}$$

so $X \otimes Y$ is a scalable monoid. \square

It follows that if X, Y, Z are scalable monoids over R then $(X \otimes Y) \otimes Z$ and $X \otimes (Y \otimes Z)$ are scalable monoids over R : the tensor product of $X \otimes Y$ and Z in the first case and of X and $Y \otimes Z$ in the second case. It can also be shown that $(X \otimes Y) \otimes Z$ and $X \otimes (Y \otimes Z)$ are isomorphic scalable monoids.

The tensor product can be used to "glue" scalable monoids together in a natural way so as to combine them into more inclusive scalable monoids. For example, $R[x; y]$ is isomorphic to the tensor product $R[x] \otimes R[y]$ but not to the direct product $R[x] \times R[y]$.

2.5. Quotients of scalable monoids by central submonoids. In a monoid we have $x(yz) = (xy)z$ and $1_X x = x = x 1_X$, so a submonoid \mathfrak{M} of a scalable monoid X can act as a monoid on X by left or right multiplication. In particular, we can define an action $\Omega : \mathfrak{M} \times X \rightarrow X$ by setting $\Omega(m, x) = mx$ for any $m \in \mathfrak{M}$ and $x \in X$. This action can be used to define further notions in the same way that \sim , $[x]$ and X/\sim were defined in terms of the scaling action $\omega : R \times X \rightarrow X$.

Definition 2.21. Let X be a scalable monoid and \mathfrak{M} a submonoid of X . Then $\sim_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is the relation on X such that $x \sim_{\mathfrak{M}} y$ if and only if $mx = ny$ for some $m, n \in \mathfrak{M}$.

Proposition 2.22. *If X is a scalable monoid and \mathfrak{M} a commutative submonoid of X then $\sim_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an equivalence relation on X .*

Proof. The relation $\sim_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is reflexive since $1_X x \sim_{\mathfrak{M}} 1_X x$ for all $x \in X$, symmetric by construction, and transitive because if $mx = ny$ and $m'y = n'z$ for $m, n, m', n' \in \mathfrak{M}$ and $x, y, z \in X$ then $m'mx = m'ny = nm'y = nn'z$, where $m'm, nn' \in \mathfrak{M}$. \square

We denote the equivalence class for $\sim_{\mathfrak{M}}$ by $[x]_{\mathfrak{M}}$, and the set of equivalence classes $\{[x]_{\mathfrak{M}} \mid x \in X\}$ by X/\mathfrak{M} .

The *center* of a scalable monoid X , denoted $Z(X)$, is the set of elements of X each of which commutes with all elements of X ; clearly, $1_X \in Z(X)$. A *central submonoid* of a scalable monoid X is a submonoid \mathfrak{M} of X such that $\mathfrak{M} \subseteq Z(X)$. We have the following corollary of Proposition 2.22.

Corollary 2.23. *If X is a scalable monoid and \mathfrak{M} a central submonoid of X then $\sim_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an equivalence relation on X .*

Results analogous to Propositions 2.13 and 2.14 hold for scalable monoids with central submonoids.

Proposition 2.24. *If X is a scalable monoid over R and \mathfrak{M} a central submonoid of X then the relation $\sim_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is a congruence on X with regard to the operations $(x, y) \mapsto xy$ and $(\lambda, x) \mapsto \lambda \cdot x$.*

Proof. If $x, x', y, y' \in X$ and $m, n, m', n' \in \mathfrak{M}$ then $mx = nx'$ and $m'y = n'y'$ implies $(mx)(m'y) = (nx')(n'y')$ so that $(mm')(xy) = (nn')(x'y')$. Hence, if $x \sim_{\mathfrak{M}} x'$ and $y \sim_{\mathfrak{M}} y'$ then $xy \sim_{\mathfrak{M}} x'y'$ since $mm', nn' \in \mathfrak{M}$.

Also, if $mx = nx'$ for some $m, n \in M$ then $\lambda \cdot mx = \lambda \cdot nx'$ for all $\lambda \in R$, so $m(\lambda \cdot x) = n(\lambda \cdot x')$. Hence, if $x \sim_{\mathfrak{M}} x'$ then $\lambda \cdot x \sim_{\mathfrak{M}} \lambda \cdot x'$. \square

Corollary 2.25. *If X is a commutative scalable monoid over R and \mathfrak{M} a submonoid of X then the relation $\sim_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is a congruence on X with regard to the operations $(x, y) \mapsto xy$ and $(\lambda, x) \mapsto \lambda \cdot x$.*

Given a central submonoid \mathfrak{M} of X , we can thus define three operations on X/\mathfrak{M} by setting $[x]_{\mathfrak{M}}[y]_{\mathfrak{M}} = [xy]_{\mathfrak{M}}$, $\lambda \cdot [x]_{\mathfrak{M}} = [\lambda \cdot x]_{\mathfrak{M}}$ and $1_{X/\mathfrak{M}} = [1_X]_{\mathfrak{M}}$. With these definitions, X/\sim is a unital R -magma and the surjective function $\phi_{\mathfrak{M}} : X \rightarrow X/\mathfrak{M}$ defined by $\phi_{\mathfrak{M}}(x) = [x]_{\mathfrak{M}}$ satisfies the conditions

$$\phi_{\mathfrak{M}}(xy) = \phi_{\mathfrak{M}}(x)\phi_{\mathfrak{M}}(y), \quad \phi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\lambda \cdot x) = \lambda \cdot \phi_{\mathfrak{M}}(x), \quad \phi_{\mathfrak{M}}(1_X) = 1_{X/\mathfrak{M}}.$$

$\phi_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is thus a homomorphism of scalable monoids, and Proposition 2.24 corresponds to the following result about homomorphisms.

Proposition 2.26. *If X is a scalable monoid over R and \mathfrak{M} a central submonoid of X then the quotient space X/\mathfrak{M} is a scalable monoid over R and the function*

$$\phi_{\mathfrak{M}} : X \rightarrow X/\mathfrak{M}, \quad x \mapsto [x]_{\mathfrak{M}}$$

is a surjective homomorphism of scalable monoids.

Let us now consider the special case where the submonoid \mathfrak{M} of X considered above is a scalable submonoid M so that $x \in M$ implies $\lambda \cdot x \in M$ for every $\lambda \in R$.

