Mathematics

Robin Adams

July 23, 2023

Chapter 1

Sets and Classes

1.1 Classes

Our language is the language of first-order logic with equality over one primitive binary predicate \in . We call all the objects we reason about *sets*. When $a \in b$, we say a is a *member* or *element* of b, or b contains a. We write $b \ni a$ for $a \in b$, and $a \notin b$ for $\neg(a \in b)$. We write $\forall x \in a.\phi$ as an abbreviation for $\forall x(x \in a \to \phi)$, and $\exists x \in a.\phi$ as an abbreviation for $\exists x(x \in a \land \phi)$.

We shall speak informally of *classes* as an abbreviation for talking about predicates. A *class* is determined by a unary predicate $\phi[x]$ (possibly with parameters). We write $\{x \mid \phi[x]\}$ or $\{x : \phi[x]\}$ for the class determined by $\phi[x]$. We write 'a is an element of $\{x \mid \phi[x]\}$ ' or ' $a \in \{x \mid \phi[x]\}$ ' for $\phi[a]$.

We say two classes **A** and **B** are *equal*, and write $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$, iff $\forall x (x \in \mathbf{A} \leftrightarrow x \in \mathbf{B})$.

The following are all valid formulas of first-order logic:

Proposition Schema 1.1.1. For any classes A, B and C, the following are theorems:

- 1. $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}$
- 2. If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$ then $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{A}$.
- 3. If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{C}$ then $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}$.

Definition 1.1.2 (Subclass). We say a class **A** is a *subclass* of **B**, or **B** is a *superclass* of **A**, or **B** *includes* **A**, and write $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{B}$ or $\mathbf{B} \supseteq \mathbf{A}$, iff every element of **A** is an element of **B**. Otherwise we write $\mathbf{A} \not\subseteq \mathbf{B}$ or $\mathbf{B} \not\supseteq \mathbf{A}$.

We say **A** is a *proper* subclass of **B**, **B** is a *proper* superclass of **A**, or **B** properly includes **A**, and write $\mathbf{A} \subsetneq \mathbf{B}$ or $\mathbf{B} \supsetneq \mathbf{A}$, iff in addition $\mathbf{A} \ne \mathbf{B}$.

The following are all valid formulas of first-order logic:

Proposition Schema 1.1.3. For any classes A, B and C, the following are theorems:

- 1. $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$
- 2. If $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq A$ then A = B.
- 3. If $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq C$ then $A \subseteq C$.

Definition 1.1.4 (Empty Class). The *empty class* \emptyset is $\{x \mid \bot\}$.

Proposition 1.1.5. For any class **A**, we have $\emptyset \subseteq \mathbf{A}$.

PROOF: Vacuously, every element of \emptyset is an element of **A**. \square

Definition 1.1.6 (Universal Class). The universal class V is $\{x \mid \top\}$.

Proposition 1.1.7. For any class A, we have $A \subseteq V$.

PROOF: Trivially, every element of **A** is an element of **V**.

Definition 1.1.8 (Union). The *union* of two classes **A** and **B** is the class $\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B} = \{x \mid x \in \mathbf{A} \lor x \in \mathbf{B}\}.$

Proposition 1.1.9. For any classes A, B, C, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B} &= \mathbf{B} \cup \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{A} \cup (\mathbf{B} \cup \mathbf{C}) &= (\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}) \cup \mathbf{C} \\ \mathbf{A} \cup \emptyset &= \mathbf{A} \end{aligned}$$

Proof: These are valid formulas of first-order logic. \square

Definition 1.1.10 (Intersection). The *intersection* of two classes **A** and **B** is the class $\{x \mid x \in \mathbf{A} \land x \in \mathbf{B}\}.$

Proposition 1.1.11. For any classes A, B, C, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B} &= \mathbf{B} \cap \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{A} \cap (\mathbf{B} \cap \mathbf{C}) &= (\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}) \cap \mathbf{C} \\ \mathbf{A} \cap \emptyset &= \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

PROOF: These are valid formulas of first-order logic. \Box

Proposition 1.1.12 (Distributive Laws). For any classes A, B, C, we have

$$\mathbf{A} \cup (\mathbf{B} \cap \mathbf{C}) = (\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}) \cap (\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{C})$$
$$\mathbf{A} \cap (\mathbf{B} \cup \mathbf{C}) = (\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}) \cup (\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{C})$$

PROOF: These are valid formulas of first-order logic. \square

Definition 1.1.13 (Union). The *union* of a class **A** is $\{x \mid \exists X \in \mathbf{A}.x \in X\}$. We write $\bigcup_{P(x)} t(x)$ for $\bigcup \{t(x) \mid P(x)\}$.

Proposition 1.1.14. For any classes A and B, if $A \subseteq B$ then $\bigcup A \subseteq \bigcup B$.

1.2. AXIOMS 5

Proof: First-order logic.

Definition 1.1.15 (Intersection). The *intersection* of a class **A** is $\{x \mid \forall X \in \mathbf{A}.x \in X\}$. We write $\bigcap_{P(x)} t(x)$ for $\bigcap \{t(x) \mid P(x)\}$.

Definition 1.1.16 (Relative Complement). Let **A** and **B** be classes. The *relative complement* of **B** in **A** is the class $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B} = \{x \in \mathbf{A} \mid x \notin \mathbf{B}\}.$

Proposition 1.1.17 (De Morgan's Laws). For any classes A, B, C, we have

$$\mathbf{A} - (\mathbf{B} \cup \mathbf{C}) = (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}) \cap (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{C})$$
$$\mathbf{A} - (\mathbf{B} \cap \mathbf{C}) = (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}) \cup (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{C})$$

Proof: First-order logic. \square

Proposition 1.1.18. If $A \subseteq B$ then $C - B \subseteq C - A$.

Proof: First-order logic. \square

Definition 1.1.19 (Symmetric Difference). The *symmetric difference* of classes **A** and **B** is the class $\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} := (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}) \cup (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})$.

Proposition 1.1.20. For any classes A, B, C, we have

$$\mathbf{A} \cap (\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{C}) = (\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}) + (\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{C})$$
$$\mathbf{A} + (\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{C}) = (\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}) + \mathbf{C}$$

Proof: First-order logic.

1.2 Axioms

Axiom 1.2.1 (Extensionality). If two sets have exactly the same members, they are equal.

Thanks to this axiom, we may identify a set a with the class $\{x \mid x \in a\}$. Our use of the symbols \in and = is consistent. We say a class \mathbf{A} is a set iff there exists a set a such that $a = \mathbf{A}$; that is, $\{x \mid \phi[x]\}$ is a set iff $\exists a \forall x (x \in a \leftrightarrow \phi[x])$. Otherwise, \mathbf{A} is a proper class.

Axiom 1.2.2 (Union). The union of a set is a set.

Axiom 1.2.3 (Power Set). For any set A, the class $PA = \{x \mid x \subseteq A\}$ is a set, called the power set of A.

Axiom 1.2.4 (Infinity). There exists a set I such that:

- There exists an element of I that has no members
- For every $x \in I$, there exists a set $y \in I$ such that the elements of y are exactly x and the members of x.

Axiom 1.2.5 (Choice). For any set A of pairwise disjoint, nonempty sets, there exists a set C such that, for all $x \in A$, $x \cap C$ has exactly one element.

Axiom Schema 1.2.6 (Replacement). For any predicate P(x, y), the following is an axiom:

Let A be a set. Assume that, for all $x \in A$, there exists at most one y such that P(x,y). Then $\{y \mid \exists x \in A.P(x,y)\}$ is a set.

Axiom 1.2.7 (Regularity). For any nonempty set A, there exists $m \in A$ such that $m \cap A = \emptyset$.

1.3 Basic Constructions on Sets

1.3.1 Consequences of the Axioms

Proposition 1.3.1. The class $\emptyset = \{x \mid \bot\}$ is a set.

PROOF: Immediate from the Axiom of Infinity.

Proposition 1.3.2 (Pairing). For any sets a and b, the class $\{a,b\} = \{x \mid x = a \lor x = b\}$ is a set.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For all $x \in \mathcal{PP}\emptyset$, there exists at most one y such that P(x,y). $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $x \in \mathcal{PP}\emptyset$ $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: y and y' be sets.

(1)1. Let: P(x,y) be the predicate $(x = \emptyset \land y = a) \lor (x = \mathcal{P}\emptyset \land y = b)$.

- $\langle 2 \rangle$ 2. Let: y and y be sets. $\langle 2 \rangle$ 3. Assume: P(x,y) and P(x,y')
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ (x = \emptyset \land y = a) \lor (x = \mathcal{P} \emptyset \land y = b)$

PROOF: From $\langle 2 \rangle 3$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ (x = \emptyset \land y' = a) \lor (x = \mathcal{P}\emptyset \land y' = b)$

PROOF: From $\langle 2 \rangle 3$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 6. \ \emptyset \neq \mathcal{P} \emptyset$

PROOF: Since $\emptyset \in \mathcal{P}\emptyset$ and $\emptyset \notin \emptyset$.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 7. \ y = y'$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: A be the set $\{ y \mid \exists x \in \mathcal{PP}\emptyset.P(x,y) \}$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ A = \{a, b\}$

Proposition 1.3.3. The union of two sets is a set.

PROOF: The union of two sets A and B is $\bigcup \{A, B\}$. \square

Proposition Schema 1.3.4. For any sets a_1, \ldots, a_n , the class $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} = \{x \mid x = a_1 \lor \cdots \lor x = a_n\}$ is a set.

PROOF: The case n=1 follows from Pairing since $\{a\}=\{a,a\}$. If we have proved the theorem for n we have $\{a_1,\ldots,a_n,a_{n+1}\}=\{a_1,\ldots,a_n\}\cup\{a_{n+1}\}$. \square

Proposition 1.3.5. For any classes **A** and **B**, if $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{B}$ then $\bigcup \mathbf{A} \subseteq \bigcup \mathbf{B}$.

```
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Assume: \mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{B}
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: x \in \bigcup \mathbf{A}
\langle 1 \rangle 3. Pick A \in \mathbf{A} such that x \in A
\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ A \in \mathbf{B}
\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ x \in \bigcup \mathbf{B}
Proposition 1.3.6. For any sets A and B, if A \subseteq B then \mathcal{P}A \subseteq \mathcal{P}B.
Proof: From Proposition 1.1.3. \square
Proposition 1.3.7. For any set A we have \bigcup \mathcal{P}A = A.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. \bigcup \mathcal{P} A \subseteq A
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: x \in \bigcup \mathcal{P}A
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. PICK X \in \mathcal{P}A such that x \in X
       Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 1
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ X \subseteq A
       Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 2
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ x \in A
       Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 2, \langle 2 \rangle 3
\langle 1 \rangle 2. A \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{P}A
   PROOF: For all x \in A we have x \in \{x\} \in \mathcal{P}A.
\langle 1 \rangle 3. Q.E.D.
   PROOF: By Proposition 1.1.3.
1.3.2
               Comprehension
Proposition Schema 1.3.8 (Comprehension). For any predicate P(x), the
following is a theorem:
     For any set A, the class \{x \in A \mid P(x)\}\ is a set.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Let: A be a set.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: Q(x,y) be the predicate P(x) \wedge y = x.
\langle 1 \rangle 3. For all x \in A, there exists at most one y such that Q(x,y).
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: x \in A
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. Let: y and y' be sets.
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. Assume: Q(x,y) and Q(x,y')
   \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ x \in A \land P(x) \land y = x \land y' = x
       Proof: From \langle 2 \rangle 3.
    \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ y = y'
       PROOF: From \langle 2 \rangle 4.
```

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: B be the set $\{y \mid \exists x \in A.Q(x,y)\}$

PROOF: This is a set by an Axiom of Replacement and $\langle 1 \rangle 3$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ B = \{ y \in A \mid P(y) \}$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} y \in B &\Leftrightarrow \exists x \in A. Q(x,y) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists x \in A(P(x) \land y = x) \\ &\Leftrightarrow P(y) \end{aligned} \tag{$\langle 1 \rangle 2$}$$

Corollary 1.3.8.1. The intersection of a set and a class is a set.

Corollary 1.3.8.2. The intersection of a nonempty class is a set.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: **A** be a nonempty class.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Pick $A \in \mathbf{A}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \cap \mathbf{A} = \{ x \in A \mid \forall X \in \mathbf{A}. x \in X \}$ which is a set.

Corollary 1.3.8.3. The relative complement of a class in a set is a set.

Corollary 1.3.8.4 (Russell's Paradox). V is a proper class.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $\mathbf{R} = \{ x \mid x \notin x \}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. **R** is a proper class.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: for a contradiction **R** is a set
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbf{R}$ iff $\mathbf{R} \notin \mathbf{R}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. This is a contradiction.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. **V** is a proper class.

PROOF: From Comprehension and $\langle 1 \rangle 2$.

П

Definition 1.3.9. For any sets A and B, the relative complement A - B is the set $\{x \in A \mid x \notin B\}$.

Proposition 1.3.10 (Distributive Laws). For any set A and class B, we have

$$A \cup \bigcap \mathbf{B} = \bigcap \{A \cup X \mid X \in \mathbf{B}\}\$$
$$A \cap \bigcup \mathbf{B} = \bigcup \{A \cap X \mid X \in \mathbf{B}\}\$$

Proof: First-order logic.

Proposition 1.3.11 (De Morgan's Laws). For any set C and class A, we have

$$C - \bigcap \mathbf{A} = \bigcup \{C - X \mid X \in \mathbf{A}\}\$$
$$C - \bigcup \mathbf{A} = \bigcap \{C - X \mid X \in \mathbf{A}\}\$$

Proof: First-order logic. \square

1.4 Transitive Classes

Definition 1.4.1 (Transitive Class). A class **A** is a *transitive class* iff whenever $x \in y \in \mathbf{A}$ then $x \in \mathbf{A}$.

Proposition 1.4.2. Let A be a set. Then the following are equivalent.

- 1. A is a transitive class.
- 2. $\bigcup A \subseteq A$
- 3. Every element of A is a subset of A.
- 4. $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}A$

PROOF: Immediate from definitions.

Proposition 1.4.3. For any set a, we have a is a transitive set if and only if $\mathcal{P}a$ is a transitive set.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If a is a transitive set then $\mathcal{P}a$ is a transitive set.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: a is a transitive set.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $a \subseteq \mathcal{P}a$

PROOF: Proposition 1.4.2, $\langle 2 \rangle 1$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $\mathcal{P}a \subseteq \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}a$

Proof: Proposition 1.3.6, $\langle 2 \rangle 2$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $\mathcal{P}a$ is a transitive set.

Proof: Proposition 1.4.2, $\langle 2 \rangle 3$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If $\mathcal{P}a$ is a transitive set then a is a transitive set.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: $\mathcal{P}a$ is a transitive set.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\bigcup \mathcal{P}a \subseteq \mathcal{P}a$

Proof: Proposition 1.4.2, $\langle 2 \rangle 1$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $a \subseteq \mathcal{P}a$

Proof: Proposition 1.3.7, $\langle 2 \rangle 2$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. a is a transitive set.

Proof: Proposition 1.4.2, $\langle 2 \rangle 3$.

Proposition 1.4.4. If **A** is a transitive class then $\bigcup \mathbf{A}$ is a transitive class.

Proof

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: **A** is a transitive class.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $x \in y \in \bigcup \mathbf{A}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ y \in \mathbf{A}$

Proof: $\langle 1 \rangle 1$, $\langle 1 \rangle 2$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ x \in \mathbf{A}$

PROOF: $\langle 1 \rangle 1$, $\langle 1 \rangle 2$, $\langle 1 \rangle 3$

Proposition 1.4.5. If every member of **A** is a transitive set then $\bigcup \mathbf{A}$ is a transitive class.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: Every member of **A** is a transitive set.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $x \in y \in \bigcup \mathbf{A}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Pick $A \in \mathbf{A}$ such that $y \in A$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ x \in A$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ x \in \bigcup \mathbf{A}$

Proposition 1.4.6. If every member of **A** is a transitive set then $\bigcap \mathbf{A}$ is a transitive class.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: Every member of **A** is a transitive set.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $x \in y \in \bigcap \mathbf{A}$ Prove: $x \in \bigcap \mathbf{A}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $A \in \mathbf{A}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ y \in A$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ x \in A$

Chapter 2

Relations

2.1 Ordered Pairs

Definition 2.1.1 (Ordered Pair). For any sets a and b, the *ordered pair* (a, b) is defined to be $\{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\}.$

Theorem 2.1.2. For any sets a, b, c, d, we have (a,b) = (c,d) if and only if a = c and b = d.

Proof:

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. If (a, b) = (c, d) then a = c and b = d.
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: \{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\} = \{\{c\}, \{c, d\}\}
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. \cap \{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\} = \bigcap \{\{c\}, \{c, d\}\}\
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \{a\} = \{c\}
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. a = c
    \langle 2 \rangle 5. \bigcup \{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\} = \bigcup \{\{c\}, \{c, d\}\}\
    \langle 2 \rangle 6. \ \{a,b\} = \{c,d\}
    \langle 2 \rangle 7. b = c or b = d
    \langle 2 \rangle 8. a = d or b = d
    \langle 2 \rangle 9. If b = c and a = d then b = d
        Proof: By \langle 2 \rangle 4.
    \langle 2 \rangle 10. b=d
        PROOF: From \langle 2 \rangle 7, \langle 2 \rangle 8, \langle 2 \rangle 9.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. If a = c and b = d then (a, b) = (c, d).
    PROOF: First-order logic.
```

Definition 2.1.3 (Cartesian Product). The *Cartesian product* of classes **A** and **B** is the class $\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B} := \{(x,y) \mid x \in \mathbf{A}, y \in \mathbf{B}\}.$

Proposition 2.1.4. If A and B are sets then $A \times B$ is a set.

PROOF: It is a subset of $\mathcal{PP}(A \cup B)$. \square

Proposition 2.1.5. For any classes A, B and C, we have $A \times (B \cup C) = (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$.

Proof:

$$(x,y) \in \mathbf{A} \times (\mathbf{B} \cup \mathbf{C}) \Leftrightarrow x \in \mathbf{A} \wedge (y \in \mathbf{B} \vee y \in \mathbf{C})$$
$$\Leftrightarrow (x \in \mathbf{A} \wedge y \in \mathbf{B}) \vee (x \in \mathbf{A} \wedge y \in \mathbf{C})$$
$$\Leftrightarrow (x,y) \in (\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}) \cup (\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{C})$$

Proposition 2.1.6. If $A \times B = A \times C$ and A is nonempty then B = C.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Pick $a \in \mathbf{A}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For all x we have $x \in \mathbf{B}$ iff $x \in \mathbf{C}$.

Proof:

$$x \in \mathbf{B} \Leftrightarrow (a, x) \in \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}$$

 $\Leftrightarrow (a, x) \in \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{C}$
 $\Leftrightarrow x \in \mathbf{C}$

П

Proposition 2.1.7. For any set A and class **B**, we have $A \times \bigcup \mathbf{B} = \bigcup \{A \times X \mid X \in \mathbf{B}\}.$

Proof:

$$(x,y) \in A \times \bigcup \mathbf{B} \Leftrightarrow x \in A \land \exists Y \in \mathbf{B}.y \in Y$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \exists Y \in \mathbf{B}(x \in A \land y \in Y)$$
$$\Leftrightarrow (x,y) \in \bigcup \{A \times X \mid X \in \mathbf{B}\}$$

2.2 Relations

Definition 2.2.1 (Relation). A relation is a class of ordered pairs.

Definition 2.2.2 (Domain). The *domain* of a class \mathbf{R} is the class

$$\operatorname{dom} \mathbf{R} := \{ x \mid \exists y . (x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \} .$$

Definition 2.2.3 (Range). The range of a class **R** is the class

$$\operatorname{ran} \mathbf{R} := \{ x \mid \exists y . (y, x) \in \mathbf{R} \} .$$

Definition 2.2.4 (Field). The *field* of a class \mathbf{R} is the class

$$\operatorname{fld} \mathbf{R} := \operatorname{dom} \mathbf{R} \cup \operatorname{ran} \mathbf{R} .$$

Proposition 2.2.5. For any set R, the classes dom R, ran R, fld R are sets.

PROOF: They are all subsets of $\bigcup \bigcup R$.

2.2. RELATIONS 13

Definition 2.2.6 (Single-Rooted). A class **R** is *single-rooted* iff, for all $y \in \operatorname{ran} \mathbf{R}$, there is exactly one x such that $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R}$.

Definition 2.2.7 (Inverse). The *inverse* of a class **F** is the class

$$\mathbf{F}^{-1} := \{ (x, y) \mid (y, x) \in \mathbf{F} \}$$
.

Proposition 2.2.8. For any class \mathbf{F} , we have dom $\mathbf{F}^{-1} = \operatorname{ran} \mathbf{F}$

Proof:

$$y \in \operatorname{dom} \mathbf{F}^{-1} \Leftrightarrow \exists x. (y, x) \in \mathbf{F}^{-1}$$

 $\Leftrightarrow \exists x. (x, y) \in \mathbf{F}$
 $\Leftrightarrow y \in \operatorname{ran} \mathbf{F}$

Proposition 2.2.9. For any class \mathbf{F} , we have ran $\mathbf{F}^{-1} = \operatorname{dom} \mathbf{F}$.

Proof:

$$y \in \operatorname{ran} \mathbf{F}^{-1} \Leftrightarrow \exists x. (x, y) \in \mathbf{F}^{-1}$$

 $\Leftrightarrow \exists x. (y, x) \in \mathbf{F}$
 $\Leftrightarrow y \in \operatorname{dom} \mathbf{F}$

Proposition 2.2.10. For any relation \mathbf{F} , we have $(\mathbf{F}^{-1})^{-1} = \mathbf{F}$.

Proof:

$$(x,y) \in (\mathbf{F}^{-1})^{-1} \Leftrightarrow (y,x) \in \mathbf{F}^{-1}$$

 $\Leftrightarrow (x,y) \in \mathbf{F}$

Definition 2.2.11 (Composition). The composition of classes ${\bf F}$ and ${\bf G}$ is the class

$$\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G} := \{(x, z) \mid \exists y.(x, y) \in \mathbf{G} \land (y, z) \in \mathbf{F}\}$$
.

Proposition 2.2.12. For any classes F and G,

$$(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G})^{-1} = \mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \mathbf{F}^{-1} .$$

Proof:

$$(z,x) \in (\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G})^{-1} \Leftrightarrow (x,z) \in \mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exists y.(x,y) \in \mathbf{G} \wedge (y,z) \in \mathbf{F}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exists y.(y,x) \in \mathbf{G}^{-1} \wedge (z,y) \in \mathbf{F}^{-1}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (z,x) \in \mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \mathbf{F}^{-1}$$

Definition 2.2.13 (Restriction). The *restriction* of the class **F** to the class **A** is the class **F** \upharpoonright **A** := $\{(x,y) \mid x \in \mathbf{A}, (x,y) \in \mathbf{F}\}.$

Definition 2.2.14 (Image). The *image* of the class **A** under the class **F** is the set $F(A) := \operatorname{ran}(F \upharpoonright A) = \{y \mid \exists x \in \mathbf{A}.(x,y) \in \mathbf{F}\}.$

Proposition 2.2.15. For any classes F, A and B, we have

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) \cup \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B}) \ .$$

Proof:

$$y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}) \Leftrightarrow \exists x \in \mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}.(x,y) \in \mathbf{F}$$

 $\Leftrightarrow \exists x \in \mathbf{A}.(x,y) \in \mathbf{F} \lor \exists x \in \mathbf{B}.(x,y) \in \mathbf{F}$
 $\Leftrightarrow y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) \cup \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B})$

Proposition 2.2.16. For any classes \mathbf{F} and \mathbf{A} we have $\mathbf{F}(\bigcup \mathbf{A}) = \bigcup \{\mathbf{F}(X) \mid X \in \mathbf{A}\}.$

Proof:

$$y \in \mathbf{F}(\bigcup \mathbf{A}) \Leftrightarrow \exists x \in \bigcup \mathbf{A}.(x,y) \in \mathbf{F}$$

 $\Leftrightarrow \exists x.\exists X.X \in \mathbf{A} \land x \in X \land (x,y) \in \mathbf{F}$
 $\Leftrightarrow \exists X \in \mathbf{F}.y \in \mathbf{F}(X)$

Proposition 2.2.17. For any classes \mathbf{F} , \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , we have $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}) \subseteq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B})$. Equality holds if \mathbf{F} is single-rooted.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}) \subseteq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B})$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B})$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Pick $x \in \mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}$ such that $(x, y) \in \mathbf{F}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A})$

PROOF: Since $x \in \mathbf{A}$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B})$

PROOF: Since $x \in \mathbf{B}$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If **F** is single-rooted then $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B})$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: **F** is single-rooted.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B})$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. PICK $x \in \mathbf{A}$ such that $(x, y) \in \mathbf{F}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. PICK $x' \in \mathbf{B}$ such that $(x', y) \in \mathbf{F}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ x = x'$

Proof: $\langle 2 \rangle 1$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 6. \ x \in \mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 7. \ y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B})$

Proposition 2.2.18. For any classes F and A we have

$$\mathbf{F}\left(\bigcap \mathbf{A}\right) \subseteq \bigcap \{\mathbf{F}(X) \mid X \in \mathbf{A}\}$$
.

Equality holds if **F** is single-rooted and **A** is nonempty.

Proof:

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \mathbf{F} (\bigcap \mathbf{A}) \subseteq \bigcap \{ \mathbf{F}(X) \mid X \in \mathbf{A} \}$$

2.2. RELATIONS 15

```
\langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: y \in \mathbf{F}(\bigcap \mathbf{A})
     \langle 2 \rangle 2. PICK x \in \bigcap \mathbf{A} such that (x, y) \in \mathbf{F}
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. Let: X \in \mathbf{A}
                Prove: y \in \mathbf{F}(X)
     \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ x \in X
     \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ y \in \mathbf{F}(X)
\langle 1 \rangle 2. If F is single-rooted then \mathbf{F} (\bigcap \mathbf{A}) = \bigcap \{ \mathbf{F}(X) \mid X \in \mathbf{A} \}
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: F is single-rooted.
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. Assume: A is nonempty.
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. Let: y \in \bigcap \{ \mathbf{F}(X) \mid X \in \mathbf{A} \}
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. Pick X_0 \in \mathbf{A}
    \langle 2 \rangle5. Pick x \in X_0 such that (x, y) \in \mathbf{F}
    \langle 2 \rangle 6. \ x \in \bigcap \mathbf{A}
         \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: X \in \mathbf{A}
         \langle 3 \rangle 2. PICK x' \in X such that (x', y) \in \mathbf{F}.
         \langle 3 \rangle 3. \ x = x'
              Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 1
          \langle 3 \rangle 4. \ x \in X
    \langle 2 \rangle 7. \ y \in \mathbf{F}(\bigcap \mathbf{A})
```

Proposition 2.2.19. For any classes F, A and B, we have

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B}) \subseteq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})$$
 .

Equality holds if \mathbf{F} is single-rooted.

```
Proof:
```

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B}) \subseteq \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})
     \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B})
     \langle 2 \rangle 2. Pick x \in \mathbf{A} such that (x, y) \in \mathbf{F}
     \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ x \notin \mathbf{B}
     \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ x \in \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}
     \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})
\langle 1 \rangle 2. If F is single-rooted then \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A}) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})
     \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: F is single-rooted.
     \langle 2 \rangle 2. Let: y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})
     \langle 2 \rangle 3. Pick x \in \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B} such that (x, y) \in \mathbf{F}
     \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{A})
     \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ y \notin \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B})
          \langle 3 \rangle 1. Assume: for a contradiction y \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{B})
          \langle 3 \rangle 2. Pick x' \in \mathbf{B} such that (x', y) \in \mathbf{F}
          \langle 3 \rangle 3. \ x = x'
               Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 1
          \langle 3 \rangle 4. \ x \in \mathbf{B}
          \langle 3 \rangle 5. Q.E.D.
               PROOF: This contradicts \langle 2 \rangle 3.
```

П

Definition 2.2.20 (Reflexive). Let **R** be a binary relation on **A**. Then **R** is *reflexive* on **A** iff $\forall x \in \mathbf{A}.(x,x) \in \mathbf{R}$.

Definition 2.2.21 (Irreflexive). A relation **R** is *irreflexive* iff there is no x such that $(x, x) \in \mathbf{R}$.

Definition 2.2.22 (Symmetric). A relation **R** is *symmetric* iff, whenever $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R}$, then $(y, x) \in \mathbf{R}$.

Definition 2.2.23 (Transitive). A relation **R** is *transitive* iff, whenever $(x, y), (y, z) \in \mathbf{R}$, then $(x, z) \in \mathbf{R}$.

Proposition 2.2.24. If R is transitive then R^{-1} is transitive.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: $(x,y), (y,z) \in \mathbf{R}^{-1}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ (y, x), (z, y) \in \mathbf{R}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ (z, x) \in \mathbf{R}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ (x,z) \in \mathbf{R}^{-1}$

2.3 *n*-ary Relations

Definition Schema 2.3.1. For any sets a_1, \ldots, a_n , define the *ordered n-tuple* (a_1, \ldots, a_n) by

$$(a_1) := a_1$$

 $(a_1, \dots, a_n, a_{n+1}) = ((a_1, \dots, a_n), a_{n+1})$

Definition Schema 2.3.2. An n-ary relation on A is a class of ordered n-tuples all of whose components are in A.

2.4 Equivalence Relations

Definition 2.4.1 (Equivalence Relation). An *equivalence relation* on a class **A** is a relation on **A** that is reflexive on **A**, symmetric and transitive.

Proposition 2.4.2. If \mathbf{R} is a symmetric and transitive relation, then \mathbf{R} is an equivalence relation on fld \mathbf{R} .

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $x \in \text{fld } \mathbf{R}$
 - PROVE: $(x, x) \in \mathbf{R}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Pick y such that either $(x,y) \in \mathbf{R}$ or $(y,x) \in \mathbf{R}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ (x,y) \in \mathbf{R} \text{ and } (y,x) \in \mathbf{R}$

PROOF: Symmetry.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ (x,x) \in \mathbf{R}$ PROOF: Transitivity.

