

# **Real and Complex Analysis**

**Lecture Notes**

Adriel Ong

April 26, 2021

Sylvester II Institute



# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>1 Set-Theoretic Preliminaries</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction to Sets . . . . .	1
1.2 Set Equivalence . . . . .	3
<b>2 Real Numbers</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Real Number Axioms . . . . .	4
2.2 Consequences of Axioms . . . . .	6
2.2.1 Addition . . . . .	6
2.2.2 Multiplication . . . . .	7
2.2.3 Consequences of Order Axioms . . . . .	11
2.2.4 Axiom of Completeness . . . . .	15
2.3 Archimedean Property and its Consequences . . . . .	17
2.4 Nested Intervals Property . . . . .	19
2.5 The Extended Real Number System . . . . .	20
<b>3 Metric Spaces</b>	<b>22</b>

# Preface

These lecture notes serve as an introduction to undergraduate Real and Complex Analysis. Mathematics undergraduates usually take this course in their first year, focusing on the Real Field, sequences, and series. Advanced Economics undergraduates would need the same topics as preparation for graduate studies. Mathematics undergraduates then go on to the Riemann Integral and other topics throughout their second year. One would usually need to take a course on Set Theory and Formal Logic before learning Analysis. The author recommends [Book of Proof](#) by Richard Hammack and [For all  \$x\$](#)  by PD Magnus, Cathal Woods, and J Robert Loftis for those self-studying these notes.

A Mathematics undergraduate usually encounters Real and Complex Analysis as one's first formal study of familiar tools like sequences, Calculus and complex numbers. Proof-based Mathematics becomes the norm, with decreasing focus on computational and algorithmic exercises so common in lower education. This transition helps a student become [rigorous](#)—no more clinging onto intuitive facts or formulas or algorithms, more focus on trial and error, solutions and insight than answers. Only in Mathematics can proving a problem to be unsolvable be cause for celebration—consistency, sense, and rigor matter more than world-changing insights. Physicists prefer the physical world's stability. Engineers prefer tangible sense for stability. Economists prefer splitting hairs on special cases than finding general principles and theorems. Computer Scientists wish to endlessly verify whether heuristics and algorithms work to solve problems. Mathematicians, however, seek escape from reality by performing useless work with symbols—the highest form of creative and artistic expression known to man.

# 1.0 Set-Theoretic Preliminaries

## 1.1 Introduction to Sets

We call a collection  $S$  of elements a **set**. The expression  $x \in S$  means that the object  $x$  is an element of  $S$ . Likewise,  $x \notin S$  means that  $x$  is not an element of  $S$ . As a general rule, we denote sets by big letters and their elements by small letters.

We may take some elements of  $S$  as their own set  $T$ . We call the set  $T$  a **subset** of  $S$ , which we denote by  $T \subseteq S$ .

**Definition 1.1.1.** A subset  $T$  of  $S$ , denoted by  $T \subseteq S$ , satisfies:

$$\forall x \in T (x \in S).$$

We may also find that two sets may be subsets of each other. One may show that

$$A \subseteq B \wedge B \subseteq A \implies A = B.$$

A **proper subset**  $T \subset S$  satisfies

$$\exists x \in S (x \notin T)$$

so that  $S$  contains elements that are not elements of  $T$ .

Our first two operations on sets  $A$  and  $B$  comprise unions and intersections.

**Definition 1.1.2.** A **union** of sets  $A$  or  $B$  satisfies

$$A \cup B = \{x : x \in A \vee x \in B\}$$

while an **intersection** of sets  $A$  and  $B$  satisfies

$$A \cap B = \{x : x \in A \wedge x \in B\}.$$

Two sets are **disjoint** if

$$A \cap B = \emptyset.$$

From these two operations and standard rules of inference, we have the following theorems.

**Theorem 1.1.1.** The formula

$$(A \cup B) \cap C = A \cap C \cup B \cap C$$

holds for all sets  $A, B$ , and  $C$ .

*Proof.* For all sets  $A, B$ , and  $C$ , and for all elements  $x$ , we have that  $(x \in A \cup B) \wedge (x \in C) \iff (x \in A \vee x \in B) \wedge x \in C$ . By Distributive Rule of Inference,  $(x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vee (x \in B \wedge x \in C) \iff (x \in A \cap C) \vee (x \in B \cap C)$ , giving us our result of  $(A \cup B) \cap C = A \cap C \cup B \cap C$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 1.1.2.** The formula

$$A \cup (B \cap C) = (A \cup B) \cap (A \cup C)$$

holds for all sets  $A, B$ , and  $C$ .

*Proof.* For all sets  $A, B$ , and  $C$ , and for all elements  $x$ , we have that  $x \in A \cup (B \cap C) \iff x \in A \vee (x \in B \cap C)$ . By distributivity,  $(x \in A \vee x \in B) \wedge (x \in A \vee x \in C) \iff (x \in A \cup B) \wedge (x \in A \cup C)$ , giving us our result of  $A \cup (B \cap C) = (A \cup B) \cap (A \cup C)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 1.1.3.** For all sets  $A$ ,

$$(A \cup A = A) \wedge (A \cap A = A).$$

*Proof.* For all sets  $A$  and elements  $x$ ,  $x \in A \vee x \in A$ . Also,  $x \in A \wedge x \in A$ . By idempotency,  $x \in A$  such that both statements above hold.  $\square$

Our next set operation comprises differences.

**Definition 1.1.3.** For sets  $A$  and  $B$ , their **difference** satisfies

$$A - B = \{x : x \in A \wedge x \notin B\}.$$

We introduce a new set operation relying on the definition of subsets and differences.