Proposition 2.27. *Let M be a central scalable submonoid of a scalable monoid X over R . Then X/M is a trivially scalable monoid over R .*

Proof. For any central scalable submonoid M of X , we have $(\lambda \cdot x) \sim_M x$ for any $\lambda \in R$ and $x \in X$ since $1_X(\lambda \cdot x) = (\lambda \cdot 1_X)x$, where $1_X, \lambda \cdot 1_X \in M$. Hence, $\lambda \cdot [x]_M = [\lambda \cdot x]_M = [x]_M$ for any $\lambda \in R$ and $[x]_M \in X/M$. \square

Proposition 2.28. *Let M be a central scalable submonoid of a scalable monoid X over R and $x, y \in X$. Then $x \sim y$ implies $x \sim_M y$.*

Proof. If $\alpha \cdot x = \beta \cdot y$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in R$ then

$$(\alpha \cdot 1_X)x = \alpha \cdot 1_X x = \beta \cdot 1_X y = (\beta \cdot 1_X)y.$$

This implies the assertion since $\lambda \cdot 1_X \in M$ for $\lambda = \alpha, \beta \in R$. \square

Proposition 2.29. *Let X be a scalable monoid over R and $x, y \in X$. Then $R \cdot 1_X$ is a central scalable submonoid of X , and $x \sim_{R \cdot 1_X} y$ implies $x \sim y$.*

Proof. We have $1_X = 1 \cdot 1_X$, $(\alpha \cdot 1_X)(\beta \cdot 1_X) = \alpha\beta \cdot 1_X$, $\lambda \cdot (\alpha \cdot 1_X) = \lambda\alpha \cdot 1_X$ and $(\alpha \cdot 1_X)x = \alpha \cdot 1_X x = \alpha \cdot x 1_X = x(\alpha \cdot 1_X)$ for all $\alpha, \beta, \lambda \in R, x \in X$, so $R \cdot 1_X$ is a central scalable submonoid of X . Also, if $x \sim_{R \cdot 1_X} y$ then

$$\alpha \cdot 1_X x = (\alpha \cdot 1_X)x = (\beta \cdot 1_X)y = \beta \cdot 1_X y$$

for some $\alpha, \beta \in R$, so $x \sim_{R \cdot 1_X} y$ implies $x \sim y$. \square

It follows from Propositions 2.28 and 2.29 that $x \sim_M y$ generalizes $x \sim y$.

Corollary 2.30. *Let X be a scalable monoid over R and $x, y \in X$. Then $R \cdot 1_X$ is a central scalable submonoid of X , and $x \sim_{R \cdot 1_X} y$ if and only if $x \sim y$.*

For example, $\kappa \cdot \lambda x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n} = (\kappa \cdot 1x_1^0 \dots x_n^0) (\lambda x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n})$ for $\kappa = \alpha, \beta \in R$, so $R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]/\sim$ and $R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]/(R \cdot 1_X)$ are isomorphic monoids.

In [17], Krystek defines "dimensions" by constructing equivalence classes of "quantity values", forming a quotient group somewhat similar to $X/(\mathbb{R} \cdot 1_X)$.

2.6. Non-trivial orbitoids with unit elements are free modules of rank 1.

Recall the principle that magnitudes of the same kind can be added and subtracted, whereas magnitudes of different kinds cannot be combined by these operations. Also recall the idea that a quantity can be represented by a "unit" and a number (measure) specifying "[how many] times the [unit] is to be taken in order to make up" that quantity [20, p. 41]. As shown below, there is a connection between these two notions.

Specifically, it may happen that $R \cdot u \supseteq [u]$ for some $u \in [u]$, and if in addition a natural uniqueness condition is satisfied we may regard u as a unit of measurement for $[u]$. If such a unit exists then a sum of elements of $[u]$ can be defined by the construction described in Definition 2.35 below.

Definition 2.31. Let C be an orbitoid in a scalable monoid over R . A *generating element* for C is some $u \in C$ such that for every $x \in C$ there is some $\rho \in R$ such that $x = \rho \cdot u$. A *unit element* for C is a generating element u for C such that if $\rho \cdot u = \rho' \cdot u$ then $\rho = \rho'$.

By this definition, if u is a generating element for $C = [u]$ then $R \cdot u \supseteq C$. On the other hand, if $1 \cdot x = x = \rho \cdot u$ for some $\rho \in R$ then $x \sim u$, so $x \in [u]$, so $R \cdot u \subseteq [u]$. Thus, actually $R \cdot u = C$.

We now need to consider zero elements in scalable monoids.

Proposition 2.32. *Let X be a scalable monoid over R . For every $C \in X/\sim$ there is a unique $0_C \in C$ such that $0_C = 0 \cdot x$ for all $x \in C$.*

Proof. If $x, y \in C$ then $\alpha \cdot x = \beta \cdot y$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in R$, so $0 \cdot x = 0\alpha \cdot x = 0 \cdot (\alpha \cdot x) = 0 \cdot (\beta \cdot y) = 0\beta \cdot y = 0 \cdot y$. \square

We call 0_C the *zero element* of C ; note that distinct orbitoids have distinct zero elements since $0_A = 0_B$ implies $A = [0_A] = [0_B] = B$. It is clear that $\lambda \cdot 0_C = 0_C$ for all $\lambda \in R$, and that $0_{[x]}y = 0_{[xy]}$ and $y0_{[x]} = 0_{[yx]}$ for all $x, y \in X$.

A *trivial* orbitoid is an orbitoid C such that $C = \{0_C\}$. As $\lambda \cdot 0_C = 0_C$ for all $\lambda \in R$, a zero element cannot be a unit element for a non-trivial orbitoid.

Proposition 2.33. *Let X be a scalable monoid over R . If there exists a non-trivial $C \in X/\sim$ containing a unit element for C then R is non-trivial and commutative.*

Proof. Let u be a unit element for C and write the zero element as $0 \cdot u$. Then $0 \cdot u \neq u = 1 \cdot u$ since C is non-trivial, so $0 \neq 1$. We also have $\alpha\beta \cdot u = \beta\alpha \cdot u$ for any $\alpha, \beta \in R$ by Lemma 2.5, so $\alpha\beta = \beta\alpha$ since u is a unit element. \square

We now turn to a lemma and a definition leading to Proposition 2.36.

