# Mathematics

Robin Adams

July 26, 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  $y \in \text{ran } \mathbf{R}$ , 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 **R** be an equivalence relation on **A** and  $a \in \mathbf{A}$ . The *equivalence class* of a modulo **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  $\Pi$  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  $\Pi$  have any common elements, and
- 2. each element of A is in some set in  $\Pi$ .

**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.

#### 2.5 **Ordering Relations**

#### 2.5.1Structures

**Definition 2.5.1** (Structure). A structure is a pair (A, R) where A is a set and R is a binary relation on A.

#### 2.5.2 **Partial Orders**

**Definition 2.5.2** (Partial Ordering). Let **A** be a class. A partial ordering on **A** is a relation **R** on **A** that is reflexive, antisymmetric and transitive.

We often write  $\leq$  for a partial ordering, and then write x < y for  $x \leq y \land x \neq y$ y.

**Definition 2.5.3** (Partially Ordered Set). A partially ordered set or poset is a pair  $(A, \leq)$  where A is a set and  $\leq$  is a partial ordering on A. We often write just A for  $(A, \leq)$ .

**Proposition 2.5.4.** If **R** is a partial order on **A** then so is  $\mathbf{R}^{-1}$ .

Proof: Easy.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 2.5.5.** Let **R** be a partial order on **A** and **B**  $\subseteq$  **A**. Then **R**  $\cap$  **B**<sup>2</sup> is a partial order on **B**.

Proof: Easy.

**Definition 2.5.6** (Minimal). Let A be a poset. An element  $m \in A$  is minimal iff there is no  $x \in A$  such that x < m.

**Definition 2.5.7** (Maximal). Let A be a poset. An element  $m \in A$  is maximal iff there is no  $x \in A$  such that m < x.

**Definition 2.5.8** (Least). Let A be a poset. An element  $m \in A$  is *least* iff for all  $x \in A$  we have  $m \le x$ .

**Proposition 2.5.9.** A poset has at most one least element.

PROOF: If m and m' are least then  $m \leq m'$  and  $m' \leq m$ , so m = m'.  $\square$ 

**Definition 2.5.10** (Greatst). Let A be a poset. An element  $m \in A$  is *greatest* iff for all  $x \in A$  we have  $x \leq m$ .

**Proposition 2.5.11.** A poset has at most one greatest element.

PROOF: If m and m' are greatest then  $m \leq m'$  and  $m' \leq m$ , so m = m'.  $\square$ 

**Definition 2.5.12** (Upper Bound). Let **R** be a partial ordering on **A** and  $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$ . Let  $u \in \mathbf{A}$ . Then u is an *upper bound* for **B** iff  $\forall x \in \mathbf{B}.x \leq u$ .

**Definition 2.5.13** (Lower Bound). Let **R** be a partial ordering on **A** and  $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$ . Let  $l \in \mathbf{A}$ . Then l is a *lower bound* for **B** iff  $\forall x \in \mathbf{B}.l \leq x$ .

**Definition 2.5.14** (Bounded Above). Let **R** be a partial ordering on **A** and  $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$ . Then **B** is *bounded above* iff it has an upper bound.

**Definition 2.5.15** (Bounded Below). Let **R** be a partial ordering on **A** and  $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$ . Then **B** is *bounded below* iff it has a lower bound.

**Definition 2.5.16** (Least Upper Bound). Let **R** be a partial 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  $s \leq u$ .

**Definition 2.5.17** (Greatest Lower Bound). Let **R** be a partial ordering on **A** and  $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$ . Let  $i \in \mathbf{A}$ . Then i is the *greatest lower bound* or *infimum* of **B** iff i is a lower bound for **B** and, for every lower bound l for **B**, we have  $i \leq l$ .

**Definition 2.5.18** (Complete). A poset is *complete* iff every nonempty subset bounded above has a supremum, and every nonempty subset bounded below has an infimum.

**Definition 2.5.19** (Dense). Let A be a poset and  $B \subseteq A$ . Then B is *dense* iff, for all  $x, y \in A$ , if x < y then there exists  $z \in B$  such that x < z < y.

**Proposition 2.5.20.** Let A be a complete poset with no least element. Let  $B \subseteq A$  be dense. Let  $\theta : A \to A$  be a monotone map that is the identity on B. Then  $\theta = \mathrm{id}_A$ .

```
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Let: a \in A
        PROVE: \theta(a) = a
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: S(a) = \{ b \in B \mid b < a \}
\langle 1 \rangle 3. S(a) is nonempty and bounded above.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. S(a) is nonempty.
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. Pick a_1 < a
          PROOF: Since a is not least.
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. There exists b \in B such that a_1 < b < a.
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. S(a) is bounded above by a.
\langle 1 \rangle 4. sup S(a) < a
\langle 1 \rangle 5. sup S(a) = a
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: for a contradiction sup S(a) < a
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. Pick b \in B such that \sup S(a) < b < a
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ b \in S(a)
   \langle 2 \rangle 4. Q.E.D.
      PROOF: This contradicts the fact that sup S(a) < b.
\langle 1 \rangle 6. For all b \in S(a) we have b < \theta(a)
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: b \in S(a)
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. b < a
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \theta(b) \le \theta(a)
   \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ b \leq \theta(a)
      PROOF: \theta(b) = b
\langle 1 \rangle 7. a \leq \theta(a)
   PROOF: Since a = \sup S(a) and \theta(a) is an upper bound for S(a).
\langle 1 \rangle 8. \ a \not< \theta(a)
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: for a contradiction a < \theta(a).
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. Pick b \in B such that a < b < \theta(a)
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. \theta(a) \leq \theta(b) = b
   \langle 2 \rangle 4. Q.E.D.
      PROOF: This contradicts the fact that b < \theta(a).
\langle 1 \rangle 9. \ \theta(a) = a
```

**Theorem 2.5.21.** Let A and P be complete posets with no least or greatest element. Let B be dense in A and Q be dense in P. Every order isomorphism  $B \cong Q$  extends uniquely to an order isomorphism  $A \cong P$ .

### Proof:

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. For a \in A, let S(a) = \{b \in B \mid b < a\}.

\langle 1 \rangle 2. Define \overline{\phi} : A \to P by \overline{\phi}(a) = \sup \phi(S(a)).

\langle 2 \rangle 1. \phi(S(a)) is nonempty.

\langle 3 \rangle 1. PICK a_1 < a
```

```
PROOF: Since a is not least.
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. Pick b \in B such that a_1 < b < a.
       \langle 3 \rangle 3. \ \phi(b) \in \phi(S(a))
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. \phi(S(a)) is bounded above.
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. Pick a_2 > a
          PROOF: Since a is not greatest.
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. Pick b \in B such that a < b < a_2
       \langle 3 \rangle 3. \phi(b) is an upper bound for \phi(S(a)).
\langle 1 \rangle 3. \overline{\phi} is monotone.
   PROOF: If a \leq a' then S(a) \subseteq S(a') and so \overline{\phi}(a) \leq \overline{\phi}(a').
\langle 1 \rangle 4. \phi extends \phi.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: b \in B
            PROVE: \phi(b) = \sup \phi(S(b))
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. \phi(b) is an upper bound for \phi(S(b))
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. Let: u be any upper bound for \phi(S(b))
            PROVE: \phi(b) \leq u
   \langle 2 \rangle 4. Assume: for a contradiction u < \phi(b)
   \langle 2 \rangle5. Pick q \in Q such that u < q < \phi(b)
   \langle 2 \rangle 6. Pick b' \in B such that \phi(b') = q
   \langle 2 \rangle 7. \ b' < b
   \langle 2 \rangle 8. \ b' \in S(b)
   \langle 2 \rangle 9. \ q = \phi(b') \le u
   \langle 2 \rangle 10. Q.E.D.
       Proof: This is a contradiction.
\langle 1 \rangle 5. Let: \psi = \phi^{-1}
(1)6. Let: \overline{\psi}: P \to A be the function \overline{\psi}(p) = \sup\{\psi(q) \mid q \in Q, q < p\}
\langle 1 \rangle 7. \overline{\psi} is monotone and extends \psi
   Proof: Similar.
\langle 1 \rangle 8. \ \psi \circ \phi : A \to A is monotone and the identity on B.
\langle 1 \rangle 9. \ \overline{\psi} \circ \overline{\phi} = \mathrm{id}_A
   Proof: Proposition 2.5.20.
\langle 1 \rangle 10. \ \phi \circ \psi = \mathrm{id}_B
   Proof: Proposition 2.5.20.
(1)11. If \phi^*: A \cong P is any order isomorphism that extends \phi then \phi^* = \overline{\phi}.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: a \in A
            PROVE: \phi^*(a) = \sup \phi(S(a))
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. \phi^*(a) is an upper bound for \phi(S(a))
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. Let: u be any upper bound for \phi(S(a))
            PROVE: \phi^*(a) \le u
   \langle 2 \rangle 4. Assume: for a contradiction u < \phi^*(a)
   \langle 2 \rangle 5. Pick q \in Q such that u < q < \phi^*(a)
   \langle 2 \rangle 6. Pick b \in B such that q = \phi(b)
   \langle 2 \rangle 7. \ b < a
   \langle 2 \rangle 8. \ b \in S(a)
   \langle 2 \rangle 9. \ \ q = \phi(b) < u
   \langle 2 \rangle 10. Q.E.D.
```

PROOF: This is a contradiction.

**Theorem 2.5.22** (Knaster Fixed-Point Theorem). Let A be a complete poset with a greatest and least element. Let  $\phi: A \to A$  be monotone. Then there exists  $a \in A$  such that  $\phi(a) = a$ .

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $B = \{ x \in A \mid x \leq \phi(x) \}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Let:  $a = \sup B$

PROOF: B is nonempty because the least element of A is in B, and it is bounded above by the greatest element of A.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . For all  $b \in B$  we have  $b \leq \phi(a)$ 
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $b \in B$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2. \ b \leq \phi(b)$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ b \leq a$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ \phi(b) \le \phi(a)$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 5.$   $b \leq \phi(a)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ a \leq \phi(a)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ \phi(a) \le \phi(\phi(a))$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \phi(a) \in B$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7. \ \phi(a) \leq a$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 8. \ \phi(a) = a$

**Definition 2.5.23** (Initial Segment). Let A be a poset and  $t \in A$ . The *initial* segment up to t is

$$\operatorname{seg} t := \left\{ x \in A \mid x < t \right\} \ .$$

#### 2.5.3 Linear Orders

**Definition 2.5.24** (Linear Ordering). Let **A** be a class. A *linear ordering* or total ordering on **A** is a partial ordering  $\leq$  on **A** that is total, i.e.

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbf{A}.x \le y \lor y \le x$$

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

**Proposition 2.5.25** (Trichotomy). Let  $\leq$  be a linear ordering on  $\mathbf{A}$ . For any  $x, y \in \mathbf{A}$ , exactly one of x < y, x = y, y < x holds.

PROOF: Immediate from definitions.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 2.5.26.** Let < be an irreflexive relation on  $\mathbf{A}$  that satisfies trichotomy. Define  $\leq$  on  $\mathbf{A}$  by  $x \leq y$  iff x < y or x = y. Then  $\leq$  is a linear ordering on  $\mathbf{A}$  and x < y iff  $x \leq y$  and  $x \neq y$ .

Proof: Easy.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 2.5.27.** 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.

**Proposition 2.5.28.** Let **R** be a linear order on **A** and  $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$ . Then  $\mathbf{R} \cap \mathbf{B}^2$  is a linear order on **B**.

Proof: Easy.

**Definition 2.5.29** (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 2.5.30.** 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.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . 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  $(a_2, b_2) < (a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2) \neq (a_1, b_1), \text{ and } (a_1, b_1) \not< (a_2, b_2).$ 

### 2.5.4 Well Orderings

**Definition 2.5.31** (Well Ordering). A well ordering on a set A is a linear ordering on A such that every nonempty subset has a least element.

**Proposition 2.5.32.** *Let*  $\mathbf{R}$  *be a well ordering on*  $\mathbf{A}$  *and*  $\mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$ *. Then*  $\mathbf{R} \cap \mathbf{B}^2$  *is a well ordering on*  $\mathbf{B}$ *.* 

Proof: Easy.

**Theorem 2.5.33** (Transfinite Induction Principle). Let < be a well ordering on A. Let  $B \subseteq A$ . Assume that, for all  $t \in A$ ,

$$\operatorname{seg} t \subseteq B \Rightarrow t \in B .$$

Then B = A.

#### PROOF:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Assume: for a contradiction  $B \neq A$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Let: m be the least element of A-B
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . seg  $m \subseteq B$

PROOF: By leastness of m.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ m \in B$
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. Q.E.D.

PROOF: This is a contradiction.

П

**Theorem 2.5.34.** Let < be a linear ordering on A. Assume that, for any  $B \subseteq A$  such that  $\forall t \in A . \operatorname{seg} t \subseteq B \Rightarrow t \in B$ , we have B = A. Then < is a well ordering on A.

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $C \subseteq A$  be nonempty.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Let:  $B = \{ t \in A \mid \forall x \in C.t < x \}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ B \cap C = \emptyset$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ B \neq A$
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. Pick  $t \in A$  such that  $\operatorname{seg} t \subseteq B$  and  $t \notin B$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$ . t is least in C.

À

# 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 27

**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  $a \in A$
  - (2)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  $H = \text{dom } F^{-1} = B$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ H: B \to A$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ .  $F \circ H = I_B$ 
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$ . 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 29

**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.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ f \in \prod_{i \in I} H(i)$ 

```
\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 A \subseteq \text{dom } 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.
3.2
           Dependent Product Sets
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
```

## 3.3 Equinumerosity

**Definition 3.3.1** (Equinumerous). Sets A and B are equinumerous,  $A \approx B$ , iff there exists a bijection between A and B.

**Proposition 3.3.2.** Equinumerosity is an equivalence relation on the class of all sets.

#### Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . For any set A we have  $A \approx A$ .

PROOF: We have  $id_A$  is a bijection between A and A.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . If  $A \approx B$  then  $B \approx A$ .

PROOF: If  $f: A \approx B$  then  $f^{-1}: B \approx A$ .

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . If  $A \approx B$  and  $B \approx C$  then  $A \approx C$ .

PROOF: If  $f: A \approx B$  and  $g: B \approx C$  then  $g \circ f: A \approx C$ .

**Proposition 3.3.3.** Let  $2 = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}\$ . For any set A we have  $\mathcal{P}A \approx 2^A$ .

PROOF: The function  $H: \mathcal{P}A \to 2^A$  defined by  $H(S)(a) = \{\emptyset\}$  if  $a \in S$  and  $\emptyset$  if  $a \notin S$  is a bijection.  $\square$ 

Theorem 3.3.4 (Cantor 1873). No set is equinumerous to its power set.

#### PROOF:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Assume: for a contradiction  $f: A \approx \mathcal{P}A$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Let:  $S = \{ x \in A \mid x \notin f(x) \}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . Pick  $a \in A$  such that f(a) = S
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ .  $a \in S$  if and only if  $a \notin S$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$ . Q.E.D.

Proof: This is a contradiction.

**Definition 3.3.5** (Dominate). A set A is dominated by a set B,  $A \leq B$ , iff there exists an injection  $A \to B$ .

### 3.4 Transfinite Recursion

**Theorem Schema 3.4.1** (Transfinite Recursion Theorem Schema). For any property G(x, y), the following is a theorem:

Assume that < is a well ordering on a set A. Assume that, for any f, there exists a unique y such that G(f,y). Then there exists a unique function F such that  $\operatorname{dom} F = A$  and

$$\forall t \in A.G(F \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} t, F(t))$$
.

#### Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1.$  For  $t \in A,$  let us say that a function v is G-constructed~up~to~t iff  $\mathrm{dom}\,v = \{x \in A \mid x \leq t\}$  and

$$\forall x \in \operatorname{dom} v. G(v \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} x, v(x)) .$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . seg t = dom F

 $\langle 2 \rangle$ 5. Let:  $v = F \cup \{(t, y)\}$  $\langle 2 \rangle$ 6. v is G-constructed up to t.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . Let: y be the unique object such that G(F,y)

