The Real Analysis and Combinatorics of Geometry

George. M. Van Treeck

Abstract. The range of combinatorial relations between members of each domain set and members of a corresponding distance set containing the same number of members, where the distance sets sometimes intersect and the set members are the same-sized subintervals of intervals, converges to the triangle inequality, taxicab (Manhattan) distance at the upper boundary, and Euclidean distance at the lower boundary, which provides set-based definitions of metric space, longest, and shortest distance measures. The Cartesian product of the same-sized subintervals of intervals converges to the product of interval sizes used in the Lebesgue measure and Euclidean integrals. A cyclic set of 3 dimensions emerges from the same combinatorial relations generating distance and volume. Four-vector lengths, like the spacetime four-vector length, are derived from two-dimensional Euclidean distance equations. Proofs are verified in Coq.

Contents

1. Introduction

The triangle inequality of a metric space, Euclidean distance metric, and the volume equation (product of interval sizes) of the Lebesgue measure and Euclidean integrals (for example, Riemann and Lebesgue integrals) are imported from Euclidean geometry as definitions [Gol76] rather than derived from set-based axioms. As a consequence, real analysis and calculus have provided no insight into the set-based relationships that motivate and generate those real-valued, geometric functions.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 28A75, 28E15.

A ruler measures an interval as the nearest number of same-sized subintervals (units), where the partial subintervals are ignored. The ruler measure allows defining combinatorial relations between the same-sized subintervals in one interval and the same-sized subintervals in another interval. The discrete, combinatorial relations converge to continuous, bijective functions as the subinterval size converges to zero.

The range of combinatorial relations between members of each domain set and members of a corresponding distance set containing the same number of members, where the distance sets sometimes intersect and the set members are the same-sized subintervals of intervals, converges to the triangle inequality, taxicab (Manhattan) distance at the upper boundary, and Euclidean distance at the lower boundary as the subinterval size converges to zero, which provides set-based definitions of metric space, longest, and shortest distance measures. The Cartesian product of the same-sized subintervals of intervals converges to the product of interval sizes used in the Lebesgue measure and Euclidean integrals.

A cyclic set of 3 dimensions emerges from the same combinatorial relations generating distance and volume. The four-vector lengths common in physics, which appear to be four-dimensional Euclidean distance equations, are actually two-dimensional Euclidean distance equations that been "flattened." As an example, in the summary, the spacetime four-vector is shown to be derived from a more concise and informative two-dimensional Euclidean distance equation.

The proofs in this article are verified formally using the Coq Proof Assistant [Coq15] version 8.7.0. The Coq-based definitions, theorems, and proofs are in the files "euclidrelations.v" and "threed.v" located at:
https://github.com/treeck/CombinatorialGeometry.

2. Ruler measure and convergence

Definition 2.1. Ruler measure: A ruler measures the size, M, of a closed, open, or semi-open interval as the nearest integer number of whole subintervals, p, of size, c, where c is the independent variable. Notionally:

$$\forall\, c\, s \in \mathbb{R},\ \ [a,b] \subset \mathbb{R},\ \ s = |a-b| \ \wedge\ c > 0\ \wedge \\ (p = floor(s/c) \ \vee\ p = ceiling(s/c)) \ \wedge\ M = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{p} c = pc. \tag{2.1}$$

Theorem 2.2. *Ruler convergence:*
$\forall\, [a,b] \subset \mathbb{R},\ \ s = |a-b| \ \Rightarrow\ M = \lim_{c\to 0} pc = s.$

The Coq-based theorem and proof in the file euclidrelations.v is "limit_c_0_M_eq_exact_size."