**Definition 1.1.4.** Let  $A \subseteq U$ . The **complement** of  $A$ , denoted by  $A^C$  or  $\bar{A}$  satisfies

$$A^C = U - A.$$

In some contexts, we call  $U$  the **universal set**, the **set of discourse**, or simply the **universe**.

**Theorem 1.1.4.** For  $B \subseteq A$ , the formula

$$(B^C)^C = A - (A - B) = B$$

$$(A - B) \cup B = A.$$

for all sets  $A$  and  $B$ .

*Proof.* For all sets  $A$  and  $B$ , and for all elements  $x$ ,  $B^C = A - B = \{x : x \in A \wedge x \notin B\}$ , so that  $(B^C)^C = (A - B)^C = \{x : x \in B \wedge x \notin (A - B)\} = B = A - B^C$ . Also,  $(A - B) = B^C = \{x : x \in A \wedge x \notin B\} \iff B^C \cup B = \{x : x \in B^C \vee x \in B\} = \{x : x \in (A - B) \vee x \in B\} = \{x : x \in A \wedge (x \notin B \vee x \in B)\} = B$ .  $\square$

We note that the formula  $(A \cup B) - B = A$  holds only for disjoint  $A$  and  $B$ . One can verify this fact as an exercise.

**Theorem 1.1.5.** The following formula holds for all sets  $A_i$ :

$$\left(\bigcup_i A_i\right)^C = \bigcap (A_i)^C.$$

*Proof.* For  $(\bigcup_i A_i)^C$ , the universe  $U$ , and element  $x$ , we have that  $x \in (\bigcup_i A_i)^C \iff x \in U \wedge x \notin A_1 \wedge x \notin A_2 \wedge \dots$ . By Addition, Commutative, and Associative Rules of Inference, we can add true statements  $x \in U$  repeatedly until we have  $(x \in U \wedge x \notin A_1) \wedge (x \in U \wedge x \notin A_2) \wedge \dots \iff x \in A_1^C \wedge x \in A_2^C \wedge \dots$  to find that this satisfies  $x \in \bigcap_i A_i^C$ .  $\square$

## 1.2 Set Equivalence

nb. use Munkres Topology notes or smthng

## 2.0 Real Numbers

### 2.1 Real Number Axioms

Mathematical Analysis studies concepts involving the real number system  $\mathbb{R}$ . Instead of real numbers themselves, we focus on their properties as undefined objects satisfying certain axioms.

**Axiom 2.1. (Addition).** The **sum**  $(x + y) \in \mathbb{R}$  of  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfies

1.  $x + y = y + x$  (**commutativity**)
2.  $\forall z \in \mathbb{R}[(x + y) + z = x + (y + z)]$  (**associativity**)
3.  $\exists 0 \in \mathbb{R} \forall x \in \mathbb{R}(x + 0 = x)$  (**zero element**)
4.  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \exists y \in \mathbb{R}(x + y = 0)$  (**negative element**)

**Axiom 2.2. (Multiplication).** The **product**  $xy \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfies

1.  $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}(xy = yx)$  (**commutativity**)
2.  $\forall z \in \mathbb{R}[(xy)z = x(yz)]$  (**associativity**)
3.  $\exists 1 \in \mathbb{R}, 1 \neq 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}(1x = x)$  (**unitary element**)
4.  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x \neq 0, \exists y \in \mathbb{R}(xy = 1)$  (**reciprocal element**)
5.  $x(y + z) = xy + xz$  (**distributive property**)

A set of objects  $x, y, z$  satisfying these axioms is called a **field**.



**Axiom 2.3.** For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  ( $x \geq y \vee x \leq y$ ) with properties

1.  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R} (x \leq x)$  (reflexivity)
2.  $(x \leq y) \wedge (y \leq x) \implies x = y$  (antisymmetry)
3.  $(x \leq y) \wedge (y \leq z) \implies x \leq z$  (transitivity)
4.  $\forall z \in \mathbb{R} (x \leq y \implies x + z \leq y + z)$
5.  $0 \leq x \wedge 0 \leq y \implies 0 \leq xy$

We call a set whose elements satisfy 1–3 a **partially ordered set**. The set  $\mathbb{R}$  is a **totally ordered set** since it satisfies  $x \geq y \vee x \leq y$  (connexity).

Before our last axiom, we need an important definition.

**Definition 2.1.1.** A set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$  is **bounded above** when

$$\exists z \in \mathbb{R} \forall x \in E (x \leq z).$$

We denote that is bounded above by  $E \leq z$ . We call the element  $z$  an **upper bound** of the set  $E$ .

**Axiom 2.4. (Axiom of Completeness).** For elements  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ , a set  $E \leq z$  satisfies the **axiom of completeness** when

$$\forall E \subset \mathbb{R}, \exists z_0 \in \mathbb{R} (z_0 \leq z).$$

We call  $z_0$  the **supremum** of  $E$  and denote it by  $z_0 = \sup[E]$ .

## Exercises

1.