```
\langle 1 \rangle 2. For all t_1, t_2 \in A with t_1 \leq t_2, if v_1 is G-constructed up to t_1 and v_2 is
         G-constructed up to t_2, then \forall x \leq t_1.v_1(x) = v_2(x).
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: x \in A
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. Assume: \forall y < x. (y \le t_1 \Rightarrow v_1(y) = v_2(y))
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. Assume: x \leq t_1
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. G(v_1 \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} x, v_1(x))
    \langle 2 \rangle 5. G(v_2 \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} x, v_2(x))
    \langle 2 \rangle 6. \ v_1 \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} x = v_2 \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} x
    \langle 2 \rangle 7. \ v_1(x) = v_2(x)
    \langle 2 \rangle 8. Q.E.D.
       Proof: By transfinite induction.
\langle 1 \rangle 3. Let \mathcal{K} be the set of all functions v such that there exists t \in A such that
         v is G-constructed up to t.
   PROOF: By an Axiom of Replacement using \langle 1 \rangle 2.
\langle 1 \rangle 4. Let: F = \bigcup \mathcal{K}
\langle 1 \rangle 5. F is a function.
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: (x, y_1), (x, y_2) \in F
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. PICK v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{K} such that v_1(x) = y_1 and v_2(x) = y_2.
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. PICK t_1, t_2 \in A such that v_1 is G-constructed up to t_1 and v_2 is G-
              constructed up to t_2.
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. Assume: w.l.o.g. t_1 \leq t_2
    \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ v_1(x) = v_2(x)
       Proof: \langle 1 \rangle 2.
    \langle 2 \rangle 6. \ y_1 = y_2
\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \forall x \in \text{dom } F.G(F \upharpoonright \text{seg } x, F(x))
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: x \in \text{dom } F
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. Pick v \in \mathcal{K} such that v(x) = F(x)
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. PICK t such that v is G-constructed up to t.
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. G(v \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} x, v(x))
    \langle 2 \rangle 5. \ v \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} x = F \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} x
        \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: y < x
                  Prove: v(y) = F(y)
        \langle 3 \rangle 2. \ y \in \operatorname{dom} F
           PROOF: Since y \in \text{dom } v \text{ and } v \in \mathcal{K}.
        \langle 3 \rangle 3. Pick u \in \mathcal{K} such that u(y) = F(y)
        \langle 3 \rangle 4. \ u(y) = v(y)
           Proof: \langle 1 \rangle 2.
        \langle 3 \rangle 5. \ v(y) = F(y)
    \langle 2 \rangle 6. \ G(F \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} x, F(x))
\langle 1 \rangle 7. dom F = A
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Assume: dom F \neq A
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. Let: t be least in A - \operatorname{dom} F
```

```
\langle 2 \rangle7. t \in \text{dom } F
\langle 2 \rangle8. Q.E.D.
PROOF: This is a contradiction.
\langle 1 \rangle8. F is unique.
```

PROOF: If F' also satisfies the theorem, prove F(x) = F'(x) by transfinite induction on x.

# 3.5 Structure Isomorphisms

**Definition 3.5.1** (Isomorphism). Let (A, R) and (B, S) be structures. An isomorphism between (A, R) and (B, S) is a bijection  $f : A \cong B$  such that, for all  $x, y \in A$ , we have  $(x, y) \in R$  if and only if  $(f(x), f(y)) \in S$ . We write  $f : (A, R) \cong (B, S)$ .

We say (A, R) and (B, S) are isomorphic iff there exists an isomorphism between them.

**Theorem 3.5.2.** Isomorphism is an equivalence relation on the class of structures.

#### Proof:

П

```
\begin{array}{l} \langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \operatorname{id}_A : (A,R) \cong (A,R) \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \operatorname{If} \ f : (A,R) \cong (B,S) \ \operatorname{then} \ f^{-1} : (B,S) \cong (A,R). \\ \langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \operatorname{If} \ f : (A,R) \cong (B,S) \ \operatorname{and} \ g : (B,S) \cong (C,T) \ \operatorname{then} \ g \circ f : (A,R) \cong (C,T). \end{array}
```

**Proposition 3.5.3.** Let B be a poset, A a set, and  $f: A \to B$  an injection. Define  $\leq$  on A by  $x \leq y$  iff  $f(x) \leq f(y)$ .

- 1.  $\leq$  is a partial order on A.
- 2. If B is a linearly ordered set then  $\leq$  is a linear order on A.
- 3. If B is a well ordered set then  $\leq$  is a well ordering on A.

Proof: Easy.

**Proposition 3.5.4.** There is at most one isomorphism between two well ordered sets.

#### Proof:

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Let: A and B be well ordered sets.
```

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Let:  $f, g : A \cong B$  be isomorphisms.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall x \in A. f(x) = g(x)$ 

PROOF: Transfinite induction on x.

**Theorem 3.5.5.** Let A and B be well ordered sets. Then one of the following holds:  $A \cong B$ ; there exists  $b \in B$  such that  $A \cong \operatorname{seg} b$ ; there exists  $a \in A$  such that  $\operatorname{seg} a \cong B$ .

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Pick e that is not in A or B.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Let:  $F: A \to B \cup \{e\}$  be the function defined by transfinite recursion thus:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . Case:  $e \in \operatorname{ran} F$ 

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Let: t be least such that F(t) = e

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ .  $F \upharpoonright \operatorname{seg} t : \operatorname{seg} t \cong B$ 

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . Case: ran F = B

PROOF: We have  $F: A \cong B$ 

 $\langle 1 \rangle 5$ . Case: ran  $F \subsetneq B$ 

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Let: b be the least element of  $B - \operatorname{ran} F$ 

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ .  $F: A \cong \operatorname{seg} b$ 

# Chapter 4

# **Ordinal Numbers**

**Definition 4.0.1** (Ordinal Number). Let A be a well ordered set. Define the function E on A by transfinite recursion by:

$$E(t) = \{ E(x) \mid x < t \}$$
.

The ordinal number of A is  $\alpha := \operatorname{ran} E$ .

**Proposition 4.0.2.** E is a bijection between A and  $\alpha$ .

PROOF: If s < t then  $E(s) \in E(t)$  so  $E(s) \neq E(t)$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 4.0.3.** For all  $s, t \in A$ , we have s < t if and only if  $E(s) \in E(t)$ .

Proof:

```
\begin{split} \langle 1 \rangle 1. & \text{ If } s < t \text{ then } E(s) \in E(t). \\ & \text{Proof: By definition of } E(t). \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. & \text{ If } E(s) \in E(t) \text{ then } s < t. \\ & \langle 2 \rangle 1. & \text{Assume: } E(s) \in E(t) \\ & \langle 2 \rangle 2. & \text{Pick } s' < t \text{ such that } E(s) = E(s') \\ & \langle 2 \rangle 3. & s = s' \\ & \text{Proof: Proposition } 4.0.2. \\ & \langle 2 \rangle 4. & s < t \end{split}
```

Corollary 4.0.3.1.  $(A, \leq)$  is isomorphic to  $\alpha$  ordered by  $\in$ .

Corollary 4.0.3.2.  $\alpha$  is well ordered by  $\in$ .

Corollary 4.0.3.3. Two well-ordered sets are isomorphic if and only if they have the same ordinal number.

**Proposition 4.0.4.**  $\alpha$  is a transitive set.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $y \in z \in \alpha$ 

```
\langle 1 \rangle 2. PICK a \in A such that z = E(a) \langle 1 \rangle 3. PICK b < a such that y = E(b) \langle 1 \rangle 4. y \in \alpha
```

**Theorem 4.0.5.** A set  $\alpha$  is an ordinal number if and only if it is a transitive set well-ordered by  $\in$ .

#### Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Every ordinal number is a transitive set.

Proof: Proposition 4.0.4.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Every ordinal number is well-ordered by  $\in$ .

Proof: Corollary 4.0.3.2.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . Every transitive set well-ordered by  $\in$  is an ordinal number.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $\alpha$  be a transitive set well-ordered by  $\in$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . Let:  $E:(\alpha,\in)\cong(\beta,\in)$  be the isomorphism between  $(\alpha,\in)$  and its ordinal number.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \forall x \in \alpha. E(x) = x$

PROOF: By transfinite induction on x.

 $(2)4. \ \beta = \alpha$ 

Proposition 4.0.6. Every element of an ordinal number is an ordinal number.

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $\alpha$  be an ordinal number.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Let:  $\beta \in \alpha$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ .  $\beta$  is a transitive set.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $x \in y \in \beta$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2. \ y \in \alpha$

PROOF: Since  $\alpha$  is a transitive set.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ x \in \alpha$ 

PROOF: Since  $\alpha$  is a transitive set.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ x \in \beta$ 

PROOF: Since  $\alpha$  is well-ordered by  $\in$ .

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ .  $\beta$  is well-ordered by  $\in$ .

PROOF: Since  $\beta \subseteq \alpha$ .

**Proposition 4.0.7.** Given two ordinal numbers  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , exactly one of  $\alpha \in \beta$ ,  $\alpha = \beta$ ,  $\beta \in \alpha$  holds.

#### Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . At most one holds.

PROOF: Since we never have  $\alpha \in \alpha$ .

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . At least one holds.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Either  $\alpha \cong \beta$  or  $\exists t \in \beta . \alpha \cong \text{seg } t$  or  $\exists t \in \alpha . \text{seg } t \cong \beta .$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . Case:  $\alpha \cong \beta$

PROOF: Then  $\alpha = \beta$  as isomorphic well-ordered sets have the same ordinal number.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . Case: There exists  $t \in \beta$  such that  $\alpha \cong \operatorname{seg} t$ 

PROOF: t is an ordinal number and  $\alpha = t$ , so  $\alpha \in \beta$ .

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . Case: There exists  $t \in \alpha$  such that  $seg t \cong \beta$ 

PROOF: t is an ordinal number and  $t = \beta$ , so  $\beta \in \alpha$ .

**Proposition 4.0.8.** Any nonempty set S of ordinal numbers has a least element.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Pick  $\beta \in S$ 

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Case:  $\beta \cap S = \emptyset$ 

PROOF: Then  $\beta$  is least in S.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . Case:  $\beta \cap S \neq \emptyset$ 

PROOF: The least element of  $\beta \cap S$  is least in S.

**Proposition 4.0.9.** Any transitive set of ordinal numbers is an ordinal number.

PROOF: It is well-ordered by  $\in$  by the above propositions.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 4.0.10.**  $\emptyset$  is an ordinal number.

PROOF: Vacuously, it is a transitive set well-ordered by  $\in$ .

**Definition 4.0.11.** We define  $0 = \emptyset$ .

**Definition 4.0.12** (Successor). The *successor* of a set a is the set  $a^+ := a \cup \{a\}$ .

Proposition 4.0.13. 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  $| | (a^+) = a$ .
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . 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 4.0.14.** 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 4.0.13 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 4.0.15.** We write 0 for  $\emptyset$ , 1 for  $\emptyset^+$ , 2 for  $\emptyset^{++}$ , etc.

**Proposition 4.0.16.** For any ordinal number  $\alpha$  we have  $\alpha^+$  is an ordinal number.

#### Proof:

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

Proof: Proposition 4.0.14.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ .  $\alpha^+$  is well-ordered by  $\in$ .
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . For all  $x, y, z \in \alpha^+$ , if  $x \in y \in z$  then  $x \in z$ 
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$ . Case:  $z = \alpha$

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

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . Case:  $z \in \alpha$ 

PROOF: Then  $x \in z$  since  $\alpha$  is well-ordered by  $\in$ .

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . For all  $x, y \in \alpha^+$  we have  $x \in y$  or x = y or  $y \in x$ 
  - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$ . Case:  $x, y \in \alpha$

PROOF: The result follows because  $\alpha$  is well-ordered by  $\in$ .

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . Case:  $x \in \alpha$ ,  $y = \alpha$ Proof: Then  $x \in y$ .

```
\langle 3 \rangle 3. Case: x = \alpha, y \in \alpha
         PROOF: Then y \in x.
      \langle 3 \rangle 4. Case: x = \alpha, y = \alpha
         PROOF: Then x = y.
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. Every nonempty subset of \alpha^+ has an \in-least element.
      \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: S \subseteq \alpha^+ be nonempty
      \langle 3 \rangle 2. Case: S = \{\alpha\}
         PROOF: \alpha is least in S.
      \langle 3 \rangle 3. Case: S \neq \{\alpha\}
         \langle 4 \rangle 1. S - \{\alpha\} is a nonempty subset of \alpha
         \langle 4 \rangle 2. Let: \beta be least in S - \{\alpha\}
         \langle 4 \rangle 3. \beta is least in S.
Proposition 4.0.17. If A is a set of ordinal numbers then \bigcup A is an ordinal
number.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. \bigcup A is a transitive set.
   Proof: Proposition 1.4.4.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. \bigcup A is a set of ordinals.
Theorem 4.0.18 (Burali-Forti). The class of ordinal numbers is a proper class.
PROOF: If it is a set then it is a transitive set of ordinal numbers, hence an
ordinal number, hence a member of itself, which is impossible. \Box
Theorem 4.0.19 (Hartogs). For any set A, there exists an ordinal not domi-
nated by A.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Let: \alpha be the class of all ordinals \beta such that \beta \leq A
        Prove: \alpha is a set.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: W = \{(B, R) \mid B \subseteq A, R \text{ is a well ordering on } B\}
\langle 1 \rangle 3. \alpha is the class of the ordinals of the elements of W.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. For all (B,R) \in W, the ordinal of (B,R) is in \alpha.
      \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: (B, R) \in W
      \langle 3 \rangle 2. Let: \beta be the ordinal of (B, R)
      \langle 3 \rangle 3. Let: E: B \cong \beta be the canonical isomorphism.
      \langle 3 \rangle 4. Let: i: B \hookrightarrow A be the inclusion
      \langle 3 \rangle 5. i \circ E^{-1} is an injection \beta \to A
      \langle 3 \rangle 6. \ \beta \in \alpha
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. For all \beta \in \alpha, there exists (B, R) \in W such that \beta is the ordinal number
           of (B,R).
      \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: \beta \in \alpha
      \langle 3 \rangle 2. Pick an injection f: \beta \to A
      \langle 3 \rangle 3. Define \leq on ran f by f(x) \leq f(y) iff x \leq y
```

 $\langle 3 \rangle 4$ .  $(\operatorname{ran} f, \leq) \in W$ 

 $\langle 3 \rangle 5$ .  $\beta$  is the ordinal number of  $(\operatorname{ran} f, \leq)$ 

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ .  $\alpha$  is a set.

