

Math 104: Real Analysis

Albert Ye

August 3, 2023

CONTENTS

Contents	3
1 Week 1	5
1.1 Lecture 1	5
1.1.1 Logic and Sets	5
1.1.2 Indexed Sets	5
1.1.3 Set of Natural Numbers	6
1.1.4 Set of Rational Numbers	6
1.2 Lecture 2	7
1.2.1 Ordered Sets	7
1.2.2 Defects of \mathbb{Q}	7
1.2.3 Real Numbers	8
1.2.4 Consequences of the Completeness Axiom	8
1.3 Lecture 3	9
1.3.1 Archimedean Property	9
1.3.2 (Gates to) Infinity	9
2 Week 2	11
2.1 Lecture 4	11
2.1.1 Limits of Sequences	11
2.1.2 Proving Limits	12
2.2 Lecture 5	14
2.2.1 Limits Theorem for Sequences	14
2.2.2 Limit Laws	14
2.3 Lecture 6	16
2.3.1 Proofs of Limit Laws	16

2.3.2	Infinite Limits	16
2.4	Lecture 7	17
2.4.1	Monotonic Sequences	17
2.4.2	Cauchy Sequences	17
3	Week 3	19
4	Week 4	21
5	Week 5	23
5.1	Lecture 14	23
5.2	Lecture 15	23
5.3	Lecture 16	23
5.4	Lecture 17	23
5.4.1	Riemann Integral	23
6	Week 6	25
6.1	Lecture 18 - Metric Spaces	25
6.2	Lecture 20	26
6.3	Lecture 21	26
6.3.1	Compactness	26
7	Week 7	29
7.1	Lecture 22	29
7.1.1	Back to Compactness	30
7.1.2	Continuity and Limits	30
7.2	Lecture 23	30
7.2.1	Continuity and Limits, continued	30
7.3	Lecture 24	31
7.4	Lecture 25	31
7.4.1	Integration	31
7.4.2	Differentiation	32

1.1 Lecture 1

1.1.1 Logic and Sets

For clauses p, q : we have $p \wedge q, p \vee q, \neg p$. These are *and, or, not*; respectively.

Moreover, we have $p \implies q$ meaning that q is true if p is true. Moreover, we have $p \iff q$ meaning that p is true if q is true and q is true if p is true.

Other terminology: $:=$ is a definition, \forall is for all, \exists is exists, $a \in A$ means that element a is in the set A , $a \notin A$ means that element a isn't in the set A .

For sets, we have $\subset, =, \subseteq$ to determine subset and equality relations. Moreover, we have \cap, \cup to represent union and intersections of sets. There is also $A \setminus B$ to denote everything in A but not B , and we have A^C to denote every element not in A .

Theorem 1.1 (DeMorgan's Laws). Let A and B be sets.

- (a) $(A \cup B)^C = A^C \cap B^C$
- (b) $(A \cap B)^C = A^C \cup B^C$
- (c) $A \setminus (B \cap C) = (A \setminus B) \cup (A \setminus C)$
- (d) $A \setminus (B \cup C) = (A \setminus B) \cap (A \setminus C)$

1.1.2 Indexed Sets

Let Λ be a set and suppose for each $a \in \Lambda$ there is a set A_a . The set $\{A_a : a \in \Lambda\}$ is called a **collection of sets indexed by Λ** . In this case, Λ is called the **indexing set** for this collection.

$$\bigcup_{a \in A} = \{x | x \in A_a \text{ for some } a \in A\}$$

$$\bigcap_{a \in A} = \{x | x \in A_a \text{ for all } a \in A\}.$$

We can generalize DeMorgan's laws to indexed collections:

Theorem 1.2 (Generalized DeMorgan). If $\{B_a : a \in \Lambda\}$ is an indexed collection of sets and A is a set, then

$$A \setminus \bigcup_{a \in \Lambda} B_a = \bigcap_{a \in \Lambda} (A \setminus B_a),$$

$$A \setminus \bigcap_{a \in \Lambda} B_a = \bigcup_{a \in \Lambda} (A \setminus B_a).$$

1.1.3 Set of Natural Numbers

We set \mathbb{N} to be all positive integers, \mathbb{Z} to be all integers, and \mathbb{N}_0 to be all nonnegative integers.