## 2.2 Consequences of Axioms

### 2.2.1 Addition

**Theorem 2.2.1.** The element  $0 \in \mathbb{R}$  is unique.

*Proof.* Assume any two zero elements,  $0_i$  and  $0_j$ . By Addition Axioms 1 and 3:

$$0_i = 0_i + 0_j = 0_j + 0_i = 0_j.$$

□

**Theorem 2.2.2.** For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , the negative element is unique.

*Proof.* Suppose  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  has any two negative elements  $y_i$  and  $y_j$ . By Addition Axioms 1, 2, 3, and 4:

$$y_i = y_i + 0 = y_i + (x + y_j) = (y_i + x) + y_j = 0 + y_j = y_j.$$

We denote the unique negative element of  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  by  $-x \in \mathbb{R}$ . We call the sum  $x + (-y)$  the **difference** of  $x$  and  $y$ , and denote it by  $x - y$ . □

**Theorem 2.2.3.** The equation  $a + x = b$  has a unique solution  $x = b - a$ .

*Proof.* Add the negative element  $-a$  to both sides of the equality:

$$a + x + -a = x = b - a.$$

Verify whether this is the solution:

$$a + x = a + (b - a) = a + b - a = b + 0 = b.$$

□

## 2.2.2 Multiplication

**Theorem 2.2.4.** The set  $\mathbb{R}$  contains a unique unit element 1.

*Proof.* Suppose two unit elements  $1_i$  and  $1_j$ . Then by Multiplication Axioms 1 and 3

$$1_i = 1_i 1_j = 1_j 1_i = 1_j.$$

□

**Theorem 2.2.5.** Every element  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  has a unique reciprocal.

*Proof.* Suppose  $x$  has two reciprocals  $y_1$  and  $y_2$ . Then

$$y_1 = y_1 1 = y_1 (x y_2) = (y_1 x) y_2 = 1 y_2 = y_2.$$

□

**Definition 2.2.1.** Numbers  $1, 2 = 1 + 1, 3 = 2 + 1, \dots$  are called the **Natural Numbers**, denoted  $\mathbb{N}$ . The set  $\mathbb{N}$  may be defined as the smallest set containing 1 and  $n + 1$  whenever  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

One may need to show sometimes that a numerical set  $A$ —a set of all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  for which some property  $T$  holds—has **all** natural numbers. The method of **mathematical induction** verifies whether

$$(1 \in A) \wedge (n \in A \implies n + 1 \in A)$$

The set of **integers** holds all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , reciprocals  $-n$ , and the number 0. We denote the set of integers by  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Mathematicians also differ in convention whether  $0 \in \mathbb{N}$  or not. To remove ambiguity, one may use  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  instead of our definition of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Additionally, suppose a number  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We call the number  $2m$  an **even number**, and  $2m + 1$  an **odd number**.

If we get all quotients of form  $\frac{m}{n}$ ,  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $n \neq 0$ , we get the set of **rational numbers**  $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}$ . All other numbers are **irrationals**.

**Theorem 2.2.6.** The equation  $ax = b, a \neq 0$  has the unique solution  $\frac{b}{a} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Multiply both sides by  $\frac{1}{a}$ :

$$\frac{1}{a}ax = \frac{1}{a}b = 1x = x = \frac{b}{a}$$

Verify the solution:

$$ax = b = a\left(\frac{b}{a}\right) = a\frac{1}{a}b = 1b = b.$$

□

Define  $x^n = \prod_n x, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We then have  $x^n x^m = \prod_n x \prod_m x = x^{n+m}$ . Additionally,  $(x^n)^m = \prod_m (\prod_n x) = x^{mn}, m, n = 1, 2, \dots$ . We also define  $x^0 = 1, x^{-m} = \frac{1}{x^m}, x \neq 0$ .

**Theorem 2.2.7.** If  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $0x = 0$ .

*Proof.* Using the definition of  $x^2$ ,

$$0x = (x - x)x = x^2 - x^2 = 0.$$

Alternatively, by Addition Axiom 3 and Multiplication Axiom 3

$$0x + 1x = (1 + 0)x = 1x = x \implies 0x = x - x = 0.$$

□

From the above theorem, we have the following useful corollary.

**Corollary 2.2.8.** If  $xy = 0$  and  $x \neq 0$ , then

$$y = \frac{1}{x}xy = \frac{1}{x}(xy) = \frac{1}{x}0 = 0.$$

Thus if a product vanishes, then so does one of its factors.

**Theorem 2.2.9.** If  $(u \neq 0) \wedge (v \neq 0)$ , then  $\frac{x}{u} + \frac{y}{v} = \frac{xv + yu}{vu}$ .

*Proof.* Multiply the lefthand side by  $\frac{vu}{vu} = 1$

$$\frac{vu}{vu} \left( \frac{x}{u} + \frac{y}{v} \right) = \frac{vu}{vu} \frac{x}{u} + \frac{vu}{vu} \frac{y}{v} = \frac{xv}{vu} + \frac{yu}{vu} = \frac{xv + yu}{vu}.$$

Alternatively, one may notice that

$$\frac{xv + yu}{vu} = \frac{1}{vu}(xv + yu) = \frac{xv}{vu} + \frac{yu}{vu} = \frac{x}{u} + \frac{y}{v}.$$

□

**Theorem 2.2.10.** If  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $-x = (-1)x$ .

*Proof.* By Multiplication Axiom 5,

$$0 = x - x = x(1 - 1) = x[1 + (-1)] = x + (-1)x.$$

□

**Definition 2.2.2.** The **factorial** of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , denoted by  $n!$  is the term  $f_n$  of the sequence  $f_0 = 1, f_n = n f_{n-1}, n \geq 1$ .

