

Introduction: naive set theory

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{N} &= \{1, 2, 3, \dots\} \\ \mathbb{Z} &= \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\} \\ \mathbb{Z}_+ &= \{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \\ \mathbb{Q} &= \left\{ \frac{a}{b} \mid a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, b \neq 0 \right\} \\ \mathbb{C} &= \{a + bi \mid a, b \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ \mathbb{C}_q &= \{a + bi \mid a, b \in \mathbb{Q}\}\end{aligned}$$

Recall: given sets X and Y , a relation from X to Y is a subset of $X \times Y$, where \times denotes the cartesian product of X and Y .

A relation $f \subseteq X \times Y$ is a function from X to Y such that $\forall x \in X, \exists! y \in Y$ such that $(x, y) \in f$. We write $f(x) = y$, and denote f as $f : X \rightarrow Y$.

X is the **domain** of f and Y is the **codomain**. The range $\text{ran}(f) = \{f(x) \mid x \in X\} \subseteq Y$.

The graph of a function $\text{Graph}(f) = \{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in X\} \subseteq X \times Y$.

Examples

$$\text{id}_X : X \rightarrow X, \text{id}_X(x) = x$$

This is the identity function.

The Characteristic Function: If $A \subseteq X$

$$\mathbf{1}_A : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{1}_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in A \\ 0, & x \notin A \end{cases}$$

Algebra of Functions

Let X be any set, and $(X; \mathbb{R}) = \{f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ represent the function space of X with codomain \mathbb{R} .

Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}(X; \mathbb{R})$. Then, $(f + g)(x) = f(x) + g(x)$, and $(f \cdot g)(x) = f(x) \cdot g(x)$.

If $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then $(tf)(x) = tf(x)$ (scalar multiplication). If $g(x) \neq 0 \forall x \in X$, then $\left(\frac{f}{g}\right)(x) := \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}$.

Finally, we have composition. If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ are functions, then $g \circ f(x) = g(f(x))$.

Injective, Subjective, and Bijective

A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a **injective** map, then, if $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$, then $x_1 = x_2$. For example, the shift map $S : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, $S(n) = n + 1$ is injective.

Any strictly increasing function $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where I is any interval, is injective.

A function f is **surjective** if $\forall y \in Y, \exists x \in X$ such that $f(x) = y$.

Consider the function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $f(x) = x^3 - 2x + 1$. We can show that this function is surjective because $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = \infty$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} f(x) = -\infty$. Due to the intermediate value theorem, we get that $\text{ran}(f) = \mathbb{R}$.

f is **bijective** if it is injective and surjective.

Invertibility

Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a function. f is **left-invertible** if $\exists g : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $g \circ f = \text{id}_X$. f is **right-invertible** if $\exists h : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $f \circ h = \text{id}_Y$.

f is **invertible** if $\exists k : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $f \circ k = \text{id}_Y$ and $k \circ f = \text{id}_X$.

Proposition

f is invertible if and only if f is left and right invertible.

Forward direction: This is via the definition of invertibility.

Reverse direction: Suppose g is a left-inverse of f , and h is a right-inverse of f . Therefore, $g \circ f = \text{id}_X$, and $f \circ h = \text{id}_Y$. Observe that $g = g \circ \text{id}_Y$. Therefore, $g = g \circ (f \circ h)$. Via associativity, $g = (g \circ f) \circ h = \text{id}_X \circ h = h$.

Theorem

If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a function:

1. f is injective $\Leftrightarrow f$ is left-invertible.
2. f is surjective $\Leftrightarrow f$ is right-invertible.
3. f is bijective $\Leftrightarrow f$ is invertible.

We will prove the first proposition in the forward direction. Suppose f is injective. Given $y \in \text{ran}(f)$, we know that $\exists! x_y \in X$ such that $f(x_y) = y$, by the definition of injective.

Let $g : Y \rightarrow X$. We will define g as follows:

$$g(y) = \begin{cases} x_y & y \in \text{ran}(f) \\ x_0 & y \notin \text{ran}(f) \end{cases}$$

Where x_0 is an arbitrary point in X . We can see that $g \circ f = \text{id}_X$.

For example, the function $\text{Sin}(x)$ defined as $\sin(x)$ restricted to $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ has an inverse, $\arcsin(x) : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$.

Cardinality and Finitude

Which set is “larger,” $\{1, 2, 3\}$ or $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$? \mathbb{N} or \mathbb{N}_0 ? \mathbb{Z} or \mathbb{Q} ?

In order to prove that one set is “the same size” as the other, we can create pairs. For two sets A and B , we can show that A is the same size as B by creating a function. For example, to show that \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{N}_0 have the same size, we create $s : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$, $s(n) = n + 1$.

Definition

Sets A and B have the same **cardinality** if \exists bijection $f : A \rightarrow B$. We write $\text{card}(A) = \text{card}(B)$.

Example

Given $a < b$ and $c < d$, we know that $\text{card}([a, b]) = \text{card}([c, d])$.

We can create a linear function from $[a, b]$ to $[c, d]$, and since linear functions are bijections, we know that $\text{card}([a, b]) = \text{card}([c, d])$.