Proof. (epsilon-delta proof)
By definition of the floor function, $floor(x) = max(\{y :\ y \le x,\ y \in \mathbb{Z},\ x \in \mathbb{R}\})$:

$$\forall\, c > 0, \quad p = floor(s/c) \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 \le |p - s/c| < 1. \tag{2.2}$$

Multiply all sides of inequality 2.2 by $|c|$:

$$\forall\, c > 0, \quad 0 \le |p - s/c| < 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 \le |pc - s| < |c|. \tag{2.3}$$

$$\forall\, \delta\ :\ |pc - s| < |c| = |c - 0| < \delta \\ \Rightarrow \quad \forall\, \epsilon = \delta,\ |c-0| < \delta\ \wedge\ |pc - s| < \epsilon\ \ :=\ \ M = \lim_{c\to 0} pc = s. \quad \square \tag{2.4}$$

The proof steps using the ceiling function (the outer measure) are the same as the steps in the previous proof using the floor function (the inner measure). The following is an example of ruler convergence, where: $[0, \pi]$, $s = |\pi - 0|$, $c = 10^{-i}$, and $p = floor(s/c) \Rightarrow p \cdot c = 3.1_{i=1},\ 3.14_{i=2},\ 3.141_{i=3}, ..., \pi$.

3. Distance

A simple countable distance measure is that an image (distance) set has the same number of members as a corresponding domain set. For example, the number of steps walked in a distance set must equal the number pieces of land traversed. Generalizing, for each disjoint domain set, x_i, containing p_i number of members there exists a corresponding distance set, y_i, with the same p_i number of members.

Notation conventions: The vertical bars around a set is the standard notation for indicating the cardinal (number of members in the set). To prevent over use of the vertical bar, the symbol for "such that" is the colon.

If the distance sets intersect ($\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| > |\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} y_i|$), then multiple domain set members can map to (combine with) a single distance set member. Therefore, the size of the union of the distance sets, d_c, is a function of the number of correspondences to (combinations with) each distance set member. Notionally:

Definition 3.1. Countable distance range, d_c:

$$\forall\, i\; n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x_i \subseteq X, \quad \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i| = |\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} x_i|, \quad \forall\, x_i \;\exists\, y_i \subseteq Y : \\ |x_i| = |y_i| = p_i \quad \wedge \quad d_c = |Y| = |\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} y_i| \leq \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i|.$$

The countable distance range principle (3.1), $|x_i| = |y_i| = p_i$, constrains the range of combinatorial relations from only one member of x_i combining with (mapping to) a member of y_i to as many as p_i number of members of x_i combining with a member of y_i. More than p_i number of combinations with a member of y_i would be over-counting combinations.

Using the rule of product, there is a range from $|y_i| \cdot 1 = p_i$ to $|y_i| \cdot p_i = p_i^2$ number of domain-to-distance combinations per distance set. Therefore, $d_c = f(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i)$ is longest possible distance because it is the case of the smallest number of combinations (p_i) per distance set. And $d_c = f(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2)$ is the shortest possible distance because it is the case of the largest number of combinations (p_i^2) per distance set (largest allowed intersection of distance sets).

It will now be proved that using the ruler (2.1) to divide a set of real-valued domain intervals and a distance interval into sets of same-sized subintervals, and applying the ruler convergence theorem (2.2) to the longest and shortest distance cases converge to the real-valued taxicab (Manhattan) and Euclidean distance equations.

Theorem 3.2. *Taxicab (longest) distance, d, is the size of the distance interval, $[d_0, d_m]$, mapping to a set of disjoint domain intervals, $\{[a_1, b_1], [a_2, b_2], \ldots, [a_n, b_n]\}$, where:*

$$d = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i, \quad d = |d_0 - d_m|, \quad s_i = |a_i - b_i|.$$

The formal Coq-based theorem and proof in file euclidrelations.v is "taxicab_distance."

Proof.
Use the ruler (2.1) to divide the exact size, $s_i = |a_i - b_i|$, of each of the domain intervals, $[a_i, b_i]$, into a set, x_i, containing p_i number of subintervals and apply

the definition of the countable distance range (3.1), where each domain set has a corresponding distance set containing the same p_i number of members.

$$\forall\, i\; n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad i \in [1, n], \quad c > 0 \quad \wedge \quad floor(s_i/c) = p_i = |x_i| = |y_i|. \tag{3.1}$$

Next, apply the rule of product to the case of one domain set member per distance set member:

$$|y_i| = p_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| \cdot 1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i. \tag{3.2}$$