**Definition 2.2.3.** For  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq k$ , the **binomial coefficient**  $\binom{n}{k} \in \mathbb{N}$  is given by

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}.$$

**Lemma 2.2.11.** For natural numbers  $n$  and  $k$  with  $n \geq k$ ,

$$\binom{n}{k-1} + \binom{n}{k} = \binom{n+1}{k}$$

*Proof.* The proof is purely computational and is left as an exercise, if the reader pleases. □

**Theorem 2.2.12. (Binomial Theorem).** For nonzero  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(a + b)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^k$$

*Proof.* For the base step, let  $n = 1$ . Then,

$$(a + b)^1 = a + b = \sum_{k=0}^1 \binom{1}{k} a^{1-k} b^k = \binom{1}{1} a^{1-1} b^1 + \binom{1}{0} a^{1-0} b^0 = a + b$$

For the induction step, assume that the theorem holds for  $n$ . For the case of  $n + 1$  we use the preceding lemma:

$$\begin{aligned} (a + b)^{n+1} &= (a + b)^n (a + b)^1 = (a + b) \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^k \sum_{k=0}^1 \\ &= a \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^k + b \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^k \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n+1-k} b^k + \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^{k+1} \\ &= a^{n+1} + \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n+1-k} b^k + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^{k+1} + b^{n+1} \\ &= a^{n+1} + \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n+1-k} b^k + \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n}{k-1} a^{n+1-k} b^k + b^{n+1} \\ &= a^{n+1} + \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n}{k} \binom{n}{k-1} a^{n+1-k} b^k + b^{n+1} \\ &= a^{n+1} + \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n+1}{k} a^{n+1-k} b^k + b^{n+1} \\ &= \binom{n+1}{0} a^{n+1} b^0 + \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n+1}{k} a^{n+1-k} b^k + \binom{n+1}{n+1} a^0 b^{n+1} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{k} a^{n+1-k} b^k \end{aligned}$$

□

## 2.2.3 Consequences of Order Axioms

**Lemma 2.2.13.** If  $x \leq y \wedge y \leq z \wedge x = z$ , then  $x = y = z$ .

*Proof.*

$$y \leq z = x \implies y \leq x$$

since  $x \leq y$ ,  $x = y = z$ . □

**Lemma 2.2.14.** If  $x < y \wedge y \leq z$ , then  $x < z$ . Similarly, if  $x \leq y \wedge y < z$ , then  $x < z$ .

*Proof.* If  $y < z$ , then by Order Axiom 3,  $x < z$ . If  $y = z$ , then by hypothesis  $x < y = z \iff x < z$ . One may show the second result through a similar way. □

**Theorem 2.2.15.** The following inequalities are equivalent:

$$\bullet \ x \leq y \qquad \bullet \ 0 \leq y - x \qquad \bullet \ x - y \leq 0$$

*Proof.* We take advantage of Order Axiom 4:

$$\begin{aligned} x \leq y &\implies x - x \leq y - x \iff 0 \leq y - x \\ 0 \leq y - x &\implies 0 - y \leq y - x + (-y) \iff -y \leq -x \\ -y + x &\leq -x + x \implies x - y \leq -x + x \implies x - y \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 2.2.16.** For all  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $x < y \implies x + z, y + z$

*Proof.*

$$x < y \implies x \leq y \implies x + z \leq y + z.$$

It must be that  $x + z < y + z$  since  $x + z = y + z \implies x = y$ , a contradiction. □

**Theorem 2.2.17.** For all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $x_i \leq y_i$  then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n y_i.$$

The inequality becomes strict when  $x_j < y_j$  for at least one pair  $x_j, y_j$ .

*Proof.* By Order Axiom 3:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \leq y_1 + \sum_{i=2}^n x_i \leq y_1 + y_2 + \sum_{i=3}^n x_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n y_i.$$

Using Lemma 2.2.16,

$$x_j < y_j \implies \sum_{i=1}^n x_i < \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$$

for at least one pair  $x_j, y_j$ . □

One can note that  $x_1 \leq 0, \dots, x_n \leq 0 \implies s = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \leq 0$ . If  $x_j < 0$ , then  $s < 0$  for any  $j$ .

**Theorem 2.2.18.** The following inequalities are equivalent:

- $x < y$
- $0 < x - y$
- $x - y < 0$

*Proof.* One may apply Lemma 2.2.16 to Theorem 2.2.15 to obtain this theorem. □

**Definition 2.2.4.** A number  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  is **nonnegative** if  $x \geq 0$ , **positive** if  $x > 0$ , **nonpositive** if  $x \leq 0$ , and **negative** if  $x < 0$ .

The number 0 is both nonnegative and nonpositive.

**Definition 2.2.5.** Suppose  $x \leq y$  for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ . We call  $x$  the **minimum** of numbers  $x$  and  $y$ . We denote this fact by  $\min\{x, y\} = x$ . Similarly, we call  $y$  the **maximum**, denoted by  $\max\{x, y\} = y$ .

One can use induction to define  $\min\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  and  $\max\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ :

$$\max\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} = \max\{\max\{x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\}, x_n\}$$

**Definition 2.2.6.** The number  $|x| = \max\{x, -x\}$  is called the **absolute value**, or modulus, of  $x$ .

We have that  $x > 0 \implies |x| = x$  and  $x < 0 \implies |x| = -x$ . Also,

$$\forall x > 0 (|x| > 0 \wedge |x| = |-x|).$$



**Theorem 2.2.19.** If  $a > 0$ , then the following are equivalent:

- $|x| \leq a$
- $x \leq a$
- $-x \leq a$

*Proof.* By definition of absolute value,

$$|x| \leq a \iff \max\{x, -x\} \leq a.$$

It follows that if  $0 < x$ , then  $x \leq a$ . Otherwise, if  $x < 0$ , then  $-x \leq a$ . Either way, both  $x \leq a$  and  $-x \leq a$ . □

By Theorem 2.2.15,  $-x \leq a \iff -a \leq x$ , so that  $-a \leq x \leq a$ .