Lemma 2.34. *Let X be a scalable monoid over R . If u and u' are unit elements for $C \in X/\sim$, $\rho, \sigma, \rho', \sigma' \in R$, $\rho \cdot u = \rho' \cdot u'$ and $\sigma \cdot u = \sigma' \cdot u'$ then $(\rho + \sigma) \cdot u = (\rho' + \sigma') \cdot u'$.*

Proof. As $u' \in \mathbf{C}$, there is a unique $\tau \in R$ such that $u' = \tau \cdot u$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho \cdot u &= \rho' \cdot u' = \rho' \cdot (\tau \cdot u) = \rho' \tau \cdot u, \\ \sigma \cdot u &= \sigma' \cdot u' = \sigma' \cdot (\tau \cdot u) = \sigma' \tau \cdot u, \\ (\rho' + \sigma') \cdot u' &= (\rho' + \sigma') \cdot (\tau \cdot u) = (\rho' + \sigma') \tau \cdot u = (\rho' \tau + \sigma' \tau) \cdot u,\end{aligned}$$

so $(\rho' + \sigma') \cdot u' = (\rho + \sigma) \cdot u$ since $\rho = \rho' \tau$ and $\sigma = \sigma' \tau$. \square

Hence, the sum of two elements of a scalable monoid can be defined as follows.

Definition 2.35. Let X be a scalable monoid over R , and let u be a unit element for $\mathbf{C} \in X/\sim$. If $x = \rho \cdot u$ and $y = \sigma \cdot u$, where $\rho, \sigma \in R$, we set

$$x + y = (\rho + \sigma) \cdot u.$$

The sum $x + y$ is given by Definition 2.35 if and only if x and y are commensurable and their orbitoid has a unit element. This suggests again that the concept of commensurability introduced in Definition 2.31 can be used to define the ancient Greek notion of magnitudes of the same kind, and to clarify the modern notion of quantities of the same kind.

It follows immediately from Definition 2.35 that

$$(x + y) + z = x + (y + z), \quad x + y = y + x$$

for all $x, y, z \in \mathbf{C}$, and that

$$x + 0_{\mathbf{C}} = 0_{\mathbf{C}} + x = x$$

for any $x \in \mathbf{C}$ since $0_{\mathbf{C}} = 0 \cdot u$.

If $x = \rho \cdot u$ so that $\lambda \cdot x = \lambda \rho \cdot u$ and $\kappa \cdot x = \kappa \rho \cdot u$ then

$$(\lambda + \kappa) \cdot x = (\lambda + \kappa) \cdot (\rho \cdot u) = (\lambda + \kappa) \rho \cdot u = (\lambda \rho + \kappa \rho) \cdot u = \lambda \cdot x + \kappa \cdot x,$$

and if $x = \rho \cdot u$ and $y = \sigma \cdot u$ so that $\lambda \cdot x = \lambda \rho \cdot u$ and $\lambda \cdot y = \lambda \sigma \cdot u$ then

$$\lambda \cdot (x + y) = \lambda \cdot ((\rho + \sigma) \cdot u) = \lambda(\rho + \sigma) \cdot u = (\lambda \rho + \lambda \sigma) \cdot u = \lambda \cdot x + \lambda \cdot y.$$

A unital ring R has a unique additive inverse -1 of $1 \in R$, and we set

$$-x = (-1) \cdot x$$

for all $x \in X$. If \mathbf{C} has a unit element u and $x = \rho \cdot u$ for some $\rho \in R$ then $-x = (-1) \cdot (\rho \cdot u) = (-\rho) \cdot u$, and using this fact it is easy to verify that

$$x + (-x) = -x + x = 0_{\mathbf{C}}.$$

As usual, we may write $x + (-y)$ as $x - y$, and thus $x + (-x)$ as $x - x$.

While a trivial orbitoid is a zero module $\{0_{\mathbf{C}}\}$ with $0_{\mathbf{C}} + 0_{\mathbf{C}} = 0_{\mathbf{C}}$ and $\lambda \cdot 0_{\mathbf{C}} = 0_{\mathbf{C}}$ for all $\lambda \in R$, a non-trivial orbitoid with a unit element is a well-behaved module.

Proposition 2.36. *Let X be a scalable monoid over R . If $\mathbf{C} \in X/\sim$ is a non-trivial orbitoid with a unit element then \mathbf{C} , with appropriate definitions of $x + y$ and $\lambda \cdot x$, is a free module of rank 1 over R , and R is a non-trivial commutative ring.*

Proof. We have seen that \mathbf{C} is a module with addition given by Definition 2.35 and scalar multiplication inherited from the scalar multiplication in X . Also, if u is a unit element for \mathbf{C} then $\{u\}$ is a basis for \mathbf{C} , and R is a non-trivial commutative ring by Proposition 2.33, so R has the invariant basis number property [24]. \square

Thus, if every orbitoid $\mathbf{C} \in X/\sim$ contains a non-zero unit element for \mathbf{C} then X is the union of disjoint isomorphic free modules of rank 1 over a non-trivial commutative ring, a result that may be compared to definitions of systems of quantities in terms of unions of one-dimensional vector spaces by Quade [22] and Raposo [23].

Recall that identities corresponding to $(\lambda + \kappa) \cdot x = \lambda \cdot x + \kappa \cdot x$, $\lambda \cdot (x + y) = \lambda \cdot x + \lambda \cdot y$ and $\lambda \cdot (\kappa \cdot x) = \lambda\kappa \cdot x$ were proved in Propositions 1–3 in Book V of the *Elements*, so rudiments of Proposition 2.36 were present already in the Greek theory of magnitudes.

2.7. Scalable monoids with sets of unit elements. In this section, we build on the discussion about unit elements and quotients of scalable monoids by central monoids in the two previous sections.

Definition 2.37. A *dense* set of elements of a scalable monoid X is a set U of elements of X such that for every $x \in X$ there is some $u \in U$ such that $u \sim x$. A *sparse* set of elements of X is a set U of elements of X such that $u \sim v$ implies $u = v$ for any $u, v \in U$. A *closed* set of elements of X is a set U of elements of X such that if $u, v \in U$ then $uv \in U$.

We call a (dense) sparse set of unit elements of X a (*complete*) *system of unit elements* for X .

Definition 2.38. A *distributive* scalable monoid X is a scalable monoid such that for all $A, B \in X/\sim$ we have

$$(x + y)z = xz + yz, \quad z(x + y) = zx + zy,$$

for all $x, y \in A$ and all $z \in B$.