PROOF: By an Axiom of Replacement.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 5$ .  $\alpha$  is an ordinal.

PROOF: It is a transitive set of ordinals.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \alpha \not \preccurlyeq A$ 

PROOF: Since  $\alpha \notin \alpha$ .

**Theorem 4.0.20** (Numeration Theorem). Every set is equinumerous with some ordinal.

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let: A be any set.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . PICK an ordinal  $\alpha$  not dominated by A.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . Pick a choice function G for A.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . Pick  $e \notin A$
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. Let:  $F: \alpha \to A \cup \{e\}$  by transfinite recursion:

$$F(\gamma) = \begin{cases} G(A - F(\{\delta \mid \delta < \gamma\}) & \text{if } A - F(\{\delta \mid \delta < \gamma\}) \neq \emptyset \\ e & \text{if } A - F(\{\delta \mid \delta < \gamma\}) = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ e \in \operatorname{ran} F$ 
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Assume: for a contradiction  $e \notin \operatorname{ran} F$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . F is an injection  $\alpha \to A$ .
    - $\langle 3 \rangle$ 1. Let:  $\beta, \gamma \in \alpha$  with  $\beta \neq \gamma$ Prove:  $F(\beta) \neq F(\gamma)$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle$ 2. Assume: w.l.o.g.  $\beta < \gamma$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ F(\gamma) \in A F(\{\delta \mid \delta < \gamma\})$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 4$ .  $F(\gamma) \notin F(\{\delta \mid \delta < \gamma\})$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 5. \ F(\gamma) \neq F(\beta)$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF: This contradicts  $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ .

- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$ . Let:  $\delta$  be least such that  $F(\delta) = e$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 8. \ F \upharpoonright \delta : \delta \approx A$

Theorem 4.0.21 (Well-Ordering Theorem). Any set can be well ordered.

- (1)1. Pick an ordinal  $\delta$  and a bijection  $F: A \approx \delta$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Define  $\leq$  on A by  $F(x) \leq F(y)$  iff  $x \leq y$  for  $x, y \in \delta$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \leq \text{is a well ordering on } A.$

# Cardinal Numbers

### 5.1 Cardinal Numbers

**Definition 5.1.1** (Cardinality). For any set A, the *cardinality* |A| of A is the least ordinal equinumerous with A.

**Proposition 5.1.2.** For any sets A and B, we have  $A \approx B$  iff |A| = |B|.

Proof: Easy.  $\square$ 

**Definition 5.1.3** (Addition). Given cardinal numbers  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$ , we define  $\kappa + \lambda$  to be  $|A \cup B|$  where A and B are disjoint sets of cardinality  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$  respectively. We prove this is well-defined.

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Assume:  $A \approx A'$ ,  $B \approx B'$ , and  $A \cap B = A' \cap B' = \emptyset$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Pick bijections  $f: A \approx A'$  and  $g: B \approx B'$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . The function  $A \cup B \to A' \cup B'$  that maps  $a \in A$  to f(a) and  $b \in B$  to g(b) is a bijection.

**Proposition 5.1.4.** For any cardinal number  $\kappa$ , we have  $\kappa + 0 = \kappa$ .

PROOF: Let A and B be disjoint sets of cardinality  $\kappa$  and A. Then  $A = \emptyset$  so  $A \cup B = A$  and so  $A \cup B = \kappa$ .  $\Box$ 

**Theorem 5.1.5** (Associative Law for Addition). For any cardinal numbers  $\kappa$ ,  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$  we have  $\kappa + (\lambda + \mu) = (\kappa + \lambda) + \mu$ .

PROOF: Since  $A \cup (B \cup C) = (A \cup B) \cup C$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.1.6.** For any cardinal numbers  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$  we have  $\kappa + \lambda = \lambda + \kappa$ .

PROOF: Since  $A \cup B = B \cup A$ .  $\square$ 

**Definition 5.1.7** (Multiplication). For  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$  cardinal numbers, we define  $\kappa\lambda$  to be the cardinal number of  $A\times B$ , where  $|A|=\kappa$  and  $|B|=\lambda$ .

We prove this is well-defined.

PROOF: If  $f: A \approx A'$  and  $g: B \approx B'$  then the function that maps (a,b) to (f(a),g(b)) is a bijection  $A \times B \approx A' \times B'$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.1.8.** For any cardinal number  $\kappa$  we have  $\kappa \cdot 0 = 0$ .

PROOF: Since  $A \times \emptyset = \emptyset$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.1.9.** For any cardinal number  $\kappa$  we have  $\kappa \cdot 1 = \kappa$ .

PROOF: The function that maps (a, e) to a is a bijection  $A \times \{e\} \approx A$ .  $\square$ 

**Theorem 5.1.10** (Distributive Law). For any cardinal numbers  $\kappa$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ , we have  $\kappa(\lambda + \mu) = \kappa\lambda + \kappa\mu$ .

PROOF: Since  $A \times (B \cup C) = (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$ .  $\square$ 

**Theorem 5.1.11** (Associative Law for Multiplication). For any cardinal numbers  $\kappa$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ , we have  $\kappa(\lambda\mu) = (\kappa\lambda)\mu$ .

PROOF: Since  $A \times (B \times C) \approx (A \times B) \times C$ .  $\square$ 

**Theorem 5.1.12** (Commutative Law for Multiplication). For any cardinal numbers  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$ , we have  $\kappa\lambda = \lambda\kappa$ .

PROOF: Since  $A \times B \approx B \times A$ .  $\square$ 

**Theorem 5.1.13.** For any cardinal numbers  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$ , if  $\kappa\lambda = 0$  then  $\kappa = 0$  or  $\lambda = 0$ .

PROOF: if  $A \times B = \emptyset$  then  $A = \emptyset$  or  $B = \emptyset$ .  $\square$ 

**Definition 5.1.14** (Exponentiation). Given cardinal numbers  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$ , we define  $\kappa^{\lambda}$  to be  $|A^{B}|$ , where  $|A| = \kappa$  and  $|B| = \lambda$ .

We prove this is well-defined.

PROOF:If  $f: A \approx A'$  and  $g: B \approx B'$ , then the function that maps  $h: B \to A$  to  $f \circ h \circ g^{-1}$  is a bijection  $A^B \approx A'^{B'}$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.1.15.** For any cardinal numbers  $\kappa$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ ,

$$\kappa^{\lambda+\mu} = (\kappa^{\lambda})^{\mu}$$

PROOF: The function that maps  $f: A \times B \to C$  to  $\lambda a \in A.\lambda b \in B.f(a,b)$  is a bijection  $A^{B \times C} \approx (A^B)^C$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.1.16.** For any cardinal numbers  $\kappa$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ ,

$$(\kappa\lambda)^{\mu} = \kappa^{\mu}\lambda^{\mu}$$
.

PROOF: The function  $f: A^C \times B^C \to (A \times B)^C$  with f(g,h)(c) = (g(c),h(c)) is a bijection.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.1.17.** For any cardinal numbers  $\kappa$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ , we have

$$\kappa^{\lambda+\mu} = \kappa^{\lambda}\kappa^{\mu}$$

PROOF: If  $B \cap C = \emptyset$ , then  $f: A^B \times A^C \to A^{B \cup C}$  given by f(g,h)(b) = g(b) and f(g,h)(c) = h(c) is a bijection.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.1.18.** For any cardinal number  $\kappa$ , we have  $\kappa^0 = 1$ .

PROOF: For any set A, we have  $A^{\emptyset} = \{\emptyset\}$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.1.19.** For any cardinal number  $\kappa$ , we have  $\kappa^1 = \kappa$ .

PROOF: For any sets A and B, if  $B = \{b\}$  then the function  $f: A \to A^B$  with f(a)(b) = a is a bijection.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.1.20.** For any non-zero cardinal number  $\kappa$  we have  $0^{\kappa} = 0$ .

PROOF: If A is nonempty then there is no function  $A \to \emptyset$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.1.21.** For any set A we have  $|\mathcal{P}A| = 2^{|A|}$ .

PROOF: The function  $f: \mathcal{P}A \to 2^A$  where f(X)(a) = 0 if  $a \notin X$  and f(X)(a) = 1 if  $a \in X$ .  $\square$ 

Corollary 5.1.21.1. For any cardinal number  $\kappa$  we have  $2^{\kappa} \neq \kappa$ .

PROOF: By Cantor's Theorem.

## 5.2 Ordering on Cardinal Numbers

**Definition 5.2.1** (Domination). A set A is dominated by a set B,  $A \leq B$ , iff there exists an injection  $A \to B$ .

**Definition 5.2.2.** Given cardinal numbers  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$ , we write  $\kappa \leq \lambda$  iff  $A \leq B$  where  $|A| = \kappa$  and  $|B| = \lambda$ . We write  $\kappa < \lambda$  iff  $\kappa \leq \lambda$  and  $\kappa \neq \lambda$ . We prove this is well-defined.

PROOF: If  $f: A \approx A', g: B \approx B'$ , and  $h: A \to B$  is an injection, then  $g \circ h \circ f^{-1}$  is an injection  $A' \to B'$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.2.3.** For any cardinal number  $\kappa$  we have  $0 \leq \kappa$ .

PROOF: For any set A, we have  $\emptyset$  is an injection  $\emptyset \to A$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 5.2.4.** For any cardinal number  $\kappa$  we have  $\kappa < 2^{\kappa}$ .

PROOF: The function that maps a to  $\{a\}$  is an injection  $A \to \mathcal{P}A$ , so  $\kappa \leq 2^{\kappa}$ . They are unequal by Cantor's Theorem.  $\square$ 

Corollary 5.2.4.1. There is no largest cardinal number.

## **Natural Numbers**

### 6.1 Inductive Sets

**Definition 6.1.1** (Inductive). A set I is *inductive* iff  $\emptyset \in I$  and  $\forall x \in I.x^+ \in I$ .

**Definition 6.1.2** (Natural Number). A *natural number* is a set that belongs to every inductive set.

**Theorem 6.1.3.** 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 6.1.4.**  $\mathbb{N}$  is inductive, and is a subset of every other inductive set.

```
PROOF: \langle 1 \rangle 1. \mathbb{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. \mathbb{N} is a subset of every inductive set.
PROOF: Immediate from definitions.
```

**Corollary 6.1.4.1** (Induction Principle for  $\mathbb{N}$ ). Any inductive subset of  $\mathbb{N}$  coincides with  $\mathbb{N}$ .

**Theorem 6.1.5.** Every natural number except 0 is the successor of some natural number.

Proof: Trivially by induction.

Proposition 6.1.6. 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 set.

Proof: Proposition 4.0.14.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 6.1.7.** For natural numbers m and n, if  $m^+ = n^+$  then m = n.

PROOF: If 
$$m^+ = n^+$$
 then
$$m = \bigcup (m^+)$$
(Proposition 4.0.13)
$$= \bigcup (n^+)$$

$$= n$$
(Proposition 4.0.13)

**Proposition 6.1.8.**  $\mathbb{N}$  *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.

## 6.2 Ordering on $\mathbb{N}$

**Proposition 6.2.1.** For any natural numbers m and n, we have m < n if and only if  $m^+ < n^+$ .

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . 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 6.1.7.
```

**Theorem 6.2.2** (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 6.1.6, 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.
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . Assume:  $\forall m (m < n \lor n < m \lor m = n)$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$ . 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 6.2.1.
⟨4⟩5. Case: n = p
Proof: Then n^+ = p^+ = m.
⟨3⟩6. Case: m = n
Proof: Then m < n^+.
```

**Corollary 6.2.2.1.** 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 6.1.6.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . 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 6.2.3** (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:  $\forall m < n.m \notin A$
  - $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ n \notin A$

