The Two Set Relations Generating Geometry

George. M. Van Treeck

Abstract. A ruler-like measure divides both domain and range intervals into sets of same-sized subintervals, ignoring partial subintervals. As the subinterval size converges to zero: 1) Distance as the union size of range sets, where for each domain set there exists a corresponding same-sized range set, converges to: the triangle inequality with Manhattan distance at the upper boundary and Euclidean distance at the lower boundary. 2) The Cartesian product of the number of members in each domain set converges to the product of interval interval sizes (Euclidean area/volume). Time constrains physical geometry to 3 dimensions. All proofs are verified in Coq.

Contents

1. Introduction

The properties of metric space, the Euclidean distance metric, and the product of interval sizes (Euclidean area/volume) are defined in real analysis [**Gol76**] [**Rud76**] rather than motivated and derived from set-based axioms. A "ruler" measure is introduced and used to prove that these geometric relations are motivated and derived from two countable set relations.

The derivation of geometric relations from set relations, *without notions of point, plane, line, angle, etc.*, identifies: 1) the single set relation generating all the properties of metric space; 2) the mapping between sets that makes Euclidean distance the smallest possible distance between two distinct points in $\mathbb{R}^n$; 3) the mapping between sets that makes distance different from area/volume; 4) how time

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 28A75, 28E15. Secondary 03E75, 51M99.

places an additional constraint on physical sets, which limits physical geometry to 3 dimensions.

Proofs accepted by the Coq logic engine [**Coq15**] are internationally recognized to have a very high probability of being correct. All the proofs in this article have corresponding formal proofs in the Coq files, "euclidrelations.v" and "threed.v," located at: `https://github.com/treeck/RASRGeometry`.

2. Ruler measure and convergence

A ruler (measuring stick) partitions both domain and range intervals to the nearest integer number of same-sized subintervals, where the partial subintervals are ignored. In contrast, Riemann and Lebesgue integrals partition the domain intervals *exactly*, where each domain subinterval and corresponding range subinterval generally differ in size [**Rud76**]. The ruler measure allows counting the number of mappings, ranging from a one-to-one correspondence to a many-to-many mapping, between the set of same-sized subintervals in one interval and the set of same-sized subintervals in another interval. The mapping (combinatorial) relations converge to continuous, bijective relations as the subinterval size converges to zero.

Definition 2.1. Ruler measure: A ruler measures the size, M, of a closed, open, or semi-open interval as the sum of the sizes of the nearest integer number of whole subintervals, p, each subinterval having the same size, c. 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 theorem, "limit_c_0_M_eq_exact_size," and formal proof is in the Coq file, euclidrelations.v.

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

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

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: $[0,\pi]$, $s = |0-\pi|$, $c = 10^{-i}$, and $p = floor(s/c) \Rightarrow\ p\cdot c = 3.1_{i=1},\ 3.14_{i=2},\ 3.141_{i=3}, ..., \pi$.

3. Distance

Notation convention: Curly brackets, $\{\cdots\}$, delimit a set; square brackets, $[\cdots]$, delimit a list; and vertical bars around a set or list, $|\{\cdots\}|$, indicates the cardinal (number of members in the set or list).

3.1. Countable distance space. A simple measure of distance is the number of steps walked, which corresponds to an equal number of pieces of land. Abstracting, distance is the number of members in a range set, y_i, which equals the number of members in a corresponding domain set, x_i: $|x_i| = |y_i|$. And the distance spanning multiple, disjoint, domain sets, $\bigcap_{i=1}^n x_i = \emptyset$, is the number of members, d_c, in the union range set, $d_c = |\bigcup_{i=1}^n y_i|$.

DEFINITION 3.1. Countable distance space, d_c:

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n x_i = \emptyset \quad \wedge \quad d_c = |\bigcup_{i=1}^n y_i| \quad \wedge \quad |x_i| = |y_i|.$$

THEOREM 3.2. *Inclusion-exclusion Inequality:* $|\bigcup_{i=1}^n y_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i|$.