Proposition 2.39. *Let X be a scalable monoid. If X is equipped with a dense closed set of unit elements U then X is a distributive scalable monoid.*

Proof. For all $x, y \in A$ and $z \in B$ there are $u, v \in U$ such that $[x] = [y] = [u]$ and $[z] = [v]$ since U is dense in X , so $x = \rho \cdot u$, $y = \sigma \cdot u$ and $z = \tau \cdot v$ for some $\rho, \sigma, \tau \in R$, so $xz = \rho\tau \cdot uv$, $yz = \sigma\tau \cdot uv$, $zx = \tau\rho \cdot vu$ and $zy = \tau\sigma \cdot vu$, so

$$\begin{aligned} (x + y)z &= ((\rho + \sigma) \cdot u)(\tau \cdot v) = (\rho + \sigma)\tau \cdot uv = (\rho\tau + \sigma\tau) \cdot uv = xz + yz, \\ z(x + y) &= (\tau \cdot v)((\rho + \sigma) \cdot u) = \tau(\rho + \sigma) \cdot vu = (\tau\rho + \tau\sigma) \cdot vu = zx + zy, \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that uv and vu are unit elements since U is closed. \square

In metrology, the concept of a coherent system of units of measurement is fundamental, so it is desirable to incorporate this metrological notion into the present framework.

Definition 2.40. A *coherent* system of unit elements for X is a submonoid of X which is a complete system of unit elements for X .

Proposition 2.41. *Let X be a scalable monoid over R , S a coherent system of unit elements for X , and $T \subseteq S$ a central submonoid of X . Then X/T is a scalable monoid, $[t]_T = [1_X]_T$ for any $t \in T$, and $S/T = \{[s]_T \mid s \in S\}$ is a coherent system of unit elements for X/T .*

Proof. By Proposition 2.26, X/T is a scalable monoid since T is a central submonoid of X , and if $t \in T$ then $t \sim_T 1_X$ since $1_X t = t 1_X$ and $1_X \in T$.

Note that $[t]_T = [1_X]_T = 1_{X/T}$ for any $t \in T$ since

$$[1_X]_T[x]_T = [1_X x]_T = [x]_T = [x1_X]_T = [x]_T[1_X]_T$$

for any $x \in X$. Also, if $[s]_T, [s']_T \in S/T$, meaning that $s, s' \in S$, then $[s]_T[s']_T = [ss']_T \in S/T$ since $ss' \in S$. Hence, S/T is a submonoid of X/T .

Assume that $[s]_T \sim [s']_T$, where $s, s' \in S$. Then $\rho \cdot [s]_T = \sigma \cdot [s']_T$ for some $\rho, \sigma \in R$, so $[\rho \cdot s]_T = [\sigma \cdot s']_T$, so $\rho \cdot s \sim_T \sigma \cdot s'$, so $t(\rho \cdot s) = t'(\sigma \cdot s')$ for some $t, t' \in T$, so $\rho \cdot ts = \sigma \cdot t's'$, so $ts \sim t's'$ where $ts, t's' \in S$. Hence, $ts = t's'$ since S is sparse in X , so $[ts]_T = [t's']_T$, so $[t]_T[s]_T = [t']_T[s']_T$, so $[s]_T = [s']_T$. Thus, S/T is a sparse set of elements of X/T .

Consider any $C \in X/T$ and let $x, x' \in X$ be such that $[x]_T, [x']_T \in C$. Then there are $s, s' \in S$ and unique $\rho, \sigma \in R$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \cdot [x]_T &= [1 \cdot x]_T = [x]_T = [\rho \cdot s]_T = \rho \cdot [s]_T, \\ 1 \cdot [x']_T &= [1 \cdot x']_T = [x']_T = [\sigma \cdot s']_T = \sigma \cdot [s']_T \end{aligned}$$

since S is a dense set of unit elements in X . Thus, $[s]_T \sim [x]_T \sim [x']_T \sim [s']_T$, so $[s]_T = [s']_T$ since S/T is sparse in X/T , so $[x']_T = \sigma \cdot [s]_T$ for a unique $\sigma \in R$. Hence, $[s]_T$ is a unit element for C , so S/T is dense in X/T as well as sparse. \square

As a simple example, $S = \{1x^{k_1}y^{k_2}z^{k_3} \mid k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ is a coherent system of unit elements for $\mathbb{R}\llbracket x; y; z \rrbracket$, $T = \{1x^{k_1}y^{k_2}z^0 \mid k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ is a central submonoid of $\mathbb{R}\llbracket x; y; z \rrbracket$, $T \subseteq S$, and $\mathbb{R}\llbracket x; y; z \rrbracket/T$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}\llbracket z \rrbracket$.

Remark 2.42. A typical application of Proposition 2.41 in physics is described by Raposo [23]:

The mechanism of taking quotients is the algebraic tool underlying what is common practice in physics of choosing “systems of units” such that some specified universal constants become dimensionless and take on the numerical value 1. [...] But it has to be remarked that the mechanism goes beyond a change of system of units; it is indeed a change of space of quantities. [p. 153]

For example, one may decide to measure both time and length by means of a measure for length, using the universal constant c , thus introducing a new system of units such that times and lengths are not distinguishable (see further [16]). Such an operation amounts to a projection $x \mapsto [x]_T$ of the original space of quantities X onto a quotient space X/T . In terms of S and T , if $S = \{t^{k_1}\ell^{k_2} \mid k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, where t is a unit for time and ℓ a unit for length, is a coherent system of unit elements for X and we set $T = \{t^k \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ then S/T corresponds to $\{\ell^k \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, meaning that both time and length are measured by reference to a unit in X/T corresponding to a unit for length in X .

3. QUANTITY SPACES

In this section, we specialize scalable monoids in order to obtain a mathematical model suitable for calculation with quantities, a quantity space.

The formal definition of a quantity space is given in Section 3.1, and some basic facts about quantity spaces are presented in Section 3.2. Coherent systems of unit quantities for quantity spaces are discussed in Section 3.3. The notion of a measure of a quantity is formally defined in Section 3.4, and ways in which measures serve as proxies for quantities are described. In Section 3.5, we show that the monoid of dimensions Q/\sim corresponding to a quantity space Q is a free abelian group and derive some related results.

3.1. Canonical construction and main definition. Recall from Section 2.1 that the set $R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]$ of all monomials of the form $\lambda x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n}$, where λ belongs to the commutative ring R , x_1, \dots, x_n are uninterpreted symbols and k_1, \dots, k_n are non-negative integers, together with the operations in Example 2.4, is a scalable monoid of a particular kind, corresponding to a finitely generated free commutative monoid.