**Theorem 2.2.20. (Triangle inequality).** For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have that  $|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$

*Proof.* Let  $x, y > 0$  or  $x, y < 0$ . Then,  $|x + y| = \max\{(x + y), -(x + y)\}$ .

If  $x \geq 0$  and  $y < 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} x + y &\leq x \leq x + |y| = |x| + |y| \\ -x - y &\leq -y \leq -y + |x| = |x| + |y| \end{aligned}$$

so that  $|x + y| = \max\{(x + y), -(x + y)\} \leq |x| + |y|$ . □

One may use induction to show that

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|.$$

**Lemma 2.2.21.** If  $x > 0$  and  $y > 0$ , then  $xy > 0$ .

*Proof.* This lemma follows from Axiom 5 and Corollary 2.2.8:

$$xy = 0 \wedge x \neq 0 \implies y = 1y = \frac{1}{x}xy = \frac{1}{x}(xy) = \frac{1}{x}0 = 0.$$

□

**Theorem 2.2.22.** If  $x \leq y$  and  $0 < z$ , then  $xz \leq yz$

*Proof.* By Axiom 4,

$$yz - xz = (y - x)z \geq 0.$$

□

One may note that by Corollary 2.2.8,  $x < z \wedge z > 0 \implies xz < yz$ . Additionally,

## 2 Real Numbers

$0 < x < 1 \implies x^2 < x$  and  $1 < x \implies x < x^2$ . One can also show that

$$0 < x \leq y \wedge 0 < z \leq u \implies xz \leq yz \leq yu.$$

We note that one may multiply inequalities under these conditions. In general, if  $0 < x < y$ , then for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that  $x^n < y^n$ .

**Theorem 2.2.23.** If  $x \leq 0$  and  $0 \leq y$ , then  $xy \leq 0$ . Similarly, if  $x \leq 0$  and  $y \leq 0$ , then  $0 \leq xy$ .

*Proof.* Since  $x \leq 0$ , we have that  $0 \leq -x$ . It follows from Axiom 5 and Theorem 2.2.10 that  $0 \leq -xy \iff xy \leq 0$ .

Similarly,  $x \leq 0$  and  $y \leq 0$  implies that  $0 \leq -x$  and  $0 \leq -y$ , so that  $0 \leq (-x)(-y) = -1(x) - 1(y) = -1(-1)xy = 1xy = xy$ .  $\square$

In particular, one may note that  $x^2 = xx > 0 \forall x \neq 0$ . One consequence of this fact is that  $1 = 1(1) > 0$ . Also, by Lemma 2.2.16,  $2 = 1 + 1 > 0$ ,  $3 = 2 + 1 > 2$ , etc.

**Theorem 2.2.24.** For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have that  $|xy| = |x||y|$ .

*Proof.* By definition of absolute value,  $|xy| = \max\{xy, -xy\}$ . Let  $x > 0$  and  $y > 0$  or  $x < 0$  and  $y < 0$ . Then,  $\max\{xy, -xy\} = |x||y|$  by Theorem 2.2.23. Suppose without loss of generality that  $x > 0$  and  $y < 0$ . Then,  $xy < 0$ . However, we now have that  $\max\{xy, -xy\} = (-x)y = |x||y|$ . If  $x = 0$  or  $y = 0$ , then the absolute value is 0 by Corollary 2.2.8.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.25.** If  $x > 0$ , then  $\frac{1}{x} > 0$ . Moreover, if  $0 < x < y$ , then  $0 < \frac{1}{y} < \frac{1}{x}$ .

*Proof.* The quotient  $\frac{1}{x}$  cannot be 0 since it is undefined for that value. Let  $\frac{1}{x} < 0$ . Then we would have  $1 < 0$ , which is impossible for  $1 = 1^2 > 0$ . Moreover, one can multiply the inequality  $0 < x < y$  by  $\frac{1}{xy}$  to get  $0 < x\frac{1}{xy} < y\frac{1}{xy} \iff 0 < \frac{1}{y} < \frac{1}{x}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.26.** Let  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $r > 0$ . For all  $r$ , if  $z \geq 0$  and  $z < r$ , then  $z = 0$ .

*Proof.* If  $z > 0$ , then then  $z > z \geq 0$ , which is impossible by conexty.  $\square$

### 2.2.4 Axiom of Completeness

**Definition 2.2.7.** A set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$  is bounded below if  $\exists z \in \mathbb{R} \forall x \in E (z \leq x)$ . We denote that  $E$  is bounded below by  $z \leq E$ .

All numbers  $z$  that satisfy this property are called **lower bounds** of  $E$ .

**Proposition 2.2.27.** If a set  $E$  is bounded above, then the set  $-E = \{-x : x \in E\}$  is bounded below.

*Proof.* By definition of upper bounds, there exists  $z \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $x \in E$ ,  $x \leq z$ . Taking their negative elements, one can find that for all  $-x \in -E$ ,  $-z \leq -x$ . The number  $-z \in \mathbb{R}$  easily satisfies the definition of a lower bound.  $\square$

One may also show that if  $E$  is bounded below by  $z$ , then  $-E$  is bounded above by  $-z$  in a similar way.

**Theorem 2.2.28.** Every set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$  bounded below has a greatest lower bound  $-\sup(-E)$ .

*Proof.* For  $-E = \{-x : x \in E\}$ , we find using Proposition 2.2.27 that  $-E$  is bounded above. By Axiom 2.4, there exists  $\sup(-E)$ . Taking the inequality  $-x \leq \sup(-E)$ , we find that  $x \geq -\sup(-E)$ , satisfying  $E$  having a greatest lower bound.  $\square$

We denote the greatest lower bound of  $E$  as  $\inf(E)$ , and call it the **infimum**.