This well-known inequality follows directly from the inclusion-exclusion principle [**CG15**]. But, a more intuitive and simple proof follows from the sum of the set sizes being equal to the number of unique members (the union set) plus the number of duplicate (intersection) members. For example, $|\{a, b, c\}| + |\{c, d, e\}| = |[a, b, c, c, d, e]| = |\{a, b, c, d, e\}| + |[c]| = 6 \Rightarrow |\{a, b, c, d, e\}| = |\{a, b, c\}| + |\{c, d, e\}| - |[c]| = 5$.

A formal proof, inclusion_exclusion_inequality, using sorting into unique members (union set) and duplicate members, is in the file euclidrelations.v.

PROOF. More generally:

$$|\bigcup_{i=1}^n y_i| + |duplicates_{i=1}^n y_i| = \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i| \\ \Rightarrow \quad |\bigcup_{i=1}^n y_i| = \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i| - |duplicates_{i=1}^n y_i|. \tag{3.1}$$

$$|\bigcup_{i=1}^n y_i| = \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i| - |duplicates_{i=1}^n y_i| \quad \wedge \quad |duplicates_{i=1}^n y_i| \geq 0 \\ \Rightarrow \quad |\bigcup_{i=1}^n y_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i|. \quad \square \tag{3.2}$$

3.2. Metric Space. Applying the ruler (2.1) and ruler convergence (2.2) to three range intervals having sizes: $d(u, w)$, $d(u, v)$, $d(v, w)$, and using the inequality, $d_c = |\bigcup_{i=1}^2 y_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^2 |y_i|$, generates the properties of metric space. The formal proofs: triangle_inequality, non_negativity, identity_of_indiscernibles, and symmetry, are in the Coq file, euclidrelations.v.

THEOREM 3.3. *Triangle Inequality:* $d(u, w) \leq d(u, v) + d(v, w)$.

PROOF.

$$\forall\, c > 0,\ |y_1| = floor(d(u, v)/c) \ \wedge\ |y_2| = floor(d(v, w)/c) \ \wedge \\ d_c = floor(d(u, w)/c) \quad \wedge \quad d_c = |y_1 \cup y_2| \leq |y_1| + |y_2| \\ \Rightarrow\ floor(d(u, w)/c) \leq floor(d(u, v)/c) + floor(d(v, w)/c) \\ \Rightarrow\ floor(d(u, w)/c) \cdot c \leq floor(d(u, v)/c) \cdot c + floor(d(v, w)/c) \cdot c \\ \Rightarrow\ \lim_{c \to 0} floor(d(u, w)/c) \cdot c \leq \lim_{c \to 0} floor(d(u, v)/c) \cdot c + \lim_{c \to 0} floor(d(v, w)/c) \cdot c \\ \Rightarrow\ d(u, w) \leq d(u, v) + d(v, w). \quad \square \tag{3.3}$$

THEOREM 3.4. *Non-negativity:* $d(u, w) \geq 0$.

PROOF.

$$\forall\, c > 0 : \quad d_c = floor(d(u, w)/c) \quad \wedge \quad d_c = |y_1 \cup y_2| \geq 0 \\ \Rightarrow \quad floor(d(u, w)/c) = d_c \geq 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad d(u, w) = \lim_{c \to 0} d_c \cdot c \geq 0. \quad \square \tag{3.4}$$

THEOREM 3.5. *Identity of Indiscernibles:* $d(w,w) = 0$.

PROOF.

$$\forall\, d(u,v) = d(v,w) = 0 \;\wedge\; d(u,w) \le d(u,v) + d(v,w) \;\wedge\; d(u,w) \ge 0 \;\Rightarrow\; d(u,w) = 0. \tag{3.5}$$

$$d(u,w) = 0 \;\wedge\; d(u,v) = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; w = v. \tag{3.6}$$

$$d(v,w) = 0 \;\wedge\; w = v \;\Rightarrow\; d(w,w) = 0. \tag{3.7}$$

□

THEOREM 3.6. *Symmetry:* $d(v,w) = d(w,v)$.