6.3. RECURSION 49

```
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 6.2.3.1.** There is no function  $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ . f(n+1) < f(n).

**Theorem 6.2.4** (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  $A = \mathbb{N}$ .

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . 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.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall m < n.m \in A$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ n \notin A$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF: This contradicts the hypothesis of the theorem.

#### 6.3 Recursion

**Theorem 6.3.1.** Let < be a linear ordering on A. Then < is a well ordering on A if and only if there does not exist a function  $f: \mathbb{N} \to A$  such that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}. f(n+1) < f(n)$ .

#### Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . If there exists a function  $f : \mathbb{N} \to A$  such that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}. f(n+1) < f(n)$  then < is not a well ordering on A.

PROOF: ran f is a nonempty subset of A with no least element.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . If < is not a well ordering on A then there exists a function  $f: \mathbb{N} \to A$  such that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}. f(n+1) < f(n)$ .
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Assume:  $\langle$  is not a well ordering on A.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . PICK a nonempty subset  $B \subseteq A$  that has no least element.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \forall x \in B. \exists y \in B. y < x$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . Choose a function  $g: B \to B$  such that  $\forall x \in B. g(x) < x$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 5. Pick  $b \in B$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 6$ . Define  $f: \mathbb{N} \to A$  recursively by f(0) = b and  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}. f(n+1) = g(f(n))$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 7. \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. f(n+1) < f(n)$

## 6.4 Cardinality

**Definition 6.4.1** (Finite). A set is *finite* iff it is equinumerous to some natural number; otherwise it is *infinite*.

**Theorem 6.4.2** (Pigeonhole Principle). No natural number is equinumerous to a proper subset of itself.

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let: P(n) be the property: any one-to-one function  $n \to n$  is surjective.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . P(0)

PROOF: The only function  $0 \to 0$  is injective.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . For every natural number n, if P(n) then P(n+1).
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Assume: P(n)
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . Let: f be a one-to-one function  $n+1 \to n+1$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ .  $f \upharpoonright n$  is a one-to-one function  $n \to n+1$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . Case:  $n \notin ranf$ 
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 1. \ f \upharpoonright n : n \to n$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . ran $(f \upharpoonright n) = n$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ f(n) = n$

Proof:  $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ .

- $\langle 3 \rangle 4$ . ran f = n + 1
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5$ . Case:  $n \in \operatorname{ran} f$ 
  - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$ . Pick  $p \in n$  such that f(p) = n
  - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . Let:  $\hat{f}: n \to n$  be the function

$$\hat{f}(p) = f(n)$$

$$\hat{f}(x) = f(x) \qquad (x \neq p)$$

- $\langle 3 \rangle 3$ .  $\hat{f}$  is one-to-one
- $\langle 3 \rangle 4$ . ran  $\hat{f} = n$

PROOF:  $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ 

 $\langle 3 \rangle 5$ . ran f = n + 1

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . For every natural number n, P(n).

Corollary 6.4.2.1. No finite set is equinumerous to a proper subset of itself.

Corollary 6.4.2.2. Every natural number is a cardinal number.

PROOF: For any natural number n, we have that n is the least ordinal such that  $n \approx n$ .  $\square$ 

Corollary 6.4.2.3.  $\mathbb{N}$  is infinite.

PROOF: The function that maps n to n+1 is a bijection between  $\mathbb N$  and  $\mathbb N-\{0\}$ .  $\sqcap$ 

**Proposition 6.4.3.** If C is a proper subset of a natural number n, then there exists m < n such that  $C \approx m$ .

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let: P(n) be the property: for every proper subset C of n, there exists a natural number m such that  $C \approx m$ .
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . P(0)

PROOF: Vacuous.  $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \text{ For every natural number } n, \text{ if } P(n) \text{ then } P(n+1).$   $\langle 2 \rangle 1. \text{ Let: } n \text{ be a natural number.}$   $\langle 2 \rangle 2. \text{ Assume: } P(n)$   $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \text{ Let: } C \text{ be a proper subset of } n+1$   $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \text{ Case: } C=n$   $\text{PROOF: } C \approx n < n+1$   $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \text{ Case: } C \subsetneq n$   $\text{PROOF: There exists } m < n \text{ such that } C \approx m \text{ by } \langle 2 \rangle 2.$   $\langle 2 \rangle 6. \text{ Case: } n \in C$   $\langle 3 \rangle 1. C - \{n\} \subsetneq n$   $\langle 3 \rangle 2. \text{ PICK } m < n \text{ such that } C - \{n\} \approx m$   $\langle 3 \rangle 3. C \approx m+1$   $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \text{ For every natural number } n, P(n).$ 

Corollary 6.4.3.1. Any subset of a finite set is finite.

**Proposition 6.4.4.** For any natural numbers m and n we have  $m + n^+ = (m+n)^+$ .

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . PICK disjoint sets A and B of cardinalities m and n.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Pick an element  $e \notin A \cup B$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ A \cup B \cup \{e\} \approx m + n^+$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ A \cup B \cup \{e\} \approx (m+n)^+$

**Proposition 6.4.5.** For any natural numbers m and n we have m + n is a natural number.

Proof: Induction on n.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 6.4.6.** For any natural numbers m and n we have  $m \cdot n^+ = mn + m$ .

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Pick sets A and B of cardinality m and n respectively.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Pick  $e \notin B$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ A \times (B \cup \{e\}) = (A \times B) \cup (A \times \{e\})$

Corollary 6.4.6.1. For any natural numbers m and n, we have mn is a natural number.

**Corollary 6.4.6.2.** If A and B are finite sets then  $A \times B$  is finite.

**Proposition 6.4.7.** The union of a finite set of finite sets is finite.

Proof: By induction on the number of elements.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 6.4.8.**  $\mathbb{N}^2 \approx \mathbb{N}$ 

PROOF: The function  $J: \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$  defined by  $J(m,n) = ((m+n)^2 + 3m + n)/2$  is a bijection.  $\square$ 

**Corollary 6.4.8.1.** For any natural numbers m and n, we have  $m^n$  is a natural number.

PROOF: By induction on n since  $m^0 = 1$  and  $m^{n+1} = m^n m$ .  $\square$ 

Corollary 6.4.8.2. If A and B are finite sets then  $A^B$  are finite.

#### 6.5 Arithmetic

**Definition 6.5.1** (Even). A natural number n is *even* iff there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that n = 2m.

**Definition 6.5.2** (Odd). A natural number n is odd iff there exists  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  such that n = 2p + 1.

**Proposition 6.5.3** (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  $\exists q, r.m^+ = dq + r \land r < d$ 
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . 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 6.5.4. 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 or odd.

#### Proof:

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ 

6.5. ARITHMETIC

53

```
\langle 2 \rangle2. If n is even then n^+ is odd.
PROOF: If n=2p then n^+=2p+1.
\langle 2 \rangle3. If n is odd then n^+ is even.
PROOF: If n=2p+1 then n^+=2(p+1).
```

**Proposition 6.5.5.** No natural number is both even and odd.

```
Proof:
```

П

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . 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 6.1.5.

 $\langle 3 \rangle 5. \ n^+ = 2q + 2$ 

PROOF:  $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ ,  $\langle 3 \rangle 4$ .

 $\langle 3 \rangle 6. \ n = 2q + 1$ 

Proof: Proposition 6.1.7,  $\langle 3 \rangle 5$ 

- $\langle 3 \rangle 7$ . *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 6.1.7,  $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ 

 $\langle 3 \rangle 4$ . *n* is even.

**Proposition 6.5.6.** For any natural numbers m and n, we have m < n if and only if there exists  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n = m + p^+$ .

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . 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 < 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 6.5.7.** 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 6.2.1.

**Corollary 6.5.7.1.** For natural numbers m, n and p, if m + p = n + p then m = n.

Proof: By trichotomy.  $\square$ 

**Theorem 6.5.8.** 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 ??.

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

Proof:

$$mp^+ = mp + m$$
  
 $< np + m$  (induction hypothesis. Theorem 6.5.7)  
 $< np + n$  ( $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ , Theorem 6.5.7)  
 $= np^+$ 

П

**Corollary 6.5.8.1.** 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 6.5.8.2.** For natural numbers m, n and p, if mp = np and  $p \neq 0$  then m = n.

Proof: By trichotomy.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 6.5.9.** 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.

7

**Proposition 6.5.10.** 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:

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

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

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

$$= 2nq + aq + nb$$

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

$$> mq + np$$

# Group Theory

## 7.1 Groups

**Definition 7.1.1** (Group). A group G consists of a set G and a function  $\cdot: G^2 \to G$  such that:

- $1. \cdot is associative$
- 2. 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 7.1.2.** The inverse of an element in a group is unique.

Proof:

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

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

Proof:

$$b = be$$

$$= bab'$$

$$= eb'$$

$$= b'$$

**Definition 7.1.3.** We write  $x^{-1}$  for the inverse of x.

**Proposition 7.1.4.** In any group, if ab = ac then b = c.

Proof:

$$b = eb$$

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

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

$$= ec$$

$$= c$$

## 7.2 Abelian Groups

**Definition 7.2.1** (Abelian group). An *Abelian group* is a group whose multiplication is commutative.

We may 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  $ab^{-1}$ .

# Ring Theory

### 8.1 Rings

**Definition 8.1.1** (Commutative Ring). A *commutative ring* consists of a set R and two binary operations +,  $\cdot$  on R 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 1 that is different from 0.

**Proposition 8.1.2.** In any commutative ring, 0x = 0.

Proof:

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

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

$$\therefore 0x = 0 \qquad \text{(Proposition 7.1.4)} \square$$

**Proposition 8.1.3.** In any commutative ring, (-a)b = -(ab).

Proof:

$$ab + (-a)b = (a + (-a))b$$
  
=  $0b$   
=  $0$  (Proposition 8.1.2) $\square$ 

## 8.2 Ordered Rings

**Definition 8.2.1** (Ordered Commutative Ring). An *ordered commutative ring* consists of a commutative ring R with a linear order < on R such that:

• for all  $x, y, z \in R$ , we have x < y if and only if x + z < y + z.

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

**Proposition 8.2.2.** In any ordered commutative ring, 0 < 1.

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

**Proposition 8.2.3.** The ordering on an ordered commutative ring is dense; that is, if x < y then there exists z such that x < z < y.

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

## 8.3 Integral Domains

**Definition 8.3.1** (Integral Domain). An *integral domain* is a commutative ring such that, for all  $a, b \in D$ , if ab = 0 then a = 0 or b = 0.

**Proposition 8.3.2.** 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.  $\square$ 

**Definition 8.3.3** (Ordered Integral Domain). An *ordered integral domain* is an ordered commutative ring that is an integral domain.

# Field Theory

### 9.1 Fields

**Definition 9.1.1** (Field). A *field* F is a commutative ring 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 9.1.2. Every field is an integral domain.

PROOF: If ab = 0 and  $a \neq 0$  then  $b = a^{-1}ab = 0$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 9.1.3.** In any field F, we have  $F - \{0\}$  is an Abelian group under multiplication.

PROOF: Immediate from the definition.  $\Box$ 

**Definition 9.1.4** (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:

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1. \sim \text{ is reflexive.}$ 

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 8.3.2.
\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.
  (2)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)]
                                            = ([(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)] \sqcup
\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)].
```

9.1. FIELDS 63

Proof:

```
 \begin{array}{l} \langle 2 \rangle 1. \ \ \text{Let:} \ [(a,b)] \in \mathbb{Q} \\ \langle 2 \rangle 2. \ \ \text{Assume:} \ [(a,b)] \neq [(0,1)] \\ \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \ a \neq 0 \\ \langle 2 \rangle 4. \ \ [(a,b)][(b,a)] = [(1,1)] \\ \square \\ \end{array}
```

**Definition 9.1.5.** For any field F, let N(F) be the intersection of all the subsets  $S \subseteq F$  such that  $1 \in S$  and  $\forall x \in S.x + 1 \in S$ .

**Definition 9.1.6** (Characteristic Zero). A field F has *characteristic*  $\theta$  iff  $0 \notin N(F)$ .

**Proposition 9.1.7.** In a field F with characteristic 0, the function  $n: \mathbb{N} \to N(F)$  defined by

$$n(0) = 1$$
$$n(x+1) = n(x) + 1$$

is a bijection.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . *n* is injective.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Assume: for a contradiction n(i) = n(j) with  $i \neq j$ 

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . Assume: w.l.o.g. i < j

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . n(j-i)=0

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF: This contradicts the fact that F has characteristic 0.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . n is surjective.

PROOF: Since ran n is a subset of F that includes 1 and is closed under +1.

**Definition 9.1.8.** In any field F, let

$$I(F) = N(F) \cup \{0\} \cup \{-x \mid x \in N(F)\}\$$

**Definition 9.1.9.** In any field F, let

$$Q(F) = \{x/y \mid x, y \in I(F), y \neq 0\}$$

**Proposition 9.1.10.** Q(F) is the smallest subfield of F.

PROOF: Q(F) is closed under + and  $\cdot$ , and any subset of F closed under + and  $\cdot$  that contains 0 and 1 must include Q(F).  $\square$ 

**Theorem 9.1.11.** Let F and G be fields of characteristic O. Then there exists a unique field isomorphism between Q(F) and Q(G).

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $\phi : N(F) \to N(G)$  be the unique function such that  $\phi(1) = 1$  and  $\forall x \in N(F). \phi(x+1) = \phi(x) + 1$ .
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ .  $\phi$  is a bijection.

PROOF: Similar to Proposition 9.1.7.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall x, y \in N(F). \phi(x+y) = \phi(x) + \phi(y)$ 

PROOF: Induction on y.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4. \ \forall x, y \in N(F). \phi(xy) = \phi(x)\phi(y)$ 

PROOF: Induction on y.

- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. Extend  $\phi$  to a bijection  $I(F) \cong I(G)$  such that  $\forall x, y \in I(F).\phi(x+y) = \phi(x) + \phi(y)$  and  $\forall x, y \in I(F).\phi(xy) = \phi(x)\phi(y)$ 
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Define  $\phi(0) = 0$  and  $\phi(-x) = -\phi(x)$  for  $x \in N(F)$ 
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 1. \ 0 \notin N(F)$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . For all  $x \in N(F)$  we have  $-x \notin N(F)$

PROOF: Then we would have  $x + -x = 0 \in N(F)$ .

- $\langle 3 \rangle 3$ . For all  $x \in N(F)$  we have  $-x \neq 0$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . For all  $x, y \in I(F)$  we have  $\phi(x+y) = \phi(x) + \phi(y)$

PROOF: Case analysis on x and y.

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . For all  $x, y \in I(F)$  we have  $\phi(xy) = \phi(x)\phi(y)$ 

PROOF: Case analysis on x and y.

- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 6. Extend  $\phi$  to a bijection  $Q(F) \cong Q(G)$  such that  $\forall x, y \in Q(F).\phi(x+y) = \phi(x) + \phi(y)$  and  $\forall x, y \in Q(F).\phi(xy) = \phi(x)\phi(y)$ 
  - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 1. Define  $\phi(x/y) = \phi(x)/\phi(y)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$ .  $\phi$  is unique.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $\theta$  satisfy the theorem.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . For all  $x \in N(F)$  we have  $\theta(x) = \phi(x)$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . For all  $x \in I(F)$  we have  $\theta(x) = \phi(x)$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . For all  $x \in Q(F)$  we have  $\theta(x) = \phi(x)$

#### 9.2 Ordered Fields

**Definition 9.2.1** (Ordered Field). An *ordered field* is an ordered commutative ring that is a field.

**Proposition 9.2.2.** Every ordered field F has characteristic  $\theta$ .

PROOF: We have 0 < n for all  $n \in N(F)$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 9.2.3.** Let F be a field of characteristic 0. Then there exists a unique relation < on Q(F) that makes Q(F) into an ordered field.

Proof: Easy.  $\square$ 

Corollary 9.2.3.1. Let F and G be ordered fields. Let  $\phi$  be the unique field isomorphism between Q(F) and Q(G). Then  $\phi$  is an ordered field isomorphism.

**Definition 9.2.4** (Archimedean). An ordered field F is Archimedean iff

$$\forall x \in F. \exists n \in N(F). n > x .$$

**Proposition 9.2.5.** Let F be an Archimedean ordered field. Let  $x, y \in F$  with x > 0. Then there exists  $n \in N(F)$  such that nx > y.

PROOF: Pick n > y/x.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 9.2.6.** Let F be an Archimedean ordered field. For all  $x, y \in F$ , if x < y, then there exists  $r \in Q(F)$  such that x < r < y.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Case: x > 0
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . PICK  $n \in N(F)$  such that n(y-x) > 1

Proof: Proposition 9.2.5.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . ny > 1 + nx
- $\langle 2 \rangle$ 3. Let: m be the least element of N(F) such that m > nx.
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ .  $m-1 \leq nx$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5$ . nx < m < ny
- $\langle 2 \rangle 6$ . x < m/n < y
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Case:  $x \leq 0$ 
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . PICK  $k \in N(F)$  such that k > -x
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . 0 < x + k < y + k
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . Pick  $r \in Q(F)$  such that x + k < r < y + k

Proof:  $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ 

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . x < r - k < y

**Definition 9.2.7** (Complete). An ordered field F is *complete* iff every nonempty subset of F bounded above has a least upper bound.

**Proposition 9.2.8.** Every complete ordered field is Archimedean.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let: F be a complete ordered field.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Let:  $x \in F$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . Assume: for a contradiction there is no member of N(F) greater than x.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . x is an upper bound for N(F).
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$ . Let:  $y = \sup N(F)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$ . Pick  $n \in N(F)$  such that y 1 < n
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$ . y < n+1
- $\langle 1 \rangle 8$ . Q.E.D.

