

ON GENERALIZED ORDERED SETS: A CONSTRUCTIVE DEVELOPMENT

JEAN S. JOSEPH

ABSTRACT. We propose a notion of a generalized order, which can be used for the notion of a strict partial order. We introduce a weak order to replace the usual weak order defined from a strict partial order. In a constructive setting, that usual weak order causes problems on the real numbers because their strict order cannot be proved to be trichotomous.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. Constructive Mathematics	3
2.2. Omniscience Principle	3
2.3. Cotransitivity	3
2.4. (Linearly) Ordered Sets	4
3. Generalized Order	4
3.1. Weak Order on the Real Numbers	7
4. Connection with Partially Ordered Sets	8
5. Orders on Products	10
5.1. Coarse Product	10
5.2. Finite and Infinite Products	11
6. Further Developments	16
6.1. An Excursion into Type Theory	16
6.2. Problems	18
6.2.1. Isomorphic theories	18
6.2.2. Unique partial order	18
6.2.3. Generalized \mathbb{N} -ordered Sets	18
References	19

1. INTRODUCTION

We introduce a structure that can be used in lieu of a strict partially ordered set. In a constructive setting, the typical weak order on a strict partially ordered set, which is defined as $x \leq y$ if $x < y$ or $x = y$, is problematic on the real numbers (see 3.1). So we propose another weak order, which we denote as \leq_P (see Section 3). We call such structure a *generalized ordered set*: it is a set with a binary relation satisfying three properties, namely asymmetry¹, transitivity², and positive antisymmetry³. The first weak order \leq has the advantage that it is an automatic partial order, but our weak order \leq_P lacks this advantage. That is why we impose *positive antisymmetry*. A generalized ordered set is not a linearly ordered set, in that there are generalized ordered sets that are not linearly ordered (see Section 3). More can be found in subsequent sections, but we will summarize the main results. In the third section, we introduce two weak orders on any set with a relation $<$; one has a negative sense and the other a positive sense. We have arrived at the following:

- when the binary relation $<$ on any set is asymmetric and cotransitive, the two weak orders coincide (Theorems 3.3 & 3.5), but the converse has no constructive proof (Theorem 3.4);

later on that section, we show there are propositions about the real numbers that have no constructive proofs if the weak order on any set is taken to be $x \leq y$ if $x < y$ or $x = y$. We show the following:

- the statement “for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, if $\neg y < x$, then $x < y$ or $x = y$ ” implies the limited principle of omniscience (LPO) (Theorem 3.12).

In the fourth section, we explain how any generalized order yields a partial order, in the usual sense, and we show that a partial order \sim cannot automatically yield a generalized order with the definition “ $x \sim y$ and $\neg x = y$ ” because

- a binary relation defined as such is not positively antisymmetric (Section 4).

In the fifth section, we have arrived at a somewhat surprising result. If we define a linearly ordered set to be a set with an asymmetric, cotransitive⁴, and negatively antisymmetric⁵ binary relation, then there

¹See Section 3.

²See Section 3.

³See Section 3.

⁴See 2.3.

⁵See 2.4.

is no constructive proof that the lexicographic order turns the Cartesian product into a linearly ordered set. In fact, we prove

- the statement “the lexicographic order on the cartesian product of any two ordered sets is cotransitive” implies the law of excluded middle (Theorem 5.1).

However, the category of generalized ordered sets is closed under Cartesian product (Theorem 5.3), which entails the following:

- the category of generalized ordered sets has all finite products (Corollary 5.5).

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Constructive Mathematics. The theoretical development that we present below is constructive, meaning the proofs of the theorems will omit the use of the law of excluded middle, which is all proposition is either true or false. Some of our theorems are “metatheorems”, meaning they are theorems about the theory we are developing; an example is Theorem 5.1. The proof of these metatheorems will also be constructive. We need to emphasize, though, that our focus will be more on the theory than on the metatheory.

There is a vast literature on constructive mathematics, so we cannot possibly be exhaustive about it here. More can be found in [1, 21, 2, 4, 6]

2.2. Omniscience Principle. In constructive mathematics, there are certain statements that are thought to have no proof. Some of these statements are the law of excluded middle (for all proposition P , P or $\neg P$), the limited principle of omniscience (each binary sequence has all its terms equal to zero or has a term equal to 1, Markov’s principle (a binary sequence, whose all terms cannot be equal to zero, contains a term equal to 1), and the law of double negation (for all proposition P , if $\neg\neg P$, then P). The list is longer than what is given here; a more detailed rendering can be found in [14, 4, 9]. A use of an omniscience principle is to show that other statements cannot have a constructive proof. For instance, if one needs to show that a statement T cannot be proved, then one can show that T implies one of the omniscience principles. We have used such move in the sections below; for instance, see Theorem 3.4.

2.3. Cotransitivity. A binary relation $<$ on a set X is cotransitive if, for all $x, y, z \in X$, $x < y$ implies $x < z$ or $z < y$ [14]. Bridges and Vîță in [5] constructs a version of the real numbers whose strict order is cotransitive [Proposition 2.1.8]. Also, Mandelkern in [12] defines a

projective plane to have inequality relations that are cotransitive. Any transitive, trichotomous relation on a set is cotransitive; in particular, the strict orders on the integers, the natural numbers, and the rational numbers are cotransitive.

2.4. (Linearly) Ordered Sets. Examples of generalized ordered sets are ordered sets (see Theorem 3.7). Ordered sets are defined in [11]. For completeness, we include the definition here. An *ordered set* is a set X with a binary relation $<$ such that, for all $x, y, z \in X$, (1) $x < y$ implies $y < x$ is false ; (2) $x < y$ implies $x < z$ or $z < x$; (3) $x < y$ is false and $y < x$ is false imply $x = y$ (*negative antisymmetry*). The real numbers are ordered, so are all of its subsets. In particular, the natural numbers, the integers, and the rational numbers are ordered.

An ordered set is a substitute for a linearly ordered set, defined as a set with a binary relation $<$ such that, for all x, y, z , (1) exactly one the following holds: $x < y$, $y < x$, or $x = y$, and (2) $x < y < z$ implies $x < z$. The first condition is known as trichotomy. Constructively, the usual notion of a linear order does not stand. For instance, there is no constructive proof that the relation $<$ on the real numbers is trichotomous (see Theorem 3.11).