PROOF.

$$w = v \;\Rightarrow\; d(w,w) = d(v,w) \;\wedge\; d(w,w) = d(w,v) \;\Rightarrow\; d(v,w) = d(w,v). \tag{3.8}$$

□

3.3. Distance space range. Distance, $d_c = |\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} y_i|$, implies that where the range sets intersect, multiple domain set members map to a single range set member. Therefore, distance is a function of domain-to-range set member mappings.

From the countable distance space definition (3.1), $|x_i| = |y_i|$. Where $|x_i| = |y_i| = p_i = 1$, each of the p_i number of domain set members in x_i: 1) maps 1-1 (bijective) to a *single*, unique range set member in y_i, yielding $|x_i|\cdot 1 = p_i\cdot 1 = p_i = 1$ number of domain-to-range set mappings. 2) maps to *all* of the p_i number of range set members in y_i, yielding $|x_i|\cdot|y_i| = p_i\cdot p_i = p_i^2 = 1$ number of domain-to-range set mappings.

Therefore, the total number of domain-to-range set mappings spanning n number of sets ranges from $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i$ to $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2$. Applying the ruler (2.1) and ruler convergence theorem (2.2) to the largest and smallest total number of domain-to-range set mapping cases converges to the real-valued, Manhattan and Euclidean distance functions.

3.4. Manhattan distance.

THEOREM 3.7. *Manhattan (longest non-increasing) 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:*

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

The theorem, "taxicab_distance," and formal proof is in the Coq file, euclidrelations.v.

PROOF.
From the countable distance space definition (3.1) and the inclusion-exclusion inequality (3.2), the largest possible countable distance, d_c, is the equality case:

$$d_c = |\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} y_i| \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| \quad \wedge \quad |y_i| = p_i \;\Rightarrow\; d_c \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \;\Rightarrow\; \exists\, p_i,\, d_c :\; d_c = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i. \tag{3.9}$$

Multiply both sides of equation 3.11 by c and take the limit:

$$d_c = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \Rightarrow d_c \cdot c = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (p_i \cdot c) \Rightarrow \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c\to 0} (p_i \cdot c). \tag{3.10}$$

Apply the ruler (2.1) and ruler convergence theorem (2.2) to the definition of d:

$$d = |d_0 - d_m| \;\Rightarrow\; \exists\, c\, d :\; \mathit{floor}(d/c) = d_c \;\Rightarrow\; d = \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c. \tag{3.11}$$

Apply the ruler (2.1) and ruler convergence theorem (2.2) to the definition of s_i:

$$(3.12)\qquad \forall\, i \in [1,n],\ s_i = |a_i - b_i| \quad \wedge \quad floor(s_i/c) = p_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lim_{c\to 0} p_i \cdot c = s_i.$$

Combine equations 3.11, 3.10, 3.12:

$$(3.13)\quad d = \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c \quad \wedge \quad \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c\to 0}(p_i \cdot c) \quad \wedge$$
$$\lim_{c\to 0}(p_i \cdot c) = s_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad d = \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c\to 0}(p_i \cdot c) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i. \quad \Box$$

3.5. Euclidean distance.

THEOREM 3.8. *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:

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

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

PROOF.
Apply the rule of product to the largest number of domain-to-range set mappings, where all p_i number of domain set members, x_i, map to each of the p_i number of members in the range set, y_i:

$$(3.14)\qquad \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| \cdot |x_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2.$$

From the countable distance space definition (3.1) and the inclusion-exclusion inequality (3.2), choose the equality case:

$$(3.15)\quad d_c = |\textstyle\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} y_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| \quad \wedge \quad |y_i| = p_i$$
$$\Rightarrow \quad d_c \leq \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \exists\, p_i,\ d_c :\ d_c = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i.$$

Square both sides of equation 3.15 ($x = y \Leftrightarrow f(x) = f(y)$):

$$(3.16)\qquad \exists\, p_i,\ d_c :\ d_c = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists\, p_i,\ d_c :\ d_c^2 = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i)^2.$$

Apply the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to equation 3.16 and select the smallest distance (equality) case:

$$(3.17)\qquad d_c^2 = (\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i)^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \exists\, p_i :\ d_c^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2.$$

Multiply both sides of equation 3.17 by c^2, simplify, and take the limit.