Definition 2.4.3 (Equivalence Class). Let \mathbf{R} be an equivalence relation on \mathbf{A} and $a \in \mathbf{A}$. The *equivalence class* of a modulo \mathbf{R} is

$$[a]_{\mathbf{R}} := \{x \mid (a, x) \in \mathbf{R}\} .$$

Proposition 2.4.4. Let **R** be an equivalence relation on **A** and $a, b \in \mathbf{A}$. Then $[a]_{\mathbf{R}} = [b]_{\mathbf{R}}$ if and only if $(a, b) \in \mathbf{R}$.

```
Proof:
```

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. If [a]_{\mathbf{R}} = [b]_{\mathbf{R}} then (a, b) \in \mathbf{R}.
     \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: [a]_{\mathbf{R}} = [b]_{\mathbf{R}}
     \langle 2 \rangle 2. (b,b) \in \mathbf{R}
           PROOF: Reflexivity
      \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ b \in [b]_{\mathbf{R}}
      \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ b \in [a]_{\mathbf{R}}
     \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ (a,b) \in \mathbf{R}
\langle 1 \rangle 2. If (a,b) \in \mathbf{R} then [a]_{\mathbf{R}} = [b]_{\mathbf{R}}.
     \langle 2 \rangle 1. For all x, y \in \mathbf{A}, if (x, y) \in \mathbf{R} then [y]_{\mathbf{R}} \subseteq [x]_{\mathbf{R}}
           \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: x, y \in \mathbf{A}
           \langle 3 \rangle 2. Assume: (x,y) \in \mathbf{R}
           \langle 3 \rangle 3. Let: t \in [y]_{\mathbf{R}}
           \langle 3 \rangle 4. \ (y,t) \in \mathbf{R}
                Proof: \langle 3 \rangle 3
           \langle 3 \rangle 5. \ (x,t) \in \mathbf{R}
                PROOF: Transitivity, \langle 3 \rangle 2, \langle 3 \rangle 4.
           \langle 3 \rangle 6. \ t \in [x]_{\mathbf{R}}
                Proof: \langle 3 \rangle 5
      \langle 2 \rangle 2. Assume: (a,b) \in \mathbf{R}
      \langle 2 \rangle 3. [b]_{\mathbf{R}} \subseteq [a]_{\mathbf{R}}
           Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 1, \langle 2 \rangle 2.
      \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ (b,a) \in \mathbf{R}
           Proof: Symmetry, \langle 2 \rangle 2.
      \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ [a]_{\mathbf{R}} \subseteq [b]_{\mathbf{R}}
           Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 1, \langle 2 \rangle 4.
     \langle 2 \rangle 6. [a]_{\mathbf{R}} = [b]_{\mathbf{R}}
           Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 3, \langle 2 \rangle 5.
```

Definition 2.4.5 (Partition). A partition Π of a set A is a set of nonempty subsets of A that is disjoint and exhaustive, i.e.

- 1. no two different sets in Π have any common elements, and
- 2. each element of A is in some set in Π .

Definition 2.4.6. Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A. The *quotient* set A/R is the set of all equivalence classes.

Proposition 2.4.7. Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A. Then A/R is a partition of A.

Proof:

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Every member of A/R is nonempty.
```

PROOF: Since $a \in [a]_R$ by reflexivity.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. No two different sets in A/R have any common elements.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $[a]_R, [b]_R \in A/R$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $c \in [a]_R \cap [b]_R$ Prove: $[a]_R = [b]_R$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ (a,c) \in R$

PROOF: $\langle 2 \rangle 2$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ (b,c) \in R$

Proof: $\langle 2 \rangle 2$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ (c,b) \in R$

Proof: Symmetry, $\langle 2 \rangle 4$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 6. \ (a,b) \in R$

PROOF: Transitivity, $\langle 2 \rangle 3$, $\langle 2 \rangle 5$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 7$. $[a]_R = [b]_R$

PROOF: Proposition 2.4.4, $\langle 2 \rangle 6$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Each element of A is in some set in A/R.

PROOF: Since $a \in [a]_R$ by reflexivity.

П

2.5 Ordering Relations

Definition 2.5.1 (Linear Ordering). Let **A** be a class. A *linear ordering* or *total ordering* on **A** is a relation **R** on **A** such that:

- 1. **R** is transitive.
- 2. Trichotomy. For all $x, y \in \mathbf{A}$, exactly one of the following holds:

$$(x,y) \in \mathbf{R}, \qquad (y,x) \in \mathbf{R}, \qquad x = y.$$

We often use the symbol < for a linear ordering, and then write x < y for $(x,y) \in <$.

Theorem 2.5.2. Any linear ordering on a class is irreflexive.

PROOF: Immediate from trichotomy. \square

Proposition 2.5.3. If **R** is a linear ordering on **A** then \mathbf{R}^{-1} is also a linear ordering on **A**.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. \mathbf{R}^{-1} is transitive.

Proof: Proposition 2.2.24.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. \mathbf{R}^{-1} satisfies trichotomy.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $x, y \in \mathbf{A}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Exactly one of $(x,y) \in \mathbf{R}, (y,x) \in \mathbf{R}, x = y$ holds.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Exactly one of $(y,x) \in \mathbf{R}^{-1}$, $(x,y) \in \mathbf{R}^{-1}$, x=y holds.

Definition 2.5.4 (Lexicographic Ordering). Let A and B be linearly ordered sets. The *lexicographic ordering* < on $A \times B$ is defined by:

$$(a,b) < (a',b') \Leftrightarrow a < a' \lor (a=a' \land b < b')$$
.

Proposition 2.5.5. Let A and B be linearly ordered sets. Then the lexicographic ordering on $A \times B$ is a linear ordering.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. < is transitive.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $(a_1, b_1) < (a_2, b_2) < (a_3, b_3)$ Prove: $(a_1, b_1) < (a_3, b_3)$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Case: $a_1 < a_2$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. $a_2 < a_3 \text{ or } a_2 = a_3$

Proof: $\langle 2 \rangle 1$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. $a_1 < a_3$

PROOF: Transitivity

- $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ (a_1, b_1) < (a_3, b_3)$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Case: $a_1 = a_2$ and $b_1 < b_2$ and $a_2 < a_3$

PROOF: We have $a_1 < a_3$ so $(a_1, b_1) < (a_3, b_3)$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. Case: $a_1 = a_2$ and $b_1 < b_2$ and $a_2 = a_3$ and $b_2 < b_3$

PROOF: We have $a_1 = a_3$ and $b_1 < b_3$ so $(a_1, b_1) < (a_3, b_3)$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. < satisfies trichotomy.
 - (2)1. Let: $(a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2) \in A \times B$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Exactly one of $a_1 < a_2$, $a_1 = a_2$, $a_2 < a_1$ holds.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Case: $a_1 < a_2$

PROOF: We have $(a_1, b_1) < (a_2, b_2), (a_1, b_1) \neq (a_2, b_2), \text{ and } (a_2, b_2) \not < (a_1, b_1).$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. Case: $a_1 = a_2$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Exactly one of $b_1 < b_2$, $b_1 = b_2$, $b_2 < b_1$ holds.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Exactly one of $(a_1, b_1) < (a_2, b_2), (a_1, b_1) = (a_2, b_2), (a_2, b_2) < (a_1, b_1)$ holds.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. Case: $a_2 < a_1$

PROOF: We have $(a_2,b_2) < (a_1,b_1), (a_2,b_2) \neq (a_1,b_1), \text{ and } (a_1,b_1) \not< (a_2,b_2).$

Definition 2.5.6 (Upper Bound). Let **R** be a linear ordering on **A** and **B** \subseteq **A**. Let $u \in$ **A**. Then u is an *upper bound* for **B** iff $\forall x \in$ **B**. $x \in$ $x \in$

Definition 2.5.7 (Bounded). Let \mathbf{R} be a linear ordering on \mathbf{A} and $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$. Then \mathbf{B} is *bounded above* iff it has an upper bound.

Definition 2.5.8 (Least Upper Bound). Let **R** be a linear ordering on **A** and $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$. Let $s \in \mathbf{A}$. Then s is the *least upper bound* or *supremum* of **B** iff s is an upper bound for **B** and, for every upper bound u for **B**, we have $s \leq u$.

Chapter 3

Functions

3.1 Functions

Definition 3.1.1 (Function). A function is a relation **F** such that, for all $x \in \text{dom } \mathbf{F}$, there is only one y such that $(x, y) \in \mathbf{F}$. We denote this y by $\mathbf{F}(x)$.

We say that **F** is a function from **A** into **B**, or that **F** maps **A** into **B**, and write $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{B}$, iff **F** is a function, dom $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{A}$ and ran $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{B}$.

Proposition 3.1.2. For any class \mathbf{F} , \mathbf{F}^{-1} is a function if and only if \mathbf{F} is single-rooted.

PROOF: Immediate from definitions.

Proposition 3.1.3. For any relation \mathbf{F} , \mathbf{F} is a function if and only if \mathbf{F}^{-1} is single-rooted.

Proof: Immediate from definitions.

Proposition 3.1.4. Let F and G be functions. Then $F \circ G$ is a function, its domain is

$$\{x \in \operatorname{dom} \mathbf{G} \mid \mathbf{G}(x) \in \operatorname{dom} \mathbf{F}\}\$$
,

and for x in this domain, $(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G})(x) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{G}(x))$.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. **F** \circ **G** is a function.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $(x,z), (x,z') \in \mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Pick y, y' such that $(x, y) \in \mathbf{G}, (y, z) \in \mathbf{F}, (x, y') \in \mathbf{G}, (y', z') \in \mathbf{F}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ y = y'$

PROOF: G is a function.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ z = z'$

PROOF: \mathbf{F} is a function.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. dom($\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G}$) = { $x \in \text{dom } \mathbf{G} \mid \mathbf{G}(x) \in \text{dom } \mathbf{F}$ }

 $(\langle 1 \rangle 5)$

Proof:

```
x \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G}) \Leftrightarrow \exists z.(x,z) \in \mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G}
                                                                                      \Leftrightarrow \exists y, z((x,y) \in \mathbf{G} \land (y,z) \in \mathbf{F})
                                                                                      \Leftrightarrow \exists y ((x,y) \in \mathbf{G} \land y \in \mathrm{dom}\,\mathbf{F})
                                                                                      \Leftrightarrow x \in \text{dom } \mathbf{G} \wedge \mathbf{G}(y) \in \text{dom } \mathbf{F}
\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall x \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G}).(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G})(x) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{G}(x))
     Proof:
     \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: x \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G})
     \langle 2 \rangle 2. \ (x, (\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G})(x)) \in \mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G}
     \langle 2 \rangle 3. PICK y such that (x,y) \in \mathbf{G} and (y,(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G})(x)) \in \mathbf{F}
     \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ y = \mathbf{G}(x)
     \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{G}(x)) = (\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G})(x)
```

Proposition 3.1.5. For any set A there exists a function $F: \mathcal{P}A - \{\emptyset\} \to A$ (a choice function for A) such that, for every nonempty $B \subseteq A$, we have $F(B) \in B$.

```
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Let: A be a set.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: \mathcal{A} = \{ \{B\} \times B \mid B \in \mathcal{P}A - \{\emptyset\} \}
\langle 1 \rangle 3. Every member of \mathcal{A} is nonempty.
\langle 1 \rangle 4. Any two distinct members of \mathcal{A} are disjoint.
\langle 1 \rangle5. PICK a set C such that, for all X \in \mathcal{A}, we have C \cap X is a singleton.
   Proof: Axiom of Choice.
\langle 1 \rangle 6. Let: F = C \cap \bigcup \mathcal{A}
\langle 1 \rangle 7. \ F : \mathcal{P}A - \{\emptyset\} \to A
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. F is a function.
        (3)1. Let: (B, b), (B, b') \in F
        \langle 3 \rangle 2. \ (B, b), (B, b') \in \{B\} \times B
            PROOF: Since (B, b), (B, b') \in \bigcup A.
        \langle 3 \rangle 3. \ (B, b), (B, b') \in C \cap (\{B\} \times B)
        \langle 3 \rangle 4. \ (B,b) = (B,b')
            PROOF: From \langle 1 \rangle 5.
        \langle 3 \rangle 5. b = b'
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. dom F = \mathcal{P}A - \{\emptyset\}
       Proof:
        B \in \operatorname{dom} F \Leftrightarrow \exists b.(B,b) \in F
                            \Leftrightarrow \exists b.((B,b) \in \bigcup A \land (B,b) \in C)
                            \Leftrightarrow \exists b. \exists B' \in \mathcal{P}A - \{\emptyset\}. ((B,b) \in \{B'\} \times B' \land (B,b) \in C)
```

 $\Leftrightarrow B \in \mathcal{P}A - \{\emptyset\} \land \exists b \in B.(B,b) \in C$

 $\Leftrightarrow B \in \mathcal{P}A - \{\emptyset\}$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 8$. For every nonempty $B \subseteq A$ we have $F(B) \in B$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. ran $F \subseteq A$

3.1. FUNCTIONS 23

Proposition 3.1.6. For any relation R there exists a function $H \subseteq R$ with dom H = dom R.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: R be a relation.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. PICK a choice function G for ran R.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Define $H : dom R \to ran R$ by $H(x) = G(\{y \mid xRy\})$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ H \subseteq R$

Proposition 3.1.7. For any function G and nonempty class A, we have

$$\mathbf{G}^{-1}\left(\bigcap \mathbf{A}\right) = \bigcap \{\mathbf{G}^{-1}(X) \mid X \in \mathbf{A}\}$$
.

Proof: Propositions 2.2.18 and 3.1.3. \square

Proposition 3.1.8. For any function G and classes A and B, we have

$$G^{-1}(A - B) = G^{-1}(A) - G^{-1}(B)$$
.

PROOF: Proposition 2.2.19 and 3.1.3. \square

Definition 3.1.9 (Identity Function). For any class **A**, the *identity function* on **A** is $I_{\mathbf{A}} = \{(x, x) \mid x \in \mathbf{A}\}.$

Definition 3.1.10 (Injective). A function is *one-to-one*, *injective* or an *injection* iff it is single-rooted.

Proposition 3.1.11. Let **F** be a one-to-one function. Let $x \in \text{dom } \mathbf{F}$. Then $\mathbf{F}^{-1}(\mathbf{F}(x)) = x$.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. \mathbf{F}^{-1} is a function.

Proof: Proposition 3.1.2.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ (x, \mathbf{F}(x)) \in \mathbf{F}$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ (\mathbf{F}(x), x) \in \mathbf{F}^{-1}$

Proposition 3.1.12. Let **F** be a one-to-one function. Let $y \in \operatorname{ran} \mathbf{F}$. Then $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{F}^{-1}(y)) = y$.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. \mathbf{F}^{-1} is a function.

Proof: Proposition 3.1.2.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ y \in \operatorname{dom} \mathbf{F}^{-1}$

Proof: Proposition 2.2.8.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ (y, \mathbf{F}^{-1}(y)) \in \mathbf{F}^{-1}$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ (\mathbf{F}^{-1}(y), y) \in \mathbf{F}$

Proposition 3.1.13. Let $F: A \to B$ where A is nonempty. There exists $G: B \to A$ (a left inverse) such that $G \circ F = I_A$ if and only if F is one-to-one.

Proof

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. If there exists G: B \to A such that G \circ F = I_A then F is one-to-one.
```

```
\langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: G: B \to A and G \circ F = I_A
```

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $x, y \in A$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Assume: F(x) = F(y)
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ x = y$

PROOF:
$$x = G(F(x)) = G(F(y)) = y$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If F is one-to-one then there exists $G: B \to A$ such that $G \circ F = I_A$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: F is one-to-one.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Pick $a \in A$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 3. Let: $G: B \to A$ be the function defined by: $G(b) = F^{-1}(b)$ if $b \in \operatorname{ran} F$, G(b) = a otherwise.

Prove:
$$G \circ F = I_A$$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. Let: $x \in A$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ G(F(x)) = x$

Definition 3.1.14 (Surjective). Let $F: A \to B$. We say that F is *surjective*, or maps A onto B, and write $F: A \twoheadrightarrow B$, iff for all $y \in B$ there exists $x \in A$ such that F(x) = y.

Proposition 3.1.15. Let $F: A \to B$. There exists $H: B \to A$ (a right inverse) such that $F \circ H = I_B$ if and only if F maps A onto B.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If F has a right inverse then F is surjective.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: F has a right inverse $H: B \to A$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $y \in B$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. F(H(y)) = y
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. There exists $x \in A$ such that F(x) = y
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If F is surjective then F has a right inverse.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: F is surjective.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. PICK a function H such that $H \subseteq F^{-1}$ and dom $H = \operatorname{dom} F^{-1} = B$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ H: B \to A$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $F \circ H = I_B$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $y \in B$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2. \ (y, H(y)) \in F^{-1}$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. F(H(y)) = y

Definition 3.1.16 (Function Set). Given a set A and a class \mathbf{B} , we write \mathbf{B}^A for the class of all functions $A \to \mathbf{B}$.

Proposition 3.1.17. If A and B are sets then A^B is a set.

PROOF: It is a subset of $\mathcal{P}(A \times B)$. \square

3.1. FUNCTIONS 25

Definition 3.1.18 (Natural Map). Let A be a set and R an equivalence relation on A. The natural map $A \to A/R$ is the function that maps $a \in A$ to $[a]_R$.

Definition 3.1.19 (Respects). Let **R** be an equivalence relation on **A** and **F** : $\mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{B}$. Then **F** respects **A** iff, whenever $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R}$, then $\mathbf{F}(x) = \mathbf{F}(y)$.

Theorem 3.1.20. Let A be a set and \mathbf{B} a class. Let R be an equivalence relation on A and $F:A\to \mathbf{B}$. Then F respects R if and only if there exists $\hat{F}:A/R\to \mathbf{B}$ such that

$$\forall a \in A.\hat{F}([a]_R) = F(a)$$
.

In this case, \hat{F} is unique.

Proof:

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. If F respects R then there exists \hat{F}: A/R \to \mathbf{B} such that \forall a \in A.\hat{F}([a]_R) = F(a).
```

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: F respects R.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $\hat{F} = \{([a]_R, F(a)) \mid a \in A\}$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. \hat{F} is a function.

 $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Assume: $a, a' \in A$ and $[a]_R = [a']_R$ Prove: F(a) = F(a')

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2. \ (a, a') \in R$

Proof: Proposition 2.4.4.

 $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. F(a) = F(a')PROOF: $\langle 2 \rangle 1$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. dom $\hat{F} = A/R$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. ran $\hat{F} \subseteq \mathbf{B}$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 6. \ \forall a \in A. \hat{F}([a]_R) = F(a)$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If there exists $\hat{F}: A/R \to \mathbf{B}$ such that $\forall a \in A.\hat{F}([a]_R) = F(a)$ then F respects R.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: $\hat{F}: A/R \to \mathbf{B}$ and $\forall a \in A.\hat{F}([a]_R) = F(a)$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $a, a' \in A$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Assume: $(a, a') \in R$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $[a]_R = [a']_R$

Proof: Proposition 2.4.4.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. F(a) = F(a')

Proof: $\langle 2 \rangle 1$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. If $G, H : A/R \to \mathbf{B}$ and $\forall a \in A.G([a]_R) = H([a]_R)$ then G = H.

Definition 3.1.21 (Strictly Monotone). Let $(A, <_A)$ and $(B, <_B)$ be linearly ordered sets. A function $f: A \to B$ is *strictly monotone* iff, whenever $x <_A y$, then $f(x) <_B f(y)$.

Proposition 3.1.22. A strictly monotone function is injective.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $(A, <_A)$ and $(B, <_B)$ be linearly ordered sets.

```
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: f: A \to B be strictly monotone.
\langle 1 \rangle 3. Let: x, y \in A
\langle 1 \rangle 4. Assume: f(x) = f(y)
\langle 1 \rangle 5. f(x) \not< f(y) and f(y) \not< f(x)
   PROOF: Trichotomy.
\langle 1 \rangle 6. x \not< y and y \not< x
\langle 1 \rangle 7. \ x = y
   PROOF: Trichotomy.
Proposition 3.1.23. Let A and B be linearly ordered sets. Let f: A \to B.
Let x, y \in A. If f is strictly monotone and f(x) < f(y) then x < y.
\langle 1 \rangle 1. f(x) \neq f(y) and f(y) \not < f(x)
   PROOF: Trichotomy.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. x \neq y and y \not< x
\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ x < y
   PROOF: Trichotomy.
Definition 3.1.24 (Closed). Let F be a function and \mathbf{A} \subseteq \text{dom } \mathbf{F}. Then A is
closed under F iff \forall x \in \mathbf{A}.\mathbf{F}(x) \in \mathbf{A}.
Definition 3.1.25 (Binary Operation). A binary operation on a set A is a
function from A \times A into A.
           Dependent Product Sets
3.2
Definition 3.2.1. Let I be a set and let \mathbf{H}(i) be a class for all i \in I. We write
\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{H}(i) for the class of all functions f with dom f = I and \forall i \in I. f(i) \in \mathbf{H}(i).
Proposition 3.2.2. If I is a set and H(i) is a set for all i \in I, then \prod_{i \in I} H(i)
is\ a\ set.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. \{ H(i) \mid i \in I \} is a set.
   Proof: Axiom of Replacement.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. \prod_{i \in I} H(i) \subseteq \bigcup \{H(i) \mid i \in I\}^I
Proposition 3.2.3. Let I be a set. Let H(i) be a set for all i \in I. If \forall i \in I
I.H(i) \neq \emptyset then \prod_{i \in I} H(i) \neq \emptyset.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Assume: \forall i \in I.H(i) \neq \emptyset
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: R = \{(i, x) \mid i \in I, x \in H(i)\}
\langle 1 \rangle 3. Pick a function f \subseteq R such that dom f = \text{dom } R
\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ f \in \prod_{i \in I} H(i)
```

Chapter 4

Natural Numbers

4.1 Inductive Sets

Definition 4.1.1 (Successor). The *successor* of a set a is the set $a^+ := a \cup \{a\}$.

Proposition 4.1.2. A set a is a transitive set if and only if

$$\bigcup (a^+) = a .$$

Proof:

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. If a is a transitive set then \bigcup (a^+) = a.
```

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: a is a transitive set.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\bigcup (a^+) \subseteq a$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $x \in \bigcup (a^+)$

Prove: $x \in a$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. PICK $y \in a^+$ such that $x \in y$.

 $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ y \in a \text{ or } y = a.$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 4$. Case: $y \in a$

PROOF: Then $x \in a$ because a is a transitive set.

 $\langle 3 \rangle 5$. Case: y = a

PROOF: Then $x \in a$ immediately.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ a \subseteq \bigcup (a^+)$

PROOF: Since $a \in a^+$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If $\bigcup (a^+) = a$ then a is a transitive set.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: $\bigcup (a^+) = a$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\bigcup a \subseteq a$

Proof:

$$\bigcup a \subseteq \bigcup (a^+)$$
 (Proposition 1.3.5)
= a ($\langle 2 \rangle 1$)

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. a is a transitive set.

Proof: Proposition 1.4.2.

Proposition 4.1.3. For any set a, we have a is a transitive set if and only if a^+ is a transitive set.

PROOF:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If a is a transitive set then a^+ is a transitive set.

PROOF: If a is a transitive set then $\bigcup (a^+) = a \subseteq a^+$ by Proposition 4.1.2 and so a^+ is a transitive set.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If a^+ is a transitive set then a is a transitive set.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: a^+ is a transitive set.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $x \in y \in a$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ x \in y \in a^+$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ x \in a^+$

Proof: $\langle 2 \rangle 1$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ x \neq a$

PROOF: From $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ and the Axiom of Regularity.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 6. \ x \in a$

Definition 4.1.4. We write 0 for \emptyset , 1 for \emptyset^+ , 2 for \emptyset^{++} , etc.

Definition 4.1.5 (Inductive). A set I is inductive iff $\emptyset \in I$ and $\forall x \in I.x^+ \in I$.

Definition 4.1.6 (Natural Number). A *natural number* is a set that belongs to every inductive set.

Theorem 4.1.7. The class \mathbb{N} of natural numbers is a set.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. PICK an inductive set I.

PROOF: Axiom of Infinity.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \mathbb{N} \subseteq I$

Theorem 4.1.8. \mathbb{N} is inductive, and is a subset of every other inductive set.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. N is inductive.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1. \ 0 \in \mathbb{N}$

PROOF: Since 0 is a member of every inductive set.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2. \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.n^+ \in \mathbb{N}$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $n \in \mathbb{N}$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Let: I be any inductive set.

Prove: $n^+ \in I$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ n \in I$

Proof: $\langle 3 \rangle 1$, $\langle 3 \rangle 2$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 4. \ n^+ \in I$

Proof: $\langle 3 \rangle 2$, $\langle 3 \rangle 3$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. N is a subset of every inductive set.

PROOF: Immediate from definitions.

4.2. RECURSION

29

П

Corollary 4.1.8.1 (Induction Principle for N). Any inductive subset of N coincides with \mathbb{N} .

Theorem 4.1.9. Every natural number except 0 is the successor of some natural number.

Proof: Trivially by induction. \Box

Proposition 4.1.10. Every natural number is a transitive set.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. 0 is a transitive set.

PROOF: Vacuously, if $x \in y \in 0$ then $x \in 0$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For every natural number n, if n is a transitive set then n^+ is a transitive

Proof: Proposition 4.1.3. П

Proposition 4.1.11. For natural numbers m and n, if $m^+ = n^+$ then m = n.

PROOF: If
$$m^+ = n^+$$
 then $m = \bigcup (m^+)$ (Proposition 4.1.2)
$$= \bigcup (n^+)$$
 = n (Proposition 4.1.2)

Proposition 4.1.12. \mathbb{N} *is a transitive set.*

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ 0 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. n \subseteq \mathbb{N} \Rightarrow n^+ \subseteq \mathbb{N}$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. n \subseteq \mathbb{N}$

PROOF: From $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ and $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ by induction.

4.2 Recursion

Theorem 4.2.1 (Recursion Theorem on \mathbb{N}). Let A be a set, $a \in A$, and F: $A \to A$. Then there exists a unique function $h: \mathbb{N} \to A$ such that

$$h(0) = a ,$$

and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$h(n^+) = F(h(n)) .$$

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Define a function v to be acceptable iff dom $v \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, ran $v \subseteq A$, and:

```
1. If 0 \in \text{dom } v \text{ then } v(0) = a

2. For all n \in \mathbb{N}, if n^+ \in \text{dom } v, then n \in \text{dom } v and v(n^+) = F(v(n)). \langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: \mathcal{K} be the set of all acceptable functions.