Example 2

$$\text{card}((0, 1)) = \text{card}(\mathbb{R})$$

- $\tan : (-\pi/2, \pi/2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bijection:
 - \tan is strictly increasing (and thus injective)
 - $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \tan(x) = \infty$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \tan(x) = -\infty$, and by intermediate value theorem, \tan is surjective
- $\ell : (0, 1) \rightarrow (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ is a bijection as it is a linear function between two intervals.
- Therefore, our bijection is $\tan \circ \ell : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Definition

A set F is **finite** if F is empty or $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{card}(F) = \text{card}(\{1, 2, \dots, n\})$. A non-finite set is called infinite.

We can *enumerate* F by creating a function $\sigma : \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \rightarrow F$, such that $x_j = \sigma(j)$ for $F = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$.

Proposition

If $m \neq n$, then $\text{card}\{1, 2, \dots, m\} \neq \text{card}\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

WLOG, suppose $m > n$.

Suppose toward contradiction that $f : \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is our bijection. This means there are m “pigeons” and n “holes.”

One hole, j , must contain at least two pigeons (i.e., $f(i) = f(k) = j$ for some $i \neq k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$). Since f is assumed to be injective, this is a contradiction.

Proposition

\mathbb{N} is infinite.

Suppose toward contradiction that \mathbb{N} is finite. Thus, $\exists m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ is a bijection.

Consider the inclusion $i : \{1, 2, \dots, m+1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. i is injective.

Then, $f \circ i : \{1, 2, \dots, m+1\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ is an injection, but by the pigeonhole principle, this cannot be. Therefore, we have reached a contradiction.

Proposition

If A is infinite, $\exists i : \mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow A$.

$\exists a_1 \in A$, as $A \neq \emptyset$.

$A \setminus \{a_1\} \neq \emptyset$, so $\exists a_2 \in A \setminus \{a_1\}$.

$A \setminus \{a_1, a_2\} \neq \emptyset$, so $\exists a_3 \in A \setminus \{a_1, a_2\}$.

\vdots

We thus get a sequence $\{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ of distinct elements of A .

Consider $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$, $f(n) = a_n$. f is injective as a_n are distinct.

Example

$$\text{card}(\mathbb{Z}) = \text{card}(\mathbb{N})$$

$$f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

$$f(m) = \begin{cases} 2m+1 & m \geq 0 \\ -2m & m < 0 \end{cases}$$

f is a bijection as $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, $g(n) = (-1)^{n+1} \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ is the inverse of f .

Definition

Given any set X , $\mathcal{P}(X) = \{A \mid A \subseteq X\}$ is the **power set** of X .

$$2^X := \{f \mid f : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}\}.$$

Proposition

$$\text{card}(\mathcal{P}(X)) = \text{card}(2^X)$$

Let $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow 2^X$.

For $A \subseteq X$, put $\varphi(A) := \mathbf{1}_A$.

Consider $\psi : 2^X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$. $\psi(f) = f^{-1}(\{1\}) = \{x \in X \mid f(x) = 1\}$.

Then, $\psi \circ \varphi(A) = \psi(\mathbf{1}_A) = \mathbf{1}^{-1}(\{1\}) = A$,

and, we claim $\varphi(\psi(f)) = \varphi(f^{-1}(\{1\})) = \mathbf{1}_{f^{-1}(\{1\})} = f$.

Cantor's theorem

\nexists surjection $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, 1)$

Fact from calculus: $\forall \sigma \in (0, 1)$, σ can be written uniquely as a decimal expansion.

$$\sigma = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma_k}{10^k}$$

Where $\sigma_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$ and not terminating in 9s.

Suppose toward contradiction that $\exists r : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ that is a surjection. Write $r(n) = 0.\sigma_1(n)\sigma_2(n)\sigma_3(n)\dots$, and $\sigma_j(n) \in \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$, and not terminating in 9s.

Consider $\tau : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$:

$$\tau(n) = \begin{cases} 3 & \sigma_n(n) = 2 \\ 2 & \sigma_n(n) \neq 2 \end{cases}$$

Let $\tau = 0.\tau(1)\tau(2)\tau(3)\dots$. Since r is surjective, $\exists m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r(m) = 0.\sigma_1(m)\sigma_2(m)\dots\sigma_m(m)\dots = \tau = 0.\tau(1)\tau(2)\dots\tau(m)\dots$.

This implies that $\sigma_m(m) = \tau(m)$, which is definitionally not true, which is our contradiction.

Comparing Cardinalities

- $\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(B) \Rightarrow \exists f : A \hookrightarrow B$
- $\text{card}(A) < \text{card}(B) \Rightarrow \text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(B), \text{card}(A) \neq \text{card}(B)$

For example, $X \subseteq Y \Rightarrow \text{card}(X) \leq \text{card}(Y)$ because $i : X \hookrightarrow Y, i(x) = x$ is an injection.

Transitive Property

If $\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(B) \leq \text{card}(C)$, then $\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(C)$.

The composition of two injective functions is injective.

Canonical Set Comparisons

Via the inclusion map, we know the following:

$$\text{card}(\mathbb{N}) \leq \text{card}(\mathbb{Z}) \leq \text{card}(\mathbb{Q}) \leq \text{card}(\mathbb{R})$$

Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein

For any set A , $\text{card}(A) < \text{card}(\mathcal{P}(A))$.

Let us construct a function: $f : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$, where $a \mapsto \{a\}$.

f is injective, as if $\{a\} = \{a'\}$, $a = a'$. So, $\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(\mathcal{P}(A))$.

Claim $\nexists g : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$, g is surjective.

Suppose toward contradiction that such a g exists. Consider $S : \{a \in A \mid a \notin g(a)\}$.