3. GENERALIZED ORDER

Let X be a set with a binary relation $<$. For $x, y \in X$, we write $x \leq_P y$ if, for all $z \in X$, $z < x$ implies $z < y$, and $y < z$ implies $x < z$. A *generalized ordered set* is a set X with a binary relation $<$ such that, for all $x, y, z \in X$,

- $x < y$ implies $y < x$ is false; (Asymmetry)
- $x < y < z$ implies $x < z$; (Transitivity)
- $x \leq_P y$ and $y \leq_P x$ imply $x = y$. (Positive Antisymmetry)

The *dual* of a generalized ordered set X is the generalized ordered set X_d whose underlying set is X and binary relation is $x < y$ in X_d if and only if $y < x$ in X .

Lemma 3.1. *Let X be a generalized ordered set. Then $x \leq_P y$ in X if and only if $y \leq_P x$ in X_d .*

Proof. Suppose $x \leq_P y$ in X . For all $z \in X_d$, if $z < y$ in X_d , then $y < z$ in X , so $x < z$, implying $z < x$ in X_d . Similarly, $x < z$ in X_d implies $y < z$ in X_d . Hence, $y \leq_P x$ in X_d . The converse is obtained in a similar way. \square

In what follows, we show that any ordered set is a generalized ordered set. Recall that we briefly talk about ordered sets in the previous section, but a more detailed account on ordered sets is in [11].

Lemma 3.2. *Let X be a generalized ordered set:*

- (1) \leq_P is transitive;
- (2) $x < y$ implies $x \leq_P y$.

Proof. (1) Let $x, y, z \in X$. Suppose $x \leq_P y \leq_P z$. Let $u \in X$. If $u < x$, then $u < y$ since $x \leq_P y$, so $u < z$ since $y \leq_P z$. Similarly, $z < u$ implies $x < u$. Therefore, $x \leq_P z$.

(2) If $x < y$, then, for all $z \in X$, $z < x$ implies $z < y$ and $y < z$ implies $x < z$, by transitivity. \square

We write $x \leq_N y$ for $\neg y < x$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let X be a set with a cotransitive binary relation $<$. If $x \leq_N y$ then $x \leq_P y$.*

Proof. For all $z \in X$, suppose $z < x$. Since $<$ is cotransitive, either $z < y$ or $y < x$. But $y < x$ is false because $x \leq_N y$, so $z < y$. Similarly, $y < z$ implies $x < z$. Hence, $x \leq_P y$. \square

Theorem 3.4. *The statement “For any set X with a binary relation $<$, if, for all $x, y \in X$, $x \leq_N y$ implies $x \leq_P y$, then that binary relation is cotransitive” implies the weak excluded middle⁶.*

Proof. Let P be any proposition. Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$ with $a = a$, $b = b$, $c = c$ and with exactly $a < b$, $a < c$ if $\neg\neg P$, and $c < b$ if $\neg P$. Suppose $x \leq_N y$. The two cases worth mentioning are when $x = b, y = c$ and when $x = c, y = a$.

Suppose $b \leq_N c$. Let $z \in X$. Also suppose $z < b$. Note that $b \leq_N c$ entails $\neg\neg P$ by definition, so $a < c$ by definition; hence, when $z = a$, we have $a < b$ implies $a < c$. Note that when $z = b, c$, “ $z < b$ implies $z < c$ ” holds trivially. Now, suppose $c < z$. Note also that “ $c < z$ implies $b < z$ ” holds trivially for all z . Therefore, $b \leq_P c$.

Suppose $c \leq_N a$. Let $z \in X$. Note that “ $z < c$ implies $z < a$ ” holds trivially. Now, suppose $a < z$. Note that $c \leq_N a$ entails $\neg\neg\neg P$, so $\neg P$, implying $c < b$ by definition; hence, when $z = b$, we have $a < b$ implies $c < b$. Also, note that “ $a < z$ implies $c < z$ ” holds trivially, when $z = a, c$. Thus, $c \leq_P a$.

Therefore, the binary relation $<$ on X is cotransitive. Since $a < b$ by definition, either $a < c$, in which case $\neg\neg P$, or $c < b$, in which case $\neg P$. \square

⁶Weak excluded middle is, for all proposition P , either $\neg P$ or $\neg\neg P$

Theorem 3.5. *Let X be a set with an asymmetric binary relation $<$. If $x \leq_P y$ then $x \leq_N y$.*

Proof. Suppose $x \leq_P y$. If $y < x$, then $y < y$, which is false by asymmetry. \square

Corollary 3.6. *Let X be an ordered set as in [11]. Then $x \leq_N y$ if and only if $x \leq_P y$.*

Proof. By Theorems 3.3 and 3.5. \square

Theorem 3.7. *Any ordered set in [11] is a generalized ordered set.*

Proof. Let X be an ordered set and $x, y, z \in X$. Suppose $x < y < z$. By cotransitivity, either $y < x$ or $x < z$. But $y < x$ is false by asymmetry, so $x < z$. Hence, transitivity holds.

Suppose $x \leq_P y$ and $y \leq_P x$. Then $x \leq_N y$ and $y \leq_N x$, by Corollary 3.6, so $x = y$ by negative antisymmetry. Hence, positive antisymmetry holds. \square

For generalized ordered sets X and Y , an *embedding* f of X into Y is a function from X to Y such that $x < y$ if and only if $f(x) < f(y)$. We call **gOrd** the category of generalized ordered sets with their embeddings, and we call **Ord** the category of ordered sets with their embeddings. An embedding of ordered sets is defined as an embedding of generalized ordered sets.

Corollary 3.8. **Ord** is a subcategory of **gOrd**.

Proof. By Theorem 3.7, the objects of **Ord** are objects of **gOrd**. The maps of **Ord** are those of **gOrd**, by definition. \square

Not all generalized ordered sets are ordered sets. Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$ with a binary relation defined as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & b & \\ & \uparrow & \\ c & a & \end{array}$$

Note that X is a generalized ordered set, but its binary relation is not cotransitive because $a < b$ but neither $a < c$ nor $c < b$. We give an example of a generalized ordered set, whose binary relation $<$ cannot be proved to be cotransitive. Let **Prop** be the collection of all propositions with equality defined as $P = Q$ if $P \iff Q$ and with a binary relation defined as $P < Q$ if $\neg P \wedge Q$. The proposition ‘‘True’’ is denoted by 1 and the proposition ‘‘False’’ by 0. Observe that $0 < 1$.

Theorem 3.9. **Prop** is a generalized ordered set.

Proof. If $P < Q$, then $\neg P \wedge Q$, and if $Q < P$, then $\neg Q \wedge P$. But $\neg P \wedge P$ is false. Hence, asymmetry holds.

Note that $P < Q < R$ implies $P < R$ is vacuously true because $P < Q < R$ is always false. Hence, transitivity holds.