Definition 1.3 (Peano Axioms). 1. $1 \in \mathbb{N}$.

2. If $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $n + 1 \in \mathbb{N}$. We'll call this the **successor**.

3. 1 is not the successor of any element

4. If $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ have the same successor, then $n = m$.

5. (Induction) If $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with the properties $1 \in S$ and $n \in S \implies n + 1 \in S$, then $S = \mathbb{N}$. This becomes induction when we have S as the set of elements where a certain property holds.

So, for induction, we have a base case where we have P_0 or P_1 or some starting value. And then, we have induction that proves that P_k being true implies P_{k+1} is true. Then it dominoes over.

Remember that we didn't prove that P_{n+1} is true, but rather that it can be implied from P_n .

1.1.4 Set of Rational Numbers

We define \mathbb{Q} , the set of rational numbers, by $\mathbb{Q} := \{\frac{m}{n} | m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \neq 0\}$.

Remark 1.4. \mathbb{Q} contains all terminating decimals.

Remark 1.5. If $\frac{m}{n} \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, then $\frac{m}{n} = \frac{rm}{rn}$, so we assume that m, n are coprime usually.

Definition 1.6 (Field Axioms). Remembering these is now an exercise for the reader.

We see that the set of rational numbers with addition and multiplication is a field. Going through the axioms is left as an exercise to the reader.

1.2 Lecture 2

1.2.1 Ordered Sets

Definition 1.7 (Ordered Set). We define an **ordered set** to be a set S with an order satisfying the following criteria:

1. $\forall \alpha, \beta \in S$, either $\alpha < \beta, \alpha = \beta, \alpha > \beta$.
2. $\alpha < \beta, \beta < \gamma \implies \alpha < \gamma$.
3. $\alpha \leq \beta \implies \alpha + \gamma \leq \beta + \gamma$
4. $\alpha \leq \beta, \gamma \geq 0 \implies \alpha\gamma \leq \beta\gamma$
5. $\alpha \leq \beta, \beta \leq \alpha \implies \alpha = \beta$

A set that is a field and an ordered set can be called an **ordered field**.

1.2.2 Defects of \mathbb{Q}

Theorem 1.8 (Irrationality of $\sqrt{2}$). There is no α such that $\alpha^2 = 2$.

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\alpha^2 = 2$. We see that $\alpha = \frac{m}{n}$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\gcd(m, n) = 1$.

Since $\alpha^2 = 2$, we have $\frac{m^2}{n^2} = 2$, implying that $m^2 = 2n^2$, or $2|m^2$. As 2 is prime, we see that $2|m \implies m = 2p$ for some integer p . Then, $(2p)^2 = 2n^2 \implies 4p^2 = 2n^2 \implies n^2 = 2p^2$. Once again, we have that $2|n$ from above, so m, n are both even. This contradicts the claim that m, n are coprime, so $\sqrt{2}$ cannot be expressed in a rational form. ■

This motivates the concept of incompleteness.

Definition 1.9 (Incompleteness). Let S be an ordered set, and let $A \subseteq S$.

1. An element $\beta \in S$ is an **upper bound** for A if $\alpha \leq \beta, \forall \alpha \in A$.
Then, we say that A is **bounded above**.
2. An element $\beta \in S$ is a **lower bound** for A if $\alpha \geq \beta, \forall \alpha \in A$.
Then, we say that A is **bounded below**.

Definition 1.10 (Supremum). Suppose S is an ordered set and $A \subseteq S$ is bounded above. Suppose $\exists \beta \in S$ such that:

1. β is an upper bound for A .
2. If r is another upper bound, then $r \geq \beta$.

Then, we will call β the least upper bound, or the **supremum** (sup) of A .