Since g is onto, $\exists a_0 \in A$ with $g(a_0) = S$. $a_0 \in g(a_0) \Leftrightarrow a_0 \in S \Leftrightarrow a_0 \notin g(a_0)$. \perp

Equivalent Propositions

- (i) $\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(B)$
- (ii) $\exists f : A \hookrightarrow B$
- (iii) $\exists g : B \rightarrow A$, g surjection.

By definition, (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii).

- (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) If $f : A \hookrightarrow B$, f is left-invertible, and thus $\exists g : B \rightarrow A$ with $g \circ f = \text{id}_A$. So, g is right-invertible, so g is surjective.
- (iii) \Rightarrow (ii) If $g : B \rightarrow A$ is surjective, then g is right-invertible, so $\exists f : A \rightarrow B$ such that $g \circ f = \text{id}_B$. So, f is left-invertible, so f is injective.

Corollary

If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is any map, $\text{card}(f(A)) \leq \text{card}(A)$.

Consider $g : A \rightarrow f(A)$, where $g(a) = f(a)$. So, g is onto, so \exists an injection $f(A) \hookrightarrow A$.

More Cardinality of Canonical Sets

Consider the map $q : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$, $q(m, n) = \frac{m}{n}$. This map is *not* injective, as $2/4 = 1/2$. However, it is surjective, meaning $\text{card}(\mathbb{Q}) \leq \text{card}(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N})$.

Earlier, we showed that $\exists h : \mathbb{Z} \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Consider $H : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$, defined as $H(m, n) = (h(m), n)$.

Claim H is a bijection.

Proof of Injection If $H(m_1, n_1) = H(m_2, n_2)$, then $h(m_1) = h(m_2)$, and $n_1 = n_2$, and since h is bijective, $m_1 = m_2$, and $n_1 = n_2$, so $(m_1, n_1) = (m_2, n_2)$.

Proof of Surjection Let $(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$. We want to find $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ such that $H(m, n) = (k, \ell)$. Set $n = \ell$, and since h is surjective, set $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h(m) = k$.

Therefore $\text{card}(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}) = \text{card}(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N})$.

We claim that $\text{card}(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}) = \text{card}(\mathbb{N})$. First, we need to find $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Consider $\varphi(m, n) = 2^m \cdot 3^n$. By the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic, φ is injective.

Bringing together our inequalities, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{card}(\mathbb{N}) &\leq \text{card}(\mathbb{Q}) \\
 &\leq \text{card}(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}) \\
 &= \text{card}(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}) \\
 &\leq \text{card}(\mathbb{N})
 \end{aligned}$$

Cardinality Rules

- (i) $\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(A)$ (Reflexivity)
- (ii) $\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(B) \leq \text{card}(C) \Rightarrow \text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(C)$ (Transitivity)
- (iii) $\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(B)$ and $\text{card}(B) \leq \text{card}(A) \Rightarrow \text{card}(A) = \text{card}(B)$ (Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein)
- (iv) Either $\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(B)$ or $\text{card}(B) \leq \text{card}(A)$.

Proof of (iii) We have injections $f : A \hookrightarrow B$ and $g : B \hookrightarrow A$.

Let $A_0 \setminus \text{ran}(g)$. Let $A_1 = g \circ f(A_0)$. Note that $A_0 \cap A_1 = \emptyset$. Let $A_2 = g \circ f(A_1)$. Note that $A_0 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$.

Claim We claim $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$. If $\exists z \in A_1 \cap A_2$, then $z = g(f(x_0))$ for some $x_0 \in A_0$, and $z = g(f(x_1))$ where $x_1 \in A_1$. However, g and f are injective, so $g \circ f$ is injective, so $x_0 = x_1$, but $A_0 \cap A_1 = \emptyset$. \perp

We let $A_n = g \circ f(A_{n-1})$ for arbitrary n , and $A_\infty = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} A_n$. If $a \notin A_\infty$, then $a \notin A_0$, so $a \in \text{ran}(g)$. Define $h : A \rightarrow B$.

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & x \in A_\infty \\ y_x & x \notin A_\infty \end{cases}$$

Where y_x is the unique element in B with $g(y_x) = x$.

Claim We claim h is the desired bijection.

Proof of Injection Suppose $h(x_1) = h(x_2)$.

If $x_1, x_2 \in A_\infty$, then by the definition of H , $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$, f is injective, so $x_1 = x_2$.

Suppose $x_1, x_2 \notin A_\infty$. Then, by definition, $h(x_1) = y_{x_1}$ and $h(x_2) = y_{x_2}$, then $g(y_{x_1}) = g(y_{x_2})$, so $x_1 = x_2$.

WLOG, suppose $x_1 \in A_\infty$, and $x_2 \notin A_\infty$. $h(x_1) = f(x_1) = h(x_2) = y_{x_2}$. Then, $g(f(x_1)) \in A_\infty = g(y_{x_2}) = x_2 \notin A_\infty$. This case is not possible.

Thus, h is injective.

Proof of Surjection Let $y \in B$. Set $x := g(y)$.

Suppose $x \notin A_\infty$. Then, $h(x) = y_x$, where y_x is the unique element in B with $g(y_x) = x = g(y)$, so $y = y_x$, so $h(x) = y$.

If $x \in A_\infty$. We know that $x \notin A_0$, as $x \in \text{ran}(g)$. So, $x = g(f(z))$ for some $z \in A_{m-1}$. Since g is injective, $y = f(z)$, $z \in A_\infty$. Thus, $h(z) = f(z) = y$.