**Theorem 2.2.29.** For  $E \subseteq F$ , if  $E$  and  $F$  are bounded above, then  $\sup(E) \leq \sup(F)$ . Likewise, if  $E$  and  $F$  are bounded below, then  $\inf(E) \geq \inf(F)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $E = F$ . They then have the same supremum. Let  $E \subset F$ . There exists at least one  $z \in F$  such that  $z \notin E$ . If  $z > \sup(E)$ , then  $\sup(E) < \sup(F)$ . If  $z < \sup(E)$ , then  $\sup(E) = \sup(F)$ . One may use a similar way to prove the lower bounded case.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.30.** For arbitrary  $x \in E, y \in F$ , if  $x \leq y$ , then  $E$  is bounded above,  $F$  is bounded below, and  $\sup(E) \leq \inf(F)$ .

*Proof.* An arbitrary  $x \in E$  immediately satisfies the definition for a lower bound since for all  $y \in F$ ,  $x \leq y$ . Likewise holds for arbitrary  $y \in F$  being an upper bound since for all  $x \in E$ ,  $y \geq x$ . It immediately follows that  $\sup(E) \leq F$  such that  $\sup(E) \leq \inf(F)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.31.** For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}, x, n > 0$ , there exists a unique  $y > 0$  such that  $y^n = x$ .

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be the set of all  $z > 0$  such that  $z^n \leq x$ . Then  $A$  is bounded above, by 1 if  $x \leq 1$  and by  $x$  if  $1 \leq x$ . Let  $y = \sup(A)$ . We will show that  $y^n = x$ .

Suppose that  $y^n < x$  and let  $x - y^n = \varepsilon$ . For all  $h$  such that  $0 < h \leq 1$ , and by Theorem 2.2.12:

$$\begin{aligned} (y + h)^n &= y^n + ny^{n-1}h + \frac{n(n-1)}{1 \cdot 2}y^{n-2}h^2 + \dots \\ &= y^n + h(ny^{n-1} + \frac{n(n-1)}{1 \cdot 2}y^{n-2}h + \dots) \\ &\leq y^n + h(ny^{n-1} + \frac{n(n-1)}{1 \cdot 2}y^{n-2} + \dots) = y^n + h[(1+y)^n - y^n] \end{aligned}$$

Set  $h < \frac{\varepsilon}{(1+y)^n - y^n}$  so that we have  $(y + h)^n \leq y^n + \varepsilon = x$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $y = \sup(A)$ . Therefore,  $y^n \geq x$ .

Suppose that  $y^n > x$ . Let  $\varepsilon = y^n - x$ . For all  $h$  such that  $0 < h \leq 1$ , and by Theorem 2.2.12:

$$\begin{aligned} (y - h)^n &= y^n - ny^{n-1}h + \frac{n(n-1)}{1 \cdot 2}y^{n-2}h^2 + \dots \\ &= y^n - h(ny^{n-1} - \frac{n(n-1)}{1 \cdot 2}y^{n-2}h + \dots) \\ &\geq y^n - h(ny^{n-1} + \frac{n(n-1)}{1 \cdot 2}y^{n-2} + \dots) = y^n - h[(1+y)^n - y^n] \end{aligned}$$

Set  $h < \frac{\varepsilon}{(1+y)^n - y^n}$  so that we have  $(y - h)^n \geq y^n - \varepsilon = x$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $y = \sup(A)$ . Therefore,  $y^n = x$ .

We call  $y$  the  **$n$ th root of  $x$** . We denote the  $n$ th root of  $x$  by  $\sqrt[n]{x}$ , or by  $x^{\frac{1}{n}}$ . The  $n$ th root is unique since  $y_1 < y_2 \implies y_1^n < y_2^n \iff x < x$ , which is impossible.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.32.** For all  $x > 0$  and  $y > 0$ ,  $(xy)^{\frac{1}{n}} = x^{\frac{1}{n}}y^{\frac{1}{n}}$

*Proof.* Note that

$$xy = x^{\frac{n}{n}}y^{\frac{n}{n}} = (xy)^{\frac{n}{n}} \iff (x^{\frac{1}{n}}y^{\frac{1}{n}})^n = \left[(xy)^{\frac{1}{n}}\right]^n \iff (x^{\frac{1}{n}}y^{\frac{1}{n}}) = \left[(xy)^{\frac{1}{n}}\right].$$

$\square$

Similarly, one can show that  $\sqrt[m]{\sqrt[n]{x}} = \sqrt[mn]{x}$ .

Suppose an even interger  $n$ . Then,  $(-x)^n = (-1)^n x^n = x^n > 0 \forall x \neq 0$ . The equation  $y^n = x > 0$  has both real solutions  $y_1 = \sqrt[n]{x}$  and  $y_2 = -\sqrt[n]{x}$ , while the equation  $y^n = x < 0$  has no real solutions.

Suppose an odd integer  $n$ . Then,  $y^n = x > 0$  has a unique real solution  $y = \sqrt[n]{x}$ , while

$y^n = x < 0$  has a unique real solution  $y = -\sqrt[n]{x}$ .

By Theorem 2.2.32, formulas like the quadratic and cubic equations hold for all real numbers.

**Definition 2.2.8.** A set  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is **bounded from both sides** or **bounded** if it has both upper and lower bounds. It follows that both  $\inf(E)$  and  $\sup(E)$  exist.

One important class of bounded sets follows.