The greatest lower bound is then called the **infimum** (inf) of A .

Remark 1.11. Supremum and infimum may not exist or belong to A .

Definition 1.12 (Completeness). An ordered set S is said to have the least upper bound property, or **completeness**, if every upper bounded set has a supremum in S .

1.2.3 Real Numbers

Theorem 1.13 (Real Numbers). There is a unique ordered field $(\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot, \leq)$ that has the following properties:

1. Completeness.
2. $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is an ordered subfield; i.e., $(+, \cdot, \leq)$ restricted to \mathbb{Q} are the usual $(+, \cdot, \leq)$ on \mathbb{Q} .

Lecturer says we will be using the result, and not the proof.

There's another theorem with properties of real number arithmetic but honestly I'm too lazy to write it as of now so you'll see it later.

1.2.4 Consequences of the Completeness Axiom

Existence of Infimum

Theorem 1.14. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a set bounded below. Then $\inf E$ exists in \mathbb{R} .

Proof. Define $-E$ to be $\{-x | x \in E\}$. Then, we see that $-E$ must be bounded above, implying that it must have a supremum by definition of completeness. Then, we let $\sup -E = \beta$.

Then, for any α such that $x \geq \alpha \forall x \in E$, then we have $y \leq -\alpha \forall y \in -E$. We see that $-\alpha \geq \beta$ by definition of supremum, so $\alpha \leq -\beta$. As a result, $\inf E = -\beta$. ■

1.3 Lecture 3

1.3.1 Archimedean Property

Theorem 1.15 (Archimedean Property). If $a > 0$ and $b > 0$, then for some positive integer n , we have $na > b$.

Proof. Assume that the Archimedean Property fails. Then, for all positive integers n , we have $na < b$ for some positive a and b .

Now, let's observe $S = \{na | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then, let $b = \sup S$, which must exist by completeness.

Consider $b - a$. Since b is a supremum and a is positive, then $\exists s \in S$ such that $s > b - a$. However, $a + s$ must also be in S by definition, and $a + s > a + (b - a) = b$, contradicting the claim that $b = \sup S$. ■

Corollary 1.16. 1. If $a > 0$, then $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{n} < a$.
2. If $b > 0$, then $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b < n$.

Theorem 1.17 (Density of \mathbb{Q}). If $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a < b$, then $\exists r \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $a < r < b$.

Proof. This is an exercise for the reader. Till I fill the proof in. ■

Theorem 1.18 (Existence of n th roots). Given any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$, and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there's a $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $\beta^n = \alpha$.

Proof. This is an exercise for the reader until I feel like writing more about this. ■

Corollary 1.19. 1. $b_1, b_2 > 0$ s.t. $b_1^n = b_2^n$. Then, $b_1 = b_2$.
2. If $a, b > 0$, then $\sqrt[n]{ab} = \sqrt[n]{a} \sqrt[n]{b}$.

1.3.2 (Gates to) Infinity

We define the set of **extended reals** to be $\mathbb{R}^* = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\} \cup \{\infty\}$, with the extended order $-\infty < \alpha < \infty$, $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then, ∞ is an upper bound for any $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $-\infty$ is a lower bound for any $E \subset \mathbb{R}$.

We can extend the definition of \sup and \inf such that

- $\sup E = \inf$ if E is not bounded above, and
- $\inf E = -\infty$ if E is not bounded below.

Note that \mathbb{R}^* does not form a field. As a result, we cannot apply a theorem or exercise stated for real numbers to $\infty, -\infty$. This set doesn't have an algebraic structure.

We also denote unbounded intervals using $-\infty, \infty$ instead of real numbers.

Remark 1.20. Let S be any nonempty subset of \mathbb{R} . The symbols $\sup S$ and $\inf S$ always make sense. If S is bounded above, then $\sup S$ is a real; otherwise, it is $+\infty$. Same logic applies to lower bounds and $-\infty$.

Moreover, the statement $\inf S \leq \sup S$ also always makes sense.