Therefore, we have $\text{card}(\mathbb{Q}) = \text{card}(\mathbb{N})$.

Countability

A set X is *countable* if $\exists f : x \hookrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ ($\text{card}(X) \leq \text{card}(\mathbb{N})$). $\text{card}(\mathbb{N}) = \aleph_0$. If X is countable and infinite, X is *denumerable*.

Corollary to Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein

If X is denumerable, then $\text{card}(X) = \aleph_0$.

Since X is infinite, $\exists f : \mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow X$. Since X is countable, $\exists g : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{N}$. By Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein, $\text{card}(X) = \text{card}(\mathbb{N})$, so $\text{card}(X) = \aleph_0$.

Thus, we have:

$$\text{card}(\mathbb{N}) = \text{card}(\mathbb{Z}) = \text{card}(\mathbb{Q})$$

(as shown earlier)

Countability under Union

The countable union of countable sets is countable. If I is a countable indexing set and for each $i \in I$, A_i is countable, then $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$ is countable.

Since each A_i is countable, $\exists \pi_i : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A_i$. Consider the function

$$\pi : I \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$$

defined as $\pi(i, j) = \pi_i(j)$.

Claim 1 π is a surjection.

Proof 1 Let $x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$. $\exists i_0$ such that $x \in A_{i_0}$. Since π_{i_0} is surjective, $\exists k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\pi_{i_0}(k) = x$. $\pi_{i_0}(k) = \pi(i_0, k)$. Therefore, π is surjective.

Claim 2 $I \times \mathbb{N}$ is countable.

Proof 2 We know $\exists f : I \hookrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ since I is countable. Thus, $g : I \times \mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$, $(i, n) \mapsto (f(i), n)$. Recall, $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{N}$, $(m, n) \mapsto 2^m \cdot 3^n$ is an injection. By composing these maps, $I \times \mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Since π is onto, and $I \times \mathbb{N}$ is countable, $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$ is countable.

Continuum Hypothesis

We saw that $\text{card}(\mathbb{N}) < \text{card}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})) = \text{card}(2^{\mathbb{N}})$, where $2^{\mathbb{N}} = \{f \mid f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}\}$.

Theorem $\text{card}(\mathbb{R}) = \text{card}(I) = \text{card}(2^{\mathbb{N}})$, where I is any non-degenerate interval.

Lemma 1 $\text{card}([0, 1]) \leq \text{card}(2^{\mathbb{N}})$.

Proof 1 Every $t \in [0, 1]$ has a binary expansion.

$$t = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma_k}{2^k}$$

where $\sigma_k \in \{0, 1\}$.

Consider $2^{\mathbb{N}} \xrightarrow{\varphi} [0, 1]$, defined as $\phi(f) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(k)}{2^k}$. Set $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, $f(k) = \sigma_k$.

Therefore, φ is surjective, so $\exists \{0, 1\} \hookrightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, so $\text{card}([0, 1]) \leq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 2 $\text{card}([0, 1]) = \text{card}(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof 2 We have $[0, 1] \xhookrightarrow{i} \mathbb{R}$ via inclusion, so $\text{card}([0, 1]) \leq \text{card}(\mathbb{R})$.

Also, $\text{card}(\mathbb{R}) = \text{card}((0, 1)) \leq \text{card}([0, 1])$, so by Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein, $\text{card}(\mathbb{R}) = \text{card}([0, 1])$.

Lemma 3 Any two non-degenerate intervals I and J have the same cardinality.

Proof 3 We can create injections $I \hookrightarrow J$ and vice-versa.

Lemma 4 $\text{card}(2^{\mathbb{N}}) \leq \text{card}([0, 1])$.

Proof 4 $\psi : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Where $\psi(f) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(k)}{3^k}$.

ψ is well-defined:

$$0 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(k)}{3^k} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3^k} \leq \frac{1}{2} \leq 1$$

We claim ψ is injective. Suppose $f \neq g$ in $2^{\mathbb{N}}$. Let $k_0 = \min\{k \mid f(k) \neq g(k)\}$. WLOG, $f(k_0) = 0, g(k_0) = 1$. Let $t_f = \sum_{k>k_0}^{\infty} \frac{f(k)}{3^k}$, $t_g = \sum_{k>k_0}^{\infty} \frac{g(k)}{3^k}$.

Therefore, $\psi(f) = \sum_{k=1}^{k_0-1} \frac{f(k)}{3^k} + 0 + t_f$, and $\psi(g) = \sum_{k=1}^{k_0-1} \frac{1}{3^k} + t_g$.

Suppose toward contradiction $\psi(f) = \psi(g)$. Then, $t_f = \frac{1}{3^{k_0}} + t_g$, or $t_f - t_g = \frac{1}{3^{k_0}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} |t_f - t_g| &= \left| \sum_{k>k_0} \frac{f(k)}{3^k} - \sum_{k>k_0} \frac{g(k)}{3^k} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k>k_0} \frac{|f(k) - g(k)|}{3^k} \\ &\leq \sum_{k>k_0} \frac{1}{3^k} \\ &= \frac{(1/3)^{k_0+1}}{1 - (1/3)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{3^{k_0}} \end{aligned}$$

⊥

We have thus shown:

$$\text{card}(\mathbb{R}) = \text{card}([0, 1]) = \text{card}(2^{\mathbb{N}})$$

We know that

$$\aleph_0 = \text{card}(\mathbb{N}) = \text{card}(\mathbb{Q}) = \text{card}(\mathbb{Z}) < 2^{\aleph_0} = \text{card}(2^{\mathbb{N}}) = \text{card}(\mathbb{R}) = \text{card}(I)$$

However, the existence of an infinity with cardinality strictly greater than \aleph_0 and strictly less than 2^{\aleph_0} is an axiom (i.e., it can be an assumption or not).