It is possible to give an abstract definition of scalable monoids of the form $R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]$. Let X be a commutative scalable monoid over a commutative ring R . A *finite basis* for X is a finite subset $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ of X such that every $x \in X$ has a unique expansion

$$x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i},$$

where $\mu \in R$ and k_i are non-negative integers. X is said to be *finitely generated free* when there exists a finite basis for X . In abstract terms, $R[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]$ is a finitely generated free commutative scalable monoid over a commutative ring.

Now, consider instead the set $K[[x_1, x_1^{-1}; \dots; x_n, x_n^{-1}]]$ of all Laurent monomials of the form $\lambda x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n}$, where $\lambda \in K$, K is a field, x_1, \dots, x_n are uninterpreted symbols and k_1, \dots, k_n are integers, together with essentially the same operations as in Example 2.4, namely

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha x_1^{j_1} \dots x_n^{j_n}) (\beta x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n}) &= (\alpha\beta) x_1^{(j_1+k_1)} \dots x_n^{(j_n+k_n)}, \\ \alpha \cdot \lambda x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n} &= (\alpha\lambda) x_1^{k_1} \dots x_n^{k_n}, \quad 1_{K[[x_1, x_1^{-1}; \dots; x_n, x_n^{-1}]]} = 1x_1^0 \dots x_n^0. \end{aligned}$$

Any such $K[[x_1, x_1^{-1}; \dots; x_n, x_n^{-1}]]$ is likewise a scalable monoid, which can again be characterized abstractly.

Definition 3.1. Let Q be a commutative scalable monoid Q over a field K . A *finite strong basis* for Q is a finite subset $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ of invertible elements of Q such that every $x \in Q$ has a unique expansion

$$x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i},$$

where $\mu \in K$ and k_i are integers. Q is said to be *finitely generated strongly free* when there exists a finite strong basis for Q .

Note that $\{\mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \mid \mu \in K, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subseteq Q$ since Q is closed under the operations involved, so $\{\mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \mid \mu \in K, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}\} = Q$. Related to this, any finitely generated strongly free commutative scalable monoid over a field can be represented by some $K[[x_1, x_1^{-1}; \dots; x_n, x_n^{-1}]]$ [14]. This kind of scalable monoid turns out to be well suited for the applications that we have in mind. It is given a special name.

Definition 3.2. A *finitely generated quantity space* is a commutative scalable monoid Q over a field, such that there exists a finite strong basis for Q .

Although finitely generated quantity spaces can be readily generalized to quantity spaces with infinite strong bases, only the finite case will be considered here. Below, "basis" and "quantity space" will be understood to mean "finite strong basis" and "finitely generated quantity space", respectively.

Elements of a quantity space are called *quantities*, unit elements are called *unit quantities*, and orbitoids in a quantity space are called *dimensions*.

Note that $K[[x_1; \dots; x_n]]$, where K is a field, is not a quantity space, so a commutative scalable monoid over a field is not necessarily a quantity space.

3.2. Some basic properties of quantity spaces.

Proposition 3.3. *Let Q be a quantity space over K with a basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and $x, y \in Q$. Then*

- (1) $1_Q = 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^0$;
- (2) if $x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ and $y = \nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$ then $xy = \mu\nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{(k_i + \ell_i)}$;
- (3) if $x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ and $\mu \neq 0$ then x^{-1} exists and $x^{-1} = \mu^{-1} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{-k_i}$.

Proof. To prove (1), note that $e_i^0 = 1_Q$ for all e_i . (2) follows from Lemma 2.5 and the fact that Q is commutative. (3) follows from (1) and (2). \square

Proposition 3.4. *Let Q be a quantity space over K with a basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and $x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) x is a non-zero quantity;
- (2) $\mu \neq 0$;
- (3) x is invertible.

Proof. (1) \iff (2). Note that $0 \cdot x = 0 \cdot \left(\mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \right) = 0 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$. Thus, if $\mu = 0$ then $0 \cdot x = x$, so x is a zero quantity. Conversely, if x is a zero quantity then $0 \cdot x = x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$, so $\mu = 0$ since the expansion of $0 \cdot x$ is unique.

(2) \iff (3). If $\mu \neq 0$ then x has an inverse by Proposition 3.3. Conversely, if $\mu = 0$ then $\mu\nu = 0 \neq 1$ for all $\nu \in K$, so x does not have an inverse $\nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$. \square

Thus, 1_Q is a non-zero quantity, and all elements of a basis are non-zero quantities. Also, it follows from Proposition 3.4 that Q has no zero divisors.

Corollary 3.5. *The product of non-zero quantities is a non-zero-quantity.*

Lemma 3.6. *Let Q be a quantity space over K with a basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, and consider $x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ and $y = \nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $x \sim y$, or equivalently $\mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \sim \nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$;
- (2) $k^i = \ell^i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$;
- (3) $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$;
- (4) $\nu \cdot x = \mu \cdot y$, or equivalently $\nu \cdot \left(\mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \right) = \mu \cdot \left(\nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i} \right)$.

Proof. The implications (2) \implies (3), (3) \implies (4) and (4) \implies (1) are trivial. To prove (1) \implies (2), note that if $x \sim y$ then

$$\alpha\mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} = \alpha \cdot \left(\mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \right) = z = \beta \cdot \left(\nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i} \right) = \beta\nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$$

for some $\alpha, \beta \in K$. As the expansion of z is unique, $k^i = \ell^i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. \square

It follows immediately from Lemma 3.6 that if not $k^i = \ell^i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ then $x \neq y$ since $x \not\sim y$; this is the essence of the principle of dimensional homogeneity formulated by Fourier [8].

3.3. Quantity spaces and unit quantities.

Proposition 3.7. *Let Q be a quantity space over K . Every non-zero $u \in Q$ is a unit quantity for $[u]$.*

Proof. Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be a basis for Q and set $u = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$, $x = \nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$. Then $\mu \neq 0$ by Proposition 3.4, and if $x \sim u$ then $\mu \cdot x = \nu \cdot u$ by Lemma 3.6, so $x = \mu^{-1} \nu \cdot u = \mu^{-1} \cdot (\mu \cdot x) = \mu^{-1} \cdot (\nu \cdot u) = \mu^{-1} \nu \cdot u$.