CHAPTER 2

WEEK 2

2.1 Lecture 4

2.1.1 Limits of Sequences

Definition 2.1 (Sequence). A **sequence** is a function S whose domain is a set of the form $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \geq m\}$; m is usually 1 or 0.

Or, a sequence is an infinite list of real numbers.

Note that we must be careful in ensuring that we have \dots at the end of our list for repeating sequences, to make clear that our sequence goes to infinity.

Given a sequence S_1, S_2, \dots , we want to figure out what happens to S_n as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Example 2.1. $S_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, n \in \mathbb{N}$. The terms seem to "approach" zero.

Example 2.2. $S_n = (-1)^n, n \geq 0$. The sequence jumps around, and it appears to not approach any single value.

Intuitively: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = S$ means that as S gets large, then S_n goes to S .

Epsilon-Delta

Definition 2.2 (Formal Definition of Convergence). A sequence S_n of real numbers is said to **converge** to the real number S if:

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists N = N(\epsilon) \text{ s. t. } n > N \implies |S_n - S| \leq \epsilon.$$

So, no matter how small ϵ is, there is a threshold N s.t. once you have $n > N$, then you can guarantee that S_n is at most ϵ away from S .

Definition 2.3 (Limits). If S_n converges to S , we will write that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = S, \text{ or } S_n \rightarrow S.$$

The number S is called the **limit** of the sequence (S_n) .

A sequence that doesn't converge to any set number is said to **diverge**.

Remark 2.4. 1. The threshold N in the first definition can be treated as a positive integer by the Archimedean Property.

2. It's traditional to use ϵ and δ in situations where the interesting values are small positive values.

3. The first definition is an infinite number of statements, one for each ϵ .

Also, usually N depends on ϵ , usually with an inverse relationship.

2.1.2 Proving Limits

Example 2.3. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} = 0$.

We see that $|S_n - S| = |\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - 0| = |\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$. We claim that this is less than ϵ for some n .

We have that $\frac{1}{n} < \epsilon^2 \implies n > \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$. However, as n is unbounded, we see that there is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n > \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$.

But this isn't a rigorous mathematical proof.

Proof. Let's set $N = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$. We claim that $|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - 0| \leq \epsilon$. Setting $n > \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$ implies that $\frac{1}{n} < \epsilon^2$. Therefore, we have $|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - 0| = |\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} < \epsilon$. Therefore, our sequence $S_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ must converge to 0. ■

Example 2.4. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2n+4}{5n+2} = \frac{2}{5}$.

We see that

$$\begin{aligned} |S_n - S| &= \left| \frac{2n+4}{5n+2} - \frac{2}{5} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{10n+20 - (10n+4)}{5(5n+2)} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{16}{25n+10} \right| \\ &= \frac{16}{25n+10}. \end{aligned}$$

We want this value to be less than ϵ , so we have $\frac{16}{25n+10} < \epsilon \implies 25n+10 > \frac{16}{\epsilon} \implies n > \frac{16-10\epsilon}{25\epsilon}$.

Proof. We set N to be $\frac{16-10\epsilon}{25\epsilon}$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. Then, we claim that for all $n > N$, $|\frac{2n+4}{5n+2} - \frac{2}{5}| < \epsilon$.

We see from above that this is equivalent to $\frac{16}{25n+10} < \epsilon$. However, we know that $n > N \implies n > \frac{16-10\epsilon}{25\epsilon}$. Then, we have

$$\frac{16}{25n+10} < \frac{16}{25\left(\frac{16-10\epsilon}{25\epsilon}\right)+10} = \frac{16}{\frac{16-10\epsilon}{\epsilon}+10} = \frac{16}{\frac{16}{\epsilon}} = \epsilon.$$

Therefore, our sequence $S_n = \frac{2n+4}{5n+2}$ does indeed converge to $\frac{2}{5}$. ■

We *must* write the formal proof, because all we do in the first part is find a potential threshold N , and not prove that it is valid.