Suppose $P \leq_P Q$. If P , then $0 < P$, so $0 < Q$, implying Q . Hence, $P \implies Q$. Similarly, $Q \leq_P P$ implies $Q \implies P$. Therefore, $P = Q$. Hence, positive antisymmetry holds. \square

Theorem 3.10. *The statement “the binary relation $<$ on \mathbf{Prop} is co-transitive” implies the law of excluded middle.*

Proof. Let P be any proposition. Since $0 < 1$, either $0 < P$, in which case P , or $P < 1$, in which case $\neg P$. \square

3.1. Weak Order on the Real Numbers. If we define the weak order on the real numbers as $x \leq y$ if $x < y$ or $x = y$, then some theorems for the real numbers, which are known to be true, will turn out to have no constructive proofs. For instance, the proposition

$$\text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ if } \neg y < x \text{ then } x \leq y \text{ (*)}$$

is true for other definitions of \leq on the real numbers. For instance, when the real numbers are defined as the completion of the rational numbers, such as in [11], the proposition (*) is trivially true since $x \leq y$ is $\neg y < x$. The same goes on as in [4-1]. In [5], this proposition (*) is also true (see Lemma 2.1.4). But if the weak order is defined as $x \leq y := x < y$ or $x = y$, then the proposition (*) has no constructive proof. A reason for this problem is that the relation $<$ on the real numbers cannot be proved to be trichotomous, constructively. Here are the details.

Theorem 3.11. *“The binary relation $<$ on \mathbb{R} is trichotomous” implies the limited principle of omniscience (LPO), which says for all $(a_n) : \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{N}}$, either for all n , $a_n = 0$, or there is n such that $a_n = 1$.*

Proof. Let (a_n) be a decreasing⁷ binary sequence. Let $x = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{2^n}$. Note that x , as a geometric series⁸, converges in \mathbb{R} . By assumption, $x < 0$, $x > 0$, or $x = 0$. If $x = 0$, then $a_0 = 0$, so $a_n = 0$ for all n . Since each $\frac{a_n}{2^n}$ is nonnegative, each partial sum is nonnegative, so $x < 0$ is impossible. If $0 < x$, there is a nonnegative integer N such that $0 < \sum_{n=0}^{n=N} \frac{a_n}{2^n}$, so there is k in $\{0, \dots, N\}$ such that $a_k = 1$. Therefore, LPO. \square

⁷Note that if each decreasing binary sequence has all zero terms or has a term equal to 1, then LPO.

⁸For more on geometric series, see [3].

Theorem 3.12. “For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, if $\neg y < x$, then $x < y$ or $x = y$ ” implies the limited principle of omniscience (LPO).

Proof. Let (a_n) be any binary sequence, and let $x = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{2^n}$. Since x is a geometric series with a ratio less than 1, it converges in \mathbb{R} . Note that it is false $x < 0$ since each $\frac{a_n}{2^n}$ is nonnegative, so either $0 < x$ or $0 = x$, by our assumption. If $0 < x$, then there is a nonnegative N such that $0 < \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{a_n}{2^n}$, so there must be $k \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ such that $a_k = 1$. If $0 = x$, then $a_n = 0$ for all n . \square

4. CONNECTION WITH PARTIALLY ORDERED SETS

Generalized ordered sets are related to partially ordered sets. A lot more can be found about partially ordered sets on the web and in [18], but we provide the definition here: a set X with a binary relation \sim is *partially ordered* if, for all $x, y, z \in X$, (1) $x \sim x$; (2) $x \sim y \sim z$ implies $x \sim y$; (3) $x \sim y$ and $y \sim x$ imply $x = y$.

Given a generalized ordered set $(X, <)$, one can create a partially ordered set as follows. Keep the underlying set X and take the binary relation to be \leq_p , which is defined from the previous section. That $x \leq_p x$ for all $x \in X$ is automatic. Lemma 3.2 (1) proves that, for all $x, y, z \in X$, $x \leq_p y \leq_p z$ implies $x \leq_p z$. Lastly, positive antisymmetry, as defined in the previous section, is the third property.

Getting a generalized ordered set from a partially ordered set is not immediate. Let (X, \sim) be a partially ordered set. We keep the underlying set, and we define the binary relation $<$ to be $x < y := x \sim y$ and $\neg x = y$. We will prove a two-part lemma for asymmetry and transitivity of $<$, and we will discuss the problem with positive antisymmetry.

Lemma 4.1. Let (X, \sim) be a partially ordered set with a binary relation $<$ defined as $x < y := x \sim y$ and $\neg x = y$. Then, for all $x, y, z \in X$,

- (1) $x < y$ implies $\neg y < x$;
- (2) $x < y < z$ implies $x < z$.

Proof. (1) If $x < y$ and $y < x$, then $x \sim y$ and $y \sim x$, so $x = y$, by property (3) of a partially ordered set. This is impossible because $\neg x = y$ from the definition of $x < y$.

(2) If $x < y < z$, then $x \sim y \sim z$, so $x \sim z$ from property (2) of a partially ordered set. To prove $\neg x = z$. Assume $x = z$, so $z \sim y$ because $x \sim y$ and \sim is well defined. Since $y \sim z$, we have $y = z$, which is impossible since $y < z$. Therefore, $x < z$. \square

We now show why positive antisymmetry cannot hold, given an arbitrary partially ordered set. We start with the set $X = \{a, b\}$ with

equality defined as $a = a$ and $b = b$, and we impose $\neg a = b$. The binary relation \sim on X is $a \sim a$ and $b \sim b$. To see that (X, \sim) is partially ordered is immediate. We recall that the binary relation $<$ defined earlier is $x < y := x \sim y$ and $\neg x = y$; also we recall that the binary relation \leq_p is as defined in the third section. Note that $a \leq_p b$. The reason is as follows. Let $c \in X$ and suppose $c < a$. By definition of $<$, we have $c \sim a$ and $\neg c = a$. But $c \sim a$ implies c is a by the definition of \sim on X , so $\neg c = a$ must be false. Hence, the statement “for all $c \in X$, $c < a$ implies $c < b$ ” is always true, vacuously. Similarly, the statement “for all $c \in X$, $b < c$ implies $a < c$ ” is true. With a similar argument, we can prove $b \leq_p a$. However, as we have defined X , it is false that $a = b$.

We need to emphasize that we have shown that an arbitrary partially ordered set (X, \sim) cannot be turned into a generalized ordered set with a binary relation $<$ defined as $x < y := x \sim y$ and $\neg x = y$. One question is whether there is any way to define a generalized order on an arbitrary partially ordered set.