PROOF: This is a set because it is a subset of \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N} \times A).
```

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $h = \bigcup \mathcal{K}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. For all n and y we have $(n,y) \in h$ iff there exists an acceptable v such that v(n) = y.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. h is a function.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: P(n) be the predicate: there is at most one y such that $(n, y) \in h$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. P(0)

PROOF: If $(0, y) \in h$ then y = a.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. P(n) \Rightarrow P(n^+)$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $n \in \mathbb{N}$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Assume: P(n)
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. Let: $(n^+, x), (n^+, y) \in h$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4$. PICK acceptable v_1, v_2 such that $v_1(n^+) = x$ and $v_2(n^+) = y$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 5$. $F(v_1(n)) = x$ and $F(v_2(n)) = y$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 6. \ v_1(n) = v_2(n)$

Proof: $\langle 3 \rangle 2$

- $\langle 3 \rangle 7. \ x = y$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.P(n)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. h is acceptable.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. If $0 \in \text{dom } h \text{ then } h(0) = a$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $n^+ \in \operatorname{dom} h$ then $n \in \operatorname{dom} h$ and $h(n^+) = F(h(n))$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$. dom $h = \mathbb{N}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. $0 \in \text{dom } h$

PROOF: Since $\{(0,a)\}$ is an acceptable function.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\forall n \in \text{dom } h.n^+ \in \text{dom } h$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $n \in \text{dom } h$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. PICK an acceptable v with $n \in \text{dom } v$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. Assume: w.l.o.g. $n^+ \notin \text{dom } v$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4. \ v \cup \{(n^+, F(v(n)))\}$ is acceptable.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 5. \ n^+ \in \operatorname{dom} h$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 8$. For any function $k : \mathbb{N} \to A$, if k(0) = a and $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}. k(n^+) = F(k(n))$ then k = h.

PROOF: Prove $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}.k(n) = h(n)$ by induction on n.

4.3 Arithmetic

Definition 4.3.1 (Addition). *Addition* + is the binary operation on \mathbb{N} defined recursively by:

$$m + 0 = m$$
$$m + n^+ = (m+n)^+$$

31

Theorem 4.3.2 (Associative Law for Addition). For all $m, n, p \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$m + (n+p) = (m+n) + p$$

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}.m + (n+0) = (m+n) + 0$ PROOF:

$$m + (n+0) = m+n$$
$$= (m+n) + 0$$

 $\langle 1\rangle 2.$ For any $p\in\mathbb{N},$ if $\forall m,n\in\mathbb{N}.m+(n+p)=(m+n)+p,$ then $\forall m,n\in\mathbb{N}.m+(n+p^+)=(m+n)+p^+$

Proof:

$$m + (n + p^{+}) = m + (n + p)^{+}$$

$$= (m + (n + p))^{+}$$

$$= ((m + n) + p)^{+}$$
 (induction hypothesis)
$$= (m + n) + p^{+}$$

Theorem 4.3.3 (Commutative Law for Addition). For all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$m+n=n+m$$

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \forall m \in \mathbb{N}.m + 0 = 0 + m$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. 0 + 0 = 0 + 0

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, if m+0=0+m then $m^++0=0+m^+$ PROOF:

$$m^+ + 0 = m^+$$

= $(m+0)^+$
= $(0+m)^+$ (induction hypothesis)
= $0+m^+$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\forall n.m + n = n + m$ then $\forall n.m^+ + n = n + m^+$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $m \in \mathbb{N}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: $\forall n.m + n = n + m$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ m^+ + 0 = 0 + m^+$
 - PROOF: $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $m^+ + n = n + m^+$ then $m^+ + n^+ = n^+ + m^+$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $n \in \mathbb{N}$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Assume: $m^+ + n = n + m^+$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ m^+ + n^+ = n^+ + m^+$

Proof:

$$m^{+} + n^{+} = (m^{+} + n)^{+}$$

$$= (n + m^{+})^{+} \qquad (\langle 3 \rangle 2)$$

$$= (n + m)^{++}$$

$$= (m + n)^{++} \qquad (\langle 2 \rangle 2)$$

$$= (m + n^{+})^{+}$$

$$= (n^{+} + m)^{+} \qquad (\langle 2 \rangle 2)$$

$$= n^{+} + m^{+}$$

Definition 4.3.4 (Multiplication). *Multiplication* \cdot is the binary operation on $\mathbb N$ defined recursively by:

$$m0 = 0$$
$$mn^+ = mn + m$$

Proposition 4.3.5. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $n \cdot 1 = n$.

Proof:

$$n \cdot 1 = n0^{+}$$

= $n0 + n$
= $0 + n$
= $n + 0$ (Theorem 4.3.3)
= n

Theorem 4.3.6 (Distributive Law). For all $m, n, p \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$m(n+p) = mn + mp .$$

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}. m(n+0) = mn + m0$ PROOF:

$$m(n+0) = mn$$
$$= mn + 0$$
$$= mn + m0$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For any $p \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}.m(n+p) = mn + mp$, then $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}.m(n+p^+) = mn + mp^+$

Proof:

$$m(n+p^+) = m(n+p)^+$$

 $= m(n+p) + m$
 $= (mn+mp) + m$ (induction hypothesis)
 $= mn + (mp+m)$ (Theorem 4.3.2)
 $= mn + mp^+$

Theorem 4.3.7 (Associative Law for Multiplication). For all $m, n, p \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$m(np) = (mn)p$$
.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}. m(n0) = (mn)0$

Proof:

$$m(n0) = m0$$
$$= 0$$
$$= (mn)0$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For any $p \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\forall m, n.m(np) = (mn)p$, then $\forall m, n.m(np^+) = (mn)p^+$ PROOF:

$$m(np^+) = m(np+n)$$

= $m(np) + mn$
= $(mn)p + mn$ (induction hypothesis)
= $(mn)p^+$

Theorem 4.3.8 (Commutative Law for Multiplication). For all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$mn = nm$$
 .

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. m0 = 0m$

Proof:

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. $0 \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot 0$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For all m, if m0 = 0m then $m^+0 = 0m^+$

Proof:

$$0m^{+} = 0m + 0$$

$$= 0m$$

$$= m0$$
 (induction hypothesis)
$$= 0$$

$$= m^{+}0$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\forall m.mn = nm$ then $\forall m.mn^+ = n^+m$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $n \in \mathbb{N}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: $\forall m.mn = nm$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ 0n^+ = n^+ 0$

Proof: $\langle 1 \rangle 1$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. For all m, if $mn^+ = n^+m$ then $m^+n^+ = n^+m^+$

Proof:

 $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $m \in \mathbb{N}$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Assume: $mn^+ = n^+m$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ m^+ n^+ = n^+ m^+$

34

Proof:

$$m^{+}n^{+} = m^{+}n + m^{+}$$

= $(m^{+}n + m)^{+}$
= $(nm^{+} + m)^{+}$
= $(nm + n + m)^{+}$

$$= (mn + n + m)^{+} \tag{\langle 2 \rangle 2}$$

$$=(mn+m+n)^+$$
 (Theorems 4.3.2, 4.3.3)

$$= (mn^+ + n)^+$$
$$= mn^+ + n^+$$

 $= n^+ m^+$

Proposition 4.3.9. For natural numbers m and n, if mn = 0 then m = 0 or n = 0.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Assume: $m \neq 0$ and $n \neq 0$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. PICK $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m = p^+$ and $n = q^+$

PROOF: Theorem 4.1.9.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ mn = (p^+q + p)^+$

Proof:

$$mn = p^+q^+$$

$$= p^+q + p^+$$

$$= (p^+q + p)^+$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ mn \neq 0$

Definition 4.3.10 (Even). A natural number n is *even* iff there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that n = 2m.

Definition 4.3.11 (Odd). A natural number n is odd iff there exists $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that n = 2p + 1.

Proposition 4.3.12 (Division Algorithm). Let m be a natural number and d a nonzero natural number. Then there exist natural numbers q and r such that m = dq + r and r < d.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: d be a nonzero natural number.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $\exists q, r.0 = dq + r \land r < d$ PROOF: Take q = r = 0.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. For any natural number m, if $\exists q, r.m = dq + r \land r < d$ then $\exists q, r.m^+ = dq + r \land r < d$

4.3. ARITHMETIC 35

```
\langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: m be a natural number.
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. Assume: m = dq + r and r < d
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ r^+ \leq d
   \langle 2 \rangle 4. Case: r^+ < d
      PROOF: In this case we have m^+ = dq + r^+.
   \langle 2 \rangle 5. Case: r^+ = d
      PROOF: In this case we have m^+ = dq^+ + 0.
Proposition 4.3.13. Every natural number is either even or odd.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. 0 is even.
   Proof: 0 = 2 \times 0.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. For any natural number n, if n is either even or odd then n^+ is either even
   Proof:
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: n \in \mathbb{N}
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. If n is even then n^+ is odd.
      PROOF: If n = 2p then n^+ = 2p + 1.
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. If n is odd then n^+ is even.
      PROOF: If n = 2p + 1 then n^{+} = 2(p + 1).
Proposition 4.3.14. No natural number is both even and odd.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. 0 is not odd.
   PROOF: For any p we have 2p + 1 = (2p)^+ \neq 0.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. For any natural number n, if n is not both even and odd, then n^+ is not
       both even and odd.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: n be a natural number.
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. If n^+ is even then n is odd.
      \langle 3 \rangle 1. Assume: n^+ is even.
      \langle 3 \rangle 2. Pick p such that n^+ = 2p
      \langle 3 \rangle 3. \ p \neq 0
         PROOF: Since n^+ \neq 0.
      \langle 3 \rangle 4. Pick q such that p = q^+
         PROOF: Theorem 4.1.9.
      \langle 3 \rangle 5. \ n^+ = 2q + 2
         Proof: \langle 3 \rangle 2, \langle 3 \rangle 4.
      \langle 3 \rangle 6. \ n = 2q + 1
         Proof: Proposition 4.1.11, \langle 3 \rangle 5
      \langle 3 \rangle 7. n is odd.
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. If n^+ is odd then n is even.
      \langle 3 \rangle 1. Assume: n^+ is odd.
      \langle 3 \rangle 2. Pick p such that n^+ = 2p + 1
```

$$\langle 3 \rangle 3.$$
 $n=2p$
PROOF: Proposition 4.1.11, $\langle 3 \rangle 2$
 $\langle 3 \rangle 4.$ n is even.

Definition 4.3.15 (Exponentiation). *Exponentiation* is the binary operation on \mathbb{N} defined recursively by:

$$m^0 = 1$$
$$m^{n^+} = m^n m$$

Proposition 4.3.16. For all $m, n, p \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$m^{n+p} = m^n m^p$$

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \forall m, n.m^{n+0} = m^n m^0$

Proof:

$$m^{n+0} = m^n$$

= $m^n \cdot 1$ (Proposition 4.3.5)
= $m^n m^0$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For any $p \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\forall m, n.m^{n+p} = m^n m^p$ then $\forall m, n.m^{n+p^+} = m^n m^{p^+}$. Proof:

$$m^{n+p^+} = m^{(n+p)^+}$$

 $= m^{n+p}m$
 $= (m^n m^p)m$ (induction hypothesis)
 $= m^n (m^p m)$ (Theorem 4.3.7)
 $= m^n m^{p^+}$

4.4 Ordering on \mathbb{N}

Definition 4.4.1. Given natural numbers m and n, we write m < n iff $m \in n$. We write $m \le n$ iff m < n or m = n.

Proposition 4.4.2. For any natural numbers m and n, we have m < n if and only if $m^+ < n^+$.

Proof

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. For any natural numbers m and n, if m < n then $m^+ < n^+$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 1. For any natural number m, if m < 0 then $m^+ < 0^+$ PROOF: Vacuous.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For any natural number n, if $\forall m < n.m^+ < n^+$ then $\forall m < n^+.m^+ < n^{++}$

```
\langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: m < n^+
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. m < n or m = n
       \langle 3 \rangle 3. Case: m < n
          \langle 4 \rangle 1. \ m^+ < n^+
              PROOF: Induction hypothesis.
          \langle 4 \rangle 2. \ m^+ < n^{++}
       \langle 3 \rangle 4. Case: m=n
          PROOF: m^+ = n^+ < n^{++}.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. For any natural numbers m and n, if m^+ < n^+ then m < n.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. We never have m^+ < 0^+.
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. \ m^+ \not< 0
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. \ m^+ \neq 0
       \langle 3 \rangle 3. \ m^+ \not< 0^+
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. For any natural number n, if \forall m.m^+ < n^+ \Rightarrow m < n, then \forall m.m^+ < n^+ \Rightarrow m < n
            n^{++} \Rightarrow m < n^+.
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: n be a natural number.
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. Assume: \forall m.m^+ < n^+ \Rightarrow m < n
       \langle 3 \rangle 3. Let: m be a natural number.
       \langle 3 \rangle 4. Assume: m^+ < n^{++}
       \langle 3 \rangle 5. \ m^+ < n^+ \text{ or } m^+ = n^+
       \langle 3 \rangle 6. Case: m^+ < n^+
          \langle 4 \rangle 1. \ m < n
              PROOF: Induction hypothesis.
          \langle 4 \rangle 2. m < n^+
       \langle 3 \rangle 7. Case: m^+ = n^+
          PROOF: m = n < n^+ by Proposition 4.1.11.
```

Theorem 4.4.3 (Trichotomy Law for \mathbb{N}). For any natural numbers m and n, exactly one of m < n, n < m, m = n holds.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. For all m and n, at most one of m < n, n < m, m = n holds.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. We do not have m < n and m = n.

PROOF: This would imply n < n contradicting the Axiom of Regularity.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. We do not have m < n and n < m.

PROOF: This would imply n < n by Proposition 4.1.10, contradicting the Axiom of Regularity.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For all m and n, either m < n or n < m or m = n.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. For all m, either m = 0 or 0 < m.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1. \ 0 = 0$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. For any natural number m, we have $0 < m^+$.
 - $\langle 4 \rangle 1. \ 0 < 0^+$
 - $\langle 4 \rangle 2$. For any natural number m, if $0 < m^+$ then $0 < m^{++}$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For any natural number n, if $\forall m (m < n \lor n < m \lor m = n)$ then $\forall m (m < n^+ \lor n^+ < m \lor m = n^+)$.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: *n* be a natural number.

```
⟨3⟩2. Assume: \forall m (m < n \lor n < m \lor m = n) ⟨3⟩3. Let: m be a natural number. ⟨3⟩4. Case: m < n Proof: Then m < n^+. ⟨3⟩5. Case: n < m ⟨4⟩1. m \neq 0 ⟨4⟩2. Pick p such that m = p^+ ⟨4⟩3. n < p or n = p ⟨4⟩4. Case: n < p Proof: Then n^+ < p^+ = m by Proposition 4.4.2. ⟨4⟩5. Case: n = p Proof: Then n^+ = p^+ = m. ⟨3⟩6. Case: m = n Proof: Then m < n^+.
```

Corollary 4.4.3.1. For natural numbers m and n, we have $m \le n$ if and only if $m \subseteq n$.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If $m \leq n$ then $m \subseteq n$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: $m \leq n$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $p \in m$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Case: m < n

PROOF: Then $p \in n$ by Proposition 4.1.10.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. Case: m = n

PROOF: Then $p \in n$ immediately.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If $m \subseteq n$ then $m \leq n$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: $m \subseteq n$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $n \not< m$

PROOF: If n < m then $n \in n$ contradicting the Axiom of Regularity.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ m \leq n$

PROOF: By trichotomy.

Theorem 4.4.4 (Well-Ordering of \mathbb{N}). Every nonempty subset of \mathbb{N} has a least element.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Assume: A has no least element.

Prove: $A = \emptyset$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall n. \forall m < n. m \notin A$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1. \ \forall m < 0.m \notin A$

PROOF: Vacuous.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For any natural number n, if $\forall m < n.m \notin A$, then $\forall m < n^+.m \notin A$.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: *n* be a natural number.

```
\langle 3 \rangle 2. Assume: \forall m < n.m \notin A
      \langle 3 \rangle 3. \ n \notin A
         PROOF: If n \in A then n is the least element in A.
       \langle 3 \rangle 4. \ \forall m < n^+.m \notin A
\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ A = \emptyset
Corollary 4.4.4.1. There is no function f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} such that \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. f(n+1) < \infty
Theorem 4.4.5 (Strong Induction Principle for \mathbb{N}). Let A \subseteq \mathbb{N}. Assume that,
for every n \in \mathbb{N}, if \forall m < n.m \in A then n \in A. Then A = \mathbb{N}.
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Assume: for a contradiction A \neq \mathbb{N}
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: n be the least element of \mathbb{N} - A
   PROOF: Since \mathbb{N} is well ordered.
\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall m < n.m \in A
\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ n \notin A
\langle 1 \rangle5. Q.E.D.
   PROOF: This contradicts the hypothesis of the theorem.
Proposition 4.4.6. For any natural numbers m and n, we have m < n if and
only if there exists p \in \mathbb{N} such that n = m + p^+.
\langle 1 \rangle 1. For any natural numbers m and p we have m < m + p^+.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. \forall m.m < m + 0^+
      PROOF: Since m \in m^+ = m + 0^+.
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. For any natural number p, if \forall m.m < m + p^+ then \forall m.m < m + p^{++}
      PROOF: If m \in m + p^+ then m \in (m + p^+)^+ = m + p^{++}.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. For any natural numbers m and n, if m < n then there exists p such that
        n=m+p^+.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. \ \forall m < 0. \exists p.0 = m + p^+
      Proof: Vacuous.
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. For any natural number n, if \forall m < n. \exists p. n = m + p^+, then \forall m < m > 0
           n^+ . \exists p. n^+ = m + p^+.
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: n be a natural number.
      \langle 3 \rangle 2. Assume: \forall m < n . \exists p. n = m + p^+
      \langle 3 \rangle 3. Let: m < n^+
       \langle 3 \rangle 4. m < n or m = n
      \langle 3 \rangle 5. Case: m < n
          \langle 4 \rangle 1. PICK p such that n = m + p^+
          \langle 4 \rangle 2. \ n^+ = m + p^{++}
      \langle 3 \rangle 6. Case: m = n
         PROOF: Then n^+ = m + 0^+.
```

Theorem 4.4.7. For natural numbers m, n and p, we have m < n iff m + p < n + p.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \forall m, n.m < n \Leftrightarrow p+0 < n+0$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For any natural number p, if $\forall m, n.m < n \Leftrightarrow m+p < n+p$ then $\forall m, n.m < n \Leftrightarrow m+p^+ < n+p^+$

Proof: Proposition 4.4.2.

Corollary 4.4.7.1. For natural numbers m, n and p, if m + p = n + p then m = n.

Proof: By trichotomy. \square

Theorem 4.4.8. For natural numbers m, n and p, if m < n and $p \neq 0$ then mp < np.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: m and n be natural numbers.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Assume: m < n

PROVE: $\forall p.mp^+ < np^+$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ m0^+ < n0^+$

Proof: Proposition 4.3.5.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. For any natural number p, if mp < np then $mp^+ < np^+$

Proof:

$$mp^+ = mp + m$$

 $< np + m$ (induction hypothesis. Theorem 4.4.7)
 $< np + n$ ($\langle 1 \rangle 2$, Theorem 4.4.7)
 $= np^+$

Corollary 4.4.8.1. For natural numbers m, n and p, if $p \neq 0$ then m < n if and only if mp < np.

Proof: Proposition 3.1.23. \square

Corollary 4.4.8.2. For natural numbers m, n and p, if mp = np and $p \neq 0$ then m = n.

Proof: By trichotomy. \square

Proposition 4.4.9. Let m, n, p, q be natural numbers. Assume m+n=p+q. Then m < p if and only if q < n.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If m < p then q < n.

PROOF: If m < p and $n \le q$ then m + n .

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If q < n then m < p.

PROOF: Similar.

Proposition 4.4.10. Let m, n, p and q be natural numbers. Assume n < m and q < p. Then

$$mq + np < mp + nq$$
 .

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. PICK positive natural numbers a and b such that m = n + a and p = q + b.

$$\langle 1 \rangle 2$$
. $mp + nq > mq + np$

Proof:

$$mp + nq = (n+a)(q+b) + nq$$

$$= 2nq + nb + aq + ab$$

$$mq + np = (n+a)q + n(q+b)$$

$$= 2nq + aq + nb$$

$$\therefore mp + nq = mq + np + ab$$

$$> mq + np$$

4.5 Cardinality

Definition 4.5.1. Let A be a set and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that A has n elements iff there exists a bijection between A and n.

Proposition 4.5.2. If A has m elements, B has n elements, and $A \cap B = \emptyset$, then $A \cup B$ has m + n elements.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: P(n) be the property: For any natural number m and sets A and B, if A has m elements, B has n elements, and $A \cap B = \emptyset$, then $A \cup B$ has m+n elements.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2. P(0)$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: A have m elements, B have 0 elements, and $A \cap B = \emptyset$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $B = \emptyset$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $A \cup B = A$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $A \cup B$ has m elements.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall n. P(n) \rightarrow P(n+1)$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: P(n)
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: A have m elements, B have n+1 elements, and $A \cap B = \emptyset$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Pick $b \in B$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $B \{b\}$ has n elements.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. $A \cup B \{b\}$ has m + n elements.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 6$. $A \cup B$ has m+n+1 elements.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ \forall n P(n)$

Proposition 4.5.3. If A has m elements and B has n elements then $A \times B$ has mn elements.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: P(n) be the property: for any natural number m and sets A and B, if A has m elements and B has n elements then $A \times B$ has mn elements.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. P(0)
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: A have m elements and B have 0 elements.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $B = \emptyset$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ A \times B = \emptyset$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $A \times B$ has 0 elements.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall n. P(n) \rightarrow P(n+1)$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: P(n)
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: A have m elements and B have n+1 elements.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Pick $b \in B$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $B \{b\}$ has n elements.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. $A \times (B \{b\})$ has mn elements.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 6$. $A \times B = (A \times (B \{b\})) \cup (A \times \{b\})$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 7$. $A \times \{b\}$ has m elements.

PROOF: It is bijective with A.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 8$. $A \times B$ has mn + m elements.

Proof: Proposition 4.5.2.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ \forall n P(n)$

Group Theory

5.1 Abelian Groups

Definition 5.1.1 (Abelian group). An Abelian group G consists of a set G and a function $\cdot: G^2 \to G$ such that:

- $1. \cdot is associative$
- $2. \cdot is commutative$
- 3. There exists $e \in G$ such that $\forall x \in G.xe = x$ and $\forall x \in G.\exists y \in G.xy = e$.

Proposition 5.1.2. The inverse of an element in an Abelian group is unique.

Proof

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: b and b' are inverses of a.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ b = b'$

Proof:

$$b = be$$

$$= bab'$$

$$= eb'$$

$$= b'$$

П

Definition 5.1.3. We write x^{-1} for the inverse of x.

We may also say we are writing an Abelian group *additively*, meaning we write a + b for ab, 0 for e and -a for a^{-1} . In this case we write a - b for ab^{-1} .

Proposition 5.1.4. In any Abelian group, if ab = ac then b = c.

$$b = eb$$

$$= a^{-1}ab$$

$$= a^{-1}ac$$

$$= ec$$

$$= c$$

Ring Theory

6.1 Integral Domains

Definition 6.1.1 (Integral Domain). An *integral domain* consists of a set D and two binary operations +, \cdot on D such that:

- D is an Abelian group under +. Let us write 0 for its identity element.
- \bullet · is commutative and associative, and distributes over +.
- \bullet · has an identity element that is different from 0.
- For all $a, b \in D$, if ab = 0 then a = 0 or b = 0.

Proposition 6.1.2. In any integral domain, 0x = 0.

Proof:

$$(0+0)x = 0x$$

$$\therefore 0x + 0x = 0x + 0$$

$$\therefore 0x = 0$$
 (Proposition 5.1.4)

Proposition 6.1.3. In any integral domain, (-a)b = -(ab).

Proof:

$$ab + (-a)b = (a + (-a))b$$

= $0b$
= 0 (Proposition 6.1.2) \square

Proposition 6.1.4. In any integral domain, if ab = ac and $a \neq 0$ then b = c.

PROOF: We have a(b-c)=0 and $a\neq 0$ so b-c=0 hence b=c. \square

Field Theory

7.1 Fields

Definition 7.1.1 (Field). A *field* F is an integral domain such that $0 \neq 1$ and, for all $x \in F$, if $x \neq 0$ then there exists $y \in F$ such that xy = 1.

Proposition 7.1.2. In any field F, we have $F - \{0\}$ is an Abelian group under multiplication.

PROOF: Immediate from the definition. \Box

Definition 7.1.3 (Field of Fractions). Let D be an integral domain. The *field* of fractions of D is the quotient set $F = (D \times (D - \{0\})) / \sim$ where

$$(a,b) \sim (c,d) \Leftrightarrow ad = bc$$

under

$$[(a,b)] + [(c,d)] = [(ad+bc,bd)]$$
$$[(a,b)][(c,d)] = [(ac,bd)]$$

We prove this is a field.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. \sim is an equivalence relation on $D \times (D - \{0\})$.

Proof:

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. \sim is reflexive.

PROOF: We always have ab = ba.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. \sim is symmetric.

PROOF: If ad = bc then cb = da.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. \sim is transitive.

 $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Assume: $(a,b) \sim (c,d) \sim (e,f)$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. ad = bc and cf = de

 $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. adf = bde

```
Proof: adf = bcf = bde
     \langle 3 \rangle 4. af = be
        Proof: Proposition 6.1.4.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Addition is well-defined.
  Proof:
  \langle 2 \rangle 1. If b \neq 0 and d \neq 0 then bd \neq 0.
     PROOF: Since D is an integral domain.
  \langle 2 \rangle 2. If ab' = a'b and cd' = c'd then (ad + bc)b'd' = (a'd' + b'c')bd.
     Proof:
                                 (ad + bc)b'd' = ab'dd' + bb'cd'
                                                 = a'bdd' + bb'c'd
                                                 = (a'd' + b'c')bd
\langle 1 \rangle 3. Multiplication is well-defined.
  Proof:
  \langle 2 \rangle 1. If b \neq 0 and d \neq 0 then bd \neq 0.
     Proof: Since D is an integral domain.
  \langle 2 \rangle 2. If [(a,b)] = [(a',b')] and [(c,d)] = [(c',d')] then [(ac,bd)] = [(a'c',b'd')].
     PROOF: If ab' = a'b and cd' = c'd then acb'd' = a'c'bd.
\langle 1 \rangle 4. Addition is commutative.
  PROOF: [(a,b)] + [(c,d)] = [(ad+bc,bd)] = [(cb+da,db)] = [(c,d)] + [(a,b)] \sqcup
\langle 1 \rangle5. Addition is associative.
  Proof:
          [(a,b)] + ([(c,d)] + [(e,f)]) = [(a,b)] + [(cf + de, df)]
                                            = [(adf + bcf + bde, bdf)]
                                            = [(ad + bc, bd)] + [(e, f)]
                                                                                        П
                                            = ([(a,b)] + [(c,d)]) + [(e,f)]
\langle 1 \rangle 6. For any x \in F we have x + [(0,1)] = x
  PROOF: [(a,b)] + [(0,1)] = [(a \cdot 1 + b \cdot 0, b \cdot 1)] = [(a,b)]
\langle 1 \rangle 7. For any x \in F, there exists y \in F such that x + y = [(0,1)].
  PROOF: [(a,b)] + [(-a,b)] = [(ab-ab,b^2)] = [(0,b^2)] = [(0,1)]
\langle 1 \rangle 8. Multiplication is commutative.
  PROOF: [(a,b)][(c,d)] = [(c,d)][(a,b)] = [(ac,bd)].
\langle 1 \rangle 9. Multiplication is assocative.
  PROOF: [(a,b)]([(c,d)][(e,f)]) = ([(a,b)][(c,d)])[(e,f)] = [(ace,bdf)].
\langle 1 \rangle 10. For any x \in F we have x[(1,1)] = x
  PROOF: [(a,b)][(1,1)] = [(a,b)]
\langle 1 \rangle 11. For any non-zero x \in F, there exists y \in F such that xy = [(1,1)].
  Proof:
  \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: [(a,b)] \in \mathbb{Q}
  \langle 2 \rangle 2. Assume: [(a,b)] \neq [(0,1)]
  \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ a \neq 0
```

```
\begin{array}{l} \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ [(a,b)][(b,a)] = [(1,1)] \\ \square \\ \langle 1 \rangle 12. \ \text{For any} \ x,y \in F, \ \text{if} \ xy = [(0,1)] \ \text{then} \ x = [(0,1)] \ \text{or} \ y = [(0,1)]. \\ \text{PROOF: If} \ qr = 0 \ \text{and} \ q \neq 0, \ \text{pick} \ q' \in F \ \text{such that} \ qq' = 1. \ \text{Then} \ r = 1r = q'qr = q'0 = 0. \\ \square \end{array}
```

7.2 Ordered Fields

Definition 7.2.1 (Ordered Field). An *ordered field* consists of a field F with a linear order < on F such that:

- for all $x, y, z \in F$, we have x < y if and only if x + z < y + z.
- for all $x, y, z \in F$, if 0 < z then we have x < y if and only if xz < yz.

Proposition 7.2.2. In any ordered field, 0 < 1.

PROOF: If 1 < 0 then we have 0 < -1 and so 0 < (-1)(-1) = 1, which is a contradiction. \square

Proposition 7.2.3. The ordering on an ordered field is dense; that is, if x < y then there exists z such that x < z < y.

PROOF: Take z = (x + y)/2. \square

Number Systems

8.1 The Integers

Definition 8.1.1. The set of *integers* \mathbb{Z} is the quotient set \mathbb{N}^2/\sim , where $(m,n)\sim(p,q)$ iff m+q=n+p.

We prove \sim is an equivalence relation on \mathbb{N}^2 .

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. \sim is reflexive.

PROOF: For all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have m + n = n + m.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. \sim is symmetric.

PROOF: If m + q = n + p then p + n = q + m.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. \sim is transitive.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: $(m,n) \sim (p,q) \sim (r,s)$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. m+q=n+p and p+s=q+r
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. m+q+s=n+q+r
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. m+s=n+r

Proof: Corollary 4.4.7.1.

Definition 8.1.2 (Addition). Define addition + on \mathbb{Z} by [(m,n)] + [(p,q)] = [(m+p,n+q)].

We prove this is well-defined.

PROOF: If m+n'=n+m' and p+q'=q+p' then m+p+n'+q'=n+q+m'+p'. \square

Proposition 8.1.3. Addition on \mathbb{Z} is commutative.

PROOF:
$$[(m,n)] + [(p,q)] = [(m+p,n+q)] = [(p+m,q+n)] = [(p,q)] + [(m,n)].$$

Proposition 8.1.4. Addition on \mathbb{Z} is associative.

PROOF: [(m,n)] + ([(p,q)] + [(r,s)]) = [(m+p+r,n+q+s)] = ([(m,n)] + [(p,q)]) + [(r,s)].

Proposition 8.1.5. Given natural numbers m and n, we have [(m,0)] = [(n,0)] iff m = n.

PROOF: Immediate from definitions.

Definition 8.1.6. We identify any natural number n with the integer [(n,0)].

Proposition 8.1.7. Addition on integers agrees with addition on natural numbers.

PROOF: Since [(m,0)] + [(n,0)] = [(m+n,0)].

Proposition 8.1.8. For all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have a + 0 = a.

PROOF:
$$[(m,n)] + [(0,0)] = [(m+0,n+0)] = [(m,n)].$$

Proposition 8.1.9. For all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that a + b = 0.

PROOF:
$$[(m,n)] + [(n,m)] = [(m+n,m+n)] = [(0,0)]$$

Proposition 8.1.10. The integers form an Abelian group under addition.

PROOF: Proposition 8.1.3, 8.1.4, 8.1.8, 8.1.9.

Definition 8.1.11. Define multiplication \cdot on \mathbb{Z} by: [(m,n)][(p,q)] = [(mp + nq, mq + np)].

We prove this is well defined.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1.$ Assume: m+n'=n+m' and p+q'=q+p' Prove: mp+nq+m'q'+n'p'=mq+np+m'p'+n'q'
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. mp + n'p = np + m'p
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. nq + m'q = mq + n'q
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. m'p + m'q' = m'q + m'p'
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ n'q + n'p' = n'p + n'q'$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ mp + n'p + nq + m'q + m'p + m'q' + n'q + n'p' = np + m'p + mq + n'q + m'q + m'p' + n'p' + n'q'$
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 7. mp + nq + m'q' + n'p' = mq + np + m'p' + n'q'PROOF: Corollary 4.4.7.1.

П

Proposition 8.1.12. Multiplication on integers agrees with multiplication on natural numbers.

Proof: Since [(m,0)][(n,0)] = [(mn+0,m0+n0)] = [(mn,0)].

Proposition 8.1.13. *Multiplication on* \mathbb{Z} *is commutative.*

Proof: [(m,n)][(p,q)] = [(mp+nq,mq+np)] = [(pm+qn,pn+qm)] = [(p,q)][(m,n)].

Proposition 8.1.14. *Multiplication on* \mathbb{Z} *is associative.*

Proof:

$$\begin{split} [(m,n)]([(p,q)][(r,s)]) &= [(m,n)][(pr+qs,ps+qr)] \\ &= [(mpr+mqs+nps+nqr,mps+mqr+npr+nqs)] \\ &= [(mp+nq,mq+np)][(r,s)] \\ &= ([(m,n)][(p,q)])[(r,s)] \end{split}$$

Proposition 8.1.15. Multiplication distributes over addition.

Proof:

$$[(m,n)]([(p,q)] + [(r,s)]) = [(m,n)][(p+r,q+s)]$$

$$= [(mp+mr+nq+ns,np+nr+mq+ms)]$$

$$[(m,n)][(p,q)] + [(m,n)][(r,s)] = [(mp+nq,mq+np)] + [(mr+ns,ms+nr)]$$

$$= [(mp+nq+mr+ns,mq+np+ms+nr)]$$

Proposition 8.1.16. For any integer a we have a1 = a.

PROOF: Since
$$[(m,n)][(1,0)] = [(m1+n0,m0+n1)] = [(m,n)]$$
.

Proposition 8.1.17. For any integers a and b, if ab = 0 then a = 0 or b = 0.

Proof:

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Assume: [(m,n)][(p,q)] = [(0,0)]
\langle 1 \rangle 2. mp + nq = mq + np
```

$$\langle 1 \rangle 3$$
. Assume: $[(m,n)] \neq [(0,0)]$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ m \neq n$

Prove: p = q

 $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. Case: m < n

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1. \ p \not< q$

PROOF: If p < q then mq + np < mp + nq by Proposition 4.4.10.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$, $a \not< n$

PROOF: If q < p then mp + nq < mq + np by Proposition 4.4.10.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ p = q$

PROOF: By trichotomy.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. Case: n < m

Proof: Similar.