$$(3.18)\quad d_c^2 = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2 \ \Rightarrow\ d_c^2 \cdot c^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2 \cdot c^2 \ \Leftrightarrow\ (d_c \cdot c)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (p_i \cdot c)^2$$
$$\Rightarrow \quad \lim_{c\to 0}(d_c \cdot c)^2 = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c\to 0}(p_i \cdot c)^2.$$

Apply the ruler (2.1) and ruler convergence theorem (2.2) and square both sides:

$$(3.19)\qquad \exists\, c\, d :\ floor(d/c) = d_c \quad \Rightarrow \quad d = \lim_{c\to 0} d_c \cdot c \quad \Rightarrow \quad d^2 = \lim_{c\to 0}(d_c \cdot c)^2.$$

Apply the ruler (2.1) and ruler convergence theorem (2.2) to each domain interval:

$$(3.20)\quad \forall\, i \in [1,n],\ s_i = |a_i - b_i| \quad \wedge \quad floor(s_i/c) = p_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lim_{c\to 0} p_i \cdot c = s_i.$$

Combine equations 3.19, 3.18, 3.20:

$$(3.21)\quad d^2 = \lim_{c\to 0}(d_c \cdot c)^2 \quad \wedge \quad \lim_{c\to 0}(d_c \cdot c)^2 = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c\to 0}(p_i \cdot c)^2 \quad \wedge$$
$$\lim_{c\to 0} p_i \cdot c = s_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad d^2 = \lim_{c\to 0}(d_c \cdot c)^2 = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c\to 0}(p_i \cdot c)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i^2. \quad \Box$$

4. Euclidean Volume

The number of all possible combinations (n-tuples) taking one member from each disjoint set is the Cartesian product of the number of members in each set. Notionally:

DEFINITION 4.1. All Possible Combinations, V_c:

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} x_i = \emptyset \quad \wedge \quad V_c = \prod_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|.$$

THEOREM 4.2. *Euclidean volume, V, is size of the range interval, $[v_0, v_m]$, corresponding to all the possible combinations of the members of disjoint domain intervals, $\{[a_1, b_1], [a_2, b_2], \ldots, [a_n, b_n]\}$. Notionally:*

$$V = \prod_{i=1}^{n} s_i, \;\; V = |v_0 - v_m|, \;\; s_i = |a_i - b_i|.$$

The theorem, "Euclidean_volume," and formal proof is in the Coq file, euclidrelations.v.

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.

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

Apply the ruler convergence theorem (2.2) to equation 4.1:

$$floor(s_i/c) = p_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lim_{c \to 0}(p_i \cdot c) = s_i. \tag{4.2}$$

Use the ruler (2.1) to divide the exact size, $V = |v_0 - v_m|$, of the range interval, $[v_0, v_m]$, into p^n subintervals. Use those cases, where V_c has an integer n^{th} root.

$$\forall\, p^n = V_c \in \mathbb{N}, \exists\, V \in \mathbb{R}, x_i \;:\, floor(V/c^n) = V_c = p^n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} |x_i| = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i. \tag{4.3}$$

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

$$floor(V/c^n) = p^n \quad \Rightarrow \quad V = \lim_{c \to 0} p^n \cdot c^n = \lim_{c \to 0}(p \cdot c)^n. \tag{4.4}$$

Multiply both sides of equation 4.3 by c^n and simplify:

$$\begin{aligned} p^n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad p^n \cdot c^n = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i\right) \cdot c^n \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (p \cdot c)^n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (p_i \cdot c) \\ \Rightarrow \quad \lim_{c \to 0}(p \cdot c)^n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c \to 0}(p_i \cdot c) \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Combine equations 4.4, 4.5, and 4.2:

$$\begin{aligned} V = \lim_{c \to 0}(p \cdot c)^n \quad \wedge \quad \lim_{c \to 0}(p \cdot c)^n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c \to 0}(p_i \cdot c) \quad \wedge \\ \lim_{c \to 0}(p_i \cdot c) = s_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad V = \lim_{c \to 0}(p \cdot c)^n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \lim_{c \to 0}(p_i \cdot c) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} s_i. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

□

5. Ordered and symmetric geometries

The set operations of countable distance range (3.1) and all possible combinations (4.1) requires sequencing through each set. The commutative property of the set operations also allows sequencing, where each set can be sequentially adjacent to any other set, herein referred to as a symmetric geometry.