A partial answer is that the binary relation $<$ we define above is positively antisymmetric for certain classes of partially ordered sets. Namely they are the partially ordered sets X such that, for all $x, y \in X$, $\neg y < x$ implies $x \sim y$. In particular, partially ordered sets with a total order and a decidable equality fall in that class. A binary relation \sim on set X is *total* if, for all $x, y \in X$, $x \sim y$ or $y \sim x$, and the equality on X is *decidable* if, for all $x, y \in X$, $x = y$ or $\neg x = y$. We show the details with the following:

Theorem 4.2. *Let X be a partially ordered set, and let the binary relation $<$ be defined as $x < y := x \sim y$ and $\neg x = y$. In addition, let X satisfy the condition (*): for all $x, y \in X$, $\neg y < x$ implies $x \sim y$. Then*

- (1) $x \leq_p y$ implies $x \sim y$;
- (2) positive antisymmetry holds.

Proof. (1) It suffices to show $x \leq_p y$ implies $\neg y < x$. This follows from Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 4.1(1). Hence, $x \leq_p y$ implies $x \sim y$, by the condition (*).

(2) Suppose, for all $x, y \in X$, $x \leq_p y$ and $y \leq_p x$. Then $x \sim y$ and $y \sim x$, by (1). Thus $x = y$. \square

By the way, partially ordered sets with a total order and a decidable equality are not exactly those in Theorem 4.2. Although the former is always the latter, the converse cannot be proved constructively. We again show the details with the following:

Theorem 4.3. *Let X be a partially ordered set, and let the binary relation $<$ be defined as $x < y := x \sim y$ and $\neg x = y$. Then, if \sim is total and $=$ is decidable, then, for all $x, y \in X$, $\neg y < x$ implies $x \sim y$.*

Proof. Suppose $\neg y < x$, meaning $\neg(y \sim x$ and $\neg y = x)$. If $y = x$, then $x \sim y$ since $x \sim x$ and \sim is well defined. If $\neg y = x$, then $y \sim x$ must be false, so $x \sim y$ since \sim is total. \square

Theorem 4.4. *The statement “For any partially ordered set X , if for all $x, y \in X$, $\neg y < x$ implies $x \sim y$, then \sim is total and $=$ is decidable” implies the weak excluded middle⁹.*

Proof. Let P be any proposition. Let $X = \{a, b\}$ be the partially ordered set with equality defined as $a = a$ and $b = b$. We also impose the condition $\neg b = a$. The partial order is defined as $a \sim a$, $b \sim b$; $a \sim b$ exactly when $\neg P$, and $b \sim a$ exactly when $\neg\neg P$. The statement “ $\neg y < x$ implies $x \sim y$ ” holds trivially when $x, y = a$ and when $x, y = b$, because $a \sim a$ and $b \sim b$. If $\neg a < b$, then $a \sim b$ must be false because $\neg a = b$, so $\neg\neg P$, implying $b \sim a$. Finally, if $\neg b < a$, then $b \sim a$ must be false because $\neg b = a$, so $\neg\neg\neg P$, implying $\neg P$; hence, $a \sim b$. Since the statement “for all $x, y \in X$, $\neg y < x$ implies $x \sim y$ ” holds, the partial order \sim is total, so $x \sim y$ or $y \sim x$, implying $\neg P$ or $\neg\neg P$. \square

5. ORDERS ON PRODUCTS

5.1. Coarse Product. Given two sets X, Y , the cartesian product $X \times Y$ is the set whose elements are pairs of elements of X and Y and whose equality is defined as $(x, y) = (x', y')$ if $x = x'$ and $y = y'$. When X, Y have each an order relation, a typical order defined on $X \times Y$ is the *lexicographic order*, which is defined as $(x, y) < (x', y')$ if $x < x'$, or $x = x'$ and $y < y'$. When X, Y are ordered sets, as defined in 2.4, there is no constructive proof that $X \times Y$, with the lexicographic order, is an ordered set. But there are some classes of cartesian products that are ordered sets when the components are ordered sets. For instance, we have shown in [11] that the cartesian product with the lexicographic order is an ordered set if the first component satisfies the property: for all x, y , $x = y$, $x < y$, or $y < x$. Here is why no constructive proof exists for the more general theorem:

Theorem 5.1. *The statement “the lexicographic order on the cartesian product of any two ordered sets is cotransitive” implies the law of excluded middle.*

⁹Weak excluded middle is, for all proposition P , either $\neg P$ or $\neg\neg P$.

Proof. Let P be any proposition. Let X be $\{0\} \cup \{1 : P\} \cup \{1 : \neg P\} \subseteq \{0, 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$. Equality on X is $0 = 0$ and $1 = 1$, and the binary relation $<$ on X is defined as $0 < 1$ if P and $1 < 0$ if $\neg P$. Let Y be $\{0, 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$; the binary relation $<$ on Y is inherited from \mathbb{Z} . Let S be the subset $\{0 \in X : \neg P\} \cup \{1 \in X : P\}$, so $S \times Y \subseteq X \times Y$. The cartesian product $X \times Y$ has the lexicographic order, so $(0, 0) < (0, 1)$. Let $(p, q) \in S \times Y$. By cotransitivity, either $(0, 0) < (p, q)$ or $(p, q) < (0, 1)$. We will refer to the latter disjuncts as “first case” and “second case”. If the first case holds, then $0 < p$, or $0 = p$ and $0 < q$. If $0 < p$, then $p = 1$, so P ; if $0 = p$, then $0 \in S$, so $\neg P$. If the second case holds, then $p < 0$, or $p = 0$ and $q < 1$. If $p < 0$, then $\neg P$; if $p = 0$, then $0 \in S$, so $\neg P$. \square

A question is whether it is possible to define a cotransitive binary relation on the cartesian product of any two ordered sets. A partial answer is that we might need to consider other types of products. For instance, given any two sets X, Y , we call the *coarse product* of X and Y the set whose elements are pairs (x, y) , where $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, and whose equality is defined as $(x, y) = (x', y')$ if $x = x'$; we also can define the equality as $(x, y) = (x', y')$ if $y = y'$. If we refine the notation to differentiate this product from the cartesian product, we denote by $X \times_c Y$ the coarse product and by $=_{c,X}$ and $=_{c,Y}$ the first and second equalities, respectively.