Apply the countable distance range defintion (3.1) to equation 3.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| \cdot 1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \quad \wedge \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| \geq d_c \\ \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \geq d_c \quad \Rightarrow \quad \exists\, p_i,\; d_c : \; \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i = d_c. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Multiply both sides of 3.3 by c and apply the ruler convergence theorem (2.2):

$$\begin{aligned} s_i = \lim_{c\to 0} p_i \cdot c \quad \wedge \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} (p_i \cdot c) = d_c \cdot c \\ \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c\to 0} (p_i \cdot c) = \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Use the ruler to divide the exact size, $d = |d_0 - d_m|$, of the image interval, $[d_0, d_m]$, into a set, Y, containing d_c number of members:

$$\forall\, d_c \in \mathbb{N},\; c > 0\; \exists\, d \in \mathbb{R} : \; floor(d/c) = d_c. \tag{3.5}$$

Apply the ruler convergence theorem (2.2):

$$floor(d/c) = d_c \;\; \Rightarrow \;\; d = \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c. \tag{3.6}$$

Combine equations 3.6 and 3.4:

$$d = \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c \quad \wedge \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i = \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c \quad \Rightarrow \quad d = \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i. \tag{3.7}$$

□

THEOREM 3.3. *Euclidean (shortest) distance, d, is the size of the distance interval, $[d_0, d_m]$, mapping to a set of disjoint domain intervals, $\{[a_1, b_1], [a_2, b_2], \ldots, [a_n, b_n]\}$, where:*

$$d^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i^2, \quad d = |d_0 - d_m|, \quad s_i = |a_i - b_i|.$$

The formal Coq-based theorem and proof in the file euclidrelations.v is "Euclidean_distance."

PROOF.
Use the ruler (2.1) to divide the exact size, $s_i = |a_i - b_i|$, of each of the domain intervals, $[a_i, b_i]$, into a set, x_i, containing p_i number of subintervals and apply the definition of the countable distance range (3.1), where each domain set has a corresponding distance set containing the same p_i number of members.

$$\forall\, i\; n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad i \in [1, n], \quad c > 0 \quad \wedge \quad floor(s_i/c) = p_i = |x_i| = |y_i|. \tag{3.8}$$

Apply the rule of product to the largest number of domain-to-distance set combinations, where all p_i number of domain set members, x_i, combine with (map to) each of the p_i number of members in the distance set, y_i:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| \cdot |x_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2. \tag{3.9}$$

Choose the equality case of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2 \leq \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i\Big)^2 \;\; \Rightarrow \;\; \exists\, p_i : \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2 = \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i\Big)^2 \tag{3.10}$$

Choose the equality case of the countable distance range definition (3.1) and square both sides ($x = y \Rightarrow f(x) = f(y)$):

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}|y_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{n}p_i \geq d_c \;\Rightarrow\; \exists\, p_i,\, d_c : \sum_{i=1}^{n}p_i = d_c \\ \Rightarrow\; \exists\, p_i,\, d_c : (\sum_{i=1}^{n}p_i)^2 = d_c^2. \tag{3.11}$$

Combine equations 3.10 and and 3.11:

$$\exists\, p_i : \sum_{i=1}^{n}p_i^2 = (\sum_{i=1}^{n}p_i)^2 \;\wedge\; \exists\, p_i,\, d_c : (\sum_{i=1}^{n}p_i)^2 = d_c^2 \\ \Rightarrow\; \exists\, p_i,\, d_c : \sum_{i=1}^{n}p_i^2 = d_c^2. \tag{3.12}$$

Multiply both sides of equation 3.12 by c^2 and apply the ruler convergence theorem:

$$s_i = \lim_{c\to 0} p_i \cdot c \;\wedge\; \sum_{i=1}^{n}(p_i \cdot c)^2 = (d_c \cdot c)^2 \\ \Rightarrow\; \sum_{i=1}^{n}s_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c\to 0}(p_i \cdot c)^2 = \lim_{c\to 0}(d_c \cdot c)^2. \tag{3.13}$$

Use the ruler to divide the exact size, $d = |d_0 - d_m|$, of the image interval, $[d_0, d_m]$ into a set, Y, containing d_c number of members:

$$\forall\, d_c \in \mathbb{N},\; c > 0\, \exists\, d \in \mathbb{R} : floor(d/c) = d_c. \tag{3.14}$$

Apply the ruler convergence theorem (2.2) and then square both sides:

$$floor(d/c) = d_c \;\Rightarrow\; d = \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c \;\Rightarrow\; d^2 = \lim_{c\to 0}(d_c \cdot c)^2. \tag{3.15}$$