Proof: This is a contradiction.

**Proposition 9.2.9.** Let F be a complete ordered field and  $a \in F$  be nonnegative. Then there exists  $b \in F$  such that  $b^2 = a$ .

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $B = \{ x \in F \mid 0 \le x \le 1 + a \}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Let:  $\phi : B \to B$  be the function

$$\phi(x) = x + \frac{1}{2(1+a)}(a-x^2) .$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ .  $\phi$  is strictly monotone.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 1. Let:  $0 \le x < y \le 1 + a$  $\langle 2 \rangle$ 2.  $1 \frac{x+y}{2(1+a)} > 0$

  - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \phi(y) \phi(x) = (y x)(1 \frac{x+y}{2(1+a)}) > 0$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ \phi(x) < \phi(y)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . Pick  $b \in B$  such that  $\phi(b) = b$ .

PROOF: Knaster Fixed-Point Theorem.

$$\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ b^2 = a$$

**Theorem 9.2.10** (Uniqueness of the Complete Ordered Field). If F and G are complete ordered fields, then there exists a unique bijection  $\phi: F \cong G$  such that, for all  $x, y \in F$ ,

$$\phi(x+y) = \phi(x) + \phi(y)$$
$$\phi(xy) = \phi(x)\phi(y)$$

This bijection also satisfies: for all  $x, y \in F$ ,

$$x < y \Leftrightarrow \phi(x) < \phi(y)$$
.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Pick a bijection  $\phi: Q(F) \cong Q(G)$  such that, for all  $x, y \in Q(F)$ ,

$$\phi(x+y) = \phi(x) + \phi(y)$$
$$\phi(xy) = \phi(x)\phi(y)$$

$$x < y \Leftrightarrow \phi(x) < \phi(y)$$

Proof: Corollary 9.2.3.1.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Q(F) intersects every interval in F.

Proof: Proposition 9.2.6.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . Q(G) intersects every interval in G.

Proof: Proposition 9.2.6.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . PICK an order isomorphism  $\psi : F \cong G$  that extends  $\phi$ .

PROOF: Theorem 2.5.21.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ \forall x, y \in F. \psi(x+y) = \psi(x) + \psi(y)$ 
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $x, y \in F$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ .  $\psi(x) + \psi(y) \not< \psi(x+y)$ 
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$ . Assume: for a contradiction  $\psi(x) + \psi(y) < \psi(x+y)$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . Pick  $r' \in Q(G)$  such that  $\psi(x) < r' < \psi(x+y) \psi(y)$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$ . Pick  $s' \in Q(G)$  such that  $\psi(y) < s' < \psi(x+y) r'$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 4. \ r' + s' < \psi(x+y)$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 5$ . Pick  $r, s \in Q(F)$  such that  $\phi(r) = r'$  and  $\phi(s) = s'$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 6. \ \phi(r+s) = r' + s'$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 7. \ \psi(x) < \psi(r)$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 8. \ \psi(y) < \psi(s)$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 9. \ \psi(x+y) > \psi(r+s)$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 10. \ x < r$

```
\langle 3 \rangle 11. \ y < s
       \langle 3 \rangle 12. x + y > r + s
       \langle 3 \rangle 13. Q.E.D.
           PROOF: This is a contradiction.
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \psi(x+y) \not< \psi(x) + \psi(y)
       Proof: Similar.
\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \forall x, y \in F. \psi(xy) = \psi(x) \psi(y)
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: x, y \in F
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. Case: x and y are positive.
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. \ \psi(x)\psi(y) \not< \psi(xy)
           \langle 4 \rangle1. Assume: for a contradiction \psi(x)\psi(y) < \psi(xy)
           \langle 4 \rangle 2. PICK r' \in Q(G) such that \psi(x) < r' < \psi(xy)/\psi(y)
           \langle 4 \rangle 3. Pick s' \in Q(G) such that \psi(y) < s' < \psi(xy)/r'
           \langle 4 \rangle 4. r's' < \psi(xy)
           \langle 4 \rangle5. PICK r, s \in Q(F) such that \phi(r) = r' and \phi(s) = s'
           \langle 4 \rangle 6. \ \phi(rs) = r's'
           \langle 4 \rangle 7. x < r, y < s \text{ and } rs < xy
           \langle 4 \rangle 8. Q.E.D.
              PROOF: This is a contradiction.
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. \ \psi(xy) \not< \psi(x)\psi(y)
           PROOF: Similar.
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. Case: x and y are not both positive.
       PROOF: Follows from \langle 2 \rangle 2 since \psi(-x) = -\psi(x) by \langle 1 \rangle 5.
\langle 1 \rangle 7. For any field isomorphism \theta : F \cong G, we have \theta = \psi.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. \ \theta \upharpoonright Q(F) = \phi
       PROOF: Theorem 9.1.11.
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. \theta is strictly monotone.
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: x, y \in F with x < y
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. y - x > 0
       \langle 3 \rangle 3. Pick z \in F such that z^2 = y - x
       \langle 3 \rangle 4. \theta(z)^2 = \theta(y) - \theta(x)
       \langle 3 \rangle 5. \theta(y) - \theta(x) > 0
       \langle 3 \rangle 6. \ \theta(x) < \theta(y)
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ \theta = \psi
       Proof: By the uniqueness of \psi.
```

# Number Systems

## 10.1 The Integers

**Definition 10.1.1.** 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 6.5.7.1.

**Definition 10.1.2** (Addition). Define  $addition + \text{ on } \mathbb{Z}$  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'.

**Proposition 10.1.3.** Addition on  $\mathbb{Z}$  is commutative.

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

**Proposition 10.1.4.** 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 10.1.5.** Given natural numbers m and n, we have [(m,0)] = [(n,0)] iff m = n.

PROOF: Immediate from definitions.

**Definition 10.1.6.** We identify any natural number n with the integer [(n,0)].

**Proposition 10.1.7.** Addition on integers agrees with addition on natural numbers.

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

**Proposition 10.1.8.** For all  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  we have a + 0 = a.

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

**Proposition 10.1.9.** 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 10.1.10. The integers form an Abelian group under addition.

PROOF: Proposition 10.1.3, 10.1.4, 10.1.8, 10.1.9.

**Definition 10.1.11.** 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
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \quad nq + m'q = mq + n'q$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . 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 6.5.7.1.

**Proposition 10.1.12.** Multiplication on integers agrees with multiplication on natural numbers.

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

**Proposition 10.1.13.** *Multiplication on*  $\mathbb{Z}$  *is commutative.* 

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

**Proposition 10.1.14.** *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 10.1.15. Multiplication distributes over addition.

Proof:

$$\begin{split} [(m,n)]([(p,q)]+[(r,s)]) &= [(m,n)][(p+r,q+s)] \\ &= [(mp+mr+nq+ns,np+nr+mq+ms)] \\ [(m,n)][(p,q)]+[(m,n)][(r,s)] &= [(mp+nq,mq+np)]+[(mr+ns,ms+nr)] \\ &= [(mp+nq+mr+ns,mq+np+ms+nr)] \end{split}$$

**Proposition 10.1.16.** For any integer a we have a1 = a.

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

**Proposition 10.1.17.** 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 6.5.10.
     PROOF: If q < p then mp + nq < mq + np by Proposition 6.5.10.
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ p = q
     PROOF: By trichotomy.
```

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

PROOF: Similar.

**Proposition 10.1.18.** The integers  $\mathbb{Z}$  form an integral domain.

PROOF: Propositions 10.1.13, 10.1.14, 10.1.15, 10.1.16, 10.1.17, 10.1.10.

**Definition 10.1.19.** Define < on  $\mathbb{Z}$  by [(m,n)] < [(p,q)] if and only if m+q <n+p.

We prove this is well-defined.

(Theorem 6.5.7)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \langle 1 \rangle 1. & \text{Assume:} \ m+n'=n+m' \ \text{and} \ p+q'=q+p'. \\ & \text{Prove:} \ m+q < n+p \ \text{if and only if} \ m'+q' < n'+p' \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. \ m+q < n+p \ \text{if and only if} \ m'+q' < n'+p' \\ & \text{Proof:} \\ & m+q < n+p \Leftrightarrow m+n'+q < n+n'+p \\ & \Leftrightarrow m'+n+q < n+n'+p \\ & \Leftrightarrow m'+q+p' < n'+p + p' \end{array}$$
 (Theorem 6.5.7) 
$$\begin{array}{ll} \Leftrightarrow m'+q+p' < n'+p+p' \\ \Leftrightarrow m'+q+p' < n'+p+p' \end{array}$$
 (Theorem 6.5.7)

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

 $\Leftrightarrow m' + q' < n' + p'$ (Theorem 6.5.7)

**Proposition 10.1.20.** The ordering on the integers agrees with the ordering on the natural numbers.

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

**Proposition 10.1.21.** < 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 6.5.7.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3.$  < 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 10.1.22** (Positive). An integer a is positive iff a > 0.

**Theorem 10.1.23.** 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 10.1.24.** 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 } 6.5.10, \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. \\ \square
```

**Proposition 10.1.25.** 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.
```

## 10.2 The Rationals

**Definition 10.2.1** (Rational Numbers). The set  $\mathbb{Q}$  of rational numbers is the field of fractions over the integers.

**Proposition 10.2.2.** 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 10.2.3.** 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 10.2.4.** Multiplication on the rationals agrees with multiplication on the integers.

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

**Definition 10.2.5.** 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.

П

**Proposition 10.2.6.** 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 10.2.7.** 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 10.2.8.** 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 10.2.8.1.** For any rational r, we have r < 0 if and only if 0 < -r.

**Definition 10.2.9** (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 10.2.10.** 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 10.2.10.1. The rationals form an ordered field.

**Proposition 10.2.11.** *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 10.1.25. ⟨1⟩3. r < pk
```

## Proposition 10.2.12. $\mathbb{Q} \approx \mathbb{N}$

PROOF: Arrange the rationals in order 0/1, 1/1, 1/2, 0/2, -1/2, -1/1, -2/1, -2/2, -2/3, -1/3, 0/3, 1/3, 2/3, etc. then remove all duplicates.  $\Box$ 

## 10.3 The Real Numbers

**Definition 10.3.1** (Cauchy Sequence). A Cauchy sequence is a sequence  $(q_n)$  of rationals such that, for every positive rational  $\epsilon$ , there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall m, n > k. |q_m - q_n| < \epsilon$ .

**Definition 10.3.2** (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 10.3.3.** 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 10.3.4.** 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.

```
 \begin{array}{l} \langle 1 \rangle 4. \ \text{If} \ q < r \ \text{then} \ q \downarrow \neq r \downarrow \\ \text{PROOF: We have} \ q \in r \downarrow \ \text{and} \ q \notin q \downarrow. \\ \langle 1 \rangle 5. \ \text{If} \ r < q \ \text{then} \ q \downarrow \neq r \downarrow \\ \text{PROOF: We have} \ r \in q \downarrow \ \text{and} \ q \notin q \downarrow. \\ \square \end{array}
```

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

**Definition 10.3.5.** Define the ordering < on  $\mathbb{R}$  by: x < y iff  $x \subseteq y$ .

**Proposition 10.3.6.** 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 \subseteq 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 10.3.4.
\langle 1 \rangle 5. If q \downarrow \subsetneq 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 10.3.7.** 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:  $x \nsubseteq y$ 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 10.3.8.** Any bounded nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  has a least upper bound.

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . 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 10.3.9** (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 10.3.10.** Addition on the reals agrees with addition on the rationals.

```
PROOF: \begin{split} &\langle 1 \rangle 1. \text{ Let: } q,r \in \mathbb{Q} \\ &\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ q \downarrow + r \downarrow \subseteq (q+r) \downarrow \\ &\text{PROOF: If } s_1 < q \text{ and } s_2 < r \text{ 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 \end{split}
```

Proposition 10.3.11. Addition is associative.

Proof:

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

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

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

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

П

Proposition 10.3.12. Addition is commutative.

Proof:

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

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

$$= y + x$$

**Proposition 10.3.13.** 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.

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

**Definition 10.3.14.** For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , define  $-x := \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \exists r > q. -r \notin x\}$ .

**Proposition 10.3.15.** 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 10.3.16.** 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 10.2.11.
    \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 10.3.17. 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 10.3.16.
    \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 10.3.17.1. The reals form an Abelian group under addition.

**Proposition 10.3.18.** For any reals x, y and z, we have x < y if and only if x + z < y + z.

```
\begin{split} &\langle 1 \rangle 1. \  \, \forall x,y,z \in \mathbb{R}. x \leq y \Rightarrow x+z \leq y+z \\ &\langle 2 \rangle 1. \  \, \text{Let:} \  \, x,y,z \in \mathbb{R} \\ &\langle 2 \rangle 2. \  \, \text{Assume:} \  \, x \leq y \\ &\langle 2 \rangle 3. \  \, \text{For all} \, \, q \in x \, \, \text{and} \, \, r \in z \, \, \text{we have} \, \, q+r \in y+z \end{split}
```

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ .  $\forall x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}.x + z = y + z \Leftrightarrow x = y$ PROOF: Proposition 7.1.4.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \forall x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}. x < y \Rightarrow x + z < y + z$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . Q.E.D.

Proof: Proposition 3.1.23.

Γ

**Definition 10.3.19** (Absolute Value). The *absolute value* of a real number x is defined to be

$$|x| = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } 0 \le x \\ -x & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases}$$

**Definition 10.3.20** (Multiplication). Define multiplication  $\cdot$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  as follows:

• If x and y are non-negative then

$$xy = 0 \cup \{rs \mid 0 \le r \in x \land 0 \le s \in y\} .$$

• If x and y are both negative then

$$xy = (-x)(-y) .$$

• If one of x and y is negative and one is non-negative then

$$xy = -(|x||y|) .$$

We prove this is well-defined.

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let: x and y be non-negative reals.

PROVE: xy is real.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ xy \neq \emptyset$ 

PROOF: Since  $-1 \in xy$ .

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ xy \neq \mathbb{Q}$ 

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Pick  $r \notin x$  and  $s \notin y$ 

Prove:  $rs \notin xy$ 

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ .  $0 \le r$  and  $0 \le s$ 

PROOF: Since  $0 \subseteq x$  and  $0 \subseteq y$ .