For any given sets X, Y , there is a natural function from $X \times Y$ into $X \times_c Y$, namely the function $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y)$. Just for the purpose of illustration, say $X = Y = \{0, 1, 2\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$. The cartesian product of X and Y has 9 distinct elements, while the coarse product of X and Y , with either equality, has 3 distinct elements. The coarse product of X and Y is an ordered set if either X is an ordered set or Y is an ordered set. The binary relation on the coarse product is defined as $(x, y) <_X (x', y')$ if $x < x'$ or $(x, y) <_Y (x', y')$ if $y < y'$. As a summary, we have the following:

Theorem 5.2. *Let X, Y be any sets:*

- (1) *if X is an ordered set, then $(X \times_c Y, =_{c,X})$ is an ordered set with $(x, y) <_X (x', y')$ if $x < x'$;*
- (2) *if Y is an ordered set, then $(X \times_c Y, =_{c,Y})$ is an ordered set with $(x, y) <_Y (x', y')$ if $y < y'$.*

5.2. Finite and Infinite Products. Contrary to the ordered sets, the lexicographic order on the cartesian product of two generalized ordered sets is a generalized order. We include the details below. In what follows, when we write $x \leq y$, we mean $x \leq_P y$.

Theorem 5.3. *The cartesian product of two generalized ordered sets with the lexicographic order is a generalized ordered set.*

Proof. Suppose $(x, y) < (x', y')$. Then either $x < x'$, or $x = x'$ and $y < y'$. If $x < x'$, then $(x', y') < (x, y)$ is false because the binary relation on X is asymmetric. If $x = x'$ and $y < y'$, then $(x', y') < (x, y)$ is false because the binary relations on X and on Y are asymmetric.

Transitivity of the lexicographic order follows from the well-definedness and transitivity of the binary relation on X and the transitivity of the binary relation on Y .

For positive antisymmetry, suppose the following: for all $(r, s), (u, v) \in X \times Y$,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (r, s) < (x, y) \text{ implies } (r, s) < (x', y'), \text{ and} \\ (x', y') < (r, s) \text{ implies } (x, y) < (r, s) \end{array} \right\} (1)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (u, v) < (x', y') \text{ implies } (u, v) < (x, y), \text{ and} \\ (x, y) < (u, v) \text{ implies } (x', y') < (u, v) \end{array} \right\} (2).$$

To show $x \leq x'$, suppose, for all $z \in X$, $z < x$. Then $(z, y') < (x, y)$, so $(z, y') < (x', y')$ by (1); hence, $z < x'$. Now, if $x' < z$, then $(x', y') < (z, y)$, so $(x, y) < (z, y)$ by (1), implying $x < z$. Similarly, $x' \leq x$. Thus $x = x'$. To show $y \leq y'$, suppose, for all $z \in Y$, $z < y$. Then $(x, z) < (x, y)$, so $(x, z) < (x', y')$. Since $x = x'$, it follows $z < y'$. Now, if $y' < z$, then $(x', y') < (x', z)$, so $(x, y) < (x', z)$, implying $y < z$ since $x = x'$. Similarly, $y' \leq y$. Thus $y = y'$. \square

For any nonnegative integer n , the *lexicographic order* on the cartesian product $\prod_{i=0}^n X_i$, where each X_i is a generalized ordered set, is $(x_0, \dots, x_n) < (y_0, \dots, y_n)$ if there is $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that $x_k < y_k$ and, for all $j < k$, $x_j = y_j$.

Theorem 5.4. *For each nonnegative integer n , the cartesian product $\prod_{i=0}^n X_i$, where each X_i is a generalized ordered set, is a generalized ordered set.*

Proof. The proof goes by induction on n and then follows from Theorem 5.3. \square

In the language of category theory, we have the following:

Corollary 5.5. *The category¹⁰ of generalized ordered sets has all finite products.*

Proof. The proof is immediate from Theorem 5.4. \square

¹⁰See Section 3 for the definition of the category of generalized ordered sets.

Besides the set of all propositions **Prop** we presented in the third section, we will exhibit a family of nontrivial generalized ordered sets (see Corollary 5.7). First, we define the cartesian product of an arbitrary collection of generalized ordered sets indexed by elements of any ordinal. Instead of Cantor's ordinals [7], we use ordinals¹¹ as defined in [20].

For an ordinal I as defined in [20], let \mathbf{g} be a function from I to the class of generalized ordered sets, and we write X_i for $\mathbf{g}(i)$. An example of such a \mathbf{g} is the function that sends each $i \in I$ to \mathbb{N} . We write $\prod_{i,\mathbf{g}} X_i$ for the set of functions f from I to $\cup_i X_i$ such that $f(i) \in X_i$. For instance, if each X_i has a distinguished element, say 0_{X_i} , an element of $\prod_{i,\mathbf{g}} X_i$ is the function that sends each i to 0_{X_i} . If \mathbf{g} is the constant function, say $\mathbf{g}(i) = X$ for all i , then $\prod_{i,\mathbf{g}} X$ is X^I , the set of functions from I to X . If $A \subseteq I$, we write $\prod_{i \in A, \mathbf{g}} X_i$ for the set of functions of $\prod_{i,\mathbf{g}} X_i$ restricted to A , where \mathbf{g} is restricted to A . The *lexicographic order* on $\prod_{i,\mathbf{g}} X_i$ is $f < g$ if there is $k \in I$ such that $f(k) < g(k)$ and, for all $j < k$, $f(j) = g(j)$; in such case, we say k witnesses $f < g$. The equality on $\prod_{i,\mathbf{g}} X_i$ is pointwise equality. For $A \subseteq I$, the *lexicographic order* on $\prod_{i \in A, \mathbf{g}} X_i$ is $f < g$ if there is $k \in A$ such that $f(k) < g(k)$ and, for all $j \in A$ with $j < k$, $f(j) = g(j)$.

A *lower subset* S of a generalized ordered set is a set such that $s' \leq s \in S$ implies $s' \in S$. For an ordinal I as defined in [20], an *initial segment* of I is a lower subset of I .

Theorem 5.6. *Let \mathcal{L} be any collection of initial segments of I . If, for each finite subcollection $\{A_0, \dots, A_m\}$ of \mathcal{L} , $\prod_{i \in \cup_{j=1}^m A_j, \mathbf{g}} X_i$ is a generalized ordered set, then the lexicographic order on $\prod_{i \in \cup \mathcal{L}, \mathbf{g}} X_i$ is asymmetric and transitive. If, in addition, the binary relation $<$ on each X_i is cotransitive, then the lexicographic order on $\prod_{i \in \cup \mathcal{L}, \mathbf{g}} X_i$ is positively antisymmetric.*

Proof. For asymmetry, suppose $f < g$ and $g < f$ in $\prod_{i \in \cup \mathcal{L}, \mathbf{g}} X_i$. Since k witnesses $f < g$, $f(k) < g(k)$, and since k' witnesses $g < f$, $g(k') < f(k')$. Since k is in some $A \in \mathcal{L}$ and k' in some $A' \in \mathcal{L}$, it follows $\prod_{i \in A \cup A', \mathbf{g}} X_i$ is a generalized ordered set by supposition. Since $k, k' \in A \cup A'$, it follows $f < g$ and $g < f$ in $\prod_{i \in A \cup A', \mathbf{g}} X_i$, when f and g are restricted to $A \cup A'$. But that is impossible since the binary relation on $\prod_{i \in A \cup A', \mathbf{g}} X_i$ is asymmetric.