Also, if $\lambda \cdot u = \lambda' \cdot u$ then $\lambda \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} = z = \lambda' \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$, so $\lambda \mu = \lambda' \mu$ since the expansion of z is unique, so $\lambda = \lambda'$ since $\mu \neq 0$. \square

Proposition 3.8. *Let Q be a quantity space over K . Then $\mathbf{C} \in Q/\sim$, with $x + y$ and $\lambda \cdot x$ appropriately defined, is a one-dimensional vector space over K .*

Proof. Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be a basis for Q . If $x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \in \mathbf{C}$ then $u = 1 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ is a unit quantity for $[u] = [x] = \mathbf{C}$ by Propositions 3.4 and 3.7 and Lemma 3.6. Hence, \mathbf{C} is a free module of rank 1 over the field K by Proposition 2.36. \square

Proposition 3.9. *Let Q be a quantity space over K with a basis $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. The subset*

$$U = \left\{ 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \mid k_i \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$$

of Q is a coherent system of unit quantities for Q .

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, all elements of U are non-zero and hence unit quantities by Proposition 3.7. Also, U is dense in Q since it follows from $x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ that $1 \cdot x = \mu \cdot \left(1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \right)$. Lastly, if $u = 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \sim 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i} = v$ then $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$ by Lemma 3.6, so $u = v$, meaning that U is sparse in Q .

It remains to prove that U is a monoid. Clearly, $1_Q \in U$ since $1_Q = 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^0$, and we have

$$\left(1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \right) \left(1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i} \right) = 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{(k_i + \ell_i)},$$

so if $u, v \in U$ then $uv \in U$. Thus, U is a submonoid of Q . \square

In other words, every basis can be extended to a coherent system of unit quantities, consisting of quantities that are expressed as products of basis quantities and their inverses.

Proposition 3.10. *Let Q be a quantity space over K . Then Q is distributive.*

Proof. The assertion follows from Propositions 3.9 and 2.39. \square

3.4. Measures of quantities.

Definition 3.11. Let Q be a quantity space over K with a basis $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. The uniquely determined scalar $\mu \in K$ in the expansion

$$x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$$

is called the *measure* of x relative to E and will be denoted by $\mu_E(x)$.

For example, $1_Q = 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^0$ for any E , so we have the following simple but useful fact:

Proposition 3.12. *Let Q be a quantity space over K . Then $\mu_E(1_Q) = 1$ for any basis E for Q .*

Relative to a fixed basis, measures of quantities can be used as proxies for the quantities themselves.

Proposition 3.13. *Let Q be a quantity space over K with a basis $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. Then*

- (1) $\mu_E(xy) = \mu_E(x)\mu_E(y)$ for all $x, y \in Q$;
- (2) x^{-1} exists and $\mu_E(x^{-1}) = \mu_E(x)^{-1}$ for all $x \in Q$ such that $\mu_E(x) \neq 0$;
- (3) $\mu_E(\lambda \cdot x) = \lambda \mu_E(x)$ for all $\lambda \in K$ and $x \in Q$;
- (4) $\mu_E(x + y) = \mu_E(x) + \mu_E(y)$ for all $x, y \in X$ such that $x \sim y$.

Proof. (1) This follows immediately from Proposition 3.3(2).

(2) This follows similarly from Proposition 3.3(3).

(3) If $x = \mu_E(x) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ then $\lambda \cdot x = \lambda \cdot (\mu_E(x) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}) = \lambda \mu_E(x) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$.

(4) Let $x = \mu_E(x) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ and $y = \mu_E(y) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$ be the expansions of x and y relative to $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$; then $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$ by Lemma 3.6. As $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ is non-zero, and thus a unit quantity for $\left[\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}\right]$ by Proposition 3.7, we have $x + y = (\mu_E(x) + \mu_E(y)) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ by Definition 2.35. \square

Proposition 3.14. *Let Q be a quantity space over K . If $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is a basis for Q and $x = \mu_E(x) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ then $E' = \{\lambda_1 \cdot e_1, \dots, \lambda_n \cdot e_n\}$, where $\lambda_i \neq 0$, is a basis for Q and $x = \mu_{E'}(x) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (\lambda_i \cdot e_i)^{k_i}$, where $\mu_{E'}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{-k_i} \mu_E(x)$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \mu_E(x) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} = \mu_E(x) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (\lambda_i^{-1} \cdot (\lambda_i \cdot e_i))^{k_i} \\ &= \mu_E(x) \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{-k_i} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (\lambda_i \cdot e_i)^{k_i} \right) = \mu_E(x) \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{-k_i} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (\lambda_i \cdot e_i)^{k_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, x has an expansion in terms of E' . Also, if $x = \mu \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{-\ell_i} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n (\lambda_i \cdot e_i)^{\ell_i}$ then a change of generators from E' to $E'' = \{\lambda_1^{-1} \cdot (\lambda_1 \cdot e_1), \dots, \lambda_n^{-1} \cdot (\lambda_n \cdot e_n)\} = E$ gives $x = \mu \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^0 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$, so $\mu = \mu_E(x)$ and $\ell_i = k_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ by the uniqueness of the expansion of x in terms of E . \square

In general, the measure of a quantity thus depends on a choice of basis, but as indicated by the fact that $\prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^0 = 1$ there is an important exception to this rule.

Proposition 3.15. *Let Q be a quantity space over K . For every $x \in [1_Q]$, $\mu_E(x)$ does not depend on E .*

Proof. 1_Q is a unit quantity for $[1_Q]$ by Proposition 3.7, so there is a unique $\lambda \in K$ such that $x = \lambda \cdot 1_Q$, so $\mu_E(x) = \lambda \mu_E(1_Q) = \lambda$ for any basis E for Q by Propositions 3.12 and 3.13. \square

The π theorem in dimensional analysis depends on this result [15]. It is common to refer to any $x \in [1_Q]$ as a ‘‘dimensionless quantity’’, although x is not really ‘‘dimensionless’’ – it belongs to, or ‘‘has’’, the dimension $[1_Q]$.

Remark 3.16. Many authors (e.g., [26, 4, 27, 17]) identify dimensionless quantities with numbers – their measures – but Proposition 3.15 does not justify such an identification. A quantity $x \in [1_Q]$ is still a quantity, and its numerical measure is determined only relative to some other entity which may in general be freely chosen. Specifically, with $q \in \mathbb{C} \in Q/\sim$ fixed and μ given by $q = \mu \cdot u$ for some unit quantity u , μ depends on u also when $\mathbb{C} = [1_Q]$. For example, the numerical value of a plane angle depends on whether it is measured in radians, degrees or some other unit, even though the dimension of a plane angle is $[1_Q]$. However, if

$u \in [1_Q]$ belongs to a coherent system of units U then necessarily $u = 1_Q$ since U is a sparse submonoid of Q by Definition 2.40. For a plane angle, 1_Q is the radian, so in this case u must be the radian. Also recall that a basis for a quantity space corresponds to a coherent system of units for that space by Proposition 3.9. Thus, the fact that $\mu_E(x)$ does not depend on E when $x \in [1_Q]$ corresponds to the fact that in a coherent system of units the unit quantity in $[1_Q]$ must be 1_Q .

