

# Pure Mathematics for Engineers and Scientists

Anthony Daniell

April 15, 2025



# Preface

The basic aim is to provide exposure to a solid foundation of mathematics based on proofs. The exit goals would be:

- Readers will be able to write valid proofs using the standard techniques of modern mathematics.

- Readers will be able to read and understand proofs at some reasonable level.

- Readers will have working knowledge of broad foundations of mathematics, and be able to confidently take dedicated courses in each area, or pursue independent studies.

From my experience, I certainly never got this stuff explicitly, but on retrospect, it certainly seems like it would help.

My original concept was that the course would be targeted from someone maybe at the junior or senior level in physics/engineering. So, the typical prerequisite would be calculus, maybe differential equations, and experience applying this math to physics, engineering problems like in mechanics, electricity and magnetism, etc. That's essentially my background, so that's why I thought of this cohort.

The main reason is that this person, in my concept, would have some context and exposure to different math, and may be better motivated to wanting to understand the underpinnings. Also, they may be more interested to branch out into the other topics on the list as these will likely be important as they take more advanced classes in their careers.

However, that being said, I think the main prerequisite is being interested in pure mathematics, perhaps with some future application in mind, but not necessarily.

Topics to be covered:

Mathematical Foundations - Mathematical logic, basic notation, axiomatic set theory (Zermelo Frankel), Peano Axioms of Arithmetic, Godel theorems.

Methods of Proof: Induction, Contradiction, Direct Proofs. Examples of classic proofs - infinite primes, irrationality of square root of two, etc. Plenty of practice examples.

Real Analysis - Study of real numbers, including construction by Dedekind Cuts etc, point set topology, continuity, metric spaces (Basically a compressed version of Rudin or equivalent).

Modern Algebra: Groups, Rings, Fields, Transformations, Representation Theory, Modules, Galois Theory

Non-euclidean geometry and topology: Various spaces and properties. Invariants, knot theory, homotopy, homology.

Number theory:

Category theory:

Computational complexity theory: Finite Automata, lambda calculus, NP and other spaces.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Mathematical Foundations</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1	Basic Notation . . . . .	7
1.2	Mathematical Logic . . . . .	8
1.3	Zermelo Frankel Axiomatic Set Theory . . . . .	12
1.4	Peano Axioms of Arithmetic . . . . .	12
1.5	Godel Theorems . . . . .	12
<b>2</b>	<b>Methods of Proof</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	Induction . . . . .	13
2.1.1	Weak Induction . . . . .	13
2.1.2	Strong Induction . . . . .	13
2.2	Proof by Contradiction . . . . .	13
2.3	Direct Proof . . . . .	14



# Chapter 1

## Mathematical Foundations

The objective of this chapter is to present some basic concepts that underlie much of the remaining material in this book.

### 1.1 Basic Notation

The reader may be familiar with some if not all of the following notation, but it is presented here for concreteness and review.

- $\forall$  is read as “for all”
- $\exists$  is read as “exists”
- $\subset$  is read as “subset of”
- $\in$  is read as “in”
- $\mathbb{Z}$  is the set of integers:  $\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$
- $\mathbb{N}$  is the set of natural numbers:  $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$  (note: Sometimes these start with 0, and sometimes with 1. Usually doesn’t matter to the argument in question, but the reader should be aware.)
- $\mathbb{Q}$  is the set of rational numbers. These are numbers of the form  $\frac{p}{q}$  where  $p, q$  are integers, and  $q \neq 0$
- $\mathbb{R}$  is the set of real numbers. These will later be defined precisely in terms of *Dedekind Cuts*, but for now we’ll just use the informal notion of all the points on a coordinate line. However, hopefully the reader can see this is not good enough for precise work.
- We use curly braces to indicate sets in general. For example,  $\mathbb{Z} = \{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$  defines the set of integers using the curly braces and examples. It is hoped the reader is able to abstract that the dots to the left imply the list has

no smallest negative value and the dots to the right imply that there is no largest positive value.

- **Set builder notation:** There are other ways to specify the set within the braces. For example, we can indicate the property that each member of the set has:  $S = \{p | p = 2m + 1, m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . This is read as the set  $S$  consists of those values  $p$  of the form  $2m + 1$  where  $m$  is an integer. In other words,  $S$  the set of odd integers. The vertical bar in the braces is read as “such that” and the comma is read as “and.”

*Exercise*

Write the definition of the set of rational numbers using set builder notation.