Ordering

Let X be a non-empty set. A relation on X is a subset of $X \times X$.

- R is *reflexive* if $\forall x \in X, (x, x) \in R$.
- R is *transitive* if $(x, y), (y, z) \in R \rightarrow (x, z) \in R$.
- If R is *antisymmetric* $(x, y), (y, x) \in R \rightarrow x = y$.

If R is reflexive, transitive, and antisymmetric, then R is an *ordering* of X .

If R is an ordering of X , then we write:

$$(x, y) \in R \Leftrightarrow xRy \Leftrightarrow x \leq_R y$$

- $x \leq_R x \quad \forall x \in X$
- $x \leq_R y, y \leq_R z \rightarrow x \leq_R z$
- $x \leq_R y, y \leq_R x \rightarrow x = y$

Additionally, $x <_R y$ means $x \leq_R y$ and $x \neq y$.

Algebraic ordering of \mathbb{N}_0

$$n \leq_a m \Leftrightarrow \exists k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ such that } n + k = m$$

\mathbb{N} ordered via division

$$n \leq_D m \Leftrightarrow n|m$$

Under this definition, it is false that $2 \leq_D 5$, but it is true that $4 \leq_D 20$.

Inclusion Let S be any set, and let $X = \mathcal{P}(S)$. For $A, B \in \mathcal{P}(S)$, we define $A \leq_i B \Leftrightarrow A \subseteq B$.

Containment With X defined as above, $A \leq_c B \Leftrightarrow A \supseteq B$.

For $\mathcal{F}(X, \mathbb{R}) = \{f \mid f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$, we can define $f \leq g \Leftrightarrow f(x) \leq g(x) \quad \forall x \in X$.

Types of Orderings

- An ordering \leq of X is *total* or *linear* if $\forall x, y \in X, x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$.
- An ordering is *directed* if $\forall x, y \in X \exists z \in X$ such that $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$.

If X is a totally ordered set, X is directed.

For example, all the following orderings are directed but not total:

$$(\mathbb{N}_0, \leq_D), (\mathcal{P}(S), \leq_i), (\mathcal{P}(S), \leq_c)$$

Upper/Lower Bounds

- (i) Let (X, \leq) be an ordered set, $A \subseteq X$. A is bounded above if $\exists v \in X$ with $a \leq v \forall a \in A$. Such a v is an upper bound.
- (ii) A is bounded below if $\exists \ell \in X$ such that $a \geq \ell \forall a \in A$. Such a w is a lower bound.
- (iii) If v is an upper bound of A and $v \in A$, then v is the greatest element of A , or $\max(A) = v$.
- (iv) If ℓ is a lower bound for A and $\ell \in A$, then ℓ is the least element of A , or $\min(A) = \ell$.
- (v) If u is an upper bound for A , and $u \leq v$ for all other upper bounds v of A , then u is the *least upper bound* of A , or $\sup(A) = u$ (for *supremum*).
- (vi) If ℓ is a lower bound for A , and $\ell \leq g$ for all other lower bounds g of A , then ℓ is the *greatest lower bound* of A , or $\inf(A) = \ell$ (for *infimum*).
- (vii) If A is bounded above and below, then A is bounded.

Well-Ordering Principle

With (\mathbb{N}, \leq_a) , every nonempty $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ has a least element.

Examples

Example 1

For $A \subseteq (\mathbb{N}, \leq_a)$, $A = \{2, 3, \dots, 12\}$, we have the following:

Bounded Above? Yes.

Upper Bounds 12, 13, 14, ...

Greatest Element 12

Example 2

For $A \subseteq (\mathbb{N}, \leq_D)$, $A = \{2, 3, \dots, 10\}$

Bounded Above? Yes.

Upper Bounds 10!

Greatest Element? No.

Supremum $2^3 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$

Bounded Below? Yes.

Lower Bound 1

Least Element? No.

Infimum 1

Example 3

For $\mathcal{A} \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(S), \leq_i)$, $A = \{A_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(S)$.

Supremum $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$

Infimum $\bigcap_{i \in I} A_i$

Complete Sets

An ordered set (X, \leq) is *complete* if for all $A \subseteq X$ bounded, $\inf(A)$ and $\sup(A)$ exist.

For example, \mathbb{Q} is *not* complete, as there is not a largest rational number less than $\sqrt{2}$, for example.

Ordering of \mathbb{Z}

$$n \leq_a m \Leftrightarrow \exists k \in \mathbb{N}_0, n + k = m$$

This defines a total and complete ordering.

Define $\mathbb{Z}^+ = \{m \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 0 \leq_a m\}$

Properties of \mathbb{Z}^+

- (i) $m, n \in \mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow m + n \in \mathbb{Z}^+, m \cdot n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$
- (ii) $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ or $-m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$
- (iii) $m, -m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, then $m = 0$
- (iv) $m \leq_a n \Leftrightarrow n - m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$

Ordering of \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{Q} , and \mathbb{R}

Recall the ordering of \mathbb{Z} :

$$n \leq_a m \stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow} \exists k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ with } n + k = m$$

Claim \leq_a is an ordering of \mathbb{Z}

We claim that $\mathbb{Z}^+ = \{m \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 0 \leq_a m\}$. Thus, $\mathbb{Z}^+ = \mathbb{N}_0$.