Combine equations 3.15 and 3.13:

$$d^2 = \lim_{c\to 0}(d_c \cdot c)^2 \;\wedge\; \sum_{i=1}^{n}s_i^2 = \lim_{c\to 0}(d_c \cdot c)^2 \;\Rightarrow\; d^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n}s_i^2. \tag{3.16}$$ □

3.1. Triangle inequality. The definition of a metric in real analysis is based on the triangle inequality, $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{w}) \leq \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$, that has been intuitively motivated by the triangle [**Gol76**]. Applying the ruler (2.1), and ruler convergence theorem (2.2) to the definition of a countable distance range (3.1) yields the real-valued triangle inequality:

$$d_c = |Y| = |\bigcup_{i=1}^{2}y_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2}|y_i| \;\wedge \\ d_c = floor(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{w})/c) \;\wedge\; |y_1| = floor(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})/c) \;\wedge\; |y_2| = floor(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})/c) \\ \Rightarrow\; \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{w}) = \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2} \lim_{c\to 0} |y_i| \cdot c = \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}). \tag{3.17}$$

The other metric space properties: $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{w}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow u = w$, $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{u})$, and $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{w}) \geq 0$ also follow from the countable distance range definition.

4. Size (length/area/volume)

The combinatorial relations between all members in set x_1 to each member of set x_2 results in the Cartesian product of $|x_1|\cdot|x_2|$ number of combinations. This section will use the ruler (2.1) and ruler convergence theorem (2.2) to prove that the Cartesian product of the same-sized subintervals of intervals converges to the product of interval sizes as the subinterval converges to zero. The first step is to define a set-based, countable size measure as the Cartesian product of disjoint domain set members.

Definition 4.1. Countable size (length/area/volume) measure, S_c:

$$\forall\; i\; n \in \mathbb{N},\quad i \in [1,n],\quad x_i \subseteq X,\quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i| = |\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} x_i|,\quad \wedge\quad S_c = \prod_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|.$$

THEOREM 4.2. *Euclidean size (length/area/volume), S, is the size of an image interval, $[v_0, v_m]$, corresponding to a set of disjoint intervals:* $\{[a_1, b_1], [a_2, b_2], \ldots, [a_n, b_n]\}$, *where:*

$$S = \prod_{i=1}^{n} s_i, \quad S = |v_0 - v_m|, \quad s_i = |a_i - b_i|, \quad i \in [1, n], \quad i, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The Coq-based theorem and proof in the file euclidrelations.v is "Euclidean_size."

PROOF.
Use the ruler (2.1) to divide the exact size, $s_i = |a_i - b_i|$, of each of the domain intervals, $[a_i, b_i]$, into a set, x_i of p_i number of subintervals.

$$\forall\, i\; n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad i \in [1, n], \quad c > 0 \quad \wedge \quad floor(s_i/c) = p_i = |x_i|. \tag{4.1}$$

Use the ruler (2.1) to divide the exact size, $S = |v_0 - v_m|$, of the image interval, $[v_0, v_m]$, into p_S^n subintervals. Every integer number, S_c, does **not** have an integer n^{th} root. However, for those cases where S_c does have an integer n^{th} root, there is a p_S^n that satisfies the definition a countable size measure, S_c (4.1). Notionally:

$$\forall\, p_S^n = S_c \in \mathbb{N},\, \exists\, S \in \mathbb{R},\, x_i\; : floor(S/c) = p_S^n = S_c = \prod_{i=1}^{n} |x_i| = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i. \tag{4.2}$$

Multiply both sides of equation 4.2 by c^n to get the ruler measures:

$$p_S^n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad (p_S \cdot c)^n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (p_i \cdot c). \tag{4.3}$$

Apply the ruler convergence theorem (2.2) to equation 4.3:

$$\begin{aligned} S = \lim_{c \to 0} (p_S \cdot c)^n \quad \wedge \quad (p_S \cdot c)^n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (p_i \cdot c) \quad \wedge \quad \lim_{c \to 0} (p_i \cdot c) = s_i \\ \Rightarrow \quad S = \lim_{c \to 0} (p_S \cdot c)^n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c \to 0} (p_i \cdot c) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} s_i. \quad \square \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

5. Ordered and symmetric geometries

Neither classical nor modern analytic geometry has provided any insight into why physical Euclidean geometry appears to be limited to at most three dimensions. It will be proved that the same combinatorial relationships that converge to the triangle inequality, taxicab distance, Euclidean distance, and volume also limit distance and volume to a cyclic set of three dimensions.