3.5. Q/\sim is a free abelian group. In this section, we show that Q/\sim regarded as a monoid has additional properties derived from the quantity space Q . Below, let \hat{x} be given by $\hat{x} = 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$, where $x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ is the expansion of $x \in Q$ relative to a basis for Q – the choice of basis does not matter here. Note that \hat{x} is a non-zero quantity by Proposition 3.4 and such that $\hat{x} \sim x$ by Lemma 3.6.

Proposition 3.17. *If Q is a quantity space then Q/\sim is an abelian group.*

Proof. Q/\sim is a commutative monoid since $[x][y] = [xy] = [yx] = [y][x]$ for all $[x], [y] \in Q/\sim$. Also, $[x][\hat{x}^{-1}] = [x\hat{x}^{-1}] = [\mu \cdot 1_Q] = [\hat{x}^{-1}x] = [\hat{x}^{-1}][x]$, so $[\hat{x}^{-1}] = [x]^{-1}$ since $[\mu \cdot 1_Q] = [1_Q] = 1_{Q/\sim}$. Thus, Q/\sim is an abelian group. \square

Recall that a basis for a finitely generated abelian group G is a set $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ such that every $x \in G$ has a unique expansion $x = \prod_{i=1}^n b_i^{k_i}$, where k_i are integers.

Proposition 3.18. *Let Q be a quantity space with a basis $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. Then $\mathbf{E} = \{[e_1], \dots, [e_n]\}$ is a basis for Q/\sim with the same cardinality as E .*

Proof. The unique expansions of $e_i, e_j \in E$ relative to E are

$$e_i = 1 \cdot (\dots e_{i-1}^0 e_i^1 e_{i+1}^0 \dots), \quad e_j = 1 \cdot (\dots e_{j-1}^0 e_j^1 e_{j+1}^0 \dots).$$

Hence, if $e_i \neq e_j$ so that $i \neq j$ then $[e_i] \neq [e_j]$ by Lemma 3.6. This means that the surjective mapping $\phi : E \rightarrow \{[e_1], \dots, [e_n]\}$ given by $\phi(e_i) = [e_i]$ is injective as well and thus a bijection. It remains to show that \mathbf{E} is a basis for Q/\sim .

First, let $[x]$ be an arbitrary dimension in Q/\sim . As E is a basis for Q , we have $x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ for some $\mu \in K$ and some integers k_1, \dots, k_n , so $[x] = [\mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}] = [\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}] = \prod_{i=1}^n [e_i]^{k_i}$. Also, if $[x] = \prod_{i=1}^n [e_i]^{k_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n [e_i]^{\ell_i}$, then $[\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}] = [\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}]$. Thus, $1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \sim 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$, so $k_i = \ell_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ by Lemma 3.6. \square

A finitely generated abelian group for which there exists a basis is said to be free abelian; recall that any two bases for a free abelian group G have the same cardinality, the rank of G . Hence, corresponding to the fact that if X is a scalable monoid then X/\sim is a monoid, we have the following much stronger result.

Proposition 3.19. *If Q is a quantity space then Q/\sim is a free abelian group of finite rank.*

In a seminal article, Fleischmann [7] proposed that a system of *Größenarten* – that is, kinds of quantities or equivalently dimensions (see Section 2.3) – is a free abelian group. That the dimensions form a free abelian group is also assumed in [23] and is present as a possibility in [17]; here, this is not assumed but proved.

Proposition 3.18 also leads to an analogue of the dimension theorem for finite-dimensional vector spaces.

Proposition 3.20. *If Q is a quantity space then any two bases for Q have the same cardinality.*

Proof. If $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and $E' = \{e'_1, \dots, e'_m\}$ are bases for Q , so that $\mathbf{E} = \{[e_1], \dots, [e_n]\}$ and $\mathbf{E}' = \{[e'_1], \dots, [e'_m]\}$ are bases for Q/\sim , then $|E| = |\mathbf{E}| = |\mathbf{E}'| = |E'|$ by Propositions 3.18 and 3.19. \square

A quantity space with bases of cardinality n is said to be of *rank n* .

Example 3.21. The dimensions corresponding to base quantities in the International System of Units (SI) [29], such as the dimensions of length, time and mass, denoted T, L and M, respectively, are elements of a basis for some free abelian group Q/\sim . For example, $\{T, L, M\}$ is a basis for Q/\sim , where Q is a space of quantities for classical mechanics. This is not the only possible basis, however. For example, $\{T, L, F\}$, where $F = MLT^{-2}$, is another three-element basis for Q/\sim , and another possible set of base dimensions for classical mechanics.

Let us consider quantity spaces Q and Q' over K with bases $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and $E' = \{e'_1, \dots, e'_n\}$. It is easy to verify that a bijection $\phi : E \rightarrow E'$ can be extended to an isomorphism $\phi^* : Q \rightarrow Q'$ by setting $\phi^*\left(\mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}\right) = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n \phi(e_i)^{k_i}$. Conversely, if $\phi^* : Q \rightarrow Q'$ is an isomorphism then $\{\phi^*(e_1), \dots, \phi^*(e_n)\}$ is clearly a basis for Q' of the same cardinality as E . These observations lead to the following classification theorem, similar to a theorem in linear algebra:

Proposition 3.22. *Quantity spaces over the same field are isomorphic if and only if they are of the same rank (cf. [23]).*

There is a reciprocal connection between bases for Q and bases for Q/\sim .

Proposition 3.23. *Let Q be a quantity space, and let $\mathbf{E} = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be a basis for Q/\sim . Then there is a subset $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ of Q such that $e_i \in e_i$ and E is a basis for Q .*

Proof. There is a function $\psi : \mathbf{E} \rightarrow \{\psi(e_1), \dots, \psi(e_n)\}$ given by $\psi(e) = \widehat{x}$, where $x \in e$. This is a surjective function such that $0_{e_i} \neq \psi(e_i) \in e_i$ for all e_i . Also, $e_i \neq e_j$ implies $e_i \cap e_j = \emptyset$, so ψ is injective as well and hence a bijection. For convenience, we write $\psi(e_i)$ as e_i . Each e_i is invertible by Proposition 3.4.