Properties of \mathbb{Z}^+

- (i) $m, n \in \mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow m + n \in \mathbb{Z}^+, m \cdot n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$
- (ii) $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ or $-m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$
- (iii) $m, -m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, then $m = 0$
- (iv) $m \leq_a n \Leftrightarrow n - m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$

Other Properties of \mathbb{Z}

- (1) $n \leq_a m \Leftrightarrow m - n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$
- (2) $m \leq_a n$ and $p \leq_a q \Rightarrow m + p \leq_a n + q$
- (3) $m \leq_a n$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \Rightarrow pm \leq_a pn$
- (4) $m \leq_a n \Rightarrow -m \geq_a n$
- (5) \leq_a is total.
- (6) If $a_a > -$, and $ab_a \geq 0$, then $b_a > 0$
- (7) If $a > 0$ and $ab_a \geq ac$, then $b \geq c$.

Proof of (3):

$m \leq_a n \Rightarrow \exists k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $m + k = n$.
 $\Rightarrow pm + pk = pn$
 $pk \in \mathbb{N}_0$ by the properties of \mathbb{Z}^+ . So, $pm \leq_a pn$

Proof of (5):

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Consider $m - n$.
 By (ii), $m - n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ or $-(m - n) \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Thus, $m - n = k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, or $-(m - n) = \ell$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.
 Thus, $n \leq_a m$ in the first case, or $m \leq_a n$ in the second case.

We now want an ordering on \mathbb{Q} .

Creating the Rationals

Recall that $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^* = \{(a, b) \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}, b \in \mathbb{Z}, b \neq 0\}$. Consider the equivalence relation:

$$(a, b) \sim (c, d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} ad = bc$$

We will let $\mathbb{Q} = \{[(a, b)] \mid (a, b) \in \mathbb{Q}\}$ be the set of all equivalence classes in \mathbb{Q} . We write:

$$[(a, b)] = \frac{a}{b}$$

We define addition as follows:

$$\frac{a}{b} + \frac{c}{d} = \frac{ad + bc}{bd}$$

We must check that addition is well-defined: $\frac{a'}{b'} = \frac{a}{b}$ and $\frac{c'}{d'} = \frac{c}{d}$, then $\frac{a'd' + c'b'}{b'd'} = \frac{ad + bc}{bd}$.

We define multiplication as follows:

$$\frac{a}{b} \cdot \frac{c}{d} = \frac{ac}{bd}$$

These operations make \mathbb{Q} a **field**:

Fields

A ring is a nonempty set R equipped with two binary operations:

- $+: R \times R \rightarrow R, (a, b) \mapsto a + b$ ("addition")
- $\cdot: R \times R \rightarrow R, (a, b) \mapsto a \cdot b$ ("multiplication")

such that the following hold:

- (1) $(a + b) + c = a + (b + c)$
- (2) $\exists z \in R$ such that $a + z = a = z + a \forall a \in R$; there is at most one such z . Set $z = 0_R$.
- (3) $\forall a \in R, \exists b \in R$ such that $a + b = 0_R = b + a$; there is at most one such b . Set $b = -a$.
- (4) $\forall a, b \in R, a + b = b + a$.
- (5) $(a \cdot b) \cdot c = a \cdot (b \cdot c)$
- (6) $a \cdot (b + c) = a \cdot b + a \cdot c, (a + b) \cdot c = a \cdot c + b \cdot c$

The above six rules define a ring. If $(R, +, \cdot)$ satisfies $ab = ba$, R is a commutative ring.

If there exists $u \in R$ such that $ua = au = a \forall a \in R$, R is a unital ring; there is at most one unit. Set $u = 1_R$.

An integral domain is a unital, commutative ring such that $ab = 0 \Rightarrow a = 0 \vee b = 0$. For example, \mathbb{Z} is an integral domain. However, $c(\mathbb{R}) = \{f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f \text{ continuous}\}$ is a unital, commutative ring, but there exist two functions such that $f, g \neq \mathbf{0}$, but $f \cdot g = \mathbf{0}$.

A field is a unital, commutative ring such that every element has a multiplicative inverse.

$$\forall a \in R, a \neq 0_R, \exists b \in R, \text{ with } ab = 1_R$$

There is only one such b . Set $b = a^{-1}$.

Proof that \mathbb{Q} is a Field:

$$\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-1} = \frac{b}{a}$$

Provided that $\frac{a}{b} \neq 0_{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Additionally, $\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{j} \mathbb{Q}, j(n) = \frac{n}{1}$ is injective.

Ordering of \mathbb{Q}

$$\frac{a}{b} \leq_a \frac{c}{d} \Leftrightarrow ad \leq_a bc \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Prove that this ordering is well-defined.