From a combinatoric perspective, there are $n!$ number of sequential arrangements of any n number of sets, where there are two arrangements having a set, x_i, that is sequentially adjacent (once as a predecessor and once as a successor) to any set, x_j. Where all arrangements exist, the properties of sequential order and symmetry are satisfied for any n number of sets (dimensions of sets).

But, a physical set (for example, a set of apples) can be arranged into only one sequential (total) order *at a point in time* because a total order requires each set member to have at most one successor and at most one predecessor. For a member of a physical set to have a different successor or predecessor, a new order at a later point in time must be arranged and the prior order no longer exists at that later time.

It will now be proved that a physical set satisfying the constraints of a single sequential (total) order *at a point in time* and symmetric defines a cyclic set containing at most 3 members (in this case, 3 dimensions of physical space).

Definition 5.1. Ordered geometry:

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

Definition 5.2. Symmetric geometry (every set member is sequentially adjacent to any other member):

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

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

$$\mathit{successor}\ x_n = x_1 \;\;\wedge\;\; \mathit{predecessor}\ x_1 = x_n.$$

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

Proof. The property of order (5.1) defines unique successors and predecessors for all set members except for the successor of x_n and the predecessor of x_1. Therefore, the only member that can be a successor of x_n, without creating a contradiction, is x_1. And the only member that can be a predecessor of x_1, without creating a contradiction, is x_n. From the properties of a symmetric geometry (5.2):

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

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

□

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

The lemmas and formal proofs in the Coq 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.
It was proved that an ordered and symmetric set is a cyclic set (5.3). In other words, the successors and predecessors of an ordered and symmetric set are cyclic:

Definition 5.5. Cyclic successor of m is n:

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

Definition 5.6. Cyclic predecessor of m is n:

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

Definition 5.7. Adjacent: member m is sequentially adjacent to member n if the cyclic successor of m is n or the cyclic predecessor of m is n. Notionally:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

$$\forall\ setsize > 3: \quad \neg Predecessor(1, 3, setsize) \\ \leftarrow Predecessor(1, n, setsize) \leftarrow (1 = 1 \land n = setsize). \tag{5.16}$$

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 $setsize > 3$.

$$\forall\ setsize > 3: \quad \neg Adjacent(1, 3, setsize) \\ \leftarrow \neg Successor(1, 3, setsize) \land \neg Predecessor(1, 3, setsize). \quad \square \tag{5.17}$$

That is, for all $setsize > 3$, some elements are not sequentially adjacent to every other element (violates the symmetry property).

6. Insights and open questions

Applying the ruler measure (2.1) and ruler convergence (2.2) to the set relations, countable distance space (3.1) and all possible combinations (4.1) yields the following insights and open questions:

(1) Notions of point, plane, side, angle, perpendicular, congruence, intersection, etc. are not necessary to motivate and derive the properties of metric space, Euclidean distance and area/volume.
(2) Distance is a function of the number of domain-to-*range* set member mappings. In contrast, area/volume is a function of the number of domain-to-*domain* set member mappings.