Proposition 8.1.18. The integers \mathbb{Z} form an integral domain.

Proof: Propositions 8.1.13, 8.1.14, 8.1.15, 8.1.16, 8.1.17, 8.1.10.

Definition 8.1.19. Define < on \mathbb{Z} by [(m,n)] < [(p,q)] if and only if m+q < n+p.

We prove this is well-defined.

⟨1⟩1. Assume:
$$m + n' = n + m'$$
 and $p + q' = q + p'$.
Prove: $m + q < n + p$ if and only if $m' + q' < n' + p'$
⟨1⟩2. $m + q < n + p$ if and only if $m' + q' < n' + p'$
Proof:

$$m + q < n + p \Leftrightarrow m + n' + q < n + n' + p$$

$$\Leftrightarrow m' + n + q < n + n' + p$$

$$\Leftrightarrow m' + q < n' + p$$

$$\Leftrightarrow m' + q + p' < n' + p + p'$$

$$\Leftrightarrow m' + q' + p < n' + p + p'$$

$$\Leftrightarrow m' + q' + p < n' + p + p'$$

$$\Leftrightarrow m' + q' < n' + p'$$
(Theorem 4.4.7)
$$\Leftrightarrow m' + q' < n' + p'$$
(Theorem 4.4.7)

Proposition 8.1.20. The ordering on the integers agrees with the ordering on the natural numbers.

PROOF: We have [(m,0)] < [(n,0)] iff m < n. \square

Proposition 8.1.21. < *is a linear order on* \mathbb{Z} .

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. < is irreflexive.

PROOF: We never have m + n < m + n.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. < is transitive.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: [(m,n)] < [(p,q)] < [(r,s)]
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. m+q < n+p and p+s < q+r
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. m+q+s < n+q+r

PROOF: m + q + s < n + p + s < n + q + r

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. m+s < n+r

PROOF: Theorem 4.4.7.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3.$ < is total.

PROOF: Given natural numbers m, n, p and q, either m+q < n+p, or m+q=n+p, or n+p < m+q.

Definition 8.1.22 (Positive). An integer a is positive iff a > 0.

Theorem 8.1.23. For any integers a, b and c, we have a < b if and only if a + c < b + c.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If a < b then a + c < b + c.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: a = [(m, n)], b = [(p, q)] and c = [(r, s)].
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: a < b
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ m+q < n+p$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. m + r + q + s < n + r + p + s
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 5. [(m+r, n+s)] < [(p+r, q+s)]$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 6$. a+c < b+c

```
\langle 1 \rangle2. If a+c < b+c then a < b.
PROOF: From \langle 1 \rangle1 and Proposition 3.1.23.
```

Proposition 8.1.24. Let a, b and c be integers. If 0 < c, then a < b if and only if ac < bc.

```
PROOF:  \langle 1 \rangle 1. \text{ Let: } c = [(r,s)] \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. \text{ Assume: } 0 < c \\ \langle 1 \rangle 3. s < r \\ \langle 1 \rangle 4. \text{ For all integers } a \text{ and } b, \text{ if } a < b \text{ then } ac < bc \\ \langle 2 \rangle 1. \text{ Let: } a = [(m,n)], b = [(p,q)]. \\ \langle 2 \rangle 2. \text{ Assume: } a < b \\ \langle 2 \rangle 3. m + q < n + p \\ \langle 2 \rangle 4. (m+q)r + (p+n)s < (m+q)s + (p+n)r \\ \text{PROOF: Proposition } 4.4.10, \langle 1 \rangle 3, \langle 2 \rangle 3. \\ \langle 2 \rangle 5. mr + ns + ps + qr < ms + nr + pr + qs \\ \langle 2 \rangle 6. [(mr + ns, ms + nr)] < [(pr + qs, ps + qr)] \\ \langle 2 \rangle 7. ac < bc \\ \langle 1 \rangle 5. \text{ For all integers } a \text{ and } b, \text{ if } ac < bc \text{ then } a < b \\ \text{PROOF: From } \langle 1 \rangle 4 \text{ and Proposition } 3.1.23.
```

Proposition 8.1.25. *Let* a *be a positive integer. For any integer* b, *there exists* $k \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* b < ak.

```
PROOF: \langle 1 \rangle 1. Case: b \leq 0
PROOF: Take k = 1. \langle 1 \rangle 2. Case: b > 0
PROOF: Take k = b + 1.
```

8.2 The Rationals

Definition 8.2.1 (Rational Numbers). The set \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers is the field of fractions over the integers.

Proposition 8.2.2. For any integers a and b, we have [(a,1)] = [(b,1)] iff a = b.

Proof: Immediate from definitions.

Henceforth we identify any integer a with the rational number [(a, 1)].

Proposition 8.2.3. Addition on the rationals agrees with addition on the integers.

PROOF:
$$[(a,1)] + [(b,1)] = [(a \cdot 1 + b \cdot 1, 1 \cdot 1)] = [(a+b,1)].$$

Proposition 8.2.4. Multiplication on the rationals agrees with multiplication on the integers.

PROOF:
$$[(a, 1)][(b, 1)] = [(ab, 1)]$$

Definition 8.2.5. Define the ordering < on the rationals by: if b and d are positive, then [(a,b)] < [(c,d)] iff ad < bc.

We prove this is well-defined.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. For any rational q, there exist integers a, b with b positive such that q = [(a, b)].

PROOF: Since [(a,b)] = [(-a,-b)], and if $b \neq 0$ then one of b and -b is positive.

 $\langle 1 \rangle$ 2. If b, b', d and d' are positive, [(a,b)] = [(a',b')], and [(c,d)] = [(c',d')], then ad < bc iff a'd' < b'c'.

Proof:

- $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. If ad < bc then a'd' < b'c'.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Assume: ad < bc
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. ab'd < bb'c
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. a'bd < bb'c
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4$. a'd < b'c
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 5$. a'dd' < b'cd'
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 6$. a'dd' < b'c'd
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 7$. a'd' < b'c'
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. If a'd' < b'c' then ad < bc.

PROOF: Similar.

Proposition 8.2.6. The ordering on the rationals agrees with the ordering on the integers.

Proof: We have [(a,1)] < [(b,1)] if and only if a < b. \square

Proposition 8.2.7. The relation < is a linear ordering on \mathbb{Q} .

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. < is irreflexive.

PROOF: We never have ab < ab.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. < is transitive.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: [(a,b)] < [(c,d)] < [(e,f)] where b, d and f are positive.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. ad < bc and cf < de
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. adf < bde

Proof: adf < bcf < bde

- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. af < be
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. < \text{is total.}$

PROOF: For any integers a, b, c, d, we have ad < bc or ad = bc or bc < ad.

П

Proposition 8.2.8. For any rationals r, s and t, we have r < s if and only if r + t < s + t.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: a, b, c, d, e, f be integers with b, d and f positive.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. [(a,b)] + [(e,f)] < [(c,d)] + [(e,f)] if and only if [(a,b)] < [(c,d)]. PROOF:

$$\begin{split} [(a,b)] + [(e,f)] < [(c,d)] + [(e,f)] &\Leftrightarrow [(af+be,bf)] < [(cf+de,df)] \\ &\Leftrightarrow (af+be)df < (cf+de)bf \\ &\Leftrightarrow afdf+bedf < cfbf+debf \\ &\Leftrightarrow afdf < cfbf \\ &\Leftrightarrow ad < bc \\ &\Leftrightarrow [(a,b)] < [(c,d)] \end{split}$$

Corollary 8.2.8.1. For any rational r, we have r < 0 if and only if 0 < -r.

Definition 8.2.9 (Absolute Value). For any rational r, the absolute value of r is defined by

$$|r| := \begin{cases} -r & \text{if } 0 < -r \\ r & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 8.2.10. For any rationals r, s and t, if t is positive then r < s iff rt < st.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: r = [(a, b)], s = [(c, d)] and t = [(e, f)] where b, d and f are positive.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Assume: 0 < t

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ e > 0$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. rt < st iff r < s

Proof:

$$rt < st \Leftrightarrow [(ae, bf)] < [(ce, df)]$$

 $\Leftrightarrow aedf < cebf$
 $\Leftrightarrow ad < bc$
 $\Leftrightarrow r < s$

Corollary 8.2.10.1. The rationals form an ordered field.

Proposition 8.2.11. Let p be a positive rational. For any rational number r, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that r < pk.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: p = a/b and r = c/d where a, b and d are positive.

```
⟨1⟩2. PICK k \in \mathbb{N} such that bc < adk
PROOF: Proposition 8.1.25.
⟨1⟩3. r < pk
```

8.3 The Real Numbers

Definition 8.3.1 (Cauchy Sequence). A Cauchy sequence is a sequence (q_n) of rationals such that, for every positive rational ϵ , there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall m, n > k. |q_m - q_n| < \epsilon$.

Definition 8.3.2 (Dedekind Cut). A *Dedekind cut* is a set $x \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ such that:

- 1. $\emptyset \neq x \neq \mathbb{Q}$
- 2. x is closed downwards.
- 3. x has no greatest member.

The set \mathbb{R} of *real numbers* is the set of Dedekind cuts.

Proposition 8.3.3. For any rational q, we have $\{r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid r < q\} \in \mathbb{R}$.

```
Proof:
```

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $q \in \mathbb{Q}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $q \downarrow = \{r \mid r < q\}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \ q \downarrow \neq \emptyset$

PROOF: We have $q - 1 \in q \downarrow$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ \ q \downarrow \neq \mathbb{Q}$

PROOF: Since $q \notin q \downarrow$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. $q \downarrow$ is closed downwards.

PROOF: Trivial.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. $q \downarrow$ has no greatest element.

PROOF: For all $r \in q \downarrow$ we have $r < (q+r)/2 \in q \downarrow$.

Proposition 8.3.4. For rationals q and r, we have q = r if and only if $\{s \in \mathbb{Q} \mid s < q\} = \{s \in \mathbb{Q} \mid s < r\}$.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $q \downarrow = \{ s \in \mathbb{Q} \mid s < q \}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $r \downarrow = \{ s \in \mathbb{Q} \mid s < r \}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. If q = r then $q \downarrow = r \downarrow$

PROOF: Trivial.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. If q < r then $q \downarrow \neq r \downarrow$

PROOF: We have $q \in r \downarrow$ and $q \notin q \downarrow$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. If r < q then $q \downarrow \neq r \downarrow$

PROOF: We have $r \in q \downarrow$ and $q \notin q \downarrow$.

П

Henceforth we identify a rational q with the real number $\{r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid r < q\}$.

Definition 8.3.5. Define the ordering < on \mathbb{R} by: x < y iff $x \subseteq y$.

Proposition 8.3.6. The ordering on the reals agrees with the ordering on the rationals.

```
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Let: q, r \in \mathbb{Q}
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: q \downarrow = \{ s \in \mathbb{Q} \mid s < q \}.
\langle 1 \rangle 3. Let: r \downarrow = \{ s \in \mathbb{Q} \mid s < r \}.
           PROVE: q < r \text{ iff } q \downarrow \subsetneq r \downarrow
\langle 1 \rangle 4. If q < r then q \downarrow \subsetneq r \downarrow
     \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: q < r
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. q \downarrow \subseteq r \downarrow
         PROOF: If s < q then s < r.
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \ q \downarrow \neq r \downarrow
         Proof: Proposition 8.3.4.
\langle 1 \rangle 5. If q \downarrow \subseteq r \downarrow then q < r
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: q \downarrow \subsetneq r \downarrow
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. Pick s \in r \downarrow such that s \notin q \downarrow
     \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ q \leq s < r
Proposition 8.3.7. The ordering < is a linear ordering on \mathbb{R}.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. < is irreflexive.
```

PROOF: No set is a proper subset of itself.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. < is transitive.

PROOF: Since the relationship \subseteq is transitive on the class of all sets.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. < is total.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: x, y be Dedekind cuts.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: $x \not\subseteq y$ PROVE: $y \subsetneq x$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. PICK $q \in x$ such that $q \notin y$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. Let: $r \in y$ Prove: $r \in x$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ q \not\leq r$

PROOF: Since y is closed downwards.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 6. \ r < q$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 7. \ r \in x$

PROOF: Since x is closed downwards.

Proposition 8.3.8. Any bounded nonempty subset of \mathbb{R} has a least upper bound.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: A be a bounded nonempty subset of \mathbb{R} .
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $\bigcup A$ is a Dedekind cut.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. $\bigcup A \neq \emptyset$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Pick $x \in A$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Pick $q \in x$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ q \in \bigcup A$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2. \bigcup A \neq \mathbb{Q}$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. PICK an upper bound u for A
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Pick $q \notin u$ Prove: $q \notin \bigcup A$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. Assume: for a contradiction $q \in \bigcup A$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4$. PICK $x \in A$ such that $q \in x$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 5. \ x \leq u$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 6. \ q \in u$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle$ 7. Q.E.D.

PROOF: This is a contradiction.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $\bigcup A$ is closed downwards.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $q \in \bigcup A$ and r < q
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. PICK $x \in A$ such that $q \in x$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ r \in x$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4. \ r \in \bigcup A$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $\bigcup A$ has no greatest element.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $q \in \bigcup A$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. PICK $x \in A$ such that $q \in x$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. Pick $r \in x$ such that q < r
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4. \ r \in \bigcup A$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. $\bigcup A$ is an upper bound for A.

PROOF: For all $x \in A$ we have $x \subseteq \bigcup A$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. For any upper bound u for $\bigcup A$ we have $\bigcup A \leq u$.

PROOF: If $\forall x \in A.x \subseteq u$ we have $\bigcup A \subseteq u$.

Definition 8.3.9 (Addition). Define addition + on the reals by

$$x+y:=\{q+r\mid q\in x, r\in y\}\ .$$

We prove this is well-defined.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$

PROVE: X + y is a Dedekind cut.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ x + y \neq \emptyset$

PROOF: Pick $q \in x$ and $r \in y$; then $q + r \in x + y$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ x + y \neq \mathbb{Q}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. PICK $q \notin x$ and $r \notin y$ PROVE: $q + r \notin x + y$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: for a contradiction $q + r \in x + y$

```
\langle 2 \rangle 3. Pick q' \in x and r' \in y such that q + r = q' + r'
   \langle 2 \rangle 4. q' < q and r' < r
   \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ q' + r' < q + r
   \langle 2 \rangle 6. Q.E.D.
      PROOF: This is a contradiction.
\langle 1 \rangle 4. x + y is closed downwards.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: q \in x and r \in y
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. Let: s < q + r
           PROVE: s \in x + y
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ s - r < q
   \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ s-r \in x
   \langle 2 \rangle 5. s = (s - r) + r \in x + y
\langle 1 \rangle 5. x + y has no greatest element.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: q \in x and r \in y
           PROVE: There exists s \in x + y such that q + r < s
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. Pick q' \in x and r' \in y such that q < q' and r < r'
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ q + r < q' + r' \in x + y
```

Proposition 8.3.10. Addition on the reals agrees with addition on the rationals.

Proof:

PROOF:
$$\langle 1 \rangle 1. \text{ Let: } q,r \in \mathbb{Q}$$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ q \downarrow +r \downarrow \subseteq (q+r) \downarrow$$
 Proof: If $s_1 < q$ and $s_2 < r$ then $s_1 + s_2 < q + r$.
$$\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ (q+r) \downarrow \subseteq q \downarrow +r \downarrow$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 1. \text{ Let: } s < q + r$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2. \ s - r < q$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 3. \text{ Pick } t \text{ such that } s - r < t < q$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ s - t < r$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ s = t + (s-t) \in q \downarrow +r \downarrow$$

$$\square$$

Proposition 8.3.11. Addition is associative.

Proof:

$$x + (y + z) = \{q + r \mid q \in x, r \in y + z\}$$

$$= \{q + s_1 + s_2 \mid q \in x, s_1 \in y, s_2 \in z\}$$

$$= \{r + s_2 \mid r \in x + y, s_2 \in z\}$$

$$= (x + y) + z$$

Proposition 8.3.12. Addition is commutative.

$$\begin{aligned} x+y &= \{q+r \mid q \in x, r \in y\} \\ &= \{r+q \mid r \in y, q \in x\} \\ &= y+x \end{aligned} \square$$

Proposition 8.3.13. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have x + 0 = x.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. $x + 0 \subseteq x$

PROOF: If $q \in x$ and r < 0 then q + r < q so $q + r \in x$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ x \subseteq x + 0$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $q \in x$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. PICK $r \in x$ such that q < r.

PROOF: x has no greatest element.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ q-r < 0$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ q = r + (q r) \in x + 0$

Definition 8.3.14. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, define $-x := \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \exists r > q. -r \notin x\}$.

Proposition 8.3.15. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $-x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $x \in \mathbb{R}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2. -x \neq \emptyset$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Pick $s \notin x$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $-s-1 \in -x$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. -x \neq \mathbb{Q}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Pick $s \in x$

Prove: $-s \notin -x$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: for a contradiction $-s \in -x$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Pick r > -s such that $-r \notin x$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. -r < s
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. Q.E.D.

PROOF: This contradicts the fact that x is closed downwards.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. -x is closed downwards.

PROOF: Immediate from definition.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. -x has no greatest element.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $q \in -x$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Pick r > q such that $-r \notin x$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Pick s such that q < s < r
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ s \in -x$

Lemma 8.3.16. Let p be a positive rational number. For any real number x, there exists a rational $q \in x$ such that $p + q \notin x$.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Pick $q_0 \in x$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. There exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $q_0 + kp \notin x$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Pick $q_1 \notin x$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. PICK $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $q_1 q_0 < pk$

Proof: Proposition 8.2.11.

```
\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ q_1 < q_0 + kp
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. q_0 + kp \notin x
\langle 1 \rangle 3. Let: k be the least natural number such that q_0 + kp \notin x
\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ k \neq 0
   Proof: \langle 1 \rangle 1
\langle 1 \rangle 5. Let: q = q_0 + (k-1)p
\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ q \in x \text{ and } q + p \notin x.
Proposition 8.3.17. For every real x we have x + (-x) = 0.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Let: x be a real number.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. x + (-x) \subseteq 0
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: q_1 \in x and q_2 \in -x
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. PICK r > q_2 such that -r \notin x
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ q_1 < -r
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. r < -q_1
    \langle 2 \rangle 5. q_2 < -q_1
    \langle 2 \rangle 6. \ q_1 + q_2 < 0
\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ 0 \subseteq x + (-x)
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: p < 0
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. 0 < -p
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. Pick q \in x such that q - p/2 \notin x
       PROOF: Lemma 8.3.16.
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. Let: s = p/2 - q
    \langle 2 \rangle 5. -s \notin x
    \langle 2 \rangle 6. \ p - q < s
    \langle 2 \rangle 7. \ p-q \in -x
    \langle 2 \rangle 8. \ p \in x + (-x)
```

Corollary 8.3.17.1. The reals form an Abelian group under addition.

Complex Analysis

Definition 9.0.1. For $p \ge 1$, let l^p be the set of all sequences of complex numbers (x_n) such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|^p < \infty$.

Proposition 9.0.2. If $(x_n), (y_n) \in l^p$ then $(x_n + y_n) \in l^p$.

Proof:

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \ \text{Let:} \ (x_n), (y_n) \in l^p \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^p \leq 2^p (\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|^p + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n|^p) \\ \text{PROOF:} \\ \langle 2 \rangle 1. \ \ \text{For all} \ n \in \mathbb{N} \ \text{we have} \ |x_n + y_n|^p \leq 2^p (|x_n|^p + |y_n|^p). \\ \text{PROOF:} \\ |x_n + y_n|^p \leq (|x_n| + |y_n|)^p \end{array} \tag{Triangle Inequality}$$

 $\leq (2\max(|x_n|,|y_n|))^p$ $\leq 2^p(|x_n|^p + |y_n|^p)$

Theorem 9.0.3 (Hölder's Inequality). Let p and q be reals such that p > 1, q > 1 and 1/p + 1/q = 1. Let $(x_n) \in l^p$ and $(y_n) \in l^q$. Then

$$\sum_{n} |x_n y_n| \le \left(\sum_{n} |x_n|^p\right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{n} |y_n|^q\right)^{1/q}$$

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: w.l.o.g. neither (x_n) nor (y_n) are all zero.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For $0 \le x \le 1$ we have

1)2. For
$$0 \le x \le 1$$
 we have
$$x^{1/p} \le \frac{1}{p}x + \frac{1}{q}.$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 1. \text{ Let: } f(x) = x/p + 1/q - x^{1/p}$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2. \ f'(x) = 1/p(1 - x^{(1-p)/p})$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ f'(x) \ge 0 \text{ for all } x \in [0, 1]$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ f \text{ is a monotonically decreasing function on}$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2$$
, $f'(x) = 1/p(1-x^{(1-p)/p})$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. f is a monotonically decreasing function on [0, 1]

$$\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ f(0) = 1/q$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 6. \ f(1) = 0$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 7$$
. $f(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0,1]$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. For any $a, b \geq 0$ we have

$$ab \leq \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{b^q}{q}$$
.

$$\langle 2 \rangle 1$$
. Case: $a^p < b^q$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 1. \ ab^{-q/p} \leq \frac{1}{p} \frac{a^p}{b^q} + \frac{1}{q}$$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 2$$
. $ab^{1-q} \le \frac{1}{p} \frac{a^p}{b^q} + \frac{1}{q}$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1. \text{ Case: } a^p \leq b^q$ $\langle 3 \rangle 1. ab^{-q/p} \leq \frac{1}{p} \frac{a^p}{b^q} + \frac{1}{q}$ Proof: Substituting $x = a^p/b^q$ in $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $\langle 3 \rangle 2. ab^{1-q} \leq \frac{1}{p} \frac{a^p}{b^q} + \frac{1}{q}$ Proof: From $\langle 3 \rangle 1$ since 1 - q = -q/p. $\langle 3 \rangle 3. ab \leq \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{b^q}{q}$ Proof: Multiplying $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ by b^q

$$\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ ab \leq \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{b^q}{q}$$

PROOF: Multiplying $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ by b^q .

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Case: $b^q \leq a^p$

Proof: Similar.

TROOF. Similar.
$$\langle 1 \rangle 4$$
. For any integers $1 \le j \le n$, we have
$$\frac{|x_j|}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^n |x_k|^p\right)^{1/p}} \frac{|y_j|}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^n |y_k|^q\right)^{1/q}} \le \frac{1}{p} \frac{|x_j|^p}{\sum_{k=1}^n |x_k|^p} + \frac{1}{q} \frac{|y_j|^q}{\sum_{k=1}^n |y_k|^q}$$
PROOF: From $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ substituting
$$a = \frac{|x_j|}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^n |x_k|^p\right)^{1/p}} \text{ and } b = \frac{|y_j|}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^n |y_k|^q\right)^{1/q}}$$
/1\(\frac{5}{5}\). For any positive integer n we have

$$a = \frac{|x_j|}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^n |x_k|^p\right)^{1/p}}$$
 and $b = \frac{|y_j|}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^n |y_k|^q\right)^{1/q}}$

(1)5. For any positive integer
$$n$$
 we have
$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} |x_k| |y_k|}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} |x_k|^p\right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} |y_k|^q\right)^{1/q}} \le 1$$
Proof:

Proof:

FROOF:
$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} |x_j| |y_j|}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} |x_k|^p\right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} |y_k|^q\right)^{1/q}} \le \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \quad \text{(Summing } \langle 1 \rangle 4 \text{ from } j = 1 \text{ to } n\text{)}$$

$$= 1$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 6$.

$$\sum_{n} |x_n y_n| \le \left(\sum_{n} |x_n|^p\right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{n} |y_n|^q\right)^{1/q}$$

PROOF: Taking the limit $n \to \infty$ in $\langle 1 \rangle 5$

Theorem 9.0.4 (Minkowski's Inequality). Let $p \ge 1$. Let $(x_n), (y_n) \in l^p$. Then

$$\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^p\right)^{1/p} \le \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|^p\right)^{1/p} + \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Case: p = 1

PROOF: This is just the Triangle Inequality.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Case: p > 1

$$\langle 2 \rangle 1$$
. Let: $q = p/(p-1)$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2$$
.

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^p \le \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|^p\right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^{q(p-1)}\right)^{1/q} + \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n|^p\right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^{q(p-1)}\right)^{1/q}$$

Proof:

$$\langle 3 \rangle 1. \ (|x_n + y_n|^{p-1}) \in l^q$$

PROOF:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^{(p-1)q} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^p$$

$$< \infty \qquad (\text{Proposition } 9.0.2)$$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Q.E.D.

PROOF:
$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^p = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n| |x_n + y_n|^{p-1}$$

$$\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n| |x_n + y_n|^{p-1} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n| |x_n + y_n|^{p-1}$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|^p\right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^{q(p-1)}\right)^{1/q}$$

$$+ \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n|^p\right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^{q(p-1)}\right)^{1/q}$$
(Hölder's Inequality, $\langle 2 \rangle 2$)

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$.

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^p \le \left\{ \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|^p \right)^{1/p} + \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n|^p \right)^{1/p} \right\} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^p \right)^{1/q}$$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 1. \ q(p-1) = p$

Proof: $\langle 2 \rangle 2$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Q.E.D.

PROOF: From $\langle 2 \rangle 2$, $\langle 3 \rangle 1$.

Part I Linear Algebra

Vector Spaces

10.1 Vector Spaces

Definition 10.1.1 (Vector Space). Let K be either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . A vector space over K is a triple $(V, +, \cdot)$ such that:

- \bullet V is a nonempty set, whose elemnts are called *vectors*;
- ullet $+: V^2 o V$
- $\bullet : K \times V \to V$

such that the following hold for all $u, v, w \in V$ and $\alpha, \beta \in K$:

- 1. u + v = v + u
- 2. u + (v + w) = (u + v) + w
- 3. For every $u, v \in V$ there exists $w \in V$ such that u + w = v
- 4. $\alpha(\beta v) = (\alpha \beta)v$
- 5. $(\alpha + \beta)v = \alpha v + \beta v$
- 6. $\alpha(u+v) = \alpha u + \alpha v$
- 7. 1v = v

Elements of K are called *scalars*.

We write real vector space for 'vector space over \mathbb{R} ', and complex vector space for 'vector space over \mathbb{C} '.

Proposition 10.1.2. Let K be either \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{C} . The set $\{0\}$ is a vector space over K under the unique functions $+: \{0\}^2 \to \{0\}, : K \times \{0\} \to \{0\}$.

PROOF: Each axiom holds trivially because x = y holds for all $x, y \in \{0\}$. \square

Proposition 10.1.3. The set \mathbb{R} is a real vector space under real addition and real multiplication.

PROOF: TODO — after we have proved these facts about \mathbb{R} . \square

Proposition 10.1.4. The set \mathbb{C} is a real vector space under complex addition and complex multiplication.

PROOF: TODO

Proposition 10.1.5. The set \mathbb{C} is a complex vector space under complex addition and complex multiplication.

PROOF: TODO

Proposition 10.1.6. Let K be either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . Let $\{V_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a family of vector spaces over K. Then $\prod_{i\in I} V_i$ is a vector space over K under the operations given by

$$\{x_i\}_{i \in I} + \{y_i\}_{i \in I} = \{x_i + y_i\}_{i \in I}$$

$$\alpha \{x_i\}_{i \in I} = \{\alpha x_i\}_{i \in I}$$

PROOF: Each axiom follows from the corresponding axiom in V_i .

Corollary 10.1.6.1. Let V be a vector space over K. For any set I, we have V^I is a vector space over K.

Corollary 10.1.6.2. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then \mathbb{R}^n is a real vector space, and \mathbb{C}^n is both a real and a complex vector space, under

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n) + (y_1, \dots, y_n) = (x_1 + y_1, \dots, x_n + y_n)$$

 $\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (\lambda x_1, \dots, \lambda x_n)$

Proposition 10.1.7. Let V be a vector space over K. Then there exists a unique $0 \in V$ such that, for all $v \in V$, we have v + 0 = v.

PROOF:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. There exists $0 \in V$ such that $\forall v \in V.v + 0 = v$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Pick $v \in V$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Pick $0 \in V$ such that v + 0 = v

Proof: Axiom 3.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. For all $u \in V$, we have u + 0 = u
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $u \in V$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Pick $u' \in V$ such that v + u' = u

PROOF: Axiom 3.

 $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. u + 0 = u

$$u + 0 = v + u' + 0 \tag{\langle 3 \rangle 2}$$

$$= v + u' \tag{22}$$

$$=u$$
 $(\langle 3 \rangle 2)$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 2$$
. If $0, 0' \in V$ are such that $\forall v \in V.v + 0 = v$ and $\forall v \in V.v + 0' = v$, then $0 = 0'$.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $0, 0' \in V$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: $\forall v \in V.v + 0 = v$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Assume: $\forall v \in V.v + 0' = v$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ 0 = 0'$

$$0 = 0 + 0' \tag{\langle 2 \rangle 2}$$

$$=0' \qquad (\langle 2 \rangle 3)$$

Proposition 10.1.8. Let V be a vector space. For any $v \in V$, there exists a unique $-v \in V$ such that v + (-v) = 0.