**Definition 2.2.9.** The set of all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $a < x < b$  is called an **open interval**, with left-hand and right-hand **endpoints**  $a$  and  $b$ , respectively. If  $a \leq x \leq b$ , then we call the set a **closed interval**, with identical endpoints.

One may see that  $\sup[a, b] = \sup(a, b)$ , and that  $\inf[a, b] = \inf(a, b)$ . Both ‘half-closed’ and ‘half-open’ intervals  $[a, b)$  and  $(a, b]$  are defined analogously.

## 2.3 Archimedean Property and its Consequences

**Theorem 2.3.1. (Archimedean Property).** For all real  $x \geq 0$  and  $y > 0$ , there exists  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $(n - 1)x \leq y < nx$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that for all  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have that  $px \leq y$ . Define the set  $A = \{px \mid px \leq y\}$ , and see that  $y$  forms an upper bound for  $A$ . Let  $\sup(A) = d \leq y$ . Take the difference  $d - x < d$ . We can set  $p_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $d - x < p_0x$ . However,  $d - x < p_0x \iff d < p_0x + x \iff d < (p_0 + 1)x$  with  $(p_0 + 1)x \in A$ , forming a contradiction for  $d$  being an upper bound.

One may set  $\{(p_i - 1), p_i\} = \{(n + 1), n\}$  so that  $(n - 1)x \leq y < nx$ . □

If we set  $x = 1$ , we find that for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  there exists  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $n - 1 \leq y \leq n$ . We call  $n$  the **integral part** of  $y$ , denoted  $[y]$ , and  $y - [y]$  the **fractional part**  $y$ , denoted  $(y)$ . Also,  $\forall y \in \mathbb{R} [y \leq [y] + (y)]$ .

**Theorem 2.3.2.** For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $x, y > 0$ , there exists  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $x^{n-1} \leq y < x^n$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that for all  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have that  $x^{p-1} < y$ . Define the set  $A = \{x^p \mid x^p \leq y\}$ , and see that  $y$  forms an upper bound for  $A$ . Let  $\sup(A) = d \leq y$ . Take the quotients  $\frac{d}{x} < d$ . We can set  $p_0$  such that  $\frac{d}{x} < x^{p_0}$ . However,  $\frac{d}{x} < x^{p_0} \iff d < xx^{p_0} \iff d < x^{p_0+1}$  with  $x^{p_0+1} \in A$ , forming a contradiction for  $d$  being an upper bound.

One may set from pairs  $\{(p_i - 1), p_i\} = \{(n + 1), n\}$  so that  $x^{n-1} \leq y < x^n$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.3.3.** For all  $x, y > 0$ , there exists an integer  $n > 0$  such that  $\frac{y}{n} < x$ .

*Proof.* By the Archimedean Property, there exists  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $y < xn$ . Set  $n > \frac{y}{x} > 0$ . Multiply both sides by  $\frac{x}{n}$  to get  $\frac{y}{n} < x$ .  $\square$

It follows that for all  $y > 0$ ,  $\inf\{\frac{y}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} = 0$ .

**Corollary 2.3.4.** The following systems of half-open intervals for  $y > 0$  has an empty intersection:

$$\dots \subseteq (0, \frac{y}{n}] \subseteq \dots \subseteq (0, \frac{y}{2}] \subseteq (0, y] \quad (2.1)$$

$$\dots \subseteq (a, a + \frac{y}{n}] \subseteq \dots \subseteq (a, a + \frac{y}{2}] \subseteq (a, a + y] \quad (2.2)$$

$$\dots \subseteq (a - \frac{y}{n}, a] \subseteq \dots \subseteq (a - \frac{y}{2}, a] \subseteq (a - y, a] \quad (2.3)$$

*Proof.* Suppose systems 2.2 and 2.3 had common elements  $c$  and  $d$ , respectively. That would mean that system 2.1 would have common points  $c - a$  and  $a - d$ . However, by Theorem 2.3.1, system 2.1 has no common points.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.3.5.** For all open intervals  $(a, b)$ , there exists an element  $z \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $a < z < b$ .

*Proof.* Take the difference  $b - a = h$ . By Theorem 2.3.1, there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  for  $\frac{1}{h}$  such that  $(n - 1) \leq \frac{1}{h} < n \iff \frac{1}{n} < h$ . By that same theorem, there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  for  $\frac{1}{n}$  such that  $\frac{m}{n} \leq a < \frac{m+1}{n}$ . Add  $\frac{1}{n}$  to both sides and subtract  $a$  to obtain  $\frac{m}{n} + \frac{1}{n} - a \leq \frac{1}{n} + a - a \iff \frac{m+1}{n} - a \leq \frac{1}{n} < h = b - a \iff \frac{m+1}{n} < b$ , showing that there exists  $z = \frac{m+1}{n}$  so that  $a < z < b$ .  $\square$

One can show that infinitely many rational elements exist in  $(a, b)$  by applying the preceding theorem to the interval  $(\frac{m+1}{n}, b)$ , and so on.

**Theorem 2.3.6.** For all  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $N_c$  be the set of all  $s \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $s \leq c$ , and  $P_c$  the set of all  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $c \leq r$ . Then,  $\sup(N_c) = c = \inf(P_c)$ .

*Proof.* The set  $N_c$  is bounded above by  $c$ , so that it has a supremum. Denote  $\sup(N_c) = a$ . By definition,  $a \leq c$ . Suppose that  $a < c$ . By Theorem 2.3.5, there exists a rational element  $p$  such that  $p \in (a, c)$ . Since  $a = \sup(N_c)$ , however,  $p \leq a$ , creating a contradiction. Therefore,  $a = c = \sup(N_c)$ .  $\square$

## 2.4 Nested Intervals Property

**Definition 2.4.1.** If a set  $Q$  of intervals on  $\mathbb{R}$  has the property that given any two intervals  $I, J \in Q$ , either  $I \subseteq J$  or  $J \subseteq I$  holds, then we call  $Q$  a **system of nested intervals**.