Let x be an arbitrary quantity in Q . As \mathbf{E} is a basis for Q/\sim , we have $[x] = \prod_{i=1}^n [e_i]^{k_i} = \left[\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}\right]$ for some integers k_1, \dots, k_n , and as $e_i \neq 0_{e_i}$ for each e_i , $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ is non-zero and thus a unit quantity for $[x]$ by Proposition 3.7. Hence, there exists a unique $\mu \in K$ for $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$ such that $x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$. Also, if $x = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} = \nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}$ then $\left[\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}\right] = \left[\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{\ell_i}\right]$, so $\prod_{i=1}^n [e_i]^{k_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n [e_i]^{\ell_i}$, so $k_i = \ell_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, since \mathbf{E} is a basis for Q/\sim , so $\mu = \nu$. \square

We can now extend to quantity spaces the theorem that a subgroup of a free abelian group is free abelian, using this fact.

Proposition 3.24. *If a subalgebra Q' of a quantity space Q regarded as a scalable monoid contains all inverses of elements of Q' then Q' is a quantity space.*

Proof. First note that Q' is a scalable monoid, so Q'/\sim is a monoid. Also, if $[x] \in Q'/\sim$ then $[x] = [\widehat{x}]$ and $[\widehat{x}]^{-1} = [\widehat{x}^{-1}] \in Q'/\sim$, so $[x]^{-1} \in Q'/\sim$. Hence, Q'/\sim

is a subgroup of Q/\sim , so Q'/\sim is a free abelian group with a basis E corresponding to a basis E for Q' by Proposition 3.23. \square

This result is analogous also to the simple fact that a subalgebra of a vector space is a vector space, so we have found yet another similarity between free abelian groups, quantity spaces and vector spaces.

Remark 3.25. In the *International Vocabulary of Metrology* from 2012 (VIM3) [28], one sense of "quantity" (1.1) is a generic one, corresponding to *Größenart* or kind of quantity, while a "quantity value" (1.19) represents a particular *Grösse* or a quantity as defined here. Unit quantities are called "(measurement) units" (1.9) in VIM3. A set of "base quantities" (1.4) is in effect a set E of selected kinds of quantities, or equivalently dimensions, which is a basis for some Q/\sim ; the elements of a corresponding basis $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ for Q are "base units" (1.10). Further, in VIM3 a "derived unit" (1.11) is some $u \in Q$, other than a base unit, with an expansion $u = \mu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$, where $\mu \neq 0$, while a "coherent derived unit" (1.12) is a derived unit v with an expansion $v = 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i}$. Following Fourier [8], VIM3 defines a "quantity dimension" (1.7) in terms of an integer tuple (k_1, \dots, k_n) and a basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ for Q/\sim , giving the dimension $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} = \left[\prod_{i=1}^n e_i^{k_i} \right]$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Birkhoff, G. (1935). On the structure of abstract algebras. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **31**, 433–454.
- [2] de Boer, J. (1994). On the history of quantity calculus and the international system, *Metrologia* **31**, 405–429.
- [3] Descartes, R. (1637). *La Geometrie, Discours de la Méthode*. Leiden.
- [4] Drobot, S. (1953). On the foundations of dimensional analysis. *Stud. Math.* **14**, 84–99.
- [5] Euclid (of Alexandria) (c 300 BC). *Stoicheia (The Elements)*.
- [6] Euler, L. (1740). *Einleitung zur Rechen-Kunst*. Bd. 2. St Petersburg.
- [7] Fleischmann, R. (1951). Die Struktur des physikalischen Begriffssystemes, *Z. Phys.* **129**, 377–400.
- [8] Fourier, J.B.J. (1822). *Théorie analytique de la Chaleur*. Paris.
- [9] Fourier, J.B.J (2009). *The Analytical Theory of Heat* (translation of [7]). Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Gowers, W.T. Two definitions of 'definition'. <https://www.dpmms.cam.ac.uk/~wtg10/definition.html>, retrieved 25-09-2019.
- [11] Gowers W.T. (2002). *Mathematics. A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- [12] Hasse, H. & Scholz, H. (1928). Die Grundlagenkrise der griechischen Mathematik, *Kant-Studien* **33**, 4-34.
- [13] Jonsson, D. (2014). *Quantities, Dimensions and Dimensional Analysis*. arXiv:1408.5024.
- [14] Jonsson, D. (2019). *Magnitudes Reborn: Quantity Spaces as Scalable Monoids*. arXiv:1911.07236.
- [15] Jonsson, D. (2020). *An Algebraic Foundation of Amended Dimensional Analysis*. arXiv:2010.15769.
- [16] Kitano, M. (2013). Mathematical structure of unit systems. *J. Math. Phys.* **54**, 052901.
- [17] Krystek, M. (2015). The term 'dimension' in the international system of units. *Metrologia* **52**, 297–300.
- [18] Lodge, A. (1888). The multiplication and division of concrete quantities. *Nature* **38** 281–283.
- [19] Malet, A. (2006). Renaissance notions of number and magnitude, *Hist. Math.* **33**, 63–81.
- [20] Maxwell, J. (1873). *Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*. Oxford University Press.
- [21] Newton, I. (1720). *Universal Arithmetick*. London.
- [22] Quade, W. (1961). Über die algebraische Struktur des Größenkalküls der Physik, *Abhandlungen der Braunschweigischen Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft* **13**, 24–65.

- [23] Raposo, A.R. (2018). The algebraic structure of quantity calculus, *Measurement Science Review* **18**, 147–157.
- [24] Richman, F. (1988). Nontrivial uses of trivial rings. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **103**, 1012–1014.
- [25] Stevin (de Bruges), S. (1585). *L'Arithmétique*. Leiden.
- [26] Wallot, J. (1926). Dimensionen, Einheiten, Masssysteme, *Handbuch der Physik II*. Springer.
- [27] Whitney, H. (1968). The mathematics of physical quantities: Part II: Quantity structures and dimensional analysis. *Amer. Math. Monthly* **75**, 227– 256.
- [28] (2012). *International Vocabulary of Metrology – Basic and General Concepts and Associated Terms (VIM)*. 3rd edition. Bureau International des Poids et Mesures.
- [29] (2019) *International System of Units (SI)*. 9th edition. Bureau International des Poids et Mesures.

DAN JONSSON, UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG, BOX 100, 405 30 GOTHENBURG, SWEDEN.
Email address: dan.jonsson@gu.se