Order Embedding

\leq is a well-defined total ordering of \mathbb{Q} , and $j : \mathbb{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Q}$, $j(n) = \frac{n}{1}$ is an order embedding.

$$j(n) \leq j(m) \Leftrightarrow n \leq_a m \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Properties of \mathbb{Q}^+

$$\mathbb{Q}^+ = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q \geq 0_{\mathbb{Q}}\}$$

$$(i) \quad q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}^+ \Rightarrow q_1 + q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}^+, \quad q_1 q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}^+$$

$$(ii) \quad q \in \mathbb{Q} \Rightarrow q \in \mathbb{Q}^+ \vee -q \in \mathbb{Q}^+$$

$$(iii) \quad \pm q \in \mathbb{Q}^+, q = 0$$

$$(iv) \quad x \leq y, u \leq v \Rightarrow x + u \leq y + v$$

$$(v) \quad x \leq y, 0 \leq z \Rightarrow zx \leq zy$$

Ordering of \mathbb{R} , cont'd

An **ordered field** is a field F equipped with a total ordering \leq_F such that:

- (i) if $s \leq_F t$, and $x \leq_F y$, then $s + x \leq_F t + y$
- (ii) if $s \leq_F t$ and $0 \leq_F z$, then $zs \leq_F zt$

For example, \mathbb{Q} with its ordering is an ordered field.

Proposition 1: If (F, \leq_F) is an ordered field, we define $F^+ = \{x \in F, x_F \geq 0\}$ with the following properties:

- (1) $x, y \in F^+ \Rightarrow x + y \in F^+, xy \in F^+$
- (2) $x \in F \Rightarrow x \in F^+, -x \in F^+$
- (3) $\pm x \in F^+ \Rightarrow x = 0_F$

Proofs

- (1) Let $x, y \in F^+$. Then, $x \geq 0$ and $y \geq 0$, so by property (i) of an ordered field, $x + y \geq 0 + 0 = 0$, so $x + y \in F^+$. Additionally, we have $x \cdot y \geq x \cdot 0 = 0$, so $xy \in F^+$.
- (2) Let $x \in F$. Since the ordering on F is total, $x \geq 0$ or $0 \geq x$. In the first case, $x \in F^+$. In the second case, we add $-x$ to both sides, so by (i), $-x \geq 0$, so $-x \in F^+$.
- (3) We have $x \geq 0$ and $-x \geq 0$. So $x \geq 0$ and $x + (-x) \geq x + 0$, so $x \geq 0$ and $0 \geq x$. So, $x = 0$ by antisymmetry.

Note: $x \leq_F y \Leftrightarrow y - x \in F^+$.

Proposition 2: Let F be an ordered field. Then, the following is true:

- (1) $\forall a \in F, a^2 \in F^+$
- (2) $0, 1 \in F^+$
- (3) If $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \cdot 1_F = \underbrace{1_F + 1_F + \cdots + 1_F}_{n \text{ times}}$

- (4) If $x \in F^+$, and $x \neq 0$, then $x^{-1} \in F^+$
- (5) If $xy > 0$, then $x, y \in F^+$, or $-x, -y \in F^+$
- (6) If $0 < x \leq y$, then $0 < y^{-1} \leq x^{-1}$
- (7) If $x \leq y$, then $-y \leq -x$
- (8) $x \geq 1 \Rightarrow x^2 \geq x \geq 1$, and $0 \leq x \leq 1 \Rightarrow 0 \leq x^2 \leq x \leq 1$.

Proofs

- (1) Let $a \in F$. Then, $a \in F^+$ or $-a \in F^+$.
 CASE 1 If $a \in F^+$, then by the previous proposition, $a^2 \in F^+$.
 CASE 2 If $-a \in F^+$, then by the previous proposition, $(-a)(-a) = a^2 \in F^+$.
- (2) $0 \geq 0$, so $0 \in F^+$. $1 = 1 \cdot 1 = 1^2 \in F^+$ by the previous result.
- (3) $n \cdot 1_F = \underbrace{1_F + 1_F + \cdots + 1_F}_{n \text{ times}} \in F^+$ by the previous proposition.
- (4) Let $x \neq 0, x \in F^+$. Suppose toward contradiction that $x^{-1} \notin F^+$, then $-x^{-1} \in F^+$. Thus, $x \cdot (-x^{-1}) \in F^+$, so $-1 \in F^+$, but $1 \in F^+$, so $1 = 0$. \perp
- (5) Let $xy > 0$, meaning $xy \in F^+$. Suppose toward contradiction that $x > 0$ and $y < 0$. So, $x > 0$ and $-y > 0$, so $(x)(-y) > 0$, so $-(xy) \in F^+$, so $xy = 0$. \perp
- (6) Let $0 < x \leq y$. We know $x^{-1} \in F^+$, so $x^{-1}x \leq x^{-1}y$. So $1 \leq x^{-1}y$. We also know $y \in F^+$, so $y^{-1} \in F^+$. So, $1 \cdot y^{-1} \leq x^{-1} \cdot y \cdot y^{-1}$.
- (7) Let $x \leq y$. Then, $0 \leq y - x$, so $-y \leq -x$.
- (8) Let $x \geq 1$. Then, $x \cdot x \geq 1 \cdot x \geq 1$.

Order Axiom

\mathbb{R} is an ordered field. The injection $\mathbb{Q} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i(q) = q$ is an order embedding.

Rational Orderings

Proposition 1: If $a \leq b$, then $a \leq \frac{1}{2}(a+b) \leq b$

Proof

$2a = a + a \leq a + b \leq b + b$, all by property (i) of an ordered field.

Therefore, $2a \leq a+b \leq 2b$. Since $2 = 1+1 \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $2^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^+$, so $(2a)/2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(a+b) \leq (2b)/2$, so $a \leq \frac{1}{2}(a+b) \leq b$.

Proposition 2: If $a \geq 0$ and $(\forall \varepsilon > 0), a \leq \varepsilon$.