2.2 Lecture 5

2.2.1 Limits Theorem for Sequences

We start by showing that limits are unique.

Theorem 2.5. If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = s$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = t$, then $s = t$.

Proof. We first reframe this in terms of ϵ . Then, we see that for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an N_1, N_2 such that $n > N_1 \implies |S_n - s| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Also, $n > N_2 \implies |S_n - t| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Now, we consider $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$.

From the Triangle Inequality, we see that for all $n > N$, $|s - t| \leq |S_n - s| + |S_n - t| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. As a result, $\forall n > N, |s - t| < \epsilon$. Therefore, $|s - t| < \epsilon$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, implying that $|s - t| = 0$, or $s = t$. ■

Definition 2.6 (Bounded Sequence). A sequence S_n is said to be **bounded** if its set of values $\{S_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a bounded set.

Theorem 2.7. Convergent sequences are bounded.

Proof. Let S_n be a convergent sequence, and let $S = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n$. Take $\epsilon = 1$, then we obtain $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\forall n > N, |S_n - S| < 1.$$

By the triangle inequality, for all $n > N$, we have $|S_n| = |S_n - S + S| \leq |S_n - S| + |S| < 1 + |S|$.

Now, let $M = \max\{|S_1|, |S_2|, \dots, |S_N|, |S| + 1\}$. Then, we see that $|S_n| \leq M, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, (S_n) is a bounded sequence. ■

Remark 2.8. The converse of the above theorem is not true. Consider $(-1, 1, \dots)$. Some condition must be added.

For cases where we need to prove a sequence is bounded, we should set ϵ to 1 and try to find a resulting upper bound.

2.2.2 Limit Laws

Theorem 2.9. If $S_n \rightarrow S$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}$, then $kS_n \rightarrow kS$.

That is, $\lim kS_n = k \lim S_n$.

Proof. Let $k \neq 0$, and let $\epsilon > 0$.

For all $n > N$, we have $|S_n - S| < \frac{\epsilon}{|k|}$. We want to show that $|kS_n - kS| < \epsilon$ for $n > N$ as well.

Then,

$$n > N \implies |k| \cdot |S_n - S| < \epsilon$$

$$n > N \implies |kS_n - kS| < \epsilon,$$

and we are done. ■

Theorem 2.10. If $s_n \rightarrow s$ and $t_n \rightarrow t$, then $(s_n + t_n) \rightarrow s + t$.

Proof. We let $\epsilon > 0$.

We know that there exists $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n > N_1$, we have $|s_n - s| < \epsilon/2$, and for $n > N_2$ we have $|t_n - t| < \epsilon/2$.

Then, let $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$. then, $\forall n > N$ we have $|s_n - s| + |t_n - t| < \epsilon$. We have that that $|s_n - s| + |t_n - t| \geq |s_n + t_n - s - t| = |(s_n + t_n) - (s + t)|$, so it follows that $|(s_n + t_n) - (s + t)| < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon$. ■

Theorem 2.11. If $s_n \rightarrow s$ and $t_n \rightarrow t$, then $s_n t_n \rightarrow st$.

Proof. I'm gettin lazy ■

Lemma 2.12. If $s_n \neq 0$ for all n and $s_n \rightarrow s \neq 0$, then $\frac{1}{s_n} \rightarrow \frac{1}{s}$.

Theorem 2.13. $\lim \frac{t_n}{s_n} = \frac{\lim t_n}{\lim s_n}$.

Theorem 2.14. We have the following limit laws:

- (a) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^p} = 0$ for $p > 0$.
- (b) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a^n = 0$ if $|a| < 1$
- (c) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{\frac{1}{n}} = 1$.
- (d) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a^{\frac{1}{n}} = 1$ if $a > 0$.

The proof uses both the binomial and squeeze theorems. Proof happens in the next lecture.