¹¹For more on ordinals, see [19]

For transitivity, suppose $f < g < h$ in $\prod_{i \in \cup \mathcal{L}, g} X_i$. Then k witnesses $f < g$ and r witnesses $g < h$, where k is in some A and r in some A' . Hence, $f < h$ in $\prod_{i \in A \cup A', g} X_i$. Thus, $f < h$ in $\prod_{i \in \cup \mathcal{L}, g} X_i$.

Now assume the binary relation on each X_i is cotransitive. Let $f, g \in \prod_{i \in \cup \mathcal{L}, g} X_i$. Suppose for all $h, h' \in \prod_{i, g} X_i$, $h < f$ implies $h < g$, and $h' < g$ implies $h' < f$. To show for all $i \in \cup \mathcal{L}$, $f(i) = g(i)$, we use induction on i . Suppose for all $j < i$, $f(j) = g(j)$. If $g(i) < f(i)$, then $g < f$, so $g < g$, which is false by asymmetry. Hence, $\neg g(i) < f(i)$, so $f(i) \leq g(i)$ by Theorem 3.3. Similarly, $\neg f(i) < g(i)$, so $g(i) \leq f(i)$. Hence, $f(i) = g(i)$, by positive antisymmetry on X_i . \square

Corollary 5.7. *For any ordered set X , the set $X^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the lexicographic order is a generalized ordered set.*

Proof. Let X be an ordered set. Recall that any ordered set is a generalized ordered set, by Theorem 3.7, so X is a generalized ordered set. Let \mathcal{L} be the collection $\{\{0, \dots, n\} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. By Theorem 5.4, for each finite subcollection $\{A_0, \dots, A_m\}$ of \mathcal{L} , $\prod_{i \in \cup_{j=1}^m A_j} X_i$ is a generalized ordered set, where $X_i = X$ for each i . Since $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{0, \dots, n\} = \mathbb{N}$ and since the binary relation $<$ on X is cotransitive, it follows $X^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a generalized ordered set by Theorem 5.6. \square

Another binary relation¹² can be defined on the cartesian product of two generalized ordered sets. This binary relation seems to have the same peculiarity as the lexicographic order on the cartesian product of ordered sets¹³, namely it is known to be a generalized order when the first component of the product satisfies the discreteness condition, that is, for all x, y , $x < y$, $x = y$, or $y < x$. One question is whether that discreteness is needed. We use discreteness to prove that relation is transitive for the product (see the proof of Theorem 5.11). Another question is whether there is any constructive proof that this relation is transitive on the cartesian product of any two generalized ordered sets. We have Theorem 5.9 that suggests there may be no such proof. Furthermore, we show that this relation is exactly the lexicographic order when discreteness holds for the first component (see Theorem 5.12). Here are the details.

For any sets X and Y with binary relations $<$, the *weak lexicographic order* on the cartesian product $X \times Y$ is $(x, y) <_w (x', y')$ if

- (1) $x \leq x'$;
- (2) $x = x'$ implies $y < y'$;

¹²This definition is due to Michael Shulman.

¹³See the first subsection of this section.

(3) $\neg x = x'$ implies $x < x'$.

Theorem 5.8. *Let X, Y be sets with asymmetric and positively antisymmetric binary relations $<$. Then the weak lexicographic order on $X \times Y$ is asymmetric and positively antisymmetric.*

Proof. Suppose $(x, y) <_w (x', y')$ and $(x', y') <_w (x, y)$. Then $x \leq x'$ and $x' \leq x$, so $x = x'$ by positive antisymmetry. Hence, $y < y'$ and $y' < y$, which is false by asymmetry.

For positive antisymmetry, suppose the following: for all $(r, s), (u, v) \in X \times Y$,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (r, s) <_w (x, y) \text{ implies } (r, s) <_w (x', y'), \text{ and} \\ (x', y') <_w (r, s) \text{ implies } (x, y) <_w (r, s) \end{array} \right\} (1)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (u, v) <_w (x', y') \text{ implies } (u, v) <_w (x, y), \text{ and} \\ (x, y) <_w (u, v) \text{ implies } (x', y') <_w (u, v) \end{array} \right\} (2).$$

For all $z \in X$, if $z < x$, then $(z, y') <_w (x, y)$, so $(z, y') <_w (x', y')$ by (1). Note that $\neg z = x'$ because $z = x'$ implies $y' < y'$, which is false, so $z < x'$. Now, if $x' < z$, then $(x', y') <_w (z, y)$, so $(x, y) <_w (z, y)$ by (1), implying $x < z$ since $\neg x = z$. Hence, $x \leq x'$. Similarly, $x' \leq x$. Therefore, $x = x'$. For all $z \in Y$, if $z < y$, then $(x, z) <_w (x, y)$, so $(x, z) <_w (x', y')$. Since $x = x'$, it follows $z < y'$. Now, if $y' < z$, then $(x', y') <_w (x', z)$, so $(x, y) <_w (x', z)$, implying $y < z$ since $x = x'$. Hence, $y \leq y'$. Similarly, $y' \leq y$. Therefore, $y = y'$. \square

Theorem 5.9. *The statement “for any set X with an asymmetric binary relation $<$ and for all $x, x' \in X$, $\neg x = x'$ and $x \leq x'$ imply $x < x'$ ” implies the law of double negation¹⁴.*

Proof. Let P be any proposition. Let $X = \{a, b\}$ with exactly $a < b$ if P and $a = b$ if $\neg P$. Suppose $\neg\neg P$. Then $\neg a = b$. Note that $a \leq b$, trivially. Hence, $a < b$. Therefore, P . \square

Lemma 5.10. *Let X be a set with an asymmetric binary relation $<$. If X is discrete, then, for all $x, x' \in X$, $\neg x = x'$ and $x \leq x'$ imply $x < x'$.*

Proof. Since $x \leq x'$, it follows $\neg x' < x$, by Theorem 3.5. Hence, $x < x'$, since X is discrete. \square

Theorem 5.11. *Let X be a discrete generalized ordered set and Y any generalized ordered set. Then $X \times Y$, with the weak lexicographic order, is a generalized ordered set.*

¹⁴The law of double negation says, for all proposition P , if $\neg\neg P$, then P .