*Solution*

$$\mathbb{Q} = \left\{ r \mid r = \frac{p}{q}, p, q \in \mathbb{Z}, q \neq 0 \right\}$$

## 1.2 Mathematical Logic

It should be remarked that a good portion of this section (as well as some others) was strongly inspired by the YouTube video series “Math Major Basics” by MathDoctorBob (<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLF2DF6C3C8015DF5F>). We cover some key aspects here. It is very helpful to understand *Truth Tables* in this context. For those who have some experience with digital logic or computer programming, much of this will be quite familiar.

We have the following logical relations, with symbols, defined by the truth tables shown below: Negation ( $\neg$ ), Conjunction/And ( $\wedge$  - note that this symbol looks like the outline of the letter “A”, to help you remember “And”), Disjunction/or ( $\vee$ ), Implication ( $\implies$ ), If and Only If ( $\iff$ ):

**Negation:**

$A$	$\neg A$
$T$	$F$
$F$	$T$

**Conjunction/And:**

$A$	$\wedge$	$B$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$F$
$F$	$F$	$T$
$F$	$F$	$F$

**Disjunction/Or:**

$A$	$\vee$	$B$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$T$	$F$
$F$	$T$	$T$
$F$	$F$	$F$



**Implication:**

$A$	$\implies$	$B$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$F$
$F$	$T$	$T$
$F$	$T$	$F$

**If and only if (Iff):**

$A$	$\iff$	$B$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$F$
$F$	$F$	$T$
$F$	$T$	$F$

In the above,  $A$  and  $B$  are statements which can be either true (T) or false (F). The result of the logical operation is shown in the column under the particular symbol. For example, if  $A$  is true, and  $B$  is true, then  $A \wedge B$  is true. However, either either  $A$  or  $B$  is false (or both) then  $A \wedge B$  is false. It is important to refer back to the truth table definitions of these logical operations to avoid confusion.

Sometimes, implication is called “if-then” as in “If  $A$  then  $B$ .” However, note that it is possible for  $A$  to be false and  $B$  to be true, and the implication  $A \implies B$  to be true. This is somewhat at odds with how this if-then might be expressed in common usage: How could something false imply something true? This seems confusing. Therefore, always refer to the truth table for clarity on this point.

Here is an illustration regarding implication ( $\implies$ ).

Let  $A = (a > 5)$ ,  $B = (a > 3)$  where  $a$  is some integer. Now consider the following cases:

If  $a = 6$ ,  $(6 > 5) = T$ ,  $(6 > 3) = T$

If  $a = 4$ ,  $(4 > 5) = F$ ,  $(4 > 3) = T$

If  $a = 2$ ,  $(2 > 5) = F$ ,  $(2 > 3) = F$

If we compare this to the truth table for implication, we see that implication is always true. Note that with this particular definition of the statements  $A$  and  $B$  we cannot have a case where  $A$  is true and  $B$  is false.

*Exercise* Show  $A \iff B$  is equivalent to  $(A \implies B) \wedge (B \implies A)$ .

*Solution*

$(A \mid \implies \mid B)$	$\wedge$	$(B \mid \implies \mid A)$
$T \mid T \mid T$	$T$	$T \mid T \mid T$
$T \mid F \mid F$	$F$	$F \mid T \mid T$
$F \mid T \mid T$	$F$	$T \mid F \mid F$
$F \mid F \mid F$	$T$	$F \mid T \mid F$

We now consider some important terminology:

- *Tautology*: Any statement that is true for all values of its components is a tautology.
- *Contradiction*: Any statement that is false for all values of its components is a contradiction. The negation of a contradiction is a tautology and the negation of a tautology is a contradiction.
- *Logically Equivalent*: When  $A \iff B$  is a tautology. This means  $A$  and  $B$  have the same truth table. The notation for this is  $A \equiv B$ .

We illustrate logical equivalence by considering “De Morgan’s Laws” for disjunction (or) and conjunction (and). De Morgan’s Law’s are useful for manipulating logical expressions:

$$\neg(A \vee B) \equiv (\neg A) \wedge (\neg B)$$

$$\neg(A \wedge B) \equiv (\neg A) \vee (\neg B)$$

In words, the first law says that the negation ( $\neg$ ) of a disjunction ( $A \vee B$ ) is logically equivalent to the conjunction of the negations of the individual statements  $A$  and  $B$ . The second law is similar, except we exchange conjunction for disjunction and vice-versa.