By Corollary 2.3.4, a system of half-open intervals may well have an empty intersection. The same holds for nested open intervals. However, we now show that a system of **closed** intervals always has an intersection.

**Theorem 2.4.1. (Nested Intervals Property).** For all systems of closed intervals  $[a_i, b_i] \in Q$ , there exists  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $c \in \bigcap_i [a_i, b_i]$ . Specifically, their intersection comprises the interval  $[\sup(A), \inf(B)]$  for sets  $A = \{a_i : [a_i, b_i] \in Q\}$  and  $B = \{b_i : [a_i, b_i] \in Q\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be the set of all left endpoints  $A = \{a_i : [a_i, b_i] \in Q\}$ , and  $B$  the set of all right endpoints  $B = \{b_i : [a_i, b_i] \in Q\}$ . Since for any two intervals  $[a_i, b_i]$  and  $[a_j, b_j]$ ,  $i \leq j$ , we have that  $[a_j, b_j] \subseteq [a_i, b_i]$ , it follows that  $a_i \leq a_j$  and  $b_j \leq b_i$ . One may also note that all  $b_i$  serve as upper bounds to  $A$ , and all  $a_i$  serve as lower bounds to  $B$ . By Completeness,  $\sup(A)$  and  $\inf(B)$  both exist. Since for all  $[a_i, b_i] \in Q$  we have  $a_i \leq \sup(A) \leq \inf(B) \leq b_i$ , it follows that  $[\sup(A), \inf(B)] \subseteq \bigcap_i [a_i, b_i]$ . Moreover, suppose an  $x$  where  $x \notin [\sup(A), \inf(B)]$  such that  $x < \sup(A)$ . Then, we can always find an  $a_i$  where  $x < a_i < \sup(A)$ . A similar result holds for some  $x > \inf(B)$ , so that  $\bigcap_i [a_i, b_i] = [\sup(A), \inf(B)]$ . The case where  $\sup(A) = \inf(B)$  gives the value for  $c$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.4.2.** For all systems of closed intervals  $[a_i, b_i] \in Q$  there exists a single point  $c$  that serves as their only intersection if and only if for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists an interval  $[a, b] \in Q$  such that  $b - a < \varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* From Theorem 2.4.1, the intersection of nested closed intervals consists of a single point if and only if  $\sup(A) = \inf(B)$ . For all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $[a_1, b_1]$  and  $[a_2, b_2]$  with  $[a_2, b_2] \subseteq [a_1, b_1]$  such that

$$a_1 > \sup(A) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \wedge b_2 < \inf(B) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Set  $c = \sup(A) = \inf(B)$ . Then,

$$c - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < a_1 \leq a_2 \iff b_2 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < c < a_1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq a_2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \iff b_2 - a_2 < c + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < a_1 + \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon$$

giving us  $b_2 - a_2 < \varepsilon$  as the required interval.

For the converse, let there be an interval  $[a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon]$  that depends on some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $b_\varepsilon - a_\varepsilon < \varepsilon$ . Taking them as part of their respective endpoint sets, we have that  $a_\varepsilon \leq \sup(A)$  and  $b_\varepsilon \geq \inf(B)$ . Since  $b_\varepsilon - a_\varepsilon \geq \sup(A) - \inf(B)$ , successively taking smaller values of  $\varepsilon$  would cause the righthand side to reduce to 0, such that  $\sup(A) = \inf(B)$ .  $\square$

## 2.5 The Extended Real Number System

**Definition 2.5.1.** The **extended real number system**  $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$  consists of the real number line  $\mathbb{R}$  and two infinity elements  $-\infty$  and  $+\infty$ . The usual order relations get extended by the following rules:

1.  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R} (-\infty < x)$ .
2.  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R} (x < \infty)$ .
3.  $-\infty < \infty$ .

Ordinary order axioms continue to hold in  $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$ . Elements  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  are called **finite**, contrasting with infinity elements  $-\infty$  and  $\infty$ .

For nonempty  $E \subseteq \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ , we define  $\sup(E) = \infty$  if  $\infty \in E$  or there exists no  $x$  such that  $E \leq x$ . Likewise,  $\inf(E) = -\infty$  if  $-\infty \in E$  or there exists no  $x$  such that  $E \geq x$ .

For two points  $a, b \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}, a < b$ , then the set  $[a, b] = \{x \in \bar{\mathbb{R}} : a \leq x \leq b\}$  is a **closed interval** with endpoints  $a$  and  $b$ . Meanwhile, the set  $(a, b) = \{x \in \bar{\mathbb{R}} : a < x < b\}$  is called an **open**



interval with the same endpoints.

We can also generalize the Nested Interval Property to  $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$ . For a system of closed intervals  $Q = \{[a_i, b_i] : a, b \in \bar{\mathbb{R}} \wedge [a_j, b_j] \subseteq [a_i, b_i]\}$ . Then, there exists  $c \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  such that for all  $[a_i, b_i]$ ,  $c \in [a_i, b_i]$ . This intersection corresponds to the interval  $\sup(A), \inf(B)$  where  $A = \{a_i : [a_i, b_i] \in Q\}$  and  $B = \{b_i : [a_i, b_i]\}$ , so that  $\sup(A) \leq \inf(B)$ .

## Exercises

## 3.0 Metric Spaces