Proof. To prove $<_w$ is transitive, suppose $(x, y) <_w (x', y') <_w (x'', y'')$. Note that $x \leq x''$ by Lemma 3.2(1). Now suppose $x = x''$. Since $x \leq x'$, it follows $x'' \leq x'$. Since $(x', y') <_w (x'', y'')$, it follows $x' \leq x''$. Hence, $x' = x''$ by positive antisymmetry, so $x = x' = x''$. Thus $y < y' < y''$, implying $y < y''$. Finally, suppose $\neg x = x''$. Since $x \leq x''$, it follows $x < x''$ by Lemma 5.10. Therefore, $(x, y) <_w (x'', y'')$.

Asymmetry and positive antisymmetry of $<_w$ follow from Theorem 5.8. \square

Theorem 5.12. *Let X be a discrete generalized ordered set and Y be any generalized ordered set. Then $(x, y) < (x', y')$ if and only if $(x, y) <_w (x', y')$.*

Proof. The forward direction is trivial. Now suppose $(x, y) <_w (x', y')$. Since X is discrete, $x < x'$, $x = x'$, or $x' < x$. Note that $x = x'$ implies $y < y'$. Also, observe that $\neg x' < x$ since $x \leq x'$ implies $\neg x' < x$ by Theorem 3.5. Hence, $(x, y) < (x', y')$. \square

Two generalized ordered sets are *isomorphic* if there is an onto embedding between them, and such an embedding is called an *isomorphism*.

Theorem 5.13. *Let X be a discrete generalized ordered set and Y be any generalized ordered set. Then $(X \times Y, <) \cong (X \times Y, <_w)$.*

Proof. The isomorphism is the identity function on $X \times Y$. It is an embedding by Theorem 5.12. \square

6. FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS

6.1. An Excursion into Type Theory. The notion of a *set*¹⁵ can be generalized to the notion of a *type* [20, 16, 17]. Properties that we have introduced earlier (e.g., asymmetry, transitivity) can be extended to types. In what follows, we will show how this can be done. To acquire some familiarity with type theory, these sources can be consulted [13, 20, 16, 8]

Before we get into more details, we introduce some basics. We will assume the existence of these types: the type with no element, the type with exactly one element, the type of natural numbers, the type of propositions, denoted **Prop**, and a universe, which has types as elements. A universe is closed under certain type formers: given types A, B in a universe \mathcal{U} ,

- (1) the type of functions, denoted by $A \rightarrow B$, is in \mathcal{U} ;
- (2) the type of pairs (a, b) with a in A and b in B , which is denoted by $A \times B$, is in \mathcal{U} ;

¹⁵Roughly speaking, a set is defined as a special kind of a type.

- (3) they type $A+B$, which consists of two functions $\text{inl} : A \rightarrow A+B$ and $\text{inr} : B \rightarrow A+B$, is in \mathcal{U} .
- (4) the type $|A|$, which is a proposition, is in \mathcal{U} .

A family of types indexed by another type A is a function B from A to the universe \mathcal{U} , so each $B(a)$ is a type. Given a family of types $B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$, one can construct two other types. These are the types of dependent functions, denoted by $\Pi_{x:A}B(x)$, where each function f has the property that $f(a)$ is in $B(a)$ for each a in A ; and the type of dependent pairs, written as $\Sigma_{a:A}B(a)$, where for each pair (a,b) , the element a is in A and b is in $B(a)$.

We need to introduce more concepts before we can implement our plan. Recall we have mentioned the type of propositions, so each proposition is a type. For instance, a theorem is a type, and a proof is an element of that theorem. In particular, the logic used for reasoning can be translated in terms of types under the so-called Curry-Howard correspondence. Here are the details. Given propositions P, Q ,

- (1) “ $\neg P$ ” is the type $P \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$, where $\mathbf{0}$ is the type with no element;
- (2) “ P and Q ” is the type $P \times Q$;
- (3) “ P or Q ” is the type $|P + Q|$;
- (4) “if P , then Q ” is the type $P \rightarrow Q$;
- (5) for any type A , “for all $x : A$, $Q(x)$ ” is the type $\Pi_{x:A}Q(x)$;
- (6) for any type A , “there exists $x : A$, $Q(x)$ ” is the type $|\Sigma_{x:A}Q(x)|$.

Before talking about binary relations, we need to mention that study of types with binary relations is nothing new. The real numbers [20, 10], defined both as Dedekind cuts and Cauchy sequences, and the surreal numbers [20] are examples of types with binary relations. A binary relation on a type A is a function from $A \times A$ to the type of propositions. Instead of writing a binary relation as a function $\text{rel} : A \times A \rightarrow \text{Prop}$, we will follow the usual practice of *currying* to write a binary relation as $\text{rel} : A \rightarrow A \rightarrow \text{Prop}$, which is a function from A to $A \rightarrow \text{Prop}$.

To differentiate the asymmetric¹⁶ property for sets from what we will define for types, we will use the letter “t” as a prefix. We will, though, use the notation $<$ for the binary relation and will write “ $x < y$ ” to mean $<(x, y)$. Since we need a type and a binary relation to define t-asymmetry, we expect the definition to depend on two parameters. Plainly, a binary relation $<$ on a type A is *t-asymmetric* if, for all x, y in A , $x < y$ implies that $y < x$ is false. Under the Curry-Howard correspondence, we can write t-asymmetry as

$$\text{t-asym}(A, <) := \Pi_{x,y:A} x < y \rightarrow (y < x \rightarrow \mathbf{0}).$$

¹⁶See the third section for the definition of asymmetry.

The other properties can be defined in a similar way, so a *generalized ordered type* A can be defined as the type

$$\text{genOrd}(A, <) := \text{t-asym}(A, <) \times \text{t-trans}(A, <) \times \text{t-posAnt}(A, <).$$

6.2. Problems.

6.2.1. *Isomorphic theories.* The notion of a set can be captured in type theory. There are several approaches, some of which are translation of Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory in type theory [15], definition of a set as a special kind of type [20], and definition¹⁷ of a set as a pair made up of a type and a binary relation on that type [17]. Whichever approach is used, the notion of a generalized ordered set can be translated in type theory, so a theory of generalized ordered sets can be developed inside type theory. Furthermore, we have shown from the previous subsection how the notion of a generalized ordered type can be defined in type theory, so a theory of generalized ordered types can also be developed. We designate the former theory as $\text{Th}_{\text{genOrd}, \text{set}}$ and the latter as $\text{Th}_{\text{genOrd}, \text{type}}$. Is there a constructive proof that these two theories are essentially the same, in the sense that for each theorem T of $\text{Th}_{\text{genOrd}, \text{set}}$ there is a theorem T' of $\text{Th}_{\text{genOrd}, \text{type}}$ such that T and T' are equivalent in the ambient type theory, and vice versa?