PROOF:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $v \in V$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. There exists $-v \in V$ such that v + (-v) = u

PROOF: Axiom 3.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. If v + x = 0 and v + y = 0 then x = y
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: v + x = 0
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: v + y = 0
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ x = y$

Proof:

$$x = x + 0$$
 (Proposition 10.1.7)
 $= x + v + y$ ($\langle 2 \rangle 2$)
 $= 0 + y$ ($\langle 2 \rangle 1$)
 $= y$ (Proposition 10.1.7)

Proposition 10.1.9. Let V be a vector space. For any $u, v \in V$, there exists a unique $u - v \in V$ such that v + (u - v) = u, namely u - v = u + (-v).

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $u, v \in V$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ v + (u + (-v)) = u$

Proof:

$$v + u + (-v) = u + 0$$
 (Proposition 10.1.8)
= u (Proposition 10.1.7)

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. For all $x \in V$, if v + x = u then x = u + (-v).

- $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $x \in V$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: v + x = u
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ x = u + (-v)$

$$u + (-v) = v + x + (-v)$$
 ($\langle 2 \rangle 2$)
= $x + 0$ (Proposition 10.1.8)
= x (Proposition 10.1.7)

П

Proposition 10.1.10. Let V be a vector space over K. Let $u, v, w \in V$. If u + v = u + w then v = w.

Proof:

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1$$
. Assume: $u + v = u + w$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ v = w$

Proof:

$$v = v + 0$$
 (Proposition 10.1.7)
 $= v + u + (-u)$ (Proposition 10.1.8)
 $= w + u + (-u)$ ($\langle 1 \rangle 1$)
 $= w + 0$ (Proposition 10.1.8)
 $= w$ (Proposition 10.1.7)

Proposition 10.1.11. Let V be a vector space over K. Let $\lambda \in K$. Then $\lambda 0 = 0$.

Proof:

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1$$
. $\lambda 0 + \lambda 0 = \lambda 0 + 0$

Proof:

$$\lambda 0 + \lambda 0 = \lambda (0 + 0)$$
 (Axiom 6)
= $\lambda 0$ (Proposition 10.1.7)

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $\lambda 0 = 0$

Proof: Proposition 10.1.10.

П

Proposition 10.1.12. Let V be a vector space over K. Let $\lambda \in K$ and $v \in V$. If $\lambda v = 0$ then $\lambda = 0$ or v = 0.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: $\lambda \neq 0$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Assume: $\lambda v = 0$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ v = 0$

Proof:

$$v = 1v$$
 (Axiom 7)
 $= \lambda^{-1} \lambda v$
 $= \lambda^{-1} 0$ ($\langle 1 \rangle 2$)
 $= 0$

Proposition 10.1.13. Let V be a vector space over K. For all $v \in V$ we have 0v = 0.

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1$$
. $0v + 0 = 0v + 0v$

$$0v+0=0v \qquad \qquad \text{(Proposition 10.1.7)}$$

$$= (0+0)v \\ = 0v+0v \qquad \qquad \text{(Axiom 5)}$$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ 0v=0 \\ \text{PROOF: Proposition 10.1.10, } \langle 1 \rangle 1.$$

Proposition 10.1.14. Let V be a vector space over K. Let $v \in V$. Then (-1)v = -v.

PROOF: $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ v + (-1)v = 0 \\ \text{PROOF:} \\ v + (-1)v = 1v + (-1)v \qquad \qquad \text{(Axiom 7)} \\ = (1 + (-1))v \qquad \qquad \text{(Axiom 5)} \\ = 0v \qquad \qquad = 0 \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \text{Q.E.D.} \\ \text{PROOF: Proposition 10.1.8.}$

10.2 Subspaces

Definition 10.2.1 (Subspace). Let V be a vector space over K and $U \subseteq V$. Then U is a *subspace* of V iff $\forall \alpha, \beta \in K. \forall u, v \in U. \alpha u + \beta v \in U$. It is a *proper* subspace iff in addition $U \neq V$.

Proposition 10.2.2. Let V be a vector space over K and U a subspace of V. Then U is a vector space over K under the restrictions of the operations of V.

PROOF: Each of the axioms follows from the corresponding axiom in V. For axiom 3, we have if $u, v \in U$ then $v - u = 1v + (-1)u \in U$. \square

Proposition 10.2.3. Every vector space is a subspace of itself.

Proof: Trivial.

Proposition 10.2.4. Let Ω be a subset of \mathbb{R}^N . Let $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ be the set of all continuous functions $\Omega \to \mathbb{C}$. Then $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ is a subspace of \mathbb{C}^{Ω} .

PROOF: If $f, g: \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ are continuous then so is $\alpha f + \beta g$. \square

Proposition 10.2.5. Let Ω be an open set in \mathbb{R}^N . Let $\mathcal{C}^k(\Omega)$ be the set of all continuous functions $\Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ with continuous partial derivatives of order k. Then $\mathcal{C}^k(\Omega)$ is a subspace of \mathbb{C}^{Ω} .

PROOF: If $f,g:\Omega\to\mathbb{C}$ have continuous partial derivatives of order k then so does $\alpha f+\beta g$. \square

Proposition 10.2.6. Let Ω be an open set in \mathbb{R}^N . Let $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\Omega)$ be the set of all infinitely differentiable functions $\Omega \to \mathbb{C}$. Then $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\Omega)$ is a subspace of \mathbb{C}^{Ω} .

PROOF: If $f, g: \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ are infinitely differentiable then so is $\alpha f + \beta g$. \square

Proposition 10.2.7. Let Ω be an open set in \mathbb{R}^N . Let $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ be the set of all polynomials in N variables considered as functions $\Omega \to \mathbb{C}$. Then $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ is a subspace of \mathbb{C}^{Ω} .

PROOF: If $f, g: \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ are polynomials in N variables then so is $\alpha f + \beta g$. \square

Proposition 10.2.8. Let V be a vector space and U_1 , U_2 subspaces of V. If $U_1 \subseteq U_2$ then U_1 is a subspace of U_2 .

PROOF: Trivial. \square

Proposition 10.2.9. Let V be a vector space over K. The intersection of a set of subspaces of V is a subspace of V.

Proof:

$$\begin{split} &\langle 1 \rangle 1. \text{ Let: } \mathcal{U} \text{ be a set of subspaces of } V. \\ &\langle 1 \rangle 2. \text{ Let: } u,v \in \bigcap \mathcal{U} \text{ and } \lambda,\mu \in K \\ &\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \lambda u + \mu v \in \bigcap \mathcal{U} \\ &\langle 2 \rangle 1. \text{ Let: } U \in \mathcal{U} \\ &\langle 2 \rangle 2. \ u,v \in U \\ &\text{PROOF: } \langle 1 \rangle 2, \ \langle 2 \rangle 1. \\ &\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \lambda u + \beta v \in U \\ &\text{PROOF: } \langle 1 \rangle 1, \ \langle 1 \rangle 2, \ \langle 2 \rangle 1, \ \langle 2 \rangle 2. \\ &\Box \end{split}$$

Proposition 10.2.10. The set of all bounded complex sequences is a proper subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

PROOF: If (x_n) and (y_n) are bounded then so is $(\lambda x_n + \mu y_n)$. \square

Proposition 10.2.11. The set of all convergent complex sequences is a proper subspace of the space of all bounded complex sequences.

PROOF: If (x_n) and (y_n) converge then so does $(\lambda x_n + \mu y_n)$. \square

Proposition 10.2.12. The set l^p of all sequences (x_n) in \mathbb{C} such that $\sum_n |x_n|^p < \infty$ is a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

PROOF: It is closed under addition by Proposition 9.0.2, and it is easy to see that it is closed under scalar multiplication. \Box

10.3 Linear Independence and Bases

Definition 10.3.1 (Linear Combination). Let V be a vector space over K. Let $v, v_1, \ldots, v_n \in V$. Then v is a *linear combination* of v_1, \ldots, v_n iff there exist scalars $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in K$ such that

$$v = \lambda_1 v_1 + \dots + \lambda_n v_n$$
.

Definition 10.3.2 (Linearly Independent). Let V be a vector space over K. Let $A \subseteq V$. Then A is *linearly independent* iff, for all $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in K$ and $v_1, \ldots, v_n \in A$, if $\lambda_1 v_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n v_n = 0$ then $\lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_n = 0$.

Definition 10.3.3 (Span). Let V be a vector space over K and $A \subseteq V$. The span of A, or the subspace of V spanned by A, is the set of all linear combinations of vectors in A.

Proposition 10.3.4. Let V be a vector space over K and $A \subseteq V$. Then span A is a subspace of V.

PROOF: Given $\alpha, \beta \in K$ and $\lambda_1 u_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m u_m, \mu_1 v_1 + \cdots + \mu_n v_n \in \operatorname{span} A$, we have

$$\alpha(\lambda_1 u_1 + \dots + \lambda_m u_m) + \beta(\mu_1 v_1 + \dots + \mu_n v_n)$$

$$= \alpha \lambda_1 u_1 + \dots + \alpha \lambda_m u_m + \beta \mu_1 v_1 + \dots + \beta \mu_n v_n$$

$$\in \operatorname{span} A$$

Definition 10.3.5 (Basis). Let V be a vector space over K and $B \subseteq V$. Then B is a *basis* for V iff B is linearly independent and span B = V.

Definition 10.3.6 (Finite Dimensional). A vector space is *finite dimensional* iff there exists a finite basis; otherwise it is *infinite dimensional*.

Proposition 10.3.7. In a finite dimensional space, any two bases have the same size.

TODO

Definition 10.3.8 (Dimension). The *dimension* of a finite dimensional vector space V, dim V, is the number of vectors in any basis.

Proposition 10.3.9. Let K be either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . Then K^n as a vector space over K has dimension n.

PROOF: The vectors with one component 1 and all other components 0 form a basis. \Box

Proposition 10.3.10. As a real vector space, \mathbb{C}^n has dimension 2n.

PROOF: The vectors with one component either 1 or i and all other components 0 form a basis. \square

Proposition 10.3.11. Let Ω be a nonempty open set in \mathbb{R}^n . The space $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ is infinite dimensional.

PROOF: Let $\pi_1 : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be the first projection. The functions $1, \pi_1(x), \pi_1(x)^2, \pi_1(x)^3, \ldots$ form an infinite linearly independent set in $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$. \square

Proposition 10.3.12. The spaces $C^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are infinite dimensional

PROOF: The monomials 1, x, x^2 , ... form an infinite linearly independent set. \sqcap

10.4 Linear Mappings

Definition 10.4.1 (Kernel). Let U and V be vector spaces and $T:U\to V$. The kernel of T is

$$\ker T := \{ u \in U \mid T(u) = 0 \}$$
.

Definition 10.4.2 (Linear Mapping). Let U and V be vector spaces over K. A function $L: U \to V$ is a linear mapping iff $\forall x, y \in U. \forall \alpha, \beta \in K. L(\alpha x + \beta y) = \alpha L(x) + \beta L(y)$.

Proposition 10.4.3. Let U and V be vector spaces over K. The set of linear mappings from U to V is a subspace of V^U .

10.5 Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors

Definition 10.5.1 (Eigenvalue and Eigenvector). Let V be a vector space over K. Let $A: V \to V$ be a linear transformation. Let $v \in V$ and $\lambda \in K$. Then v is an eigenvector of A with eigenvalue λ iff $A(v) = \lambda v$.

Chapter 11

Normed Spaces

Definition 11.0.1 (Norm). Let K be either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . Let V be a vector space over K. A *norm* on V is a function $\| \ \| : V \to \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all $u, v \in V$ and $\lambda \in K$:

- 1. If ||v|| = 0 then v = 0.
- $2. \|\lambda v\| = |\lambda| \|v\|$
- 3. (Triangle Inequality) $||u+v|| \le ||u|| + ||v||$

A normed space over K is a pair (V, || ||) where V is a vector space over K and || || is a norm on V.

Proposition 11.0.2. In a normed space, ||0|| = 0.

PROOF:
$$||0|| = |0|||0|| = 0$$
 by Axiom 2. \square

Proposition 11.0.3. Let V be a normed vector space over K. For all $v \in V$ we have $||v|| \ge 0$.

Proof:

$$0 = ||0||$$
 (Proposition 11.0.2)

$$= ||v - v||$$
 (Triangle Inequality)

$$= 2||v||$$
 (Axiom 2)

Proposition 11.0.4. Let V be a normed space. Let $u, v \in V$. Then

$$|||u|| - ||v||| \le ||u - v||$$
.

Proof:

$$\|u\| \le \|u - v\| + \|v\|$$
 (Triangle Inequality)

$$\therefore \|u\| - \|v\| \le \|u - v\|$$
 (Triangle Inequality)

$$\|v\| \le \|v - u\| + \|u\|$$
 (Axiom 2)

$$\therefore \|v\| - \|u\| \le \|u - v\|$$

Definition 11.0.5 (Euclidean Norm). The *Euclidean norm* on K^n is defined by

$$||(x_1,\ldots,x_n)|| = \sqrt{|x_1|^2 + \cdots + |x_n|^2}$$
.

Proposition 11.0.6. The Euclidean norm on K^n is a norm.

Proof:

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1$$
. If $\|\vec{x}\| = 0$ then $\vec{x} = \vec{0}$
PROOF: If $\sqrt{|x_1|^2 + \cdots + |x_n|^2} = 0$ then $x_1 = \cdots = x_n = 0$. $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $\|\lambda \vec{x}\| = |\lambda| \|\vec{x}\|$
PROOF:

$$\|\lambda \vec{x}\| \sqrt{|\lambda x_1|^2 + \dots + |\lambda x_n|^2}$$

$$= \sqrt{|\lambda|^2 |x_1|^2 + \dots + |\lambda|^2 |x_n|^2}$$

$$= |\lambda| \sqrt{|x_1|^2 + \dots + |x_n|^2}$$

$$= |\lambda| \|\vec{x}\|$$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 3. \|\vec{u} + \vec{v}\| \le \|\vec{u}\| + \|\vec{v}\|$$

Proof:

$$\|\vec{u} + \vec{v}\|^2 = |u_1 + v_1|^2 + \dots + |u_n + v_n|^2$$

$$= |u_1|^2 + \dots + |u_n|^2 + |v_1|^2 + \dots + |v_n|^2$$

$$+ 2|u_1||v_1| + \dots + 2|u_n||v_n|$$

$$\leq \|\vec{u}\|^2 + \|\vec{v}\|^2 + 2|u_1v_1 + \dots + u_nv_n|$$

$$\leq \|\vec{u}\|^2 + \|\vec{v}\|^2 + 2\|\vec{u}\|\|\vec{v}\| \qquad \text{(Cauchy-Schwarz)}$$

$$= (\|\vec{u}\| + \|\vec{v}\|)^2$$

Corollary 11.0.6.1. The absolute value function | | is a norm on K.

Proposition 11.0.7. The function $\|\vec{x}\| = |x_1| + \cdots + |x_n|$ is a norm on \mathbb{C}^n .

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1$$
. If $||\vec{x}|| = 0$ then $\vec{x} = \vec{0}$
PROOF: If $|x_1| + \dots + |x_n| = 0$ then $x_1 = \dots = x_n = 0$. $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $||\lambda \vec{x}|| = |\lambda| ||\vec{x}||$

Proof:

$$\|\lambda \vec{x}\| |\lambda x_1| + \dots + |\lambda x_n|$$

$$= |\lambda| (|x_1| + \dots + |x_n|)$$

$$= |\lambda| \|\vec{x}\|$$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 3. \|\vec{u} + \vec{v}\| \le \|\vec{u}\| + \|\vec{v}\|$$
PROOF:
$$\|\vec{u} + \vec{v}\|^2 = |u_1 + v_1| + \dots + |u_n + v_n|$$

$$\le |u_1| + |v_1| + \dots + |u_n| + |v_n|$$

$$= \|\vec{u}\| + \|\vec{v}\|$$

Proposition 11.0.8. The function $\|\vec{x}\| = \max(|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|)$ is a norm on \mathbb{C}^n .

Proof:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{TROOF:} \\ \langle 1 \rangle 1. \text{ If } \|\vec{x}\| = 0 \text{ then } \vec{x} = \vec{0} \\ \text{PROOF:} \text{ If } \max(|x_1|, \dots, |x|n|) = 0 \text{ then } x_1 = \dots = x_n = 0. \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \|\lambda \vec{x}\| = |\lambda| \|\vec{x}\| \\ \text{PROOF:} \\ \|\lambda \vec{x}\| = \max(|\lambda x_1|, \dots, |\lambda x_n|) \\ &= |\lambda| \max(|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|) \\ &= |\lambda| \|\vec{x}\| \\ \langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \|\vec{u} + \vec{v}\| \leq \|\vec{u}\| + \|\vec{v}\| \\ \text{PROOF:} \\ \|\vec{u} + \vec{v}\| = \max(|u_1 + v_1|, \dots, |u_n + v_n|) \\ &\leq \max(|u_1| + |v_1|, \dots, |u_n| + |v_n|) \\ &\leq \max(|u_1|, \dots, |u_n|) + \max(|v_1|, \dots, |v_n|) \end{array}$$

Definition 11.0.9 (Uniform Convergence Norm). Let Ω be a closed bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^n . The *uniform convergence norm* on $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ is the function defined by $||f|| = \max_{x \in \Omega} |f(x)|$.

Proposition 11.0.10. Let Ω be a closed bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^n . The uniform convergence norm is a norm on $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$.

$$\begin{split} \langle 1 \rangle 1. & \text{ If } \|f\| = 0 \text{ then } f = 0 \\ & \text{Proof: If } \max_x |f(x)| = 0 \text{ then } f(x) = 0 \text{ for all } x. \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. & \|\lambda f\| = |\lambda| \|f\| \\ & \text{Proof:} \\ & \|\lambda f\| = \max_x |\lambda f(x)| \\ & = |\lambda| \max_x |f(x)| \\ & = |\lambda| \|f\| \end{split}$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \| f + g \| \le \| f \| + \| g \|$ PROOF:

$$||f + g|| = \max_{x} |f(x) + g(x)|$$

$$\leq \max_{x} (|f(x)| + |g(x)|)$$

$$\leq \max_{x} |f(x)| + \max_{x} |g(x)|$$

$$= ||f|| + ||g||$$

Proposition 11.0.11. Let $p \ge 1$. The function $||(z_n)|| = (\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |z_n|^p)^{1/p}$ is a norm on l^p .

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If $||(z_n)|| = 0$ then $(z_n) = (0)$ PROOF: If $(\sum_n |z_n|^p)^{1/p} = 0$ then $\sum_n |z_n|^p = 0$ so $|z_n|^p = 0$ for all n, and so $z_n = 0$ for all n.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $\|(\lambda z_n)\| = |\lambda| \|(z_n)\|$

Proof:

$$\|(\lambda z_n)\| = \left(\sum_n |\lambda z_n|^p\right)^{1/p}$$
$$= |\lambda| \left(\sum_n |z_n|^p\right)^{1/p}$$
$$= |\lambda| |(z_n)|$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. The triangle inequality holds.

PROOF: This is Minkowski's Inequality.

Proposition 11.0.12. Let V be a normed space and U a vector subspace of V. Then U is a normed space under the restriction of the norm to U.

PROOF: Each axiom follows from the fact it holds in V. \square

Proposition 11.0.13. Let V be a normed space over K. Let x_1, \ldots, x_n be linearly independent elements of V. Then there exists a real number c > 0 such that, for all $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in K$, we have

$$\|\alpha_1 x_1 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n\| \ge c(|\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n|).$$

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Define $f: K^n \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = \|\alpha_1 x_1 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n\|$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. f is continuous.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in K^n$ and $\epsilon > 0$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $\delta = \epsilon/(\|x_1\| + \cdots + \|x_n\|)$

PROOF: x_1, \ldots, x_n are not all zero because they are linearly independent.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Let: $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n)$ with $|\alpha_i - \beta_i| < \delta$ for all i

```
\langle 2 \rangle 4. \|(\alpha_1 x_1 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n) - (\beta_1 x_1 + \beta_n x_n)\| < \epsilon
                  \|(\alpha_1 x_1 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n) - (\beta_1 x_1 + \beta_n x_n)\|
               \leq |\alpha_1 - \beta_1| ||x_1|| + \dots + |\alpha_n - \beta_n| ||x_n||
                                                                                      (Axioms 2 and 3)
               <\delta(||x_1|| + \cdots + ||x_n||)
                                                                                                         (\langle 2 \rangle 3)
                                                                                                         (\langle 2 \rangle 2)
\langle 1 \rangle 3. Pick (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in \{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in K^n \mid |\beta_1| + \dots + |\beta_n| = 1\} at which
         f attains its minimum.
   PROOF: Extreme Value Theorem.
\langle 1 \rangle 4. Let c = f(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)
\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ c > 0
   Proof: Linear independence.
\langle 1 \rangle 6. Let: \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in K
\langle 1 \rangle 7. \|\alpha_1 x_1 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n\| \ge c(|\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n|)
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: w.l.o.g. \alpha_1 \ldots, \alpha_n are not all zero.
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. Let: \beta_i = \alpha_i/(|\alpha_1| + \cdots + |\alpha_n|) for i = 1, \dots, n
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. |\beta_1| + \cdots + |\beta_n| = 1
   \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ f(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \ge c
   \langle 2 \rangle5. Q.E.D.
       PROOF: Multiply both sides by |\alpha_1| + \cdots + |\alpha_n|.
П
Proposition 11.0.14. Let V be a normed space over K. Define d: V^2 \to \mathbb{R}
by d(x,y) = ||x-y||. Then d is a metric on V.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. For all x, y \in V we have d(x, y) \geq 0
   Proof: Proposition 11.0.3.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. For all x, y \in V we have d(x, y) = 0 iff x = y
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. If d(x,y) = 0 then x = y
       Proof: Axiom 1.
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. If x = y then d(x, y) = 0
       Proof: Proposition 11.0.2.
\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall x, y \in V.d(x, y) = d(y, x)
   PROOF: By Axiom 2.
\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ \forall x, y, z \in V.d(x, z) \le d(x, y) + d(y, z)
   Proof: By Axiom 3.
```

Henceforth we identify any normed space with this metric space.

11.1 Convergence

Proposition 11.1.1. Let V be a normed space over K. Let (x_n) be a sequence in V and $l \in V$. Then $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$ in V if and only if $||x_n - l|| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ in \mathbb{R} .

PROOF: Immediate from definitions.

Proposition 11.1.2. In a normed space, a sequence has at most one limit.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a vector space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Assume: $x_n \to l$ and $x_n \to m$ as $n \to \infty$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Assume: for a contradiction $l \neq m$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $\epsilon = ||l m||/2$
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. PICK N such that $\forall n \geq N. ||x_n l|| < \epsilon$ and $\forall n \geq N. ||x_n m|| < \epsilon$ PROOF: $\langle 1 \rangle 2$, $\langle 1 \rangle 4$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \|l m\| < \|l m\|$

Proof:

$$\begin{split} \|l-m\| &\leq \|x_N-l\| + \|x_N-m\| & \text{(Triangle Inequality)} \\ &< 2\epsilon & \text{($\langle 1\rangle 5$)} \\ &= \|l-m\| & \text{($\langle 1\rangle 4$)} \end{split}$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 7$. Q.E.D.

PROOF: This is a contradiction.

Definition 11.1.3 (Bounded). Let V be a normed space over K. A sequence (x_n) in V is bounded iff there exists B such that $\forall n \leq N . ||x_n|| < B$.

Proposition 11.1.4. Every convergent sequence is bounded.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. PICK N such that $\forall n \geq N . ||x_n l|| < 1$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $B = \max(||x_1||, ||x_2||, \dots, ||x_{N-1}||, ||l|| + 1)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $n \in \mathbb{N}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \|x_n\| \leq B$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Case: n < N

PROOF: $||x_n|| \leq B$ from $\langle 1 \rangle 3$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Case: $n \geq N$

Proof:

$$||x_n|| \le ||l|| + ||x_n - l||$$
 (Triangle Inequality)
 $< ||l|| + 1$ ($\langle 1 \rangle 2$)
 $\le B$ ($\langle 1 \rangle 3$)

Proposition 11.1.5. Let V be a normed space over K. If $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$ in V, and $\lambda_n \to \lambda$ as $n \to \infty$ in K, then $\lambda_n x_n \to \lambda l$ as $n \to \infty$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a normed space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $\lambda_n \to \lambda$ as $n \to \infty$

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle 1 \rangle 4. \ \ \text{Let: } \epsilon > 0 \\ \langle 1 \rangle 5. \ \ \text{PICK } N \ \text{such that, for all } n \geq N, \ \text{we have } \|x_n - l\| < \epsilon/2|\lambda| \ \text{and } |\lambda_n - \lambda| < \sqrt{\epsilon/2} \ \text{and } \|x_n\| < \sqrt{\epsilon/2} \\ \langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \ \text{Let: } n \geq N \\ \langle 1 \rangle 7. \ \|\lambda_n x_n - \lambda l\| < \epsilon \\ \text{PROOF: } \\ \|\lambda_n x_n - \lambda l\| \leq \|\lambda_n x_n - \lambda x_n\| + \|\lambda x_n - \lambda l\| \qquad \text{(Triangle Inequality)} \\ &= |\lambda_n - \lambda| \|x_n\| + |\lambda| \|x_n - l\| \qquad \text{(Axiom 2)} \\ &< \sqrt{\epsilon/2} \sqrt{\epsilon/2} + |\lambda| \epsilon/2|\lambda| \qquad \text{($\langle 1 \rangle 5$)} \end{array}$$

 $< \sqrt{\epsilon/2}\sqrt{\epsilon/2} + |\lambda|\epsilon/2|\lambda|$ $= \epsilon$ $(\langle 1 \rangle 5)$

Proposition 11.1.6. Let V be a normed space over K. If $x_n \to l$ and $y_n \to m$ as $n \to \infty$, then $x_n + y_n \to l + m$ as $n \to \infty$.

Proof:

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1$$
. Let: $\epsilon > 0$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. PICK N such that, for all $n \geq N$, we have $||x_n - l|| < \epsilon/2$ and $||y_n - m|| < \epsilon/2$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 3$$
. Let: $n \geq N$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ \|(x_n + y_n) - (l+m)\| < \epsilon$$

Proof:

$$\|(x_n+y_n)-(l+m)\| \leq \|x_n-l\|+\|y_n-m\|$$
 (Triangle Inequality)
$$<\epsilon/2+\epsilon/2$$
 (\langle 1\rangle 2)
$$=\epsilon$$

Definition 11.1.7 (Uniform Convergence). Let Ω be a closed bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^n . Let (f_n) be a sequence in $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$. Then (f_n) converges uniformly to f iff, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists N such that $\forall x \in \Omega. \forall n \geq N. |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$.

Proposition 11.1.8. Let Ω be a closed bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^n . Let (f_n) be a sequence in $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$. Then (f_n) converges uniformly to f iff f_n converges to f under the uniform convergence norm.

Proof:

$$(f_n)$$
 converges to f under the uniform convergence norm $\Leftrightarrow \forall \epsilon > 0. \exists N. \forall n \geq N. ||f_n - f|| < \epsilon$ $\Leftrightarrow \forall \epsilon > 0. \exists N. \forall n \geq N. \forall x \in X. |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$

Definition 11.1.9 (Pointwise Convergence). Let (f_n) be a sequence in $\mathcal{C}([0,1])$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}([0,1])$. Then (f_n) converges pointwise to f iff, for all $t \in [0,1]$, we have $|f_n(t) - f(t)| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Proposition 11.1.10. There is no norm n on C([0,1]) such that, for every sequence (f_n) and function f in C([0,1]), we have (f_n) converges pointwise to f if and only if (f_n) converges to f under n.

86

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: for a contradiction $\| \|$ is a norm on $\mathcal{C}([0,1])$ such that, for every sequence (f_n) and function f in $\mathcal{C}([0,1])$, we have (f_n) converges pointwise to f if and only if (f_n) converges to f under $\| \|$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, define $g_n \in \mathcal{C}([0,1])$ by

$$g_n(t) = \begin{cases} 2^n t & \text{if } 0 \le t \le 2^{-n} \\ 2 - 2^n t & \text{if } 2^{-n} \le t \le 2^{1-n} \\ 0 & \text{if } 2^{1-n} \le t \le 1 \end{cases}$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. For all n, $||g_n|| \neq 0$

Proof: Axiom 1.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, define $f_n \in \mathcal{C}([0,1])$ by $f_n = g_n/\|g_n\|$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. For all n, $||f_n|| = 1$

Proof: Axiom 2.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. (f_n) does not converge under $\| \|$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 7$. (f_n) converges pointwise to 0.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 8$. This is a contradiction.

Definition 11.1.11 (Equivalence of Norms). Let $\| \|_1$ and $\| \|_2$ be two norms on the same vector space V. Then the norms are *equivalent* if and only if, for any sequence (x_n) in V and $l \in V$, we have that (x_n) converges to l under $\| \|_1$ if and only if (x_n) converges to l under $\| \|_2$.

Theorem 11.1.12. Let $\| \|_1$ and $\| \|_2$ be two norms on the same vector space E over K. Then $\| \|_1$ and $\| \|_2$ are equivalent if and only if there exist positive real numbers α and β such that, for all $x \in E$,

$$\alpha ||x||_1 \le ||x||_2 \le \beta ||x||_1$$
.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If $\| \|_1$ and $\| \|_2$ are equivalent then there exist positive real numbers α and β such that, for all $x \in E$, $\alpha \|x\|_1 \le \|x\|_2 \le \beta \|x\|_1$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: $\| \|_1$ and $\| \|_2$ are equivalent.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. There exists $\alpha > 0$ such that, for all $x \in E$, we have $\alpha ||x||_1 \leq ||x||_2$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Assume: for a contradiction there is no $\alpha > 0$ such that, for all $x \in E$, we have $\alpha ||x||_1 \leq ||x||_2$.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, PICK $x_n \in E$ such that $1/n ||x_n||_1 > ||x||_2$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, Let:

$$y_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{x_n}{\|x_n\|_2}$$

- $\langle 3 \rangle 4$. (y_n) converges to 0 under $\| \|_2$
- $\langle 3 \rangle 5.$ (y_n) converges to 0 under $\| \|_1$
- $\langle 3 \rangle 6$. For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have $||y_n|| > \sqrt{n}$
- $\langle 3 \rangle$ 7. This is a contradiction.
- $\langle 2 \rangle$ 3. There exists $\beta > 0$ such that, for all $x \in E$, we have $||x||_2 \le \beta ||x||_1$ PROOF: Similar.

```
\langle 1 \rangle 2. If there exist positive real numbers \alpha and \beta such that, for all x \in E, \alpha \|x\|_1 \le \|x\|_2 \le \beta \|x\|_1, then \|\cdot\|_1 and \|\cdot\|_2 are equivalent.
```

- $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: α and β are positive reals with $\forall x \in E.\alpha ||x||_1 \leq ||x||_2 \leq \beta ||x||_1$.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let (x_n) be a sequence in E and $l \in E$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. If (x_n) converges to l under $\| \|_1$ then (x_n) converges to l under $\| \|_2$.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Assume: (x_n) converges to l under $\| \|_1$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. PICK N such that $\forall n \geq N . ||x_n l||_1 < \epsilon/\beta$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4. \ \forall n \geq N. ||x_n l||_2 < \epsilon$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. If (x_n) converges to l under $|| ||_2$ then (x_n) converges to l under $|| ||_1$. PROOF: Similar.