Both taxicab (Manhattan) and Euclidean distance exists between every two distinct points because both types of distance are allowed by the countable distance range (3.1). Likewise, the commutative properties of union, addition, and multiplication in the definitions of countable distance range and countable size (4.1) allows every sequential ordering of a set of domain intervals (dimensions of intervals). And the commutative property and every ordering implies every interval is sequentially adjacent to every other interval in some ordering (herein referred to as a "symmetric geometry").

It will now be proved that an "ordered" and "symmetric" set is a cyclic set containing at most three members (in this case, three dimensions of intervals).

Definition 5.1. Ordered geometry:

$$\forall\, i\, n \in \mathbb{N},\ \ i \in [1, n-1],\ \ \forall\, x_i\ \in \{x_1, \dots, x_n\},\\ \textit{successor}\ x_i = x_{i+1}\ \ \wedge\ \ \textit{predecessor}\ x_{i+1} = x_i.$$

where $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ are a set of real-valued intervals (dimensions of intervals).

Definition 5.2. Symmetric geometry (every member is sequentally adjacent to every other member):

$$\forall\, i\, j\, n \in \mathbb{N},\ \ \forall\, x_i\, x_j \in \{x_1, \dots, x_n\},\ \ \textit{successor}\ x_i = x_j\ \ \wedge\ \ \textit{predecessor}\ x_j = x_i.$$

Theorem 5.3. *An ordered and symmetric geometry is a cyclic set.*

$$\textit{successor}\ x_n = x_1\ \ \wedge\ \ \textit{predecessor}\ x_1 = x_n.$$

The theorem and formal Coq-based proof is "ordered_symmetric_is_cyclic," which is located in the file threed.v.

Proof. The property of order (5.1) defines unique successors and predecessors for all members except for the successor of x_n and the predecessor of x_1. From the properties of a symmetric geometry (5.2):

$$i = n\ \ \wedge\ \ j = 1\ \ \wedge\ \ \textit{successor}\ x_i = x_j\ \ \Rightarrow\ \ \textit{successor}\ x_n = x_1. \tag{5.1}$$

$$i = n\ \ \wedge\ \ j = 1\ \ \wedge\ \ \textit{predecessor}\ x_j = x_i\ \ \Rightarrow\ \ \textit{predecessor}\ x_1 = x_n. \tag{5.2}$$

□

Theorem 5.4. *An ordered and symmetric geometry is limited to at most 3 members.*

The Coq-based lemmas and proofs in the file threed.v are:

`Lemmas: adj111, adj122, adj212, adj123, adj133, adj233, adj213, adj313, adj323, and not_all_mutually_adjacent_gt_3.`

The following proof uses Horn clauses (a subset of first-order logic) that uses unification and resolution. Horn clauses make it clear which facts satisfy a proof goal.

Proof.
Because a symmetric and ordered set is a cyclic set (5.3), the successors and predecessors are cyclic:

Definition 5.5. Successor of m is n:

$$\textit{Successor}(m, n, \textit{setsize}) \leftarrow (m = \textit{setsize} \wedge n = 1) \vee (m + 1 \leq \textit{setsize}). \tag{5.3}$$

Definition 5.6. Predecessor of m is n:

$$\textit{Predecessor}(m, n, \textit{setsize}) \leftarrow (m = 1 \wedge n = \textit{setsize}) \vee (m - 1 \geq 1). \tag{5.4}$$

Definition 5.7. Adjacent: member m is sequentially adjacent to member n (required for a "symmetric" set (5.2)), if the cyclic successor of m is n or the cyclic predecessor of m is n. Notionally:

$$\textit{Adjacent}(m, n, \textit{setsize}) \leftarrow \textit{Successor}(m, n, \textit{setsize}) \vee \textit{Predecessor}(m, n, \textit{setsize}). \tag{5.5}$$