(3) All notions of distance are derived from the principle that every domain set, x_i, has corresponding range (distance) set, y_i, containing the same number of members: $|x_i| = |y_i|$. And the distance spanning multiple, disjoint, domain sets is the number of members, d_c, of the corresponding union range set: $d_c = |\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} y_i|$ (3.1).
   (a) A direct consequence of the inclusion-exclusion principle [CG15] is the set relation, $d_c = |\bigcup_{i=1}^{2} y_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2} |y_i|$ (3.2), which generates all the properties of metric space (3.2).
   (b) Distance, $d_c = |\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} y_i|$, implies that where the range sets intersect, multiple domain set members map to a single range set member. Therefore, distance is a function of domain-to-range set member mappings. And $|x_i| = |y_i| = p_i$ constrains the range of the total number of domain-to-range set member mappings from $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i$ to $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2$ (3.3). $d_c = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i$ converges to Manhattan distance (3.7). Square both sides and apply the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality: $d_c^2 = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i)^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2$. The smallest possible distance is the equality case: $d_c^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^2$ (3.17). The case of the largest possible number of domain-to-range set member mappings is the reason that Euclidean distance is the smallest possible distance between two distinct points in $\mathbb{R}^n$.
   (c) Using the Taylor series and the Euclidean distance equation with two domain intervals sizes yields the arc sine and arc cosine functions. In other words, the parametric variable equating arc sine and arc cosine maps to the notion of angle, where the two domain intervals map to the notion of two line segments (two sides).
   Euclidean geometry [Joy98] and axiomatic geometry (for example, Hilbert [Hil80] and Birkhoff [Bir32], Veblen [Veb04], and Tarski [TG99]) either use notions of line and angle as undefined primitives or as definitions in terms of other undefined primitives.
   (d) In order to satisfy the triangle inequality of metric space, all hyperbolic geometry distance measures must be $\leq$ Manhattan distance and $>$ Euclidean distance.
   (e) Conjecture: the constraints: $|x_i| < |y_i|$, $|x_i| = |y_i|$, and $|x_i| > |y_i|$ could yield three types of distance spaces: open, flat, and closed. But, a broader definition of a distance measure would be required because open space measures would not satisfy the triangle inequality of metric space.

(4) Euclidean volume was derived, where a combination (n-tuple) of one member from each disjoint domain set corresponds 1-1 to a range set member and where the size of the range set is the Cartesian product of the number members in each domain set. Obviously, each n-tuple is a Cartesian coordinate.
   (a) Euclidean volume has as many range set elements, V_c, as n-tuples, T_c. Conjecture: the constraints: $T_c < V_c$, $T_c = V_c$, and $T_c > V_c$ yields three types of volume spaces: open, flat, and closed.
   (b) Conjecture: Open, flat, and closed volume spaces correspond 1-1 to open, flat, and closed distance spaces.

(5) Euclidean distance and volume were derived in this article for any number of dimensions. But, it was also proved that time constrains physical sets, such that more than 3 members (dimensions) would lead to contradictions (5.4).
   (a) Conjecture: All higher dimensional physics theories must be *hierarchical* 2 or 3-dimensional geometries with at most 3 dimensions of physical space. As shown below, the four-vectors common in physics [**Bru17**] are hierarchical, 2-dimensional geometries.
   (b) The spacetime interval (relativistic change in 3-dimensional distance) has the four-vector length, $\Delta d = \sqrt{(c\Delta t)^2 - (\Delta x^2 + \Delta y^2 + \Delta z^2)}$, where c is the speed of light and t is time, can be expressed in the 2-dimensional form, $(c\Delta t)^2 = \Delta d_1^2 + \Delta d_2^2$, where $\Delta d_1^2 = \Delta x^2 + \Delta y^2 + \Delta z^2$ and $\Delta d_2 = \Delta d$.
   (c) Likewise, the energy-momentum four-vector used in particle physics has the 2-dimensional form: $E^2 = (mv^2)^2 + (pc)^2$, where E is energy, m is the resting mass, v is the *3-dimensional* velocity, c is the speed of light, and p is the relativistic momentum ($p = \gamma mv$, where $\gamma = (1/(1-(v/c)^2))^{1/2}$ is the Lorentz factor).

References

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

[Bru17] P. Bruskiewich, *A very simple introduction to special relativity: Part two - four vectors, the lorentz transformation and group velocity (the new mathematics for the millions book 38)*, Pythagoras Publishing, 2017. ↑10

[CG15] W. Conradie and V. Goranko, *Logic and discrete mathematics*, Wiley, 2015. ↑3, 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

[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

[Rud76] W. Rudin, *Principles of mathematical analysis*, McGraw Hill Education, 1976. ↑1, 2

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

[Veb04] O. Veblen, *A system of axioms for geometry*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc **5** (1904), 343–384. https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-1904-1500678-X. ↑9

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