Theorem 11.1.13. Any two norms on a finite dimensional vector space are equivalent.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a finite dimensional vector space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Assume: w.l.o.g. dim V > 0
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. PICK a basis $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ for V.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $\| \|_0 : V \to \mathbb{R}$ be the function: $\| \alpha_1 e_1 + \dots + \alpha_n e_n \|_0 = |\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n|$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. $\| \|_0$ is a norm.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. If $||v||_0 = 0$ then v = 0

PROOF: If $|\alpha_1| + \cdots + |\alpha_n| = 0$ then $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_n = 0$ so $\alpha_1 e_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n e_n = 0$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\|\lambda v\|_0 = |\lambda| \|v\|_0$

Proof:

$$\|\lambda(\alpha_1 e_1 + \dots + \alpha_n e_n)\|_0 = \|\lambda \alpha_1 e_1 + \dots + \lambda \alpha_n e_n\|_0$$

$$= |\lambda \alpha_1| + \dots + |\lambda \alpha_n| \qquad (\langle 1 \rangle 4)$$

$$= |\lambda|(|\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n|)$$

$$= |\lambda|\|\alpha_1 e_1 + \dots + \alpha_n e_n\|_0 \qquad (\langle 1 \rangle 4)$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \|u + v\|_0 \le \|u\|_0 + \|v\|_0$

Proof:

$$\|(\alpha_1 e_1 + \dots + \alpha_n e_n) + (\beta_1 e_1 + \dots + \beta_n e_n)\| = |\alpha_1 + \beta_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n + \beta_n|$$

$$\leq |\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n| + |\beta_1| + \dots + |\beta_n|$$

$$= \|\alpha_1 e_1 + \dots + \alpha_n e_n\|_0 + \|\beta_1 e_1 + \dots + \beta_n e_n\|_0$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. Any norm on V is equivalent to $\| \cdot \|_0$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $\| \|$ be any norm on V.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. PICK $\alpha > 0$ such that, for all $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in K$, we have $\|\alpha_1 e_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n e_n\| \ge \alpha(|\alpha_1| + \cdots + |\alpha_n|)$

PROOF: Proposition 11.0.13, $\langle 2 \rangle 1$, $\langle 1 \rangle 3$.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Let: $\beta = \max(\|e_1\|, \dots, \|e_n\|)$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ \beta > 0$

PROOF: e_1, \ldots, e_n cannot all be zero by $\langle 1 \rangle 3$.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. For all $x \in V$ we have $\alpha ||x||_0 \le ||x|| \le \beta ||x||_0$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $x \in V$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. $\alpha ||x||_0 \leq ||x||$

Proof: $\langle 1 \rangle 3$, $\langle 1 \rangle 4$, $\langle 2 \rangle 2$.

 $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. $||x|| \leq \beta ||x||_0$

 $\langle 4 \rangle 1$. Let: $x = \alpha_1 e_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n e_n$

 $\langle 4 \rangle 2$. Q.E.D.

Proof:

$$||x|| = ||\alpha_1 e_1 + \dots + \alpha_n e_n|| \qquad (\langle 4 \rangle 1)$$

$$\leq |\alpha_1| \|e_1\| + \dots + |\alpha_n| \|e_n\| \tag{2}1$$

$$\leq \beta(|\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n|) \tag{(2)3}$$

$$= \beta \|x\|_0 \tag{\langle 1 \rangle 4}$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 6$. Q.E.D.

PROOF: Theorem 11.1.12, $\langle 1 \rangle 5$, $\langle 2 \rangle 1$, $\langle 2 \rangle 2$, $\langle 2 \rangle 4$, $\langle 2 \rangle 5$.

Definition 11.1.14 (Open Ball). Let V be a normed space over K. Let $x \in V$. Let r > 0. The *open ball* with *centre* x and *radius* r is

$$B(x,r) := \{ y \in V \mid ||y - x|| < r \} .$$

Definition 11.1.15 (Closed Ball). Let V be a normed space over K. Let $x \in V$. Let r > 0. The *closed ball* with *centre* x and *radius* r is

$$\overline{B}(x,r) := \{ y \in V \mid ||y - x|| \le r \}$$
.

Definition 11.1.16 (Sphere). Let V be a normed space over K. Let $x \in V$. Let r > 0. The *sphere* with *centre* x and *radius* r is

$$S(x,r) := \{ y \in V \mid ||y - x|| = r \} .$$

Definition 11.1.17 (Open Set). Let V be a normed space over K. A set $S \subseteq V$ is *open* iff, for all $x \in S$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq S$.

Proposition 11.1.18. Equivalent norms define the same set of open sets.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a normed space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $\| \|_1$ and $\| \|_2$ be equivalent norms on V.
- (1)3. PICK reals $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that, for all $x \in V$, we have $\alpha ||x||_1 \le ||x||_2 \le \beta ||x||_1$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $S \subseteq V$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. If S is open under $\| \|_1$ then S is open under $\| \|_2$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: S is open under $\| \|_1$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $x \in S$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Pick $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\{ y \in V \mid ||x y||_1 < \epsilon \} \subseteq S$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. Let: $\delta = \alpha \epsilon$

```
\langle 2 \rangle5. \{ y \in V \mid \|x - y\|_2 < \delta \} \subseteq S
\langle 1 \rangle6. If S is open under \| \ \|_2 then S is open under \| \ \|_1.
PROOF: Similar.
```

Proposition 11.1.19. Every open ball is open.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a normed space over K.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $c \in V$ and r > 0Prove: B(c, r) is open.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $x \in B(c,r)$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $\epsilon = r - ||x - c||$ Prove: $B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq B(c, r)$

 $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. Let: $y \in B(x, \epsilon)$ Prove: $y \in B(c, r)$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \|y - c\| < r$

Proof:

$$\begin{split} \|y-c\| &\leq \|y-x\| + \|x-c\| & \text{(Triangle Inequality)} \\ &< \epsilon + \|x-c\| & \text{($\langle 1 \rangle 5$)} \\ &= r & \text{($\langle 1 \rangle 4$)} \end{split}$$

Proposition 11.1.20. Let Ω be a closed bounded set in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$. Then $U = \{g \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \mid \forall x \in \Omega. g(x) < f(x)\}$ is open.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $g \in U$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $\epsilon = \max_{x \in \Omega} (f(x) - g(x))$ Prove: $B(g, \epsilon) \subseteq S$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \epsilon > 0$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $h \in B(g, \epsilon/2)$

Prove: $h \in S$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. Let: $x \in \Omega$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ h(x) < f(x)$

Proof:

$$h(x) \le g(x) + \epsilon/2 \tag{\langle 1 \rangle 4}$$

$$\langle g(x) + \epsilon \rangle$$
 ($\langle 1 \rangle 3$)

$$\leq f(x)$$
 $(\langle 1 \rangle 2)$

Proposition 11.1.21. Let Ω be a closed bounded set in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$. Then $U = \{g \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \mid \forall x \in \Omega . g(x) > f(x)\}$ is open.

PROOF: Given $g \in U$, let $\epsilon = \max_x (g(x) - f(x))/2$. Then $B(g, \epsilon) \subseteq U$. \square

Proposition 11.1.22. Let Ω be a closed bounded set in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ be such that f(x) > 0 for all $x \in \Omega$. Then $U = \{g \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \mid \forall x \in \Omega. |g(x)| < f(x)\}$ is open.

PROOF: Given $g \in U$, let $\epsilon = \max_x (f(x) - |g(x)|)/2$. Then $B(g, \epsilon) \subseteq U$. \square

Proposition 11.1.23. Let Ω be a closed bounded set in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ be such that f(x) > 0 for all $x \in \Omega$. Then $U = \{g \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \mid \forall x \in \Omega. |g(x)| > f(x)\}$ is open.

PROOF: Given $g \in U$, let $\epsilon = \max_{x} (|g(x)| - f(x))/2$. Then $B(g, \epsilon) \subseteq U$. \square

Proposition 11.1.24. The union of a set of open sets is open.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a normed space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: \mathcal{U} be a set of open sets in V.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{U}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. PICK $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $x \in U$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. Pick $\epsilon > 0$ such that $B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq U$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{U}$

Proposition 11.1.25. The intersection of two open sets is open.

PROOF:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a normed space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: U_1 and U_2 be open sets in V.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $x \in U_1 \cap U_2$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Pick $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that $B(x, \epsilon_1) \subseteq U_1$
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. PICK $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that $B(x, \epsilon_2) \subseteq U_2$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. Let: $\epsilon = \min(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7. \ B(x,\epsilon) \subseteq U_1 \cap U_2$

Proposition 11.1.26. In any normed space, \emptyset is open.

Proof: Vacuous.

Proposition 11.1.27. In any normed space V, the whole space V is open.

PROOF: For any $x \in V$ we have $B(x,1) \subseteq V$. \square

Definition 11.1.28 (Closed Set). Let V be a normed space over K. A set $S \subseteq V$ is *closed* iff V - S is open.

Proposition 11.1.29. Every closed ball is closed.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a normed space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $c \in V$ and r > 0Prove: $\overline{B}(c,r)$ is closed.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $x \in V \overline{B}(c, r)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $\epsilon = ||x c|| r$ Prove: $B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq V - \overline{B}(c, r)$

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle 1 \rangle 5. \ \epsilon > 0 \\ \text{PROOF: Since } \|x-c\| > r \text{ by } \langle 1 \rangle 3. \\ \langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \text{Let: } y \in B(x,\epsilon) \\ \langle 1 \rangle 7. \ \|y-c\| > r \\ \text{PROOF: } \\ \|y-c\| \geq \|x-c\| - \|x-y\| \\ > \|x-c\| - \epsilon \\ = r \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{l} \text{(Triangle Inequality)} \\ \langle 1 \rangle 6 \\ \end{array}$$

Proposition 11.1.30. The intersection of a set of closed sets is closed.

PROOF: From Proposition 11.1.24.

Proposition 11.1.31. The union of two closed sets is closed.

Proof: From Proposition 11.1.25. \square

Proposition 11.1.32. Every sphere is closed.

PROOF: $S(c,r) = \overline{B}(c,r) - B(c,r)$.

Proposition 11.1.33. Let Ω be a closed bounded set in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$. Then $\{g \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \mid \forall x \in \Omega. g(x) \leq f(x)\}$ is closed.

PROOF: It is $\mathcal{C}(\Omega) - \{g \mid \forall x \in \Omega. g(x) > f(x)\}.$

Proposition 11.1.34. Let Ω be a closed bounded set in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$. Then $\{g \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \mid \forall x \in \Omega. g(x) \geq f(x)\}$ is closed.

PROOF: It is $\mathcal{C}(\Omega) - \{g \mid \forall x \in \Omega. g(x) < f(x)\}.$

Proposition 11.1.35. Let Ω be a closed bounded set in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$. Then $\{g \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \mid \forall x \in \Omega. | g(x)| \leq f(x)\}$ is closed.

PROOF: It is $\mathcal{C}(\Omega) - \{g \mid \forall x \in \Omega . |g(x)| > f(x)\}.$

Proposition 11.1.36. Let Ω be a closed bounded set in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$. Then $\{g \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \mid \forall x \in \Omega. | g(x)| \geq f(x)\}$ is closed.

PROOF: It is $C(\Omega) - \{g \mid \forall x \in \Omega . |g(x)| < f(x)\}.$

Proposition 11.1.37. Let Ω be a closed bounded set in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Then $C = \{g \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) \mid g(x_0) = \lambda\}$ is closed.

PROOF: Given $g \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega) - C$, let $\epsilon = |g(x_0) - \lambda|/2$. Then $B(g, \epsilon) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\Omega) - C$. \square

Proposition 11.1.38. In any normed space V, we have \emptyset is closed.

PROOF: Since $V - \emptyset = V$ is open. \square

Proposition 11.1.39. In any normed space V, the whole space V is closed.

PROOF: Since $V - V = \emptyset$ is open. \square

Theorem 11.1.40. Let V be a normed space over K. Let S be a subset of V. Then S is closed if and only if, for any sequence (x_n) in S, if $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$ then $l \in S$.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If S is closed then, for any sequence (x_n) in S, if $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$ then $l \in S$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: S is closed.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: (x_n) be a sequence in S.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Assume: $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. Assume: for a contradiction $l \notin S$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 5. PICK $\epsilon > 0$ such that $B(l, \epsilon) \subseteq V S$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 6$. Pick N such that $\forall n \geq N.x_n \in B(l, \epsilon)$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 7. \ x_N \in V S$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 8$. This contradicts $\langle 2 \rangle 2$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If, for any sequence (x_n) in S, if $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$ then $l \in S$, then S is closed.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: for any sequence (x_n) in S, if $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$ then $l \in S$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $x \in V S$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Assume: for a contradiction there is no $\epsilon > 0$ such that $B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq V S$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, Pick $x_n \in B(x, 1/n) \cap S$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ x_n \to x \text{ as } n \to \infty$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 6. \ x \in S$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 7$. This contradicts $\langle 2 \rangle 2$.

Definition 11.1.41 (Closure). Let V be a normed space over K. Let S be a subset of V. The *closure* of S, $\operatorname{cl} S$, is the intersection of the set of closed sets that include S.

Proposition 11.1.42. Let V be a normed space over K. Let S be a subset of V. Then the closure of S is the smallest closed set that includes S.

Proof: Proposition 11.1.30.

Theorem 11.1.43. Let V be a normed space over K. Let S be a subset of V. Then

$$\operatorname{cl} S = \{ l \in V \mid \exists \ a \ sequence \ (x_n) \ in \ S.x_n \to l \ as \ n \to \infty \} \ .$$

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. For all $l \in \operatorname{cl} S$, there exists a sequence (x_n) in S such that $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $l \in \operatorname{cl} S$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, pick $x_n \in B(l, 1/n) \cap S$

PROOF: There must be such an x_n otherwise S - B(l, 1/n) would be a smaller closed set that includes S.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ x_n \to l \text{ as } n \to \infty$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For any sequence (x_n) in S, if $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$ then $l \in \operatorname{cl} S$.

PROOF: Theorem 11.1.40.

Definition 11.1.44 (Dense). Let V be a normed space over K. Let $S \subseteq V$. Then S is dense if and only if cl S = V.

Theorem 11.1.45 (Weierstrass Approximation Theorem). Let a and b be real numbers with a < b. In C([a,b]), the set of polynomials is dense.

PROOF:TODO

Proposition 11.1.46. *Let* $p \ge 1$. *The set of all sequences that have only finitely* many non-zero terms is dense in l^p .

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $(z_n) \in l^p$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$

PROVE: There exists a sequence (x_n) with only finitely many non-zero terms such that $(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|z_n-x_n|^p)^{1/p}<\epsilon$ $\langle 1\rangle 3$. PICK N such that $|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|z_n|^p-\sum_{n=1}^{N}|z_n|^p|<\epsilon^p$ $\langle 1\rangle 4$. Let: (x_n) be the sequence that agrees with (z_n) up to term N, and then

zeros after that. $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. $(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |z_n - x_n|^p)^{1/p} < \epsilon$

Proof:

$$\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |z_n - x_n|^p\right)^{1/p} = \left(\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} |z_n|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

$$< \epsilon$$

$$(\langle 1 \rangle 4)$$

Theorem 11.1.47. Let V be a normed space over K. Let $S \subseteq V$. Then the following are equivalent.

- 1. S is dense.
- 2. For all $l \in V$, there exists a sequence (x_n) in S such that $x_n \to l$ as
- 3. Every nonempty open subset of V intersects S.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. $1 \Leftrightarrow 2$

PROOF: Theorem 11.1.43.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ 1 \Rightarrow 3$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: S is dense.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: U be a nonempty open subset of V.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. X U does not include S.

```
PROOF: Lest we have \operatorname{cl} S \subseteq X - U. \langle 2 \rangle 4. U intersects S. \langle 1 \rangle 3. 3 \Rightarrow 1 \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: Every nonempty subset of V intersects S. \langle 2 \rangle 2. Every closed proper subset of V does not include S. \langle 2 \rangle 3. \operatorname{cl} S = V
```

Definition 11.1.48 (Compact). Let V be a normed space over K and $S \subseteq V$. Then S is *compact* if and only if every sequence in S has a convergent subsequence whose limit is in S.

Proposition 11.1.49. In K^n , a set is compact if and only if it is bounded and closed.

PROOF: TODO

Definition 11.1.50 (Bounded). Let V be a normed space over K and $S \subseteq V$. Then S is bounded iff there exists r > 0 such that $V \subseteq B(0, r)$.

Theorem 11.1.51. Every compact set is closed and bounded.

```
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Let: V be a normed space over K.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: S \subseteq V be compact.
\langle 1 \rangle 3. S is closed.
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: (x_n) be a sequence in S that converges to l
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. PICK a sequence (x_{n_r}) that converges to x \in S
       Proof: \langle 1 \rangle 2, \langle 2 \rangle 1
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ x_{n_r} \to l \text{ as } n \to \infty
       Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 1, \langle 2 \rangle 2
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ l = x
       Proof: Proposition 11.1.2.
    \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ l \in S
       Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 2, \langle 2 \rangle 4
    \langle 2 \rangle 6. Q.E.D.
       Proof: Theorem 11.1.40.
\langle 1 \rangle 4. S is bounded.
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: for a contradiction S is unbounded.
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. For n \in \mathbb{Z}_+, PICK x_n \in S - B(0, n)
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. Pick a convergent subsequence (x_{n_r}) that converges to l, say.
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. Pick N \in \mathbb{Z}_+ such that ||l|| < N
    \langle 2 \rangle5. PICK r such that n_r > N and ||x_{n_r} - l|| < N - ||l||
    \langle 2 \rangle 6. \|x_{n_r}\| < N < n_r
    \langle 2 \rangle 7. This contradicts \langle 2 \rangle 2.
```

Proposition 11.1.52. In C([0,1]), the closed ball $\overline{B}(0,1)$ is closed and bounded but not compact.

PROOF: The sequence of functions (x^n) is in $\overline{B}(0,1)$ but has no convergent subsequence. \square

Theorem 11.1.53 (Riesz's Lemma). Let V be a normed vector space over K. Let X be a closed proper subspace of V. Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Then there exists $x \in V$ such that ||x|| = 1 and $\forall y \in X. ||x - y|| \ge \epsilon$.

Proof:

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1$$
. Pick $z \in V - X$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 2$$
. Let: $d = \inf_{x \in X} ||z - x||$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ d > 0$$

PROOF: Since X is closed, there exists e > 0 such that $B(z,d) \subseteq V - X$ and hence $||z - x|| \ge d$ for all $x \in X$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. PICK $x_0 \in X$ such that $d \leq ||z - x_0|| \leq d/\epsilon$

PROOF: One exists since d/ϵ is not a lower bound for $\{||z-x|| \mid x \in X\}$.

$$\langle 1 \rangle 5$$
. Let: $x = (z - x_0) / ||z - x_0||$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 6$$
. Let: $y \in X$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 7. \|x - y\| \ge \epsilon$$

Proof:

$$||x - y|| = \left\| \frac{z - x_0}{||z - x_0||} - y \right\|$$

$$= \frac{1}{||z - x_0||} ||z - (x_0 + ||z - x_0||y)||$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{||z - x_0||} d$$

$$\geq \epsilon$$

$$(\langle 1 \rangle 2)$$

$$\geq \epsilon$$

$$(\langle 1 \rangle 4)$$

Theorem 11.1.54. Let V be a normed space over K. Then V is finite dimensional if and only if $\overline{B}(0,1)$ is compact.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If V is finite dimensional then $\overline{B}(0,1)$ is compact.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: V is finite dimensional.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Pick a basis $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Assume: w.l.o.g. $\|\alpha_1 e_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n e_n\| = |\alpha_1| + \cdots + |\alpha_n|$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. Let: $(\alpha_{k1}e_1 + \cdots + \alpha_{kn}e_n)$ be a sequence in $\overline{B}(0,1)$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 5. PICK a convergent subsequence $(\alpha_{k_r 1})$ of (α_{k1}) , a convergent subsequence $(\alpha_{k'_r} 2)$ of $(\alpha_{k_r 2}), \ldots,$ a convergent subsequence $(\alpha_{k''_r} n)$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 6$. $(\alpha_{k_r''1}e_1 + \cdots + \alpha_{k_r''n})$ converges.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If V is infinite dimensional then $\overline{B}(0,1)$ is not compact.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: V is infinite dimensional.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Choose a sequence (x_n) with $||x_n|| = 1$ and $||x_m x_n|| \ge 1/2$ for $m \ne n$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Assume: x_1, \ldots, x_n satisfy $||x_i|| = 1$ and $||x_i x_j|| \ge 1/2$ for $i \ne j$
 - (3)2. PICK $x_{n+1} \in V$ such that $||x_{n+1}|| = 1$ and for all $y \in \text{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ we have $||x_{n+1} y|| \ge 1/2$

```
\langle 4 \rangle 1. span\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} is closed.
              \langle 5 \rangle 1. Let: S = \operatorname{span}\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}
              \langle 5 \rangle 2. Let: (a_n) be a sequence in S that converges to a \in V
                      Prove: a \in S
              \langle 5 \rangle 3. (a_n) is a Cauchy sequence in V.
              \langle 5 \rangle 4. (a_n) is a Cauchy sequence in S.
              \langle 5 \rangle 5. A finite dimensional normed space is a Banach space.
              \langle 5 \rangle 6. S is complete.
              \langle 5 \rangle 7. \ a \in S
          \langle 4 \rangle 2. span\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} is a proper subspace of V.
             Proof: \langle 2 \rangle 1
          \langle 4 \rangle3. Q.E.D.
             Proof: Riesz's Lemma.
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. Assume: for a contradiction (x_{n_r}) is a subsequence that converges to l
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. For all r \in \mathbb{N}, we have ||x_{n_r} - l|| + ||x_{n_{r+1}} - l|| \ge 1/2
    \langle 2 \rangle5. This is a contradiction.
```

Proposition 11.1.55. Let V be a normed space. The closure of a subspace of V is a subspace.

```
Proof:
```

```
\langle 1 \rangle1. Let: U be a subspace of V \langle 1 \rangle2. Let: x, y \in \operatorname{cl} U and \alpha, \beta \in K \langle 1 \rangle3. Pick sequences (x_n), (y_n) in U that converge to x and y respectively. \langle 1 \rangle4. \alpha x_n + \beta y_n \to \alpha x + \beta y as n \to \infty \langle 1 \rangle5. \alpha x + \beta y \in \operatorname{cl} U
```

11.2 Continuous Linear Mappings

Definition 11.2.1 (Continuous). Let U and V be normed spaces. Let $f: U \to V$ and $x \in U$. Then f is continuous at x iff, for any sequence (x_n) in U, if $x_n \to x$ as $n \to \infty$ then $f(x_n) \to f(x)$ as $n \to \infty$. The function f is continuous iff f is continuous at every point.

Proposition 11.2.2. Let V be a normed space. Then the norm is a continuous function $V \to \mathbb{R}$.

Proof: From Proposition 11.0.4. \Box

Proposition 11.2.3. Let U and V be normed space. Let $f: U \to V$. Then the following are equivalent.

- 1. f is continuous.
- 2. For any open set S in V, we have $f^{-1}(S)$ is open in U.

3. For any closed set C in V, we have $f^{-1}(C)$ is closed in U.

Proposition 11.2.4. Let U and V be normed spaces over K. Let $T: U \to V$ be a linear transformation. If T is continuous at some point, then it is continuous.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: T is continuous at u_0
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$ in U
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. $x_n l + u_0 \to u_0$ as $n \to \infty$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. $T(x_n l + u_0) \to T(u_0)$ as $n \to \infty$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. $T(x_n) T(l) + T(u_0) \to T(u_0)$ as $n \to \infty$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ T(x_n) \to T(l) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$

Definition 11.2.5 (Bounded). Let U and V be normed spaces over K. Let $T:U\to V$ be a linear transformation. Then T is bounded iff there exists $\alpha>0$ such that, for all $x\in U$, we have $\|T(x)\|\leq \alpha\|x\|$.

Theorem 11.2.6. Let U and V be normed spaces over K. Let $T: U \to V$ be a linear transformation. Then T is continuous if and only if it is bounded.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If T is continuous then T is bounded.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 1. Assume: T is not bounded.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, PICK $x_n \in U$ such that $||T(x_n)|| > n||x_n||$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, LET:

$$y_n = \frac{x_n}{n||x_n||}$$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ y_n \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. $T(y_n) \not\to 0$ as $n \to \infty$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 6$. T is not continuous.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If T is bounded then T is continuous.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: T is bounded.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. PICK $\alpha > 0$ such that $\forall x \in U ||T(x)|| \leq \alpha ||x||$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. T is continuous at 0.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: (x_n) be a sequence that converges to 0 in U
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. $T(x_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$

Proof:

$$||T(x_n)|| \le \alpha ||x_n||$$
 $(\langle 2 \rangle 2)$
 $\to 0$ as $n \to \infty$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. T is continuous.

Proof: Proposition 11.2.4.

Proposition 11.2.7. Let U and V be normed spaces over K where U is finite dimensional. Let $T: U \to V$ be a linear transformation. Then T is bounded.

Proof:

П

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. PICK a basis $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ of unit vectors for U.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $M = \max(||T(e_1)||, \dots, ||T(e_n)||)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 3. PICK C > 0 such that, for all $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in K$, we have $|\alpha_1| + \cdots + |\alpha_n| \le C \|\alpha_1 e_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n e_n\|$

Proof: Theorem 11.1.13.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $x \in U$

PROVE: $||T(x)|| \le CM||x||$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. Let: $x = \alpha_1 e_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n e_n$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \|T(x)\| \le CM\|x\|$

Proof:

$$||T(x)|| = ||\alpha_1 T(e_1) + \dots + \alpha_n T(e_n)||$$
 (T linear)

$$\leq |\alpha_1||T(e_1)|| + \dots + |\alpha_n||T(e_n)||$$
 (Triangle inequality)

$$\leq M(|\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n|)$$
 (\lambda 1\rangle 2)

$$\leq CM||x||$$
 (\lambda 1\rangle 3)

Corollary 11.2.7.1. Let U and V be normed spaces over K where U is finite dimensional. Let $T: U \to V$ be a linear transformation. Then T is continuous.

Proposition 11.2.8. Let U and V be normed spaces over K. Let $T: U \to V$ be a linear transformation. If T is continuous, then T is uniformly continuous.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: T is continuous
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Pick B > 0 such that $\forall x \in U . ||T(x)|| \leq B||x||$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $\delta = \epsilon/B$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. Let: $x, y \in U$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. Assume: $||x y|| < \delta$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$. $||T(x) T(y)|| < \epsilon$

Proof:

$$||T(x) - T(y)|| = ||T(x - y)||$$

$$\leq B||x - y||$$

$$< B\delta$$

$$= \epsilon$$

$$(\langle 1 \rangle 2)$$

$$(\langle 1 \rangle 6)$$

$$(\langle 1 \rangle 4)$$

Proposition 11.2.9. Let U and V be normed spaces over K. The set $\mathcal{B}(U,V)$ of all bounded linear maps from U to V forms a subspace of the space of all linear maps from U to V.

- (1)1. Let: $S, T : U \to V$ be bounded linear maps and $\alpha, \beta \in K$. Prove: $\alpha S + \beta T$ is bounded.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. PICK B, C > 0 such that $\forall x \in U ||S(x)|| \leq B||x||$ and $||T(x)|| \leq C||x||$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall x \in U. \|(\alpha S + \beta T)(x)\| \le (|\alpha|B + |\beta|C)\|x\|$

Proposition 11.2.10. Let U and V be normed spaces over K. Define the operator norm $\| \|$ on $\mathcal{B}(U,V)$ by $\|T\| := \sup\{\|T(x)\| \mid x \in U, \|x\| = 1\}$. Then $\| \|$ is a norm on $\mathcal{B}(U,V)$.