Every member is adjacent to every other member, where $setsize \in \{1,\ 2,\ 3\}$:

$$Adjacent(1,1,1) \leftarrow Successor(1,1,1) \leftarrow (1 = 1 \wedge 1 = 1). \tag{5.6}$$

$$Adjacent(1,2,2) \leftarrow Successor(1,2,2) \leftarrow (1 + 1 \leq 2). \tag{5.7}$$

$$Adjacent(2,1,2) \leftarrow Successor(2,1,2) \leftarrow (2 = 2 \wedge 1 = 1). \tag{5.8}$$

$$Adjacent(1,2,3) \leftarrow Successor(1,2,3) \leftarrow (1 + 1 \leq 2). \tag{5.9}$$

$$Adjacent(2,1,3) \leftarrow Predecessor(2,1,3) \leftarrow (2 - 1 \geq 1). \tag{5.10}$$

$$Adjacent(3,1,3) \leftarrow Successor(3,1,3) \leftarrow (3 = 3 \wedge 1 = 1). \tag{5.11}$$

$$Adjacent(1,3,3) \leftarrow Predecessor(1,3,3) \leftarrow (1 = 1 \wedge 3 = 3). \tag{5.12}$$

$$Adjacent(2,3,3) \leftarrow Successor(2,3,3) \leftarrow (2 + 1 \leq 3). \tag{5.13}$$

$$Adjacent(3,2,3) \leftarrow Predecessor(3,2,3) \leftarrow (3 - 1 \geq 1). \tag{5.14}$$

Must prove that for all $setsize > 3$, there exist non-adjacent members. For example, the first and third members are not adjacent:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall\ setsize > 3 : \quad & \neg Successor(1,3,setsize) \\ & \leftarrow Successor(1,2,setsize) \leftarrow (1 + 1 \leq setsize). \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

That is, 2 is the only successor of 1 for all $setsize > 3$, which implies 3 is not a successor of 1 for all $setsize > 3$.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall\ setsize > 3 : \quad & \neg Predecessor(1,3,setsize) \\ & \leftarrow Predecessor(1,n,setsize) \leftarrow (1 = 1 \wedge n = setsize). \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

That is, $n = setsize$ is the only predecessor of 1 for all $setsize > 3$, which implies 3 is not a predecessor of 1 for all $setsize > 3$.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall\ setsize > 3 : \quad & \neg Adjacent(1,3,setsize) \\ & \leftarrow \neg Successor(1,3,setsize) \wedge \neg Predecessor(1,3,setsize). \quad \square \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

6. Summary

Applying some very simple real analysis, in the form of the ruler measure (2.1) and ruler convergence proof (2.2), to a set of real-valued domain intervals and an image interval yields some new insights into geometry and physics.

(1) Discrete, combinatorial relations converge to the continuous, bijective functions: triangle inequality, taxicab (Manhattan) distance, Euclidean distance and volume.

(2) Ruler-based proofs expose the difference between distance and size (length/area/volume) measures: Distance is the combinatorial relation between the members of each disjoint domain set and a corresponding image (distance) set. In contrast, volume is a combinatorial relation between the members of disjoint domain sets.

(3) Applying the ruler measure to the countable distance range (3.1) provides the insight that all notions of distance are based on the principle that for each disjoint domain set there exists a corresponding distance set containing the same number of members, where the distance sets sometimes intersect:

(a) The countable distance range principle converges to the real-valued triangle inequality (3.1), which is the basis for the definition of metric space. The other properties of metric space also come from the countable distance range principle. Therefore, a function is not a distance metric unless it satisfies the more fundamental countable distance range (3.1).

(b) The upper bound of the countable distance range converging to taxicab (Manhattan) distance (3.2) is the case of the minimum number of combinations (mappings) per distance set, where each member in the i^{th} domain set combines with (maps to) only one member in the i^{th} distance set, which is the case of disjoint distance sets.

(c) The lower bound of the countable distance range converging to Euclidean distance (3.3) provides the insight that the shortest possible distance path is the case of the maximum number of combinations (mappings) per distance set, where all of the p_i number of members in the i^{th} domain set combine with (map to) each of the p_i number of members in the i^{th} distance set, which is the case of the maximum allowed intersection of the distance sets.