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . Assume: for a contradiction  $rs \in xy$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . Pick r' and s' such that  $0 \leq r' \in x$ ,  $0 \leq s' \in y$  and rs = r's'
- $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ r' < r$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 6. \ s' < s$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 7$ . r's' < rs
- $\langle 2 \rangle 8$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF: This is a contradiction.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . xy is closed downwards.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $q \in xy$  and r < q

```
\langle 2 \rangle 2. Case: q \in 0
      PROOF: Then r < q < 0 so r \in xy
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. Case: q = s_1 s_2 where 0 \le s_1 \in x and 0 \le s_2 \in y
      \langle 3 \rangle 1. Assume: w.l.o.g. 0 \le r
      \langle 3 \rangle 2. 0 < s_1 and 0 < s_2
      \langle 3 \rangle 3. \ r/s_2 < s_1
      \langle 3 \rangle 4. \ r/s_2 \in x
      \langle 3 \rangle 5. r = (r/s_2)s_2 \in xy
\langle 1 \rangle 5. xy has no greatest element.
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: q \in xy
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. Case: q \in 0
      Proof: q < q/2 \in 0
   \langle 2 \rangle 3. Case: q = rs where 0 \le r \in x and 0 \le s \in y
      \langle 3 \rangle 1. Pick r' and s' with r < r' \in x and s < s' \in y
      \langle 3 \rangle 2. q < r's' \in xy
П
Proposition 10.3.21. Multiplication is commutative.
PROOF: Immediate from definition.
Proposition 10.3.22. Multiplication is associative.
Proof:
\langle 1 \rangle 1. For non-negative reals x, y and z, we have x(yz) = (xy)z
   PROOF: It computes to 0 \cup \{qrs \mid 0 \le q \in x, 0 \le r \in y, 0 \le s \in z\}.
\langle 1 \rangle 2. For all reals x, y and z, we have x(yz) = (xy)z
   PROOF: It is equal to |x||y||z| if an even number of them are negative, and
   -(|x||y||z|) otherwise.
Proposition 10.3.23. Multiplication distributes over addition.
\langle 1 \rangle 1. For all non-negative reals x, y and z, we have x(y+z) = xy + xz
   \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: x, y and z be non-negative reals.
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. x(y+z) \subseteq xy+xz
      \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: q \in x(y+z)
      \langle 3 \rangle 2. Case: q < 0
         PROOF: Then we have q/2 \in xy and q/2 \in xz so q \in xy + xz.
      \langle 3 \rangle 3. Case: q = rs where 0 \le r \in x and 0 \le s \in y + z
         \langle 4 \rangle 1. PICK s_1 \in y and s_2 \in z such that s = s_1 + s_2
         \langle 4 \rangle 2. \ rs_1 \in xy
            PROOF: If s_1 < 0 then rs_1 < 0 so rs_1 \in xy. If 0 \le s_1 then we also
            have rs_1 \in xy.
         \langle 4 \rangle 3. \ rs_2 \in xz
            PROOF: Similar.
         \langle 4 \rangle 4. \ \ q \in xy + xz
```

PROOF: Since  $q = rs_1 + rs_2$ .

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ xy + xz \subseteq x(y+z)$ 
  - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $q \in xy$  and  $r \in xz$ .

PROVE:  $q + r \in x(y + z)$ 

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . Case: q < 0 and r < 0

PROOF: Then q + r < 0 so  $q + r \in x(y + z)$ .

- $\langle 3 \rangle 3$ . Case: q < 0 and  $r = r_1 r_2$  where  $0 \le r_1 \in x$  and  $0 \le r_2 \in z$ 
  - $\langle 4 \rangle 1. \ q + r < r$
  - $\langle 4 \rangle 2. \ q + r \in xz$
  - $\langle 4 \rangle 3$ . Assume: w.l.o.g.  $0 \leq q + r$

PROOF: Otherwise  $q + r \in x(y + z)$  immediately.

- $\langle 4 \rangle 4$ . PICK  $s_1, s_2$  with  $0 \leq s_1 \in x$ ,  $0 \leq s_2 \in y$  and  $q + r = s_1 s_2$
- $\langle 4 \rangle 5. \ s_2 \in y + z$

PROOF: Since  $0 \in z$  so  $s_2 = s_2 + 0 \in y + z$ .

- $\langle 4 \rangle 6. \ q+r \in x(y+z)$
- $\langle 3 \rangle 4$ . Case:  $q = q_1 q_2$  where  $0 \le q_1 \in x$  and  $0 \le q_2 \in y$  and r < 0 Proof: Similar.
- $\langle 3 \rangle$ 5. CASE:  $q=q_1q_2$  where  $0 \leq q_1 \in x$  and  $0 \leq q_2 \in y$  and  $r=r_1r_2$  where  $0 \leq r_1 \in x$  and  $0 \leq r_2 \in z$ 
  - $\langle 4 \rangle 1$ . Assume: w.l.o.g.  $q_1 \leq r_1$
  - $\langle 4 \rangle 2. \ \ q + r \le r_1(q_2 + r_2) \in x(y + z)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 2. For any negative real x and non-negative reals y and z, we have x(y+z)=xy+xz

Proof:

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

$$= -((-x)y) - ((-x)z)$$

$$= xy + xz$$
(\langle 1\rangle 1)

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . For any non-negative real x and reals y and z with one negative and one non-negative, we have x(y+z)=xy+xz
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Assume: w.l.o.g. y is negative and z is non-negative.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . Case:  $0 \le y + z$

$$xy + xz = xy + x(-y + y + z)$$

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

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

$$= x(y + z)$$
(\langle 1\rangle 1)

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . Case: y + z < 0
  - $\langle 3 \rangle 1. -y z > 0$
  - $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . -y = z y z
  - $\langle 3 \rangle 3$ . xy + xz = x(y+z)

Proof:

$$xy + xz = -(x(-y)) + xz$$

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

$$= -(xz + x(-y - z)) + xz \qquad (\langle 1 \rangle 1)$$

$$= -xy - x(-y - z) + xz$$

$$= -x(-y - z)$$

$$= x(y + z)$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . For any non-negative real x and negative reals y and z, we have x(y+z)=xy+xz

Proof:

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

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

$$= -x(-y) - x(-z)$$

$$= xy + xz$$

$$(\langle 1 \rangle 1)$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle$ 5. For any negative real x and reals y and z with one negative and one non-negative, we have x(y+z)=xy+xz
  - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 1. Assume: w.l.o.g. y is negative and z is non-negative.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . Case:  $0 \le y + z$

Proof:

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

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

$$= -((-x)y) - ((-x)z)$$

$$= (-x)(-y) - ((-x)z)$$

$$= xy + xz$$
(\langle 1\rangle 3)

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . Case: y + z < 0

Proof:

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

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

$$= xy + xz$$

$$(\langle 1 \rangle 3)$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle$ 6. For any negative reals x, y and z, we have x(y+z) = xy + xz Proof:

$$x(y+z) = (-x)(-y-z) = (-x)(-y) + (-x)(-z) = xy + xz$$
 (\langle 1\rangle 1)

**Proposition 10.3.24.** For any real x we have x1 = x.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Case:  $0 \le x$ 
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ .  $x1 \subseteq x$ 
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 1$ . Let:  $q \in x1$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 2. \text{ CASE: } q < 0$$

$$\text{PROOF: Then } q \in x \text{ because } 0 \leq x.$$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 3. \quad q = rs \text{ where } 0 \leq r \in x \text{ and } 0 \leq s < 1$$

$$\text{PROOF: Then } q < r \text{ so } q \in x.$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 2. \quad x \subseteq x1$$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 1. \text{ Let: } q \in x$$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 2. \text{ Assume: w.l.o.g. } 0 \leq q$$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 3. \text{ PICK } r \text{ such that } q < r \in x$$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 4. \quad 0 \leq q/r < 1$$

$$\langle 3 \rangle 5. \quad q = r(q/r) \in x1$$

$$\langle 1 \rangle 2. \text{ CASE: } x < 0$$

$$\text{PROOF:}$$

$$x1 = -((-x)1)$$

$$= -(-x)$$

$$= x$$

$$(\langle 1 \rangle 1)$$

**Lemma 10.3.25.** Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and c be a positive rational. Then there exists  $a \in x$  and a non-least rational upper bound b for x such that b - a = c.

#### PROOF:

- (1)1. PICK  $a_1 \in x$  such that if x has a rational supremum s then  $a_1 > s c$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . There exists a natural number n such that  $a_1 + nc$  is an upper bound for x.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . PICK a non-least upper bound  $b_1$  for x.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . PICK a natural number n such that  $nc > b_1 a_1$

PROOF: Proposition 10.2.11.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ .  $a_1 + nc > b_1$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ .  $a_1 + nc$  is an upper bound for x.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . Let: k be the least natural number such that  $a_1 + kc$  is an upper bound for x.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ .  $a_1 + (k-1)c \in x$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$ .  $a_1 + kc$  is not the supremum of x.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 1. Assume: for a contradiction  $a_1 + kc$  is the supremum of x.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ .  $a_1 > a_1 + (k-1)c$

Proof:  $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ 

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

PROOF: This is a contradiction.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$ . Let:  $a = a_1 + (k-1)c$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$ . Let:  $b = a_1 + kc$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 8. \ b-a=c$

Ù.

**Proposition 10.3.26.** For any non-zero real x, there exists a real y such that xy = 1.

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Case: 0 < x
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. Let: y = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q \leq 0\} \cup \{u^{-1} \mid u \text{ is an upper bound for } x \text{ but not the supremum of } x\}
   \langle 2 \rangle 2. y is a real number.
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. \ y \neq \emptyset
           PROOF: Since 0 \in y.
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. \ y \neq \mathbb{Q}
           \langle 4 \rangle 1. PICK q \in x such that 0 < q
           \langle 4 \rangle 2. \ q^{-1} \notin y
       \langle 3 \rangle 3. y is closed downwards.
           \langle 4 \rangle 1. Let: q \in y and r < q
                    Prove: r \in y
           \langle 4 \rangle 2. Assume: w.l.o.g. 0 < r
           \langle 4 \rangle 3. q^{-1} is a non-least upper bound for x. \langle 4 \rangle 4. q^{-1} < r^{-1}
           \langle 4 \rangle 5. r^{-1} is a non-least upper bound for x.
           \langle 4 \rangle 6. \ r \in y
       \langle 3 \rangle 4. y has no greatest element.
           \langle 4 \rangle 1. Let: q \in y
                    PROVE: There exists r \in y such that q < r
           \langle 4 \rangle 2. Case: q \leq 0
               \langle 5 \rangle 1. PICK a non-least upper bound u for x.
               \langle 5 \rangle 2. \ q < u^{-1} \in x
           \langle 4 \rangle 3. Case: q = u^{-1} where u is a non-least upper bound for x.
               \langle 5 \rangle1. PICK a non-least upper bound v with v < u
               \langle 5 \rangle 2. \ u^{-1} < v^{-1} \in y
    \langle 2 \rangle 3. \ 0 < y
    \langle 2 \rangle 4. xy \subseteq 1
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: q \in xy
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. Assume: w.l.o.g. 0 < q
       \langle 3 \rangle 3. Pick 0 < r \in x and 0 < s \in y such that q = rs
       \langle 3 \rangle 4. \ s^{-1} is a non-least upper bound for x
       \langle 3 \rangle 5. \ r < s^{-1}
       \langle 3 \rangle 6. \ rs < 1
    \langle 2 \rangle 5. 1 \subseteq xy
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. Let: q < 1
                Prove: q \in xy
       \langle 3 \rangle 2. Assume: w.l.o.g. 0 < q
       \langle 3 \rangle 3. PICK a_1 with 0 < a_1 \in x
       \langle 3 \rangle 4. \ (1-q)a_1 > 0
       \langle 3 \rangle 5. Pick a \in x and a non-least upper bound w of x such that w - a =
                (1-q)a_1
           Proof: Lemma 10.3.25.
       \langle 3 \rangle 6. \ \ w - a < (1 - q)w
       \langle 3 \rangle 7. qw < a
       \langle 3 \rangle 8. \ w < a/q
       \langle 3 \rangle 9. a/q is a non-least upper bound for x
```