6.2.2. *Unique partial order.* Different partial orders can be defined on a set with a binary relation $<$. For instance, \leq_N , \leq_P , and the relation $x \leq y$ if $x < y$ or $x = y$ are all partial orders (see Sections 3 & 4), but they are not all the same: on the real numbers, there is no constructive proof that \leq_N is the same as \leq (see 3.1). However, \leq_N and \leq_P are the same if $<$ is asymmetric and cotransitive (Theorems 3.3 & 3.5). A natural question is whether it is possible to impose certain conditions on the relation $<$ such that any partial order defined from $<$ is unique.

6.2.3. *Generalized \mathbb{N} -ordered Sets.* Given any set X , we can define an \mathbb{N} -ary relation on X as any subset of $X^{\mathbb{N}}$, where $X^{\mathbb{N}}$ is the set of all functions from the natural numbers \mathbb{N} to X . We can follow a similar convention to a binary relation when writing that an infinite sequence of elements of X are related. We denote an \mathbb{N} -ary relation as $<_{\mathbb{N}}$, and we write $<_{\mathbb{N}}(x_1, x_2, \dots)$ to mean that the terms of the infinite sequence x_1, x_2, \dots are related under $<_{\mathbb{N}}$. A question is what a natural definition

¹⁷This definition of a set as a pair is sometimes called a *setoid* or a *Bishop set*.

of asymmetry¹⁸, transitivity¹⁹, and positive antisymmetry²⁰ is for any \mathbb{N} -ary relation.

Furthermore, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, any \mathbb{N} -ary relation on X yields a natural k -ary relation on X , which is the restriction of the \mathbb{N} -ary relation on the first k terms of each $\langle_{\mathbb{N}}(x_1, x_2, \dots)$. The identity function on X naturally preserves the \mathbb{N} -ary relation to the k -ary relation, in the sense that if $\langle_{\mathbb{N}}(x_1, x_2, \dots)$ then $\langle_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote by id_k that natural order-preserving identity function from $(X, \langle_{\mathbb{N}})$ to (X, \langle_k) . A question is whether there is a natural universal property for \mathbb{N} -ary relations in this sense: for any \mathbb{N} -ary relation $\langle'_{\mathbb{N}}$ on X and any sequence of order-preserving functions f_k from $(X, \langle'_{\mathbb{N}})$ to (X, \langle_k) , there is a unique order-preserving function g from $(X, \langle'_{\mathbb{N}})$ to $(X, \langle_{\mathbb{N}})$ such that $f_k = \text{id}_k \circ g$ for each k .

The author thanks Michael Shulman and Martín Escardó for bringing Prop to his attention.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bauer, Andrej, Five Stages of Accepting Constructive Mathematics, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 54 (2017) 481-498: <http://www.ams.org/journals/bull/2017-54-03/S0273-0979-2016-01556-4/S0273-0979-2016>
- [2] Bishop, Errett, *Foundations of Constructive Analysis*. Ishi Press, 2012.
- [3] Bishop, Errett, and Douglas S. Bridges, *Constructive Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, 1985.
- [4-1] Bridger, Mark, *Real Analysis: A Constructive Approach*. Wiley, 2007.
- [4] Bridges, Douglas, and Fred Richman, *Varieties of Constructive Mathematics*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series (97). Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [5] Bridges, Douglas S., and Luminița Viță, *Techniques of Constructive Analysis*. Springer, 2006.

¹⁸See Section 3.

¹⁹See Section 3.

²⁰See Section 3.

- [6] Brouwer, L E J, On the Foundations of Mathematics in *L.E.J. Brouwer Collected Works: Philosophy and Foundations of Mathematics* (vol. 1), Editor: A. Heyting. North-Holland/American Elsevier, 1975.
- [7] Cantor, Georg, Beiträge zur Begründung der transfiniten Mengenlehre. *Mathematische Annalen* 46 (1895) 481 - 512. (English translation by Philip Jourdain, published by Dover Publications in 1915).
- [8] Coquand, Thierry, "Type Theory", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/type-theory/>.
- [9] Diener, Hannes, Constructive Reverse Mathematics. May 2018: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1804.05495.pdf>.
- [10] Gilbert, Gaëtan, Formalising real numbers in homotopy type theory. *CPP 2017 Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs* (2017), pp. 112 - 114: <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3018614>, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1610.05072.pdf>.
- [11] Joseph, Jean, S., *A Constructive Theory of Ordered Sets and their Completions*. Dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, May 2018: <https://pqdtopen.proquest.com/doc/2054019354.html?FMT=ABS>.
- [12] Mandelkern, Mark, A constructive real projective plane. *Journal of Geometry* (April 2016) Volume 107, Issue 1, pp 19–60 : http://www.zianet.com/mandelkern/mandelkern_rpp.pdf
- [13] Martin-Löf, Per, Intuitionistic Type Theory, *Studies in Proof Theory*, Bibliopolis, 1984.
- [14] Mines, Ray, Fred Richman, and Wim Ruitenburg, *A Course in Constructive Algebra*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 1988.
- [15] Miquel, Alexandre. *Le Calcul des Constructions implicite: syntaxe et sémantique*. PhD thesis, Université Paris 7, 2001.
- [16] Nederpelt, Rob, and Herman Geuvers, *Type Theory and Formal Proof: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [17] Rijke, Egbert, and Bas Spitters, Sets in homotopy type theory. *Math. Struct. in Comp. Science* (2015), vol. 25, pp. 1172–1202: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/12923C0993730DE101029B542D66F736/S0960129514000553a.pdf/sets>
- [18] Stanley, Richard, *Eumerative Combinatorics* (Vol. 1), 2nd. Ed., *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics* (49). Cambridge University Press, 2012.

- [19] Taylor, Paul. Intuitionistic Sets and Ordinals. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 61 (1996) 705–744: <http://www.paultaylor.eu/ordinals/intso.pdf>.
- [20] The Univalent Foundations Program, *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*, 2013: <https://homotopytypetheory.org/book/>.
- [21] Troelstra, Anne, and Dirk van Dalen, *Constructivism in Mathematics: An Introduction* (vol. I). Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics (Volume 121). North Holland, 1988.