Proof:

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. For all T \in \mathcal{B}(U, V), the set \{ ||T(x)|| \mid x \in U, ||x|| = 1 \} is bounded above.
```

$$\langle 2 \rangle 1$$
. Let: $T \in \mathcal{B}(U, V)$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2$$
. PICK B such that $\forall x \in U . ||T(x)|| \leq B||x||$.

$$\langle 2 \rangle 3$$
. B is an upper bound for $\{ ||T(x)|| \mid x \in U, ||x|| = 1 \}$.

$$\langle 1 \rangle 2$$
. If $||T|| = 0$ then $T = 0$.

$$\langle 2 \rangle 1$$
. Assume: $||T|| = 0$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2$$
. Let: $x \in U$

PROVE:
$$T(x) = 0$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 3$$
. Assume: w.l.o.g. $||x|| \neq 0$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 4$$
. Let: $y = x/||x||$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 5$$
. $||y|| = 1$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 6$$
. $||T(y)|| = 0$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 7$$
. $T(y) = 0$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 8. \ T(x) = 0$$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 3$$
. For all $\lambda \in K$ and $T \in \mathcal{B}(U,V)$, we have $\|\lambda T\| = |\lambda| \|T\|$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 1$$
. Let: $\lambda \in K$ and $T \in \mathcal{B}(U, V)$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2$$
. $||\lambda T|| = |\lambda|||T||$

Proof:

$$\begin{split} \|\lambda T\| &= \sup\{\|\lambda T(x)\| \mid x \in U, \|x\| = 1\} \\ &= \sup\{|\lambda| \|T(x)\| \mid x \in U, \|x\| = 1\} \\ &= |\lambda| \sup\{\|T(x)\| \mid x \in U, \|x\| = 1\} \\ &= |\lambda| \|T\| \end{split}$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. For all $S, T \in \mathcal{B}(U, V)$, we have $||S + T|| \le ||S|| + ||T||$.

$$\langle 2 \rangle 1$$
. Let: $S, T \in \mathcal{B}(U, V)$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2. \ \|S + T\| \le \|S\| + \|T\|$$

Proof:

$$\begin{split} \|S+T\| &= \sup\{\|S(x)+T(x)\| \mid x \in U, \|x\| = 1\} \\ &\leq \sup\{\|S(x)\| + \|T(x)\| \mid x \in U, \|x\| = 1\} \\ &\leq \sup\{\|S(x)\| \mid x \in U, \|x\| = 1\} + \sup\{\|T(x)\| \mid x \in U, \|x\| = 1\} \\ &= \|S\| + \|T\| \end{split}$$

Proposition 11.2.11. Let U and V be normed spaces. Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(U,V)$. Then ||T|| is the least number such that $\forall u \in U. ||T(u)|| \le ||T|| ||u||$.

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \forall u \in U. ||T(u)|| \le ||T|| ||u||$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 1$$
. Let: $u \in U$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2$$
. Let: $v = u/||u||$

```
 \begin{array}{l} \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \|T(v)\| \leq \|T\| \\ \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ \|T(u)\| \leq \|T\| \|u\| \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \text{If } \alpha \ \text{satisfies} \ \forall u \in U. \|T(u)\| \leq \alpha \|u\|, \ \text{then} \ \|T\| \leq \alpha \\ \langle 2 \rangle 1. \ \text{Assume:} \ \forall u \in U. \|T(u)\| \leq \alpha \|u\| \\ \langle 2 \rangle 2. \ \text{For all} \ x \in U, \ \text{if} \ \|x\| = 1 \ \text{then} \ \|T(x)\| \leq \alpha \\ \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \|T\| \leq \alpha \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \end{array}
```

Proposition 11.2.12. Let V be a normed space. Then id_V is a bounded linear function $V \to V$, and $\|id_V\| = 1$.

Proposition 11.2.13. Let U and V be normed spaces. The constant zero function $U \to V$ is a bounded linear transformation with norm 0.

Proposition 11.2.14. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $T : \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}^N$ be a linear transformation with matrix $A = (a_{ij})$. Then T is bounded and

$$||T|| \le \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} |a_{ij}|^2}$$
.

Definition 11.2.15 (Uniform Convergence). Let U and V be normed spaces. Let (T_n) be a sequence in $\mathcal{B}(U,V)$ and $T \in \mathcal{B}(U,V)$. Then (T_n) converges uniformly to T iff (T_n) converges to T under the standard norm defined above.

Theorem 11.2.16. Let U and V be normed spaces. Let $T: U \to V$ be a continuous linear function. Then $\ker T$ is a closed subspace of U.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. ker T is a subspace of U

PROOF: If $x, y \in \ker T$ and $\alpha, \beta \in K$ then $T(\alpha x + \beta y) = \alpha T(x) + \beta T(y) = 0$. $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $\ker T$ is closed.

PROOF: Let (x_n) be a sequence in ker T and $x_n \to l$. Then $T(l) = \lim_{n \to \infty} T(x_n) = 0$.

Theorem 11.2.17. Let U and V be normed spaces. Let W be a closed subspace of U and $T: W \to V$ be a continuous linear mapping. Then the graph $G = \{(x, T(x)) \mid x \in W\}$ is closed in $U \times V$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: w.l.o.g. $T \neq 0$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $(x,y) \in (U \times V) G$, i.e. $y \neq T(x)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $\epsilon = ||y T(x)|| > 0$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $x' \in W$ with $||x x'|| < \epsilon/3||T||$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. Let: $y' \in V$ with $||y y'|| < \epsilon/3$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ y' \neq T(x')$

Proof:

$$||y' - T(x')|| \ge ||y - T(x)|| - ||y - y'|| - ||T(x) - T(x')||$$

> $\epsilon/3$
> 0

Theorem 11.2.18 (Diagonal Theorem). Let E be a normed space over K. Let (x_{ij}) be an infinite matrix of elements of V. If:

- 1. For all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have $x_{ij} \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$;
- 2. Every increasing sequence of positive integers (p_j) has a subsequence (p_{j_r}) such that

$$\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} x_{p_{j_r}p_{j_s}} \to 0 \text{ as } r \to \infty$$

then $x_{ii} \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: for a contradiction $x_{ii} \not\to 0$ as $i \to \infty$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. PICK $\epsilon > 0$ such that, for all N, there exists $n \geq N$ such that $||x_{nn}|| \geq \epsilon$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. PICK an increasing sequence of integers (p_j) such that $||x_{p_jp_j}|| \geq \epsilon$ for all j.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. PICK a subsequence (q_i) such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_{q_i q_j} \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. For all i, we have $x_{q_i q_j} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$ $\langle 1 \rangle$ 6. For all j, we have $x_{q_i q_j} \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$. Define a subsequence (r_n) of (q_i) by $r_1 = q_1$ and, for all n, r_{n+1} is the first entry such that $r_{n+1} > r_n$, $||x_{q_i r_n}|| < \epsilon/2^{n+1}$ for all $q_i \ge r_{n+1}$, and $||x_{r_j r_{n+1}}|| < \epsilon/2^{n+2}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 8$. $||x_{r_i r_j}|| < \epsilon/2^{j+1}$ for all i, j such that $i \neq j$ $\langle 1 \rangle 9$. PICK a subsequence (s_j) of (r_j) such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_{s_i s_j} \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$ $\langle 1 \rangle 10$. For all i we have $||\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_{s_i s_j}|| \geq \epsilon/2$

Proof

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_{s_{i}s_{j}} \right\| = \left\| x_{s_{i}s_{i}} + \sum_{i \neq j} x_{s_{i}s_{j}} \right\|$$

$$\geq \left\| \|x_{s_{i}s_{i}}\| - \left\| \sum_{i \neq j} x_{s_{i}s_{j}} \right\| \right\|$$

$$\geq \left\| \|x_{s_{i}s_{i}}\| - \sum_{i \neq j} \|x_{s_{i}s_{j}}\| \right\|$$

$$\geq \epsilon/2 \qquad (\langle 1 \rangle 2, \langle 1 \rangle 8)$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 11$. Q.E.D.

PROOF: $\langle 1 \rangle 9$ and $\langle 1 \rangle 10$ form a contradiction.

11.3 Banach Spaces

Definition 11.3.1 (Cauchy Sequence). Let V be a normed space over K. A Cauchy sequence is a sequence of points (x_n) such that, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists N such that $\forall m, n \geq N . ||x_m - x_n|| < \epsilon$.

Theorem 11.3.2. Let V be a normed space over K. Let (x_n) be a sequence in V. The following are equivalent.

- 1. (x_n) is Cauchy.
- 2. For every pair of increasing sequences of positive integers (p_n) and (q_n) , we have $||x_{p_n} x_{q_n}|| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.
- 3. For every increasing sequence of positive integers (p_n) , we have $||x_{p_n} x_n|| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ 1 \Rightarrow 2$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: (x_n) is Cauchy.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: (p_n) and (q_n) are increasing sequences of positive integers.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. PICK N such that $\forall m, n \geq N . ||x_m x_n|| < \epsilon$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 5. $\forall n \geq N. ||x_{p_n} x_{q_n}|| < \epsilon$ PROOF: Since $p_n, q_n \geq n \geq N$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $2 \Rightarrow 3$

PROOF: Trivial.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ 2 \Rightarrow 1$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: (x_n) is not Cauchy
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Pick $\epsilon > 0$ such that, for every $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, there exist $m_N, n_N \geq N$ such that $||x_{m_N} x_{n_N}|| \geq \epsilon$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Assume: w.l.o.g. (m_N) and (n_N) are increasing sequences.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $||x_{m_N} x_{n_N}|| \not\to 0$ as $N \to \infty$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ 3 \Rightarrow 2$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: 3
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: (p_n) and (q_n) be increasing sequences of positive integers.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
 - $\langle 2\rangle 4.$ Pick N such that $\forall n\geq N.\|x_{p_n}-x_n\|<\epsilon/2$ and $\forall n\geq N.\|x_{q_n}-x_n\|<\epsilon/2$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ \forall n \ge N. \|x_{p_n} x_{q_n}\| < \epsilon$

Proposition 11.3.3. Every convergent sequence is Cauchy.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: $x_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. PICK N such that $\forall n \geq N . ||x_n l|| < \epsilon/2$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. For all $m, n \geq N$ we have $||x_m - x_n|| < \epsilon$.

Proposition 11.3.4. In $\mathcal{P}([0,1])$, let

$$P_n(x) = 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{2} + \dots + \frac{x^n}{n!}$$
.

Then (P_n) is Cauchy but does not converge.

PROOF: It converges to e^x in $\mathcal{C}([0,1])$, therefore it is Cauchy in $\mathcal{C}([0,1])$, hence Cauchy in $\mathcal{P}([0,1])$. Since $e^x \notin \mathcal{P}([0,1])$, it does not converge in that space. \sqcup

Proposition 11.3.5. Let V be a normed space over K. Let (x_n) be a Cauchy sequence in V. Then $(\|x_n\|)$ converges in \mathbb{R} .

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. ($||x_n||$) is Cauchy.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. PICK N such that $\forall m, n \geq N . ||x_m x_n|| < \epsilon$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \forall m, n \geq N. ||x_m|| ||x_n||| < \epsilon$

Proof: Proposition 11.0.4.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Q.E.D.

PROOF: Since every Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{R} converges.

Proposition 11.3.6. Every Cauchy sequence is bounded.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a normed space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: (x_n) be a Cauchy sequence in V.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. PICK N such that $\forall m, n \geq N . ||x_m x_n|| < 1$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: $B = \max(\|x_1\|, \dots, \|x_{N-1}\|, \|x_N\| + 1)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ \forall n. ||x_n|| \le B$

Definition 11.3.7 (Banach Space). A normed space V over K is complete or a Banach space iff every Cauchy sequence converges.

Proposition 11.3.8. l^2 is complete.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: (a_n) be a Cauchy sequence in l^2 where $a_n = (\alpha_{n1}, \alpha_{n2}, \ldots)$. $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\forall m, n \geq n_0$. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_{mk} \alpha_{mk}| = 1$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\forall m, n \geq 1$ $n_0.|\alpha_{mk}-\alpha_{nk}|<\epsilon.$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, (α_{nk}) is Cauchy in \mathbb{C} .
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, (α_{nk}) converges in \mathbb{C} .
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