```
\langle 3 \rangle 10. \ q/a \in y
\langle 3 \rangle 11. \ q \in xy
\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \text{Case:} \ x < 0
\langle 2 \rangle 1. \ \text{Pick} \ y \ \text{such that} \ (-x)y = 1
\text{Proof:} \ \langle 1 \rangle 1
\langle 2 \rangle 2. \ x(-y) = 1
```

**Proposition 10.3.27.** For real numbers x, y and z, if 0 < z then x < y if and only if xz < yz.

#### Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . For any real numbers x, y and z, if 0 < z and x < y then xz < yz
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Let: x, y and z be real numbers.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . Assume: 0 < z and x < y.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 3. \ y = x + (y x)$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ y x > 0$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 5$ . (y-x)z > 0
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 6$ . yz > xz

Proof:

$$yz = (x + (y - x))z$$
$$= xz + (y - x)z$$
$$> xz$$

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . For any real numbers x, y and z, if 0 < z and xz < yz then x < y PROOF: Proposition 3.1.23.

Corollary 10.3.27.1. The real numbers form a complete ordered field.

## Proposition 10.3.28.

$$(0,1) \approx \mathbb{R}$$

PROOF: The function  $f(x) = (2x-1)/(x-x^2)$  is a bijection between (0,1) and  $\mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$ 

## Proposition 10.3.29.

$$\mathbb{R} \not\approx \mathbb{N}$$

## Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Assume: for a contradiction  $f : \mathbb{N} \approx \mathbb{R}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Let: z be the real number with integer part 0 whose n+1st decimal place is 7 unless the n+1st decimal place of f(n) is 7, in which case it is 6.
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3. \ z \neq f(n) \text{ for all } n.$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . Q.E.D.

Proof: This is a contradiction.

## Chapter 11

# Complex Analysis

**Definition 11.0.1.** 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 11.0.2.** If  $(x_n), (y_n) \in l^p$  then  $(x_n + y_n) \in l^p$ .

Proof:

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1$$
. Let:  $(x_n), (y_n) \in l^p$   
 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ .  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n + y_n|^p \leq 2^p (\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|^p + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n|^p)$   
PROOF:

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $|x_n + y_n|^p \leq 2^p (|x_n|^p + |y_n|^p)$ .

Proof:  $|x_n + y_n|^p \le (|x_n| + |y_n|)^p$ 

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

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

**Theorem 11.0.3** (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

$$x^{1/p} \le \frac{1}{p}x + \frac{1}{q} .$$

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

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

 $x^{1/p} \leq \frac{1}{p}x + \frac{1}{q} .$   $\langle 2 \rangle 1.$  Let:  $f(x) = x/p + 1/q - x^{1/p}$   $\langle 2 \rangle 2.$   $f'(x) = 1/p(1 - x^{(1-p)/p})$   $\langle 2 \rangle 3.$   $f'(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$   $\langle 2 \rangle 4.$   $f : \mathbb{R}^n$  $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . 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:  $a^p \leq b^q$ 

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

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

 $\langle 2 \rangle 1. \text{ Case: } a^p \leq b^q$   $\langle 3 \rangle 1. ab^{-q/p} \leq \frac{1}{p} \frac{a^p}{b^q} + \frac{1}{q}$ 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 11.0.4** (Minkowski's Inequality). Let  $p \geq 1$ . 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:

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

$$< \infty$$
 (Proposition 11.0.2)

 $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . 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

# Chapter 12

# Vector Spaces

## 12.1 Vector Spaces

**Definition 12.1.1** (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*;
- $\bullet \ +: V^2 \to V$
- $\bullet : K \times V \to V$

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 12.1.2.** 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 12.1.3.** 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 12.1.4.** The set  $\mathbb{C}$  is a real vector space under complex addition and complex multiplication.

PROOF: TODO

**Proposition 12.1.5.** The set  $\mathbb{C}$  is a complex vector space under complex addition and complex multiplication.

PROOF: TODO

**Proposition 12.1.6.** 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  $V_i$ .  $\square$ 

**Corollary 12.1.6.1.** Let V be a vector space over K. For any set I, we have  $V^I$  is a vector space over K.

**Corollary 12.1.6.2.** 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 12.1.7.** 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.

 $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ u + 0 = u$ 

$$u + 0 = v + u' + 0 \tag{\langle 3 \rangle 2}$$

$$= v + u' \tag{222}$$

$$=u$$
  $(\langle 3 \rangle 2)$ 

$$\langle 1 \rangle 2$$
. 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:  $\forall v \in V.v + 0' = v$
- $\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ 0 = 0'$

$$0 = 0 + 0' \tag{\langle 2 \rangle 2}$$

$$=0' \qquad (\langle 2 \rangle 3)$$

П

**Proposition 12.1.8.** 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 12.1.7)  
 $= x + v + y$  ( $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ )  
 $= 0 + y$  ( $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ )  
 $= y$  (Proposition 12.1.7)

**Proposition 12.1.9.** 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 12.1.8)  
=  $u$  (Proposition 12.1.7)

 $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . 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 12.1.8)  
=  $x$  (Proposition 12.1.7)

П

**Proposition 12.1.10.** 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 12.1.7)  
 $= v + u + (-u)$  (Proposition 12.1.8)  
 $= w + u + (-u)$  ( $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ )  
 $= w + 0$  (Proposition 12.1.8)  
 $= w$  (Proposition 12.1.7)

**Proposition 12.1.11.** 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 12.1.7)

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

Proof: Proposition 12.1.10.

П

**Proposition 12.1.12.** 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 12.1.13.** Let V be a vector space over K. For all  $v \in V$  we have 0v = 0.

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

$$0v+0=0v \qquad \qquad \text{(Proposition 12.1.7)}$$
 
$$= (0+0)v \qquad \qquad = 0v+0v \qquad \qquad \text{(Axiom 5)}$$
 
$$\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ 0v=0 \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{PROOF: Proposition 12.1.10, } \langle 1 \rangle 1.$$
 
$$\square$$

**Proposition 12.1.14.** Let V be a vector space over K. Let  $v \in V$ . Then (-1)v = -v.

PROOF:  $\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ v + (-1)v = 0$ PROOF: v + (-1)v = 1v + (-1)v (Axiom 7) = (1 + (-1))v (Axiom 5) = 0v = 0 (Proposition 12.1.13)  $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \text{Q.E.D.}$  PROOF: Proposition 12.1.8.

## 12.2 Subspaces

**Definition 12.2.1** (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 12.2.2.** 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 12.2.3. Every vector space is a subspace of itself.

Proof: Trivial.

**Proposition 12.2.4.** Let  $\Omega$  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  $\mathbb{C}^{\Omega}$ .

PROOF: If  $f, g: \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$  are continuous then so is  $\alpha f + \beta g$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 12.2.5.** Let  $\Omega$  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  $\mathbb{C}^{\Omega}$ .

PROOF: If  $f, g: \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$  have continuous partial derivatives of order k then so does  $\alpha f + \beta g$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 12.2.6.** Let  $\Omega$  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  $\mathbb{C}^{\Omega}$ .

PROOF: If  $f, g: \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$  are infinitely differentiable then so is  $\alpha f + \beta g$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 12.2.7.** Let  $\Omega$  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  $\mathbb{C}^{\Omega}$ .

PROOF: If  $f, g: \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$  are polynomials in N variables then so is  $\alpha f + \beta g$ .  $\square$ 

**Proposition 12.2.8.** 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 12.2.9.** 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 12.2.10.** 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 12.2.11.** 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 12.2.12.** 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 11.0.2, and it is easy to see that it is closed under scalar multiplication.  $\Box$ 

## 12.3 Linear Independence and Bases

**Definition 12.3.1** (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 12.3.2** (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 12.3.3** (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 12.3.4.** 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 12.3.5** (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 12.3.6** (Finite Dimensional). A vector space is *finite dimensional* iff there exists a finite basis; otherwise it is *infinite dimensional*.

**Proposition 12.3.7.** In a finite dimensional space, any two bases have the same size.

TODO

**Definition 12.3.8** (Dimension). The *dimension* of a finite dimensional vector space V, dim V, is the number of vectors in any basis.

**Proposition 12.3.9.** 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 12.3.10.** 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 12.3.11.** Let  $\Omega$  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 12.3.12.** 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.  $\sqcap$ 

## 12.4 Linear Mappings

**Definition 12.4.1** (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 12.4.2** (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 12.4.3.** Let U and V be vector spaces over K. The set of linear mappings from U to V is a subspace of  $V^U$ .

## 12.5 Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors

**Definition 12.5.1** (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  $\lambda$  iff  $A(v) = \lambda v$ .

# Chapter 13

# Normed Spaces

**Definition 13.0.1** (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 13.0.2.** In a normed space, ||0|| = 0.

PROOF: 
$$||0|| = |0|||0|| = 0$$
 by Axiom 2.

**Proposition 13.0.3.** Let V be a normed vector space over K. For all  $v \in V$  we have  $||v|| \ge 0$ .

Proof:

$$0 = ||0||$$
 (Proposition 13.0.2)  

$$= ||v - v||$$
 (Triangle Inequality)  

$$= 2||v||$$
 (Axiom 2)

**Proposition 13.0.4.** 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)  

$$= ||v - v|| + ||u||$$
 (Axiom 2)  

$$\therefore ||v|| - ||u|| \le ||u - v||$$

**Definition 13.0.5** (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 13.0.6.** 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:

$$\|\vec{u} + \vec{v}\|^{2} = |u_{1} + v_{1}|^{2} + \dots + |u_{n} + v_{n}|^{2}$$

$$= |u_{1}|^{2} + \dots + |u_{n}|^{2} + |v_{1}|^{2} + \dots + |v_{n}|^{2}$$

$$+ 2|u_{1}||v_{1}| + \dots + 2|u_{n}||v_{n}|$$

$$\leq \|\vec{u}\|^{2} + \|\vec{v}\|^{2} + 2|u_{1}v_{1} + \dots + u_{n}v_{n}|$$

$$\leq \|\vec{u}\|^{2} + \|\vec{v}\|^{2} + 2\|\vec{u}\|\|\vec{v}\| \qquad \text{(Cauchy-Schwarz)}$$

$$= (\|\vec{u}\| + \|\vec{v}\|)^{2}$$

Corollary 13.0.6.1. The absolute value function | | is a norm on K.

**Proposition 13.0.7.** 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 13.0.8.** The function  $\|\vec{x}\| = \max(|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|)$  is a norm on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ .

Proof:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{TROOF.} \\ \langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \text{If } \|\vec{x}\| = 0 \ \text{then } \vec{x} = \vec{0} \\ \text{PROOF: If } \max(|x_1|, \dots, |x|n|) = 0 \ \text{then } x_1 = \dots = x_n = 0. \\ \langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \|\lambda \vec{x}\| = |\lambda| \|\vec{x}\| \\ \text{PROOF:} \\ \|\lambda \vec{x}\| = \max(|\lambda x_1|, \dots, |\lambda x_n|) \\ &= |\lambda| \max(|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|) \\ &= |\lambda| \|\vec{x}\| \\ \langle 1 \rangle 3. \ \|\vec{u} + \vec{v}\| \leq \|\vec{u}\| + \|\vec{v}\| \\ \text{PROOF:} \\ \|\vec{u} + \vec{v}\| = \max(|u_1 + v_1|, \dots, |u_n + v_n|) \\ &\leq \max(|u_1| + |v_1|, \dots, |u_n| + |v_n|) \\ &\leq \max(|u_1|, \dots, |u_n|) + \max(|v_1|, \dots, |v_n|) \end{array}$$

**Definition 13.0.9** (Uniform Convergence Norm). Let  $\Omega$  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 13.0.10.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.0.11.** 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 13.0.12.** 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 13.0.13.** 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 13.0.14. 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 13.0.3.
\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 13.0.2.
\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.

## 13.1 Convergence

**Proposition 13.1.1.** 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.  $\Box$ 

Proposition 13.1.2. 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:  $\epsilon = ||l m||/2$
- (1)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 13.1.3** (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 13.1.4. 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 13.1.5.** 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  $n \to \infty$

П

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle 1 \rangle 4. \ \ \text{Let: } \epsilon > 0 \\ \langle 1 \rangle 5. \ \ \text{Pick } N \ \text{such that, for all } n \geq N, \ \text{we have } \|x_n - l\| < \epsilon/2 |\lambda| \ \text{and } |\lambda_n - \lambda| < \sqrt{\epsilon/2} \ \text{and } \|x_n\| < \sqrt{\epsilon/2} \\ \langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \ \text{Let: } n \geq N \\ \langle 1 \rangle 7. \ \|\lambda_n x_n - \lambda l\| < \epsilon \\ \ \ \text{Proof:} \\ \|\lambda_n x_n - \lambda l\| \leq \|\lambda_n x_n - \lambda x_n\| + \|\lambda x_n - \lambda l\| \qquad \text{(Triangle Inequality)} \\ = |\lambda_n - \lambda| \|x_n\| + |\lambda| \|x_n - l\| \qquad \qquad (\text{Axiom 2}) \\ < \sqrt{\epsilon/2} \sqrt{\epsilon/2} + |\lambda| \epsilon/2 |\lambda| \qquad \qquad (\langle 1 \rangle 5) \\ = \epsilon \end{array}$$

**Proposition 13.1.6.** 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 13.1.7** (Uniform Convergence). Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.8.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.9** (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 13.1.10.** 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.

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 13.1.11** (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 13.1.12.** 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  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  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  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  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 \leq \|x\|_2 \leq \beta \|x\|_1, then \| \ \|_1 and \| \ \|_2 are equivalent.
```

- $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . Assume:  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  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 13.1.13.** 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  $|\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n| = 0$  then  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n = 0$  so  $\alpha_1 e_1 + \dots + \alpha_n e_n = 0$ 

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ .  $\|\lambda v\|_0 = |\lambda| \|v\|_0$ 

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 13.0.13,  $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ ,  $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ .

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . 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:

$$||x|| = ||\alpha_1 e_1 + \dots + \alpha_n e_n|| \qquad (\langle 4 \rangle 1)$$

$$\leq |\alpha_1| ||e_1|| + \dots + |\alpha_n| ||e_n|| \qquad (\langle 2 \rangle 1)$$

$$\leq \beta(|\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n|) \tag{(2)3}$$

$$=\beta \|x\|_0 \tag{(1)4}$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 6$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF: Theorem 13.1.12,  $\langle 1 \rangle 5$ ,  $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ ,  $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ ,  $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ ,  $\langle 2 \rangle 5$ .

**Definition 13.1.14** (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 13.1.15** (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 13.1.16** (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 13.1.17** (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 13.1.18.** 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 13.1.19. 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 13.1.20.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.21.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.22.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.23.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.24. 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 13.1.25. 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 13.1.26.** In any normed space,  $\emptyset$  is open.

Proof: Vacuous.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 13.1.27.** 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 13.1.28** (Closed Set). Let V be a normed space over K. A set  $S \subseteq V$  is *closed* iff V - S is open.

Proposition 13.1.29. Every closed ball is closed.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . Let: V be a normed space over K.
- $\begin{array}{ll} \langle 1 \rangle 2. \ \ \mathrm{Let:} \ \ c \in V \ \ \mathrm{and} \ \ r > 0 \\ & \mathrm{Prove:} \ \ \overline{B}(c,r) \ \mathrm{is} \ \mathrm{closed}. \end{array}$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . Let:  $x \in V \overline{B}(c, r)$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . Let:  $\epsilon = ||x c|| r$ Prove:  $B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq V - \overline{B}(c, r)$

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle 1 \rangle 5. \ \epsilon > 0 \\ \text{PROOF: Since } \|x-c\| > r \text{ by } \langle 1 \rangle 3. \\ \langle 1 \rangle 6. \ \text{Let: } y \in B(x,\epsilon) \\ \langle 1 \rangle 7. \ \|y-c\| > r \\ \text{PROOF: } \\ \|y-c\| \geq \|x-c\| - \|x-y\| \\ & > \|x-c\| - \epsilon \\ & = r \end{array} \qquad \text{(Triangle Inequality)}$$

**Proposition 13.1.30.** The intersection of a set of closed sets is closed.

Proof: From Proposition 13.1.24.  $\square$ 

Proposition 13.1.31. The union of two closed sets is closed.

Proof: From Proposition 13.1.25.  $\square$ 

Proposition 13.1.32. Every sphere is closed.

PROOF:  $S(c,r) = \overline{B}(c,r) - B(c,r)$ .

**Proposition 13.1.33.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.34.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.35.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.36.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.37.** Let  $\Omega$  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 13.1.38.** In any normed space V, we have  $\emptyset$  is closed.

PROOF: Since  $V - \emptyset = V$  is open.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 13.1.39.** In any normed space V, the whole space V is closed.

PROOF: Since  $V - V = \emptyset$  is open.  $\square$ 

**Theorem 13.1.40.** 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 13.1.41** (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 13.1.42.** 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 13.1.30.  $\square$ 

**Theorem 13.1.43.** 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 13.1.40.

**Definition 13.1.44** (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 13.1.45** (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 13.1.46.** *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 13.1.47.** 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 13.1.43.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2. \ 1 \Rightarrow 3$ 
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . 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 13.1.48** (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 13.1.49.** In  $K^n$ , a set is compact if and only if it is bounded and closed.

PROOF: TODO

**Definition 13.1.50** (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 13.1.51. 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 13.1.2.
    \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 13.1.40.
\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 13.1.52.** 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 13.1.53** (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  $d/\epsilon$  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 13.1.54.** 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  $(\alpha_{k1})$ , 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 \rangle 5. This is a contradiction.
```

**Proposition 13.1.55.** Let V be a normed space. The closure of a subspace of V is a subspace.

```
Proof:
```

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. Let: U be a subspace of V \langle 1 \rangle 2. Let: x, y \in \operatorname{cl} U and \alpha, \beta \in K \langle 1 \rangle 3. Pick sequences (x_n), (y_n) in U that converge to x and y respectively. \langle 1 \rangle 4. \alpha x_n + \beta y_n \to \alpha x + \beta y as n \to \infty \langle 1 \rangle 5. \alpha x + \beta y \in \operatorname{cl} U
```

### 13.2 Continuous Linear Mappings

**Definition 13.2.1** (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 13.2.2.** *Let* V *be a normed space. Then the norm is a continuous function*  $V \to \mathbb{R}$ .