(d) All $L^{p>2}$ norms generated from the countable distance range principle would require more than all the p_i number of members in the i^{th} domain set combining with a member of the i^{th} distance set, which would be over-counting the number of combinations. Therefore, $L^{p>2}$ norms are not valid distance measures and not useful for calculating relevance in data mining and search. The definition of metric space and number theory have not provided this over-counting insight into $L^{p>2}$ norms.

(e) Euclidean distance (3.3) was derived without any notions of side, angle, or shape. A parametric variable relating the sizes of two domain intervals can be easily derived using using calculus (Taylor series) and the Euclidean distance equation to generate the arc sine and arc cosine functions of the parametric variable (arc angle). In other words, the notions of side and angle are derived from Euclidean distance, which is the reverse perspective of classical geometry [**Joy98**] [**Loo68**] [**Ber88**] and axiomatic foundations for geometry [**Bir32**] [**Hil80**] [**TG99**].

(4) Applying the ruler measure and ruler convergence proof to the countable size definition (4.1) allows a proof that the Cartesian product of same-sized subintervals of real-valued intervals converges to the product of the interval sizes (Euclidean volume):

(a) Euclidean size (length/area/volume) was derived from a countable set-based notion of size without notions of sides, angles, and shape.

(5) The set-based definitions of countable distance range converging to the triangle inequality, taxicab (Manhattan) distance, Euclidean distance and countable size converging to Euclidean volume provides a self-contained foundation under real analysis, calculus, and measure theory by not having to import those equations from Euclidean geometry as definitions and not having to rely on external geometry notions of side, angle, shape, side-angle-side relation, etc.

(6) The combinatorial relations of countable distance range (3.1) and countable size (4.1) that generate the real-valued triangle inequality, taxicab (Manhattan) distance, Euclidean distance, and volume equations also have a symmetry property (5.2) that limits distance and volume to a cyclic set (5.3) of three dimensions (5.4). This symmetry property explains why only three dimensions of physical space can be observed.

(7) The four-vector lengths common in physics, like the spacetime four-vector length, are "flattened" equations derived from two-dimensional Euclidean distance equations. For example, the spacetime four-vector length, $d = \sqrt{(tc)^2 - (x^2 + y^2 + z^2)}$, where $d_1 = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}$ reduces spacetime to an equation of the form, $d_2 = \sqrt{(tc)^2 - d_1^2}$, which implies $(tc)^2 = d_1^2 + d_2^2$. The Euclidean distance proof (3.3) provides the insight that d_1 and d_2 are domain interval sizes in each frame of reference and tc is the size of the union of the intersecting distance intervals, where for each domain interval, $[a_i, b_i]$ where $d_i = |a_i - b_i|$, there exists a corresponding distance interval with the same number of same-sized subintervals. That is, the size of the time-light speed subintervals are the same size (same speed of light) in both frames of reference. Spacetime in the two-dimensional Euclidean distance form, $(tc)^2 = d_1^2 + d_2^2$, is simpler and more informative than the "flattened" four-vector length.

References

[Ber88] B. C. Berndt, *Ramanujan-100 years old (fashioned) or 100 years new (fangled)?*, The Mathematical Intelligencer **10** (1988), no. 3. ↑9

[Bir32] G. D. Birkhoff, *A set of postulates for plane geometry (based on scale and protractors)*, Annals of Mathematics **33** (1932). ↑9

[Coq15] Coq, *Coq proof assistant*, 2015. https://coq.inria.fr/documentation. ↑2

[Gol76] R. R. Goldberg, *Methods of real analysis*, John Wiley and Sons, 1976. ↑1, 5

[Hil80] D. Hilbert, *The foundations of geometry (2cd ed)*, Chicago: Open Court, 1980. http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/17384. ↑9

[Joy98] D. E. Joyce, *Euclid's elements*, 1998. http://aleph0.clarku.edu/~djoyce/java/elements/elements.html. ↑9

[Loo68] E. S. Loomis, *The pythagorean proposition*, NCTM, 1968. ↑9

[TG99] A. Tarski and S. Givant, *Tarski's system of geometry*, The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic **5** (1999), no. 2, 175–214. ↑9

George Van Treeck, 668 Westline Dr., Alameda, CA 94501