```
Let: \alpha_k = \lim_{n \to \infty} \alpha_{nk}
\langle 1 \rangle 7. Let a be the sequence (\alpha_k)
(1)8. For all \epsilon > 0, there exists n_0 such that \forall n \geq n_0. \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_k - \alpha_{nk}|^2 \leq \epsilon^2.
   PROOF: Letting m \to \infty in \langle 1 \rangle 2.
\langle 1 \rangle 9. \ a \in l^2
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. PICK n_0 such that \forall n \geq n_0. \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_k - \alpha_{nk}|^2 \leq 1
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. \ (\alpha_k - \alpha_{n_0 k}) \in l^2
\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ (\alpha_{n_0 k}) \in l^2
       PROOF: By \langle 1 \rangle 1 since the sequence is a_{n_0}.
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ (\alpha_k) \in l^2
       Proof: Proposition 9.0.2.
\langle 1 \rangle 10. \ a_n \to a \text{ as } n \to \infty
   PROOF: By \langle 1 \rangle 8 since ||a - a_n|| = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_k - \alpha_{nk}|^2}.
Proposition 11.3.9. Let a and b be real numbers with a < b. The space C([a,b])
is complete.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Let: X = [a, b]
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: (f_n) be a Cauchy sequence in \mathcal{C}([a,b]).
\langle 1 \rangle 3. For all \epsilon > 0, there exists n_0 such that \forall n, m \geq n_0 . ||f_n - f_m|| < \epsilon.
\langle 1 \rangle 4. For all \epsilon > 0, there exists n_0 such that \forall n, m \geq n_0 . \forall x \in X. | f_n(x) - f_n(x)| = 0
          |f_m(x)| < \epsilon.
\langle 1 \rangle 5. For all x \in [a, b], (f_n(x)) is Cauchy.
\langle 1 \rangle 6. Define f: [a,b] \to \mathbb{C} by f(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} f_n(x).
\langle 1 \rangle 7. For all \epsilon > 0, there exists n_0 such that \forall n \geq n_0 . \forall x \in X . |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon
   PROOF: Letting m \to \infty in \langle 1 \rangle 4.
\langle 1 \rangle 8. f is continuous
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: x_0 \in X
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. Let: \epsilon > 0
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. PICK n_0 such that \forall n \geq n_0 . \forall x \in X . |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon/3
       Proof: By \langle 1 \rangle 7.
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. Pick \delta > 0 such that \forall x \in X | |x - x_0| < \delta \Rightarrow |f_{n_0}(x) - f_{n_0}(x_0)| < \epsilon/3
       PROOF: Since f_{n_0} is continuous.
    \langle 2 \rangle 5. Let: x \in X
    \langle 2 \rangle 6. Assume: |x - x_0| < \delta
    \langle 2 \rangle 7. |f(x) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon
       Proof:
       |f(x) - f(x_0)| \le |f(x) - f_{n_0}(x)| + |f_{n_0}(x) - f_{n_0}(x_0)| + |f_{n_0}(x_0) - f(x_0)| (Triangle Inequality)
                                 <\epsilon/3+\epsilon/3+\epsilon/3
                                                                                                                                                       (\langle 2 \rangle 3, \langle 2 \rangle 4)
\langle 1 \rangle 9. (f_n) converges to f uniformly.
    Proof: From \langle 1 \rangle 7
```

Definition 11.3.10 (Series). Let V be a normed space over K. A convergent series in V is a sequence (x_n) in V such that $(x_1 + \cdots + x_n)$ is a convergent sequence, in which case we write $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ for its limit.

Definition 11.3.11 (Absolutely Convergent Series). Let V be a normed space over K. An absolutely convergent series in V is a sequence (x_n) such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x_n\| < \infty.$

Proposition 11.3.12. In $\mathcal{P}([0,1])$, the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n/n!$ is absolutely convergent but not convergent.

Proof: Proposition 11.3.4.

Theorem 11.3.13. A normed space is complete if and only if every absolutely convergent series is convergent.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a normed space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If V is complete then every absolutely convergent series is convergent.

 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: V is complete. $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ be absolutely convergent in V. $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, Let: $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. (s_n) is Cauchy.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle$ 2. PICK k such that $\sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} ||a_n|| < \epsilon$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. Let: m > n > k
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4$. $||s_m s_n|| < \epsilon$

$$||s_m - s_n|| = \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^m a_i \right\|$$
 (\langle 2\rangle 3, \langle 3\rangle 3)
$$\leq \sum_{i=s+1}^m ||a_i||$$
 (Triangle inequality)
$$\leq \sum_{i=k+1}^\infty ||a_i||$$

$$< \epsilon$$
 (\langle 3\rangle 2, \langle 3\rangle 3)

- $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. (s_n) converges.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. If every absolutely convergent series is convergent then V is complete.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: Every absolutely convergent series in V is convergent.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: (a_n) be a Cauchy sequence in V.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. PICK a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers (p_n) such that $\forall k. \forall m, n \ge p_k. ||x_m - x_n|| < 2^{-k}.$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (x_{p_{k+1}} x_{p_k})$ is absolutely convergent.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|x_{p_{k+1}} - x_{p_k}\| < \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-k}$$
 (\langle 2\rangle 3)

$$\langle 2 \rangle 5$$
. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (x_{p_{k+1}} - x_{p_k})$ is convergent. PROOF: $\langle 2 \rangle 1$, $\langle 2 \rangle 5$

$$(2)6$$
. Let: $s = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (x_{n_{k+1}} - x_{n_k})$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 7$$
. $x_{n_k} \to s + x_{n_k}$ as $k \to \infty$.

PROOF:
$$\langle 2 \rangle 1$$
, $\langle 2 \rangle 3$
 $\langle 2 \rangle 6$. Let: $s = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (x_{p_{k+1}} - x_{p_k})$
 $\langle 2 \rangle 7$. $x_{p_k} \to s + x_{p_1}$ as $k \to \infty$.
 $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. $\sum_{i=1}^{k} (x_{p_{i+1}} - x_{p_i}) \to s$ as $k \to \infty$
PROOF: $\langle 2 \rangle 6$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 2$$
. $x_{p_{k+1}} - x_{p_1} \to s \text{ as } k \to \infty$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 8. \ x_n \to s + x_{p_1} \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

Proof:

 $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. PICK N such that $\forall k \geq N . ||x_{p_k} - (s + x_{p_1})|| < \epsilon/2$ and $\forall m, n \geq 1$ $N.||x_m - x_n|| < \epsilon/2$

Proof: $\langle 2 \rangle 2$, $\langle 2 \rangle 7$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ \forall n \ge N. ||x_n - (s + x_{p_1})|| < \epsilon$$

Theorem 11.3.14. A closed vector subspace of a Banach space is a Banach space.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a Banach space over K.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: U be a closed vector subspace of V.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: (a_n) be a Cauchy sequence in U.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. (a_n) is a Cauchy sequence in V.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. Let: $l = \lim_{n \to \infty} a_n$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ l \in U$

PROOF: Theorem 11.1.40.

$$\langle 1 \rangle 7$$
. $a_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$ in U .

Definition 11.3.15 (Completion). Let V be a normed space over K. A completion of V consists of a normed space W over K and an injection $\phi: V \to W$ such that:

1.
$$\forall x, y \in V. \forall \alpha, \beta \in K. \phi(\alpha x + \beta y) = \alpha \phi(x) + \beta \phi(y)$$

2.
$$\forall x \in V || \phi(x) || = ||x||$$

- 3. $\phi(V)$ is dense in W.
- 4. W is complete.

Proposition 11.3.16. Every normed space has a completion.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: V be a normed space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let us say two Cauchy sequences (x_n) , (y_n) ore equivalent iff $x_n y_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Equivalence is an equivalence relation on the set of Cauchy sequences.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. Let: W be the set of Cauchy sequences in V quotiented by equivalence.
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. Define addition and multiplication on W by

$$[(x_n)] + [(y_n)] = [(x_n + y_n)]$$

 $\lambda[(x_n)] = [(\lambda x_n)]$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. Define a norm on W by $||[(x_n)]|| = \lim_{n \to \infty} ||x_n||$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$. Define $\phi : V \to W$ by $\phi(v) = [(v)]$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 8$. ϕ is injective.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 9. \ \forall x, y \in V. \forall \alpha, \beta \in K. \phi(\alpha x + \beta y) = \alpha \phi(x) + \beta \phi(y)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 10. \ \forall x \in V. \| \phi(x) \| = \| x \|$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 11$. $\phi(V)$ is dense in W.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $[(a_n)] \in W$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

PROVE: $B([(a_n)], \epsilon)$ intersects $\phi(V)$.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. PICK N such that $\forall m, n \geq N . ||a_m a_n|| < \epsilon/2$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \phi(a_N) \in B([(a_n)], \epsilon)$

Proof:

$$\|[(a_n)] - \phi(a_N)\| = \lim_{n \to \infty} \|a_n - a_N\|$$

$$\leq \epsilon/2$$

$$< \epsilon$$

$$(\langle 2 \rangle 2)$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 12$. W is complete.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: (X_n) be a Cauchy sequence in W.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, PICK $x_n \in V$ such that

$$\|\phi(x_n) - X_n\| < 1/n$$
.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. (x_n) is Cauchy in V.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. PICK N such that $\forall m, n \geq N . ||X_n X_m|| < \epsilon/3$ and $1/N < \epsilon/3$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. Let: $m, n \geq N$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4$. $||x_m x_n|| < \epsilon$

Proof:

$$||x_m - x_n|| = ||\phi(x_m) - \phi(x_n)||$$

$$\leq ||\phi(x_m) - X_m|| + ||X_m - X_n|| + ||X_n - \phi(x_n)||$$

$$< ||X_m - X_n|| + 1/m + 1/n$$

$$< \epsilon$$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. Let: $X = [(x_n)]$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ X_n \to X \text{ as } n \to \infty$

$$||X_n - X|| \le ||X_n - \phi(x_n)|| + ||\phi(x_n) - X||$$

 $< ||\phi(x_n) - X|| + 1/n$
 $\to 0$ as $n \to \infty$

Proposition 11.3.17. Let U be a normed space and V a Banach space. Then $\mathcal{B}(U,V)$ is a Banach space.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: (T_n) be a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{B}(U,V)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For all $u \in U$, $(T_n(u))$ is a Cauchy sequence in V.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $u \in U$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$

PROVE:
$$\exists N. \forall m, n \geq N. ||T_m(u) - T_n(u)|| < \epsilon$$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Assume: w.l.o.g. $u \neq 0$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. PICK N such that $\forall m, n \geq N . ||T_m T_n|| < \epsilon / ||u||$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. Let: $m, n \geq N$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 6. \|T_m(u) T_n(u)\| < \epsilon$

Proof:

$$||T_m(u) - T_n(u)|| \le ||T_m - T_n|| ||u||$$
 (Proposition 11.2.11)

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Define $T: U \to V$ by $T(u) = \lim_{n \to \infty} T_n(u)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ T \in \mathcal{B}(U, V)$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. For all $x, y \in U$ and $\alpha, \beta \in K$ we have $T(\alpha x + \beta y) = \alpha T(x) + \beta T(y)$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $x, y \in U$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Let: $\alpha, \beta \in K$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. $T(\alpha x + \beta y) = \alpha T(x) + \beta T(y)$

Proof:

$$T(\alpha x + \beta y) = \lim_{n \to \infty} T_n(\alpha x + \beta y)$$
$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} (\alpha T_n(x) + \beta T_n(y))$$
$$= \alpha T(x) + \beta T(y)$$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. T is bounded.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. PICK N such that $\forall n \geq N . ||T_n T|| < 1$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Pick B > 0 such that $\forall x \in U . ||T_N(x)|| \leq B||x||$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. Let: $x \in U$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4. \ \|T(x)\| \le (B+1)\|x\|$

Proof:

$$||T(x)|| \le ||T_N(x) - T(x)|| + ||T(x)||$$
 (Triangle inequality)
 $\le ||T_N - T|| ||x|| + ||T|| ||x||$ (Proposition 11.2.11)
 $< ||x|| + B||x||$ ($\langle 3 \rangle 1, \langle 3 \rangle 2$)
 $= (B+1)||x||$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ T_n \to T \text{ as } n \to \infty$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Pick N such that $\forall m, n \geq N . ||T_m T_n|| < \epsilon/2$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Let: $n \geq N$ Prove: $||T_n - T|| < \epsilon$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. Let: $x \in U$ with ||x|| = 1
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. $||T_n(x) T(x)|| < \epsilon/2$

PROOF: Let $n \to \infty$ in $\langle 2 \rangle 2$.

Corollary 11.3.17.1. For any normed space V over K, the space $\mathcal{B}(V,K)$ is a Banach space.

Theorem 11.3.18. Let U be a normed space and V a Banach space. Let W be a subspace of U. Let $T:W\to V$ be a continuous linear transformation. Then T has a unique extension to a continuous linear transformation $\operatorname{cl} W\to V$.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Define $S: \operatorname{cl} W \to V$ by: $S(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} T(x_n)$, where (x_n) is any sequence in W that converges to x.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. For all $x \in \operatorname{cl} W$, there exists a sequence (x_n) in W that converges to x. PROOF: Theorem 11.1.43.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. If (x_n) is a Cauchy sequence in W then $(T(x_n))$ is Cauchy in V.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Assume: w.l.o.g. $T \neq 0$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Let: (x_n) be a Cauchy sequence in W.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. Pick B > 0 such that $\forall x \in W . ||T(x)|| \leq B||x||$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle$ 5. PICK N such that $\forall m, n \geq N . ||x_m x_n|| < \epsilon / ||T||$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 6$. Let: $m, n \geq N$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 7. \|T(x_m) T(x_n)\| < \epsilon$
 - (2)3. If (x_n) and (y_n) are sequences in W that converge to the same element in cl W then $(T(x_n))$ and $(T(y_n))$ have the same limit in V.
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Assume: w.l.o.g. $T \neq 0$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$. Assume: $x_n \to l$ and $y_n \to l$ as $n \to \infty$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$. Let: $T(x_n) \to a$ and $T(y_n) \to b$ as $n \to \infty$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 4$. Assume: for a contradiction $a \neq b$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 5$. Let: $\epsilon = ||a b||$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 6$. Pick N such that $\forall n \geq N. \|x_n l\| < \epsilon/3 \|T\|$ and $\forall n \geq N. \|y_n l\| < \epsilon/3 \|T\|$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 7. \ \forall n \geq N. ||T(x_n) T(y_n)|| < 2\epsilon/3$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 8. \ \|a b\| \le 2\epsilon/3$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 9$. This contradicts $\langle 3 \rangle 5$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. S extends T
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $w \in W$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $w \to w$ as $n \to \infty$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $T(w) \to T(w)$ as $n \to \infty$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. S(w) = T(w)
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. S is bounded.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $x \in \operatorname{cl} W$

PROVE: $||S(x)|| \le ||T|| ||x||$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. PICK a sequence (x_n) in W that converges to x.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $||T(x_n)|| \le ||T|| ||x_n||$ for all n.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ \| S(x) \| \le \| T \| \| x \|$

PROOF: Taking the limit as $n \to \infty$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. S is linear.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $x, y \in \operatorname{cl} W$ and $\alpha, \beta \in K$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. PICK sequences (x_n) and (y_n) in W that converge to x and y.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $T(\alpha x_n + \beta y_n) = \alpha T(x_n) + \beta T(y_n)$ for all n.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $S(\alpha x + \beta y) = \alpha S(x) + \beta S(y)$

PROOF: Taking the limit as $n \to \infty$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. S is unique.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: S' be a continuous linear extension of S defined on cl W.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $x \in W$ Prove: S(x) = S'(x)
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. PICK a sequence (x_n) in W that converges to x.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $T(x_n) = S'(x_n) \to S'(x)$ as $n \to \infty$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ S'(x) = S(x)$

Corollary 11.3.18.1. Let U be a normed space and V a Banach space. Let W be a dense subspace of U. Let $T:W\to V$ be a continuous linear transformation. Then T has a unique extension to a continuous linear transformation $U\to V$.

Definition 11.3.19 (Functional). Let V be a normed space over K. A functional on V is a bounded linear mapping $V \to K$. The dual space of V is the space $\mathcal{B}(V,K)$ of all functionals.

Theorem 11.3.20 (Banach-Steinhaus Theorem). Let \mathcal{T} be a family of bounded linear mappings from a Banach space X into a normed space Y. If, for every $x \in X$, there exists a constant M_x such that $\forall T \in \mathcal{T}. ||T(x)|| \leq M_x$, then there exists a constant M > 0 such that $\forall T \in \mathcal{T}. ||T|| \leq M$.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: for a contradiction no such M exists.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, PICK $T_n \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $||T_n|| > n2^n$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, PICK $x_n \in X$ such that $||x_n|| = 1$ and $||T_n(x_n)|| > n2^n$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} T_n \left(\frac{x_n}{2^n} \right) \right\| > 1 .$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. For $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, LET: $y_{ij} = \frac{1}{i} T_i(\frac{x_j}{2^j})$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. For all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $y_{ij} \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Pick M such that $\forall T \in \mathcal{T} . ||T(x_i/2^j)|| \leq M$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. For all $i, ||y_{ij}|| \leq M/i$
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 7. For any increasing sequence of positive integers (p_i) , we have $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_{p_i p_j} \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: (p_i) be an increasing sequence of positive integers.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $z = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_{p_j}/2^{p_j}$

PROOF: This converges by Theorem 11.3.13.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. PICK C such that $\forall T \in \mathcal{T} . ||T(z)|| \leq C$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. For all i, $\|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_{p_i p_j}\| \leq C/p_i$.

PROOF:
$$\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}y_{p_{i}p_{j}}\right\| = \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{p_{i}}T_{p_{i}}\left(\frac{x_{p_{j}}}{2^{p_{j}}}\right)\right\| \qquad (\langle 1\rangle 5)$$

$$= \frac{1}{p_{i}}\left\|T_{p_{i}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{x_{p_{j}}}{2^{p_{j}}}\right)\right\| \qquad (T_{p_{i}} \text{ continuous})$$

$$= \frac{1}{p_{i}}\left\|T_{p_{i}}(z)\right\| \qquad (\langle 2\rangle 2)$$

$$\leq \frac{C}{p_{i}} \qquad (\langle 2\rangle 5. \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}y_{p_{i}p_{j}} \to 0 \text{ as } i \to \infty$$

$$\langle 2\rangle 5. \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}y_{p_{i}p_{j}} \to 0 \text{ as } i \to \infty$$

$$\langle 1\rangle 8. \ y_{ii} \to 0 \text{ as } i \to \infty$$

$$\text{PROOF: Diagonal Theorem, } \langle 1\rangle 6, \langle 1\rangle 7.$$

$$\langle 1\rangle 9. \ \text{Q.E.D.}$$

11.4 Contraction Mappings

PROOF: $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ and $\langle 1 \rangle 8$ form a contradiction.

Definition 11.4.1 (Contraction Mapping). Let E be a normed space over K. Let $A \subseteq E$. A function $f: A \to E$ is a contraction (mapping) iff there exists a real α such that $0 < \alpha < 1$ and

$$\forall x, y \in A. ||f(x) - f(y)|| \le \alpha ||x - y||.$$

Proposition 11.4.2. Contraction mappings are uniformly continuous.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: E be a normed space over K.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $A \subseteq E$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $f: A \to E$ be a contraction mapping.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. PICK α such that $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\forall x, y \in A . || f(x) f(y) || \le \alpha || x y ||$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. Let: $\delta = \epsilon / \alpha$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$. For all $x, y \in A$, if $||x y|| < \delta$ then $||f(x) f(y)|| < \epsilon$.

Theorem 11.4.3 (Banach Fixed Point Theorem). Let E be a Banach space over K. Let F be a nonempty closed subset of E. Let $f: F \to F$ be a contraction mapping. Then there exists a unique $z \in F$ such that f(z) = z.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. PICK α such that $0 < \alpha < 1$ and

$$\forall x, y \in F. ||f(x) - f(y)|| \le \alpha ||x - y||.$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Pick $x_0 \in F$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 3$$
. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,
LET: $x_n = f^n(x_0)$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. (x_n) is a Cauchy sequence.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we have $||x_{n+1} x_n|| \le \alpha^n ||x_1 x_0||$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ with m < n we have $||x_n x_m|| < \alpha^m ||x_1 x_0||/(1-\alpha)$.

$$||x_{n} - x_{m}|| \le ||x_{n} - x_{n-1}|| + ||x_{n-1} - x_{n-2}|| + \dots + ||x_{m+1} - x_{m}|| \quad \text{(Triangle inequality)}$$

$$\le (\alpha^{n-1} + \alpha^{n-2} + \dots + \alpha^{m}) ||x_{1} - x_{0}||$$

$$< \frac{||x_{1} - x_{0}||}{1 - \alpha} \alpha^{m}$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 3. \text{ Let: } \epsilon > 0$$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. PICK N such that $\alpha^N ||x_1 x_0||/(1 \alpha) < \epsilon$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. For all $m, n \geq N$, we have $||x_n x_m|| < \epsilon$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. Let: $z = \lim_{n \to \infty} x_n$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ f(z) = z$

Proof:

$$f(z) = f\left(\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n\right)$$

$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} f(x_n)$$
 (Proposition 11.4.2)
$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} x_{n+1}$$

$$= z$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$. For any $w \in F$, if f(w) = w then w = z.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $w \in F$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: f(w) = w
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \|z w\| \le \alpha \|z w\|$

PROOF: $||z - w|| = ||f(z) - f(w)|| \le \alpha ||z - w||$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ \|z w\| = 0$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ z = w$

Chapter 12

Inner Product Spaces

Definition 12.0.1 (Inner Product Space). Let E be a complex vector space. An *inner product* on E is a function $\langle \ , \ \rangle : E^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ such that, for all $x,y,z \in E$ and $\alpha,\beta \in \mathbb{C}$, we have:

- 1. $\langle x, y \rangle = \overline{\langle y, x \rangle}$
- 2. $\langle \alpha x + \beta y, z \rangle = \alpha \langle x, z \rangle + \beta \langle y, z \rangle$
- 3. $\langle x, x \rangle \geq 0$
- 4. If $\langle x, x \rangle = 0$ then x = 0

An inner product space consists of a complex vector space V and an inner product on V.

Proposition 12.0.2. *Let* E *be an inner product space. For any* $x \in E$ *, we have* $\langle x, x \rangle$ *is real.*

Proof: Since $\langle x, x \rangle = \overline{\langle x, x \rangle}$. \square

Proposition 12.0.3.

$$\langle x,\alpha y+\beta z\rangle=\overline{\alpha}\langle x,y\rangle+\overline{\beta}\langle x,z\rangle$$

Proposition 12.0.4.

$$\langle 0, y \rangle = \langle x, 0 \rangle = 0$$

Proposition 12.0.5. The function $\langle \vec{x}, \vec{y} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \overline{y_i}$ is an inner product on \mathbb{C}^n .

Proposition 12.0.6. The function $\langle (x_n), (y_n) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i \overline{y_i}$ is an inner product on l^2 .

Proposition 12.0.7. The function $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_a^b f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx$ is an inner product on C([a, b]).

Proposition 12.0.8. Let p > 1 and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$. Let $L^p(\Omega)$ be the set of all functions $f: \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $|f|^p$ is Lebesgue integrable.

The function $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{\Omega} f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx$ is an inner product on $L^2(\Omega)$.

Proposition 12.0.9. Let E_1 and E_2 be inner product spaces. Then the function $\langle (e_1, e_2), (e'_1, e'_2) \rangle = \langle e_1, e'_1 \rangle + \langle e_2, e'_2 \rangle$ is an inner product on $E_1 \times E_2$.

Definition 12.0.10 (Norm). In an inner product space, define $||x|| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$.

Proposition 12.0.11 (Schwarz's Inequality). In any inner product space,

$$|\langle x, y \rangle| \le ||x|| ||y||$$
.

Equality holds iff x and y are linearly dependent.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Assume: w.l.o.g. $y \neq 0$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ |\langle x, y \rangle| \le ||x|| ||y||$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. For all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ we have $\langle x, x \rangle + \overline{\alpha} \langle x, y \rangle + \alpha \langle y, x \rangle + |\alpha|^2 \langle y, y \rangle$ PROOF: The right-hand side is $\langle x + \alpha y, x + \alpha y \rangle$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\langle x, x \rangle \langle y, y \rangle |\langle x, y \rangle|^2 \ge 0$

Proof: Taking $\alpha = -\langle x, x \rangle / \langle y, y \rangle$ in $\langle 2 \rangle 1$.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. If $|\langle x, y \rangle| = ||x|| ||y||$ then x and y are linearly dependent.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: $|\langle x, y \rangle| = ||x|| ||y||$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2. \ \langle x, y \rangle \langle y, x \rangle = \langle x, x \rangle \langle y, y \rangle$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \langle y, y \rangle x \langle x, x \rangle y = 0$

Proof:

$$\langle \langle y, y \rangle x - \langle x, y \rangle y, \langle y, y \rangle x - \langle x, y \rangle y \rangle = \langle y, y \rangle^2 \langle x, x \rangle - \langle y, y \rangle \langle y, x \rangle \langle x, y \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle \langle y, y \rangle \langle y, x \rangle + \langle x, y \rangle \langle y, x \rangle = 0$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. If x and y are linearly dependent then $|\langle x, y \rangle| = ||x|| ||y||$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: x and y are linearly dependent.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $y = \alpha x$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ |\langle x, y \rangle| = ||x|| ||y||$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle x, y \rangle| &= |\langle x, \alpha x \rangle| \\ &= |\alpha| |\langle x, x \rangle| \\ &= |\alpha| ||x||^2 \\ &= ||x|| ||\alpha x|| \\ &= ||x|| ||y|| \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 12.0.11.1 (Triangle Inequality). In any inner product space,

$$||x + y|| \le ||x|| + ||y||$$

$$||x + y||^2 = \langle x + y, x + y \rangle$$

$$= \langle x, x \rangle + \langle x, y \rangle + \langle y, x \rangle + \langle y, y \rangle$$

$$\leq \langle x, x \rangle + 2|\langle x, y \rangle| + \langle y, y \rangle$$

$$\leq ||x||^2 + 2||x|| ||y|| + ||y||^2 \qquad \text{(Schwarz's Inequality)}$$

$$= (||x|| + ||y||)^2 \qquad \Box$$

Corollary 12.0.11.2. The norm in an inner product space is a norm.

Theorem 12.0.12 (Parallelogram Law). In any inner product space,

$$||x + y||^2 + ||x - y||^2 = 2(||x||^2 + ||y||^2)$$

Proof:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \|x+y\|^2 = \|x\|^2 + \langle x,y \rangle + \langle y,x \rangle + \|y\|^2 \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \|x-y\|^2 = \|x\|^2 - \langle x,y \rangle - \langle y,x \rangle + \|y\|^2 \\ \langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \mathrm{Q.E.D.} \end{array}$$

PROOF: Add $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ and $\langle 1 \rangle 2$.

Proposition 12.0.13. Let E be a normed space over \mathbb{C} . Then there exists an inner product on E that induces the norm of E iff E satisfies the Parallelogram Law.

Proof: If E satisfies the parallelogram law, define

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \frac{1}{4} (\|x + y\|^2 - \|x - y\|^2 + i\|x + iy\|^2 - i\|x - iy\|^2)$$
.

Definition 12.0.14 (Orthogonal). Vectors x and y in an inner product space are *orthogonal*, $x \perp y$, iff $\langle x, y \rangle = 0$.

Theorem 12.0.15 (Pythagorean Formula). If x and y are orthogonal then

$$||x+y||^2 = ||x||^2 + ||y||^2$$
.

Definition 12.0.16 (Weak Convergence). Let E be an inner product space. Let (x_n) be a sequence in E and $l \in E$. Then (x_n) weakly converges to l, $x_n \stackrel{w}{\to} l$ as $n \to \infty$, iff $\forall y \in E. \langle x_n, y \rangle \to \langle l, y \rangle$ as $n \to \infty$.

Proposition 12.0.17. In any inner product space E, the inner product $\langle , \rangle : E^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ is continuous.

Proof:

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1$$
. Let: $x_n \to x$ and $y_n \to y$ in E . $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. $\langle x_n, y_n \rangle \to \langle x, y \rangle$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle x_n, y_n \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle| &\leq |\langle x_n, y_n \rangle - \langle x_n, y \rangle| + |\langle x_n, y \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle| \\ &= |\langle x_n, y_n - y \rangle| + |\langle x_n - x, y \rangle| \\ &\leq \|x_n\| \|y_n - y\| + \|x_n - x\| \|y\| \end{aligned} \qquad \text{(Schwarz's Inequality)}$$

$$\to 0$$

using the fact that (x_n) is bounded.

Theorem 12.0.18. $x_n \to l$ if and only if $x_n \stackrel{w}{\to} l$ and $||x_n|| \to ||x||$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If $x_n \to l$ then $x_n \stackrel{w}{\to} l$ and $||x_n|| \to ||l||$.

PROOF: Easy using the fact that the inner product is continuous.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If $x_n \stackrel{w}{\to} l$ and $||x_n|| \to ||l||$ then $x_n \to l$.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: $x_n \stackrel{w}{\to} l$ and $||x_n|| \to ||l||$ $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\langle x_n, l \rangle \to ||l||^2$

 - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \|x_n l\| \to 0$

Proof:

$$||x_n - l||^2 = \langle x_n - l, x_n - l \rangle$$

$$= \langle x_n, x_n \rangle - \langle x_n, l \rangle - \langle l, x_n \rangle + \langle l, l \rangle$$

$$= ||x_n||^2 - \langle x_n, l \rangle - \overline{\langle x_n, l \rangle} + ||l||^2$$

$$\to ||l||^2 - 2||l||^2 + ||l||^2$$

$$= 0$$

Theorem 12.0.19. Let S be a subset of an inner product space E such that span S is dense in E. If (x_n) is a bounded sequence in E and, for all $y \in S$, we have $\langle x_n, y \rangle \to \langle x, y \rangle$ then $x_n \stackrel{w}{\to} x$.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. For all $y \in \operatorname{span} S$, we have $\langle x_n, y \rangle \to \langle x, y \rangle$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: $z \in E$

Prove: $\langle x_n, z \rangle \to \langle x, z \rangle$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. Let: $\epsilon > 0$

PROVE: There exists n_0 such that $\forall n \geq n_0 . |\langle x_n, z \rangle - \langle x, z \rangle| < \epsilon$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. PICK M > 0 such that $||x|| \leq M$ and $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ . ||x_n|| \leq M$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. Pick $y_0 \in \operatorname{span} S$ such that $||z y_0|| < \epsilon/3M$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. Pick $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that, for all $n \geq n_0$, we have $|\langle x_n, y_0 \rangle \langle x, y_0 \rangle| < \epsilon/3$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$. Let: $n \geq n_0$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 8. \ |\langle x_n, z \rangle \langle x, z \rangle| < \epsilon$

Proof:

$$\begin{split} |\langle x_n, z \rangle - \langle x, z \rangle| &\leq |\langle x_n, z \rangle - \langle x_n, y_0 \rangle| + |\langle x_n, y_0 \rangle - \langle x, y_0 \rangle| + |\langle x, y_0 \rangle - \langle x, z \rangle| \\ &< \|x_n\| \|z - y_0\| + \epsilon/3 + \|x\| \|y_0 - z\| \\ &< M(\epsilon/3M) + \epsilon/3 + M(\epsilon/3M) \\ &= \epsilon \end{split}$$

12.1 Orthonormal Bases

Definition 12.1.1 (Orthogonal). Let V be an inner product space and $S \subseteq V$. Then S is *orthogonal* iff any two distinct elements of S are orthogonal.

Definition 12.1.2 (Orthonormal). Let V be an inner product space and $S \subseteq V$. Then S is orthonormal iff it is orthogonal and $\forall x \in S. ||x|| = 1$.

Proposition 12.1.3. Orthonormal sets are linearly independent.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: S be orthonormal

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Assume: $\alpha_1 e_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n e_n = 0$ where $e_1, \dots, e_n \in S$ $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. $|\alpha_1|^2 + \cdots + |\alpha_n|^2 = 0$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ |\alpha_1|^2 + \dots + |\alpha_n|^2 = 0$$

Proof:

$$0 = \sum_{m=1}^{n} \langle 0, \alpha_m e_m \rangle$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{n} \langle \sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k e_k, \alpha_m e_m \rangle$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k \overline{\alpha_m} \langle e_k, e_m \rangle$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{n} |\alpha_k|^2$$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n = 0$$

Proposition 12.1.4. In l^2 , let e_n be the sequence whose nth element is 1 and whose other elements are 0. Then $\{e_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is orthonormal.

Proposition 12.1.5. In $L^2([-\pi,\pi])$, let $\phi_n(x) = e^{inx}/\sqrt{2\pi}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\{\phi_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}\ is\ orthonormal.$

Definition 12.1.6 (Legendre Polynomials). The Legendre polynomials $P_n \in$ $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ are defined by

$$P_0 = 1$$

$$P_n = \frac{1}{2^n n!} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} (x^2 - 1)^n$$

Proposition 12.1.7. Let P_n be the nth Legendre polynomial. Then $\{P_n \mid n \in P_n \mid n \in P_n$ \mathbb{N} is orthogonal in $L^2([-1,1])$.

Definition 12.1.8 (Hermite Polynomial). The Hermite polynomials $H_n \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ are defined by

$$H_n(x) = (-1)^n e^{x^2} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} e^{-x^2}$$
.

Proposition 12.1.9. Let H_n be the nth Hermite polynomial. Then $\{e^{-x^2/2}H_n(x)\mid$ $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is orthogonal in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Theorem 12.1.10. Let V be an inner product space. If $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in V$ are orthogonal then

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \right\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_i\|^2.$$

Theorem 12.1.11 (Bessel's Equality). Let V be an inner product space. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in V$ be orthonormal. Let $x \in V$. Then

$$\left\| x - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle x, x_k \rangle x_k \right\|^2 = \|x\|^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n} |\langle x, x_k \rangle|^2.$$

Proof.

$$\left\|x - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle x, x_k \rangle x_k \right\|^2 = \left\langle x - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle x, x_k \rangle x_k, x - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle x, x_k \rangle x_k \right\rangle$$

$$= \langle x, x \rangle - \left\langle x, \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle x, x_k \rangle x_k \right\rangle - \left\langle \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle x, x_k \rangle x_k, x \right\rangle$$

$$+ \left\langle \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle x, x_k \rangle x_k, \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle x, x_k \rangle x_k \right\rangle$$

$$= \langle x, x \rangle - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle x, x_k \rangle \langle x_k, x \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \langle x, x_i \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle \langle x_i, x_j \rangle$$

$$= \|x\|^2 - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n} |\langle x, x_k \rangle|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle x, x_i \rangle \langle x_i, x \rangle$$

$$= \|x\|^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n} |\langle x, x_k \rangle|^2$$

Corollary 12.1.11.1 (Bessel's Inequality). Let V be an inner product space. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in V$ be orthonormal. Let $x \in E$. Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} |\langle x, x_k \rangle|^2 \le ||x||^2.$$

Corollary 12.1.11.2. Orthonormal sequences are weakly convergent to 0.

PROOF: Let (x_n) be an orthonormal sequence. Taking the limit in Bessel's inequality we have $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, x_k \rangle|^2 \leq ||x||^2 < \infty$ and so $\langle x, x_k \rangle \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

Corollary 12.1.11.3 (Generalized Fourier Series). Let V be an inner product space. Let (e_n) be an orthonormal sequence in V. For any $x \in V$, the generalized Fourier series of x is

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle x, e_n \rangle e_n ,$$

and $\langle x, e_n \rangle$ is called the nth generalized Fourier coefficient of x with respect to (e_n) . We have $(\langle x, e_n \rangle e_n)_n \in l^2$.

Definition 12.1.12 (Complete Orthonormal Sequence). Let E be an inner product space. Let (x_n) be an orthonormal sequence in E. Then (x_n) is *complete* iff, for all $x \in E$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_n \rangle x_n = x .$$

Chapter 13

Hilbert Spaces

Definition 13.0.1 (Hilbert Space). A *Hilbert space* is a complete inner product space.

Proposition 13.0.2. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathbb{C}^n is a Hilbert space.

Proposition 13.0.3. l^2 is a Hilbert space.

Proposition 13.0.4. $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is a Hilbert space.

Proposition 13.0.5. $L^2([a,b])$ is a Hilbert space.

Proposition 13.0.6. Let ρ be a measurable function on [a,b] such that $\rho(x) > 0$ almost everywhere. Let $L^{2\rho}([a,b])$ be the set of all measurable functions $f:[a,b] \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\int_{a}^{b} |f(x)|^{2} \rho(x) dx < \infty .$$

Define an inner product on $L^{2\rho}([a,b])$ by

$$\langle f,g\rangle = \int_a^b f(x)\overline{g(x)}\rho(x)dx \ .$$

Then $L^{2\rho}([a,b])$ is a Hilbert space.

Proposition 13.0.7. Let m and N be positive integers. Let Ω be an open set in \mathbb{R}^N . Let $\tilde{H}^m(\Omega)$ be the set of all $f \in \mathcal{C}^m(\Omega)$ such that, for every $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ with $|\alpha| := \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_N \leq m$, we have

$$D^{\alpha} f := \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} f}{\partial x_1^{\alpha_1} \partial x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots \partial x_N^{\alpha_N}} \in L^2(\Omega) .$$

Define an inner product on $\tilde{H}^m(\Omega)$ by

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \int_{\Omega} \sum_{\alpha} D^{\alpha} f \overline{D^{\alpha} g} .$$

Let $H^m(\Omega)$ be the completion of $\tilde{H}^m(\Omega)$. Then $H^m(\Omega)$ is a Hilbert space.

Theorem 13.0.8. Weakly convergent sequences in a Hilbert space are bounded.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: H be a Hilbert space.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: (x_n) be a weakly convergent sequence in H.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, Let: $f_n: H \to \mathbb{C}, f_n(x) = \langle x, x_n \rangle$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, f_n is a bounded linear functional.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 5$. For every $x \in H$, the sequence $(f_n(x))$ is bounded.

PROOF: Since it converges.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 6$. PICK M > 0 such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have $||f_n|| \leq M$. PROOF: Banach-Steinhaus Theorem, $\langle 1 \rangle 4$, $\langle 1 \rangle 5$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 7. \ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+. ||f_n|| = ||x_n||$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $||f_n|| \leq ||x_n||$

PROOF: Since for all $x \in H$ we have $|f_n(x)| = |\langle x, x_n \rangle| \le ||x|| ||x_n||$ by Schwarz's Inequality.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $||x_n|| \leq ||f_n||$

PROOF: Since $||x_n||^2 = |\langle x_n, x_n \rangle| = |f_n(x_n)| \le ||f_n|| ||x_n||$.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 8. \ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+. ||x_n|| \leq M$

Proof: $\langle 1 \rangle 6$, $\langle 1 \rangle 7$

Theorem 13.0.9. Let H be a Hilbert space. Let (x_n) be an orthonormal sequence in H and let (α_n) be a sequence of complex numbers. Then the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n$ converges in H if and only if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n|$ converges in \mathbb{R} , in which

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n \right\|^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n|^2.$$

PROOF:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. For m > k > 0 we have

$$\left\| \sum_{n=k}^{m} \alpha_n x_n \right\|^2 = \sum_{n=k}^{m} |\alpha_n|^2.$$

PROOF: Theorem 12.1.10.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n|^2 < \infty$ then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n$ converges. $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. ASSUME: $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n|^2 < \infty$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $(\sum_{n=1}^{m} \alpha_n x_n)_m$ is Cauchy. PROOF: From $\langle 1 \rangle 1$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n$ converges. $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \text{ If } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n$ converges then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n|^2 < \infty$.

PROOF: From $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n|^2 < \infty$ then

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n \right\|^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n|^2.$$

Proof: From $\langle 1 \rangle 1$.

Proposition 13.0.10. Every complete orthonormal sequence in a Hilbert space is a basis.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. Let: E be an inner product space.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Let: (e_n) be a complete orthonormal sequence in E.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$. For all $x \in E$, there exists a sequence (α_n) in \mathbb{C} such that $x = \sum_n \alpha_n e_n$. PROOF: Immediate from $\langle 1 \rangle 2$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. If $\sum_{n} \alpha_{n} e_{n} = \sum_{n} \beta_{n} e_{n}$ then $\alpha_{n} = \beta_{n}$ for all n. $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Let: $x = \sum_{n} \alpha_{n} e_{n} = \sum_{n} \beta_{n} e_{n}$ $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\sum_{n} |\alpha_{n} \beta_{n}|^{2} = 0$

Proof:

$$0 = \|x - x\|^{2}$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{n} e_{n} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta_{n} e_{n} \right\|^{2}$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_{n} - \beta_{n}) e_{n} \right\|^{2}$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_{n} - \beta_{n}|^{2}$$
(Theorem 13.0.9)

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $\alpha_n = \beta_n$ for all n.

Theorem 13.0.11. An orthonormal sequence (x_n) in a Hilbert space H is complete if and only if, for all $x \in H$, if $\forall n. \langle x, x_n \rangle = 0$ then x = 0.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If (x_n) is complete then, for all $x \in H$, if $\forall n. \langle x, x_n \rangle = 0$ then x = 0.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: (x_n) is complete.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $x \in H$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. Assume: $\forall n. \langle x, x_n \rangle = 0$ $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_n \rangle x_n = 0$ $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If, for all $x \in H$, if $\forall n. \langle x, x_n \rangle = 0$ then x = 0, then (x_n) is complete.
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: For all $x \in H$, if $\forall n. \langle x, x_n \rangle = 0$, then x = 0. $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $y = x \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_n \rangle x_n$ $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. For all $n, \langle y, x_n \rangle = 0$

 - - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$. Let: $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$
 - $\langle 3 \rangle 2. \ \langle y, x_n \rangle = 0$

$$\langle y, x_n \rangle = \left\langle x - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_m \rangle x_m, x_n \right\rangle$$
$$= \langle x, x_n \rangle - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_m \rangle \langle x_m, x_n \rangle$$
$$= \langle x, x_n \rangle - \langle x, x_n \rangle$$
$$= 0$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ y = 0$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_n \rangle x_n$

Theorem 13.0.12 (Parseval's Formula). Let H be a Hilbert space. Let (x_n) be an orthonormal sequence in H. Then (x_n) is complete if and only if, for all $x \in H$,

$$||x||^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, x_n \rangle|^2.$$

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. If (x_n) is complete then for all $x \in H$ we have $||x||^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, x_n \rangle|^2$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: (x_n) is complete.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: $x \in H$ $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $||x||^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, x_n \rangle|^2$ PROOF:

$$||x||^2 = \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_n \rangle x_n \right\|^2$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, x_n \rangle|^2$$
(Theorem 13.0.9)

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. If, for all $x \in H$, we have $||x||^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, x_n \rangle|^2$, then (x_n) is complete. $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Assume: For all $x \in H$, we have $||x||^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, x_n \rangle|^2$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2$$
. Let: $x \in H$
 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. $x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_n \rangle x_n$

Proposition 13.0.13. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\pi_n(x) = e^{inx}/\sqrt{2\pi}$. Then $\{\pi_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a complete orthonormal set in $L^2([-\pi, \pi])$.

TODO

Proposition 13.0.14. $B = \{1/\sqrt{2\pi}\} \cup \{\cos nx/\sqrt{\pi} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \cup \{\sin nx/\sqrt$ $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is a complete orthonormal set in $L^2([-\pi, \pi])$.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$. For all $f \in B$ we have ||f|| = 1 $\langle 2 \rangle 1. \ \|1/\sqrt{2\pi}\| = 1$

$$||1/\sqrt{2\pi}|| = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dx/2\pi$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we have $\|\cos nx/\sqrt{\pi}\| = 1$ Proof:

$$\|\cos nx/\sqrt{\pi}\| = 1/\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cos^2 nx \, dx$$

$$= 1/2\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (\cos 2nx + 1) dx$$

$$= 1/2\pi \left[1/2n \sin 2nx + x \right]_{-\pi}^{\pi}$$

$$= (1/2\pi)(2\pi)$$

$$= 1$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we have $\|\sin nx/\sqrt{\pi}\| = 1$ PROOF:

$$\|\sin nx/\sqrt{\pi}\| = 1/\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sin^2 nx \, dx$$

$$= -1/2\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (\cos 2nx - 1) dx$$

$$= -1/2\pi \left[1/2n \sin 2nx - x \right]_{-\pi}^{\pi}$$

$$= (-1/2\pi)(-2\pi)$$

$$= 1$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2.$ For all $f,g \in B$ with $f \neq g$ we have $\langle f,g \rangle = 0$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1. \ \langle 1, \cos nx \rangle = 0$ PROOF:

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cos nx \, dx = \left[1/n \sin nx\right]_{-\pi}^{\pi}$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. $\langle 1, \sin nx \rangle = 0$

Proof:

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sin nx \, dx = \left[-1/n \cos nx \right]_{-\pi}^{\pi}$$
$$= -1/n \cos n\pi + 1/n \cos n\pi$$
$$= 0$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. If $m \neq n$ then $\langle \cos mx, \cos nx \rangle = 0$

PROOF:

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cos mx \cos nx \, dx = 1/2 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (\cos(n+m)x - \cos(n-m)x) dx$$

$$= 1/2 \left[\frac{1}{n+m} \sin(n+m)x - \frac{1}{n-m} \sin(n-m)x \right]_{-\pi}^{\pi}$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. $\langle \cos mx, \sin nx \rangle = 0$

PROOF:

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cos mx \sin nx \, dx = 1/2 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (\sin(n+m)x - \sin(n-m)x) dx$$

$$= 1/2 \left[-\frac{1}{n+m} \cos(n+m)x + \frac{1}{n-m} \cos(n-m)x \right]_{-\pi}^{\pi}$$

$$= 0 \qquad (\cos \text{ is odd})$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 5$. If $m \neq n$ then $\langle \sin mx, \sin nx \rangle = 0$

PROOF:

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sin mx \sin nx \, dx = 1/2 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (\cos(n-m)x - \cos(n+m)x) dx$$

$$= 1/2 \left[\frac{1}{n-m} \sin(n-m)x - \frac{1}{n+m} \sin(n+m)x \right]_{-\pi}^{\pi}$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3.$ For all $f \in L^2([-\pi,\pi]),$ if $\forall g \in B. \langle f,g \rangle = 0$ then f=0 $\langle 2 \rangle 1.$ Let: $f \in L^2([-\pi,\pi])$

 - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Assume: $\forall g \in B. \langle f, g \rangle = 0$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$. For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\langle f, e^{inx} \rangle = 0$ PROOF: Since $e^{inx} = \cos nx + i \sin nx$.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$. f = 0

Proof: From Proposition 13.0.13.

Proposition 13.0.15. $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\}\cup\{\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\cos nx\mid n\in\mathbb{Z}_+\}\ is\ a\ complete\ orthonormal$ set in $L^{2}([0,\pi])$.

Proposition 13.0.16. $\{\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\sin nx \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}\ is\ a\ complete\ orthonormal\ set\ in$ $L^2([0,\pi]).$

Definition 13.0.17 (Signum). The *signum* function sgn : $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\operatorname{sgn} x = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases}$$

Definition 13.0.18 (Rademacher Functions). The Rademarcher functions R: $\mathbb{N} \times [0,1] \to \{-1,0,1\}$ are defined by

$$R(m,x) = \operatorname{sgn}(\sin(2^m \pi x)) .$$

Proposition 13.0.19. The Rademacher functios $\{R(m, -) \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are orthonormal in $L^2([0,1])$.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. ||R(m, -)|| = 1$

PROOF: $\int_0^1 \operatorname{sgn}(\sin(2^m \pi x))^2 dx = 1$ since the integrand is 1 except for finitely many points in [0,1].

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$. Given natural numbers $m \neq n$, we have $\langle R(m,-), R(n,-) \rangle = 0$
 - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$. Given reals a, b and a natural number m, we have $\int_a^b R(m,x)dx = 0$ whenever $2^m(b-a)$ is an even integer.

PROOF: If m > 0, or if m = 0 and b - a is an even integer, then the regions where R(m, x) = 1 are isometric with the regions where R(m, x) = -1.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$. Let: m and n be natural numbers with n < m.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \langle R(m,-), R(n,-) \rangle = 0$

Proof:

$$\int_{0}^{1} R(m,x)R(n,x)dx = \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n}} \int_{\frac{k-1}{2^{n}}}^{\frac{k}{2^{n}}} R(m,x)R(n,x)dx$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n}} (-i)^{k+1} \int_{\frac{k-1}{2^{n}}}^{\frac{k}{2^{n}}} R(m,x)dx$$

$$= 0 \qquad (\langle 2 \rangle 1, 2^{m} \left(\frac{k}{2^{n}} - \frac{k-1}{2^{n}}\right) = 2^{m-n} \text{ is an even integer})$$

Proposition 13.0.20. The set of Rademacher functions is not complete.

Proof:

- (1)1. Define $f:[0,1]\to\mathbb{C}$ by f(x)=0 if $0\leq x<1/4$, f(x)=1 if $1/4\leq x\leq 1$ 3/4, f(x) = 0 if $3/4 < x \le 1$.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ f \in L^2([0,1])$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \langle R(0, -), f \rangle = 1/2$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$. $\langle R(m, -), f \rangle = 0$ for $m \ge 1$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ f \neq 1/2R(0, -)$

Definition 13.0.21 (Walsh Functions). Define the Walsh functions $W: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ $[0,1] \to \{-1,0,1\}$ as follows. Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $m = \sum_{k=1}^n 2^{k-1} a_k$ where each a_k is either 0 or 1. Then

$$W(m,x) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} R(k,x)^{a_k}$$
.

Proposition 13.0.22. The set of Walsh functions $\{W(m,-) \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a compete orthonormal set.

TODO