Proof: From Proposition 13.0.4.  $\square$ 

**Proposition 13.2.3.** 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 13.2.4.** 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 13.2.5** (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 13.2.6.** 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 13.2.4.

**Proposition 13.2.7.** 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:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . 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  $|\alpha_1| + \cdots + |\alpha_n| \leq$  $C\|\alpha_1e_1+\cdots+\alpha_ne_n\|$

PROOF: Theorem 13.1.13.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . Let:  $x \in U$ 

PROVE:  $||T(x)|| \le CM||x||$ 

- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$ . Let:  $x = \alpha_1 e_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n e_n$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6$ .  $||T(x)|| \leq CM||x||$

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 13.2.7.1. 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 13.2.8.** 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 13.2.9.** 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.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . 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 13.2.10.** 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 13.2.11.** Let U and V be normed spaces. Let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(U,V)$ . Then ||T|| is the least number such that  $\forall u \in U.||T(u)|| \leq ||T|| ||u||$ .

$$\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ \forall u \in U. ||T(u)|| \le ||T|| ||u||$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 1$$
. 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 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}
```

**Proposition 13.2.12.** Let V be a normed space. Then  $id_V$  is a bounded linear function  $V \to V$ , and  $\|id_V\| = 1$ .

**Proposition 13.2.13.** Let U and V be normed spaces. The constant zero function  $U \to V$  is a bounded linear transformation with norm 0.

**Proposition 13.2.14.** 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 13.2.15** (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 13.2.16.** 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 13.2.17.** 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 13.2.18** (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.

### 13.3 Banach Spaces

**Definition 13.3.1** (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 13.3.2.** 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 13.3.3. 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 13.3.4. 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 13.3.5.** 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 13.0.4.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF: Since every Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$  converges.

**Proposition 13.3.6.** 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 13.3.7** (Banach Space). A normed space V over K is complete or a Banach space iff every Cauchy sequence converges.

Proposition 13.3.8.  $l^2$  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  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,  $(\alpha_{nk})$  is Cauchy in  $\mathbb{C}$ .
- $\langle 1 \rangle 5$ . For every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,  $(\alpha_{nk})$  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 11.0.2.
\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 13.3.9. 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
```

129

**Definition 13.3.10** (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 13.3.11** (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 13.3.12.** In  $\mathcal{P}([0,1])$ , the series  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n/n!$  is absolutely convergent but not convergent.

Proof: Proposition 13.3.4.

**Theorem 13.3.13.** 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:  $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ ,  $\langle 2 \rangle 5$ 

$$\langle 2 \rangle 6$$
. 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  $k \to \infty$ .

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:  $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ ,  $\langle 2 \rangle 7$ 

 $\langle 3 \rangle 3. \ \forall n \geq N. \|x_n - (s + x_{p_1})\| < \epsilon$ 

Theorem 13.3.14. 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 13.1.40.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 7$ .  $a_n \to l$  as  $n \to \infty$  in U.

**Definition 13.3.15** (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 13.3.16.** 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  $\phi(v) = [(v)]$ .
- $\langle 1 \rangle 8$ .  $\phi$  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 13.3.17.** 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 13.2.11)

- $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . 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 13.2.11)  
 $< ||x|| + B||x||$  ( $\langle 3 \rangle 1, \langle 3 \rangle 2$ )  
 $= (B+1)||x||$ 

- $\langle 1 \rangle 5. \ T_n \to T \text{ as } n \to \infty$ 
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . 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 13.3.17.1.** For any normed space V over K, the space  $\mathcal{B}(V,K)$  is a Banach space.

**Theorem 13.3.18.** 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 13.1.43.
  - $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . 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:  $m, n \geq N$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 7. \|T(x_m) T(x_n)\| < \epsilon$
  - $\langle 2 \rangle$ 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  $\forall n \geq N. \|y_n l\| < \epsilon/3 \|T\|$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 7. \ \forall n \geq N. ||T(x_n) T(y_n)|| < 2\epsilon/3$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 8$ .  $||a-b|| \leq 2\epsilon/3$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 9$ . 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 13.3.18.1. 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 13.3.19** (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 13.3.20** (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  $i, ||y_{ij}|| \leq M/i$
- (1)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 13.3.13.

- $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . 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: 
$$\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}y_{p_{i}p_{j}}\right\| = \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{p_{i}}T_{p_{i}}\left(\frac{x_{p_{j}}}{2^{p_{j}}}\right)\right\| \qquad (\langle 1\rangle 5)$$

$$= \frac{1}{p_{i}}\left\|T_{p_{i}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{x_{p_{j}}}{2^{p_{j}}}\right)\right\| \qquad (T_{p_{i}} \text{ continuous})$$

$$= \frac{1}{p_{i}}\left\|T_{p_{i}}(z)\right\| \qquad (\langle 2\rangle 2)$$

$$\leq \frac{C}{p_{i}} \qquad (\langle 2\rangle 5. \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}y_{p_{i}p_{j}} \to 0 \text{ as } i \to \infty$$

$$\langle 2\rangle 5. \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}y_{p_{i}p_{j}} \to 0 \text{ as } i \to \infty$$

$$\langle 1\rangle 8. \ y_{ii} \to 0 \text{ as } i \to \infty$$
PROOF: Diagonal Theorem,  $\langle 1\rangle 6$ ,  $\langle 1\rangle 7$ .
$$\langle 1\rangle 9. \ \text{Q.E.D.}$$

PROOF: Diagonal Theorem,  $\langle 1 \rangle 6$ ,  $\langle 1 \rangle 7$ .

PROOF:  $\langle 1 \rangle 4$  and  $\langle 1 \rangle 8$  form a contradiction. 

#### 13.4 Contraction Mappings

**Definition 13.4.1** (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  $\alpha$  such that  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and

$$\forall x, y \in A. ||f(x) - f(y)|| \le \alpha ||x - y||.$$

**Proposition 13.4.2.** 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  $\alpha$  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 13.4.3** (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  $\alpha$  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  $||x_n x_m|| < \alpha^m ||x_1 x_0||/(1-\alpha)$ .

Proof:

$$||x_{n} - x_{m}|| \le ||x_{n} - x_{n-1}|| + ||x_{n-1} - x_{n-2}|| + \dots + ||x_{m+1} - x_{m}|| \quad \text{(Triangle inequality)}$$

$$\le (\alpha^{n-1} + \alpha^{n-2} + \dots + \alpha^{m}) ||x_{1} - x_{0}||$$

$$< \frac{||x_{1} - x_{0}||}{1 - \alpha} \alpha^{m}$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 3. \text{ Let: } \epsilon > 0$$

- $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ . 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:  $z = \lim_{n \to \infty} x_n$
- $\langle 1 \rangle 6. \ f(z) = z$

$$f(z) = f\left(\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n\right)$$

$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} f(x_n)$$
 (Proposition 13.4.2)
$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} x_{n+1}$$

$$= z$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 7$ . 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 14

# Inner Product Spaces

**Definition 14.0.1** (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 14.0.2.** *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 14.0.3.

$$\langle x,\alpha y+\beta z\rangle=\overline{\alpha}\langle x,y\rangle+\overline{\beta}\langle x,z\rangle$$

Proposition 14.0.4.

$$\langle 0, y \rangle = \langle x, 0 \rangle = 0$$

**Proposition 14.0.5.** 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 14.0.6.** 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 14.0.7.** The function  $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_a^b f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx$  is an inner product on  $\mathcal{C}([a, b])$ .

**Proposition 14.0.8.** 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 14.0.9.** 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 14.0.10** (Norm). In an inner product space, define  $||x|| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$ .

Proposition 14.0.11 (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:

$$\langle \langle y, y \rangle x - \langle x, y \rangle y, \langle y, y \rangle x - \langle x, y \rangle y \rangle = \langle y, y \rangle^2 \langle x, x \rangle - \langle y, y \rangle \langle y, x \rangle \langle x, y \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle \langle y, x \rangle \langle y, x \rangle + \langle x, y \rangle \langle y, x \rangle \langle$$

- $\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . 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 14.0.11.1 (Triangle Inequality). In any inner product space,

$$||x + y|| \le ||x|| + ||y||$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \|x+y\|^2 &= \langle x+y, x+y \rangle \\ &= \langle x, x \rangle + \langle x, y \rangle + \langle y, x \rangle + \langle y, y \rangle \\ &\leq \langle x, x \rangle + 2|\langle x, y \rangle| + \langle y, y \rangle \\ &\leq \|x\|^2 + 2\|x\| \|y\| + \|y\|^2 \qquad \text{(Schwarz's Inequality)} \\ &= (\|x\| + \|y\|)^2 \qquad \Box \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 14.0.11.2. The norm in an inner product space is a norm.

Theorem 14.0.12 (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 14.0.13.** 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 14.0.14** (Orthogonal). Vectors x and y in an inner product space are *orthogonal*,  $x \perp y$ , iff  $\langle x, y \rangle = 0$ .

**Theorem 14.0.15** (Pythagorean Formula). If x and y are orthogonal then

$$||x + y||^2 = ||x||^2 + ||y||^2$$
.

**Definition 14.0.16** (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 14.0.17.** 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:

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle x_n, y_n \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle| &\leq |\langle x_n, y_n \rangle - \langle x_n, y \rangle| + |\langle x_n, y \rangle - \langle x, y \rangle| \\ &= |\langle x_n, y_n - y \rangle| + |\langle x_n - x, y \rangle| \\ &\leq \|x_n\| \|y_n - y\| + \|x_n - x\| \|y\| \end{aligned}$$
 (Schwarz's Inequality) 
$$\to 0$$

using the fact that  $(x_n)$  is bounded.

**Theorem 14.0.18.**  $x_n \to l$  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:

$$||x_n - l||^2 = \langle x_n - l, x_n - l \rangle$$

$$= \langle x_n, x_n \rangle - \langle x_n, l \rangle - \langle l, x_n \rangle + \langle l, l \rangle$$

$$= ||x_n||^2 - \langle x_n, l \rangle - \overline{\langle x_n, l \rangle} + ||l||^2$$

$$\rightarrow ||l||^2 - 2||l||^2 + ||l||^2$$

$$= 0$$

**Theorem 14.0.19.** 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:

$$\begin{split} |\langle x_n, z \rangle - \langle x, z \rangle| &\leq |\langle x_n, z \rangle - \langle x_n, y_0 \rangle| + |\langle x_n, y_0 \rangle - \langle x, y_0 \rangle| + |\langle x, y_0 \rangle - \langle x, z \rangle| \\ &< \|x_n\| \|z - y_0\| + \epsilon/3 + \|x\| \|y_0 - z\| \\ &< M(\epsilon/3M) + \epsilon/3 + M(\epsilon/3M) \\ &= \epsilon \end{split}$$

#### Orthonormal Bases 14.1

**Definition 14.1.1** (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 14.1.2** (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 14.1.3. 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 14.1.4.** 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 14.1.5.** 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 14.1.6** (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 14.1.7.** Let  $P_n$  be the nth Legendre polynomial. Then  $\{P_n \mid n \in$  $\mathbb{N}$  is orthogonal in  $L^2([-1,1])$ .

**Definition 14.1.8** (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 14.1.9.** 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 14.1.10.** 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 14.1.11** (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 14.1.11.1 (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 14.1.11.2. 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 14.1.11.3 (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 14.1.12** (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 15

# Hilbert Spaces

**Definition 15.0.1** (Hilbert Space). A *Hilbert space* is a complete inner product space.

**Proposition 15.0.2.** For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is a Hilbert space.

**Proposition 15.0.3.**  $l^2$  is a Hilbert space.

**Proposition 15.0.4.**  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  is a Hilbert space.

**Proposition 15.0.5.**  $L^2([a,b])$  is a Hilbert space.

**Proposition 15.0.6.** Let  $\rho$  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 15.0.7.** Let m and N be positive integers. Let  $\Omega$  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 15.0.8.** 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 15.0.9.** Let H be a Hilbert space. Let  $(x_n)$  be an orthonormal sequence in H and let  $(\alpha_n)$  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 14.1.10.

 $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . 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.  $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . 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 15.0.10.** 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  $(\alpha_n)$  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 15.0.9)

 $\langle 2 \rangle 3$ .  $\alpha_n = \beta_n$  for all n.

**Theorem 15.0.11.** 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.

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . 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:  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$
    - $\langle 3 \rangle 2. \ \langle y, x_n \rangle = 0$

Proof:

$$\langle y, x_n \rangle = \left\langle x - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_m \rangle x_m, x_n \right\rangle$$
$$= \langle x, x_n \rangle - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_m \rangle \langle x_m, x_n \rangle$$
$$= \langle x, x_n \rangle - \langle x, x_n \rangle$$
$$= 0$$

$$\langle 2 \rangle 4. \ y = 0$$
  
 $\langle 2 \rangle 5. \ x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle x, x_n \rangle x_n$ 

**Theorem 15.0.12** (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 15.0.9)

- $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . 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 15.0.13.** 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 15.0.14.**  $B = \{1/\sqrt{2\pi}\} \cup \{\cos nx/\sqrt{\pi} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \cup \{\sin nx/\sqrt$  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  is a complete orthonormal set in  $L^2([-\pi, \pi])$ .

Proof:

 $\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . For all  $f \in B$  we have ||f|| = 1 $\langle 2 \rangle 1. \ \|1/\sqrt{2\pi}\| = 1$ 

Proof:

$$||1/\sqrt{2\pi}|| = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dx/2\pi$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . 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:  

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cos mx \cos nx \, dx = 1/2 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (\cos(n+m)x - \cos(n-m)x) dx$$

$$= 1/2 \left[ \frac{1}{n+m} \sin(n+m)x - \frac{1}{n-m} \sin(n-m)x \right]_{-\pi}^{\pi}$$

$$= 0$$

 $\langle 2 \rangle 4$ .  $\langle \cos mx, \sin nx \rangle = 0$ 

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 15.0.13.

**Proposition 15.0.15.**  $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\}\cup\{\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\cos nx\mid n\in\mathbb{Z}_+\}\ is\ a\ complete\ orthonormal$ set in  $L^{2}([0,\pi])$ .

**Proposition 15.0.16.**  $\{\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\sin nx \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}\ is\ a\ complete\ orthonormal\ set\ in$  $L^2([0,\pi]).$ 

**Definition 15.0.17** (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 15.0.18** (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 15.0.19.** 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 15.0.20.** The set of Rademacher functions is not complete.

Proof:

- $\langle 1 \rangle 1.$  Define  $f:[0,1] \to \mathbb{C}$  by f(x)=0 if  $0 \le x < 1/4, \ f(x)=1$  if  $1/4 \le x \le 3/4, \ f(x)=0$  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 15.0.21** (Walsh Functions). Define the Walsh functions  $W: \mathbb{N} \times [0,1] \to \{-1,0,1\}$  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 15.0.22.** The set of Walsh functions  $\{W(m,-) \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is a compete orthonormal set.

TODO