*Exercise* Verify the De Morgan law for disjunction by showing the logical equivalence of the left and right hand sides using a truth table:

*Solution*

$\neg$	$(A \mid \vee \mid B)$	$\iff$	$(\neg \mid A) \mid \wedge \mid (\neg \mid B)$
$F$	$T \mid T \mid T$	$T$	$F \mid T \mid F$
$F$	$T \mid T \mid F$	$T$	$F \mid T \mid F$
$F$	$F \mid T \mid T$	$T$	$T \mid F \mid F$
$T$	$F \mid F \mid F$	$T$	$T \mid F \mid T$

We note that for any value of statements  $A$  and  $B$ , the values under the column for  $\iff$  are all true, indicating that both expressions  $\neg(A \vee B)$ ,  $(\neg A) \wedge (\neg B)$  have the same truth tables, as required.

Another useful logical equivalence is the following “contrapositive” form of implication, which we explore in the next exercise:

*Exercise* Show that  $(A \implies B) \iff (\neg B \implies \neg A)$  is a tautology, i.e. this means that  $A \implies B$  is logically equivalent (LE) to  $\neg B \implies \neg A$ .

*Solution*

$(A \implies B)$	$\iff$	$(\neg B \implies \neg A)$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$F$
$F$	$T$	$T$
$F$	$F$	$F$

To show a situation where expressions are not logically equivalent, the following exercise may be considered:

*Exercise* Show  $A \implies B$  is not logically equivalent to  $B \implies A$

*Solution*

$(A \implies B)$	$\iff$	$(B \implies A)$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$F$
$F$	$T$	$T$
$F$	$F$	$F$

Notice the middle column  $\iff$  has false entries, so we don't have logical equivalency.

Another item of terminology is *Logical Implication*. Logical implication is when the expression  $A \implies B$  is a tautology. If the statements  $A$  and  $B$  are such that we only get true statements from  $A \implies B$ , then  $A$  logically implies (**LI**)  $B$ . This was the situation with the earlier illustration where we had defined statements  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $A = (a > 5), B = (a > 3)$  where  $a$  is some integer.

If  $A$  is logically equivalent (LE) to  $B$ , then  $A$  LI  $B$  and  $B$  LI  $A$ .

*Exercise:* Show  $A \wedge (A \implies B)$  logically implies  $B$ . This is called "Modus Ponens."

*Solution*

$(A \wedge (A \implies B))$	$\implies$	$B$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$F$
$F$	$T$	$T$
$F$	$F$	$F$

**1.3 Zermelo Frankel Axiomatic Set Theory****1.4 Peano Axioms of Arithmetic****1.5 Godel Theorems**

## Chapter 2

# Methods of Proof

### 2.1 Induction

#### 2.1.1 Weak Induction

#### 2.1.2 Strong Induction

### 2.2 Proof by Contradiction

Proof by contradiction is a very useful method of proof which is used quite frequently. The usual pattern is one assumes the converse of what is being asserted, and then following a sequence of logical deductions arriving at a contradiction. Once this contradiction has been uncovered, then it implies the original assumption must have been false thus completing the proof. Here is an example to illustrate the points.

*Prove that there is no rational number whose square is 12.* (Note: This was originally an exercise in Rudin PMA 3rd Edition).

Proof:

**Suppose that there was a rational number whose square was 12.** This means that

$$\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^2 = 12$$

for integers  $p, q$ . We assume that  $p$  and  $q$  are not both even. In other words, all common factors of 2 have been cancelled. This can always been done for a rational number.

Upon expansion we obtain:

$$p^2 = 12q^2 = 2(6q^2)$$

This implies that  $p^2$  and  $p$  are both even. Thus  $q$  is odd. So we write  $p = 2m$  for integer  $m$  and obtain:

$$(2m)^2 = 4m^2 = 12q^2$$

This implies that

$$m^2 = 3q^2$$

Since  $q$  is assumed to be odd,  $q^2$  is odd, and  $3q^2$  is also odd. Now,  $m^2$  must be therefore be odd, and likewise for  $m$ . Therefore, for integers  $r, n$  we can rewrite the above as:

$$(2r + 1)^2 = 3(2n + 1)^2$$

Now, expanding both sides yields:

$$4r^2 + 4r + 1 = 3(4n^2 + 4n + 1)$$

$$4r^2 + 4r + 1 = 12n^2 + 12n + 3$$

$$4r^2 + 4r = 12n^2 + 12n + 2$$

$$4r^2 + 4r = 12n^2 + 12n + 2$$

The left side is clearly divisible by 4.

$$r^2 + r = 3n^2 + 3n + \frac{2}{4}$$

The left side is an integer, but the right side is not, which is a contradiction. Therefore our assumption about both  $p, q$  not even is false. However, since this can always be done for the rational number  $p/q$  it implies that there is no rational  $p/q$  such that  $(p/q)^2 = 12$ .

### 2.3 Direct Proof

# Index

De Morgan's Law's, 10

Dedekind Cuts, 7

Set builder notation, 8