Proof

If $a \geq 0$ and $a \neq 0$, then $a > 0$. So, we have that $\frac{1}{2}a < a$. Let $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}a$. We also have that $a \leq \varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}a < a$, so $a < a$. \perp

Arithmetic and Geometric Means

Given $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^+$:

Arithmetic Mean

$$= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{m}$$

Geometric Mean

$$= \sqrt[n]{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_m}$$

Arithmetic Mean-Geometric Mean Inequality

Let $a, b \geq 0$.

$$(ab)^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{2}(a+b)$$

If $x, y \geq 0$, $x \leq y \Leftrightarrow x^2 \leq y^2$.

$$0 \leq x \cdot x \leq x \cdot y \leq y \cdot y$$

by property (ii) of ordered fields

Therefore,

$$(ab)^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{2}(a+b)$$

$$ab \leq \frac{1}{4}(a^2 + 2ab + b^2)$$

$$4ab \leq a^2 + 2ab + b^2$$

$$0 \leq a^2 - 2ab + b^2$$

$$0 \leq (a-b)^2$$

by definition

Challenge: Prove for m .

Remark: The harmonic mean is defined as:

$$\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i}}$$

Bernoulli's Inequality

If $x \geq -1$, then $(1+x)^n \geq 1+nx$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$

By induction, we know that for $n=0$ and $n=1$, this holds.

Assume the inequality holds for some $m \geq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} (1+x)^{m+1} &= (1+x)^m(1+x) \\ &\geq (1+mx)(1+x) \\ &= 1+x+mx+mx^2 \\ &= 1+(m+1)x+mx^2 \\ &\geq 1+(m+1)x \end{aligned}$$

by the inductive hypothesis

Cauchy's Inequality

Let $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n a_j b_j \right| \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n b_j^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

In linear algebra language, this is equivalent to $\vec{v} \cdot \vec{w} \leq \|\vec{v}\| \cdot \|\vec{w}\|$.

Consider $f : \mathbb{R} \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i - b_i x)^2$$

We know that $f(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i^2 - 2a_i b_i x + b_i^2 x^2) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^n b_j^2 \right) x^2 + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n -2a_j b_j \right) x + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 \\ &= Ax^2 + Bx + C \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\Delta = B^2 - 4AC \leq 0 \Rightarrow B^2 \leq 4AC$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(-2 \sum_{j=1}^n a_j b_j \right)^2 &\leq 4 \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n b_j^2 \right) \\ \left| \sum_{j=1}^n a_j b_j \right| &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n b_j^2 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

As we know from linear algebra, the way we get equality is when $\vec{v} = c\vec{w}$, or that $a_j = cb_j \forall j$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Triangle Inequality

Given $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n (a_j + b_j)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 \right)^{1/2} + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n b_j^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

In linear algebra, this is equivalent to $\|\vec{v} + \vec{w}\| \leq \|\vec{v}\| + \|\vec{w}\|$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum (a_j + b_j)^2 &= \sum a_j^2 + \sum 2a_j b_j + \sum b_j^2 \\ &\leq \sum a_j^2 + 2 \left(\sum a_j^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum b_j^2 \right)^{1/2} + \sum b_j^2 && \text{by Cauchy} \\ &= \left(\left(\sum a_j^2 \right)^{1/2} + \left(\sum b_j^2 \right)^{1/2} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

we take square roots to get our end result

Metrics and Norms on \mathbb{R}^n

Consider $|\cdot| : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined as follows:

$$|x| := \begin{cases} x, & x \in \mathbb{R}^+ \\ -x, & x \notin \mathbb{R}^+ \end{cases}$$

Theorems about Absolute Value:

- (i) $|ab| = |a||b|$
- (ii) $|a^2| = |a|^2$
- (iii) $|-a| = |a|$
- (iv) $|a| \in \mathbb{R}^+$
- (v) $-|a| \leq a \leq |a|$

(vi) $|a| \leq \delta \Rightarrow -\delta \leq a \leq \delta$ for $\delta > 0$

(vii) $|a + b| \leq |a| + |b|$, $|a - b| \leq |a| + |b|$, $||a| - |b|| \leq |a - b|$

Proofs

Proof of (i)

Case 1: If $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then $|a| = a$, and $|b| = b$, and $ab \in \mathbb{R}^+$, so $|ab| = ab$

Case 2: If $a, b \notin \mathbb{R}^+$, then $|a| = -a$, and $|b| = -b$. Additionally, $(-a)(-b) = ab \in \mathbb{R}^+$, so $|ab| = ab$. The LHS = ab , and the RHS = ab .

Case 3: $a \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $-b \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then, $|a||b| = (a)(-b) = -ab$. Then, since $a(-b) \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $-ab \in \mathbb{R}^+$, so $|ab| = -ab$. Therefore, the LHS and RHS are equal.

Proof of (vii) Having established that $|a + b| \leq |a| + |b|$, we will show that $||a| - |b|| \leq |a - b|$.

$$\begin{aligned} |a| &= |a - b + b| \\ &\leq |a - b| + |b| \\ |a| - |b| &\leq |a - b| \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by exchanging a for b

$$\begin{aligned} |b| - |a| &\leq |b - a| \\ |b| - |a| &\leq |a - b| \end{aligned}$$

Let $t = |a| - |b|$. We have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \pm t &\leq |a - b| \\ -|a - b| &\leq t \leq |a - b| \\ |t| &\leq |a - b| \end{aligned}$$