Theorem 2.15 (Squeeze Theorem). Let $(a_n), (b_n), (c_n)$ be sequences such that $a_n \leq b_n \leq c_n$. Then,

1. If $a_n \rightarrow A, b_n \rightarrow B, c_n \rightarrow C$, then $A \leq B \leq C$.
2. If $\lim a_n = \lim c_n = L$, then $\lim b_n$ exists and is equal to L .

2.3 Lecture 6

2.3.1 Proofs of Limit Laws

- (a) fill out later
- (b) fill out later
- (c) fill out later
- (d) fill out later

2.3.2 Infinite Limits

Definition 2.16 (Divergence). There are two cases for divergence.

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \infty$ if for each $M > 0$, there exists an N such that $n > N \implies s_n > M$.

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = -\infty$ if for each $M < 0$, there exists an N such that $n > N \implies s_n < M$.

From now on, we'll say that a limit **converges**, **diverges to** $+\infty$, or **diverges to** $-\infty$.

We now say that (s_n) **has a limit**, or the limit **exists**, if it is convergent or divergent.

Remark 2.17. Many sequences don't have limits of $+\infty$, $-\infty$, even when unbounded.

Example 2.5. Show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n-5} + 3 = +\infty$.

Proof. Our first step is to find N . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n-5} + 3 > M &\implies \sqrt{n-5} > M-3 \\ &\implies n-5 > (M-3)^2 \\ &\implies n > (M-3)^2 + 5. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we let $N = (M-3)^2 + 5$.

Next, we let $M > 0$ be given, and let $N = (M-3)^2 + 5$ s.t. $n > N \implies \sqrt{n-5} + 3 > \sqrt{(M-3)^2 + 5 - 5} + 3 = M - 3 + 3 = M$. ■

Theorem 2.18. Suppose $s_n \rightarrow +\infty$, $t_n \rightarrow t$. Then, $s_n t_n \rightarrow +\infty$. This is true for any $t > 0$ or $t = +\infty$.

Proof. Let $M > 0$. Select a real number m such that $0 < m < \lim t_n$. Regardless of if $t_n \rightarrow \infty$, there exist an N_1 such that $n > N_1 \implies t_n > m$.

$s_n \rightarrow +\infty$ implies that there exists an N_2 such that $n > N_2 \implies s_n > \frac{M}{m}$. Now, let $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$. We see that $n > N \implies s_n t_n > \frac{M}{m} \cdot m = M$. ■

Theorem 2.19 (Duality). If $s_n > 0 \forall n$, then

$$s_n \rightarrow +\infty \iff \frac{1}{s_n} \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. For the forward direction, let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Let $M = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$. Since $s_n \rightarrow \infty$, then there must exist an N such that $\forall n > N \implies s_n > M = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$.

But then, for that same N , if $n > N$, we have $|\frac{1}{s_n} - 0| = \frac{1}{s_n} < \frac{1}{M} = \epsilon$ from the previous paragraph. This implies that $|\frac{1}{s_n} - 0| = 0$, or the limit is 0. ■

For the backwards direction, we let $M > 0$ be given. Let $\epsilon = \frac{1}{M}$. Then, since $\frac{1}{s_n} \rightarrow 0$, there exists an N such that $\forall n > N, |\frac{1}{s_n}| = \frac{1}{s_n} < \epsilon = \frac{1}{M}$.

But for the same N , we have $n > N \implies s_n > \frac{1}{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{M}} = M$, so the limit must tend to infinity. ■

2.4 Lecture 7

2.4.1 Monotonic Sequences

Definition 2.20 (Monotonicity). A sequence (s_n) is increasing if $s_{n+1} \geq s_n$ for all n , and decreasing if $s_{n+1} \leq s_n$ for all n . If either of these describes a sequence, that sequence is **monotonic**.

The following theorem shows why we care about monotonic sequences:

Theorem 2.21. Let (s_n) be a sequence.

1. If (s_n) is increasing and bounded above then (s_n) converges.
2. If (s_n) is decreasing and bounded below then (s_n) converges.

Corollary 2.22. All monotonic sequences that are bounded converge.

- Theorem 2.23.**
1. An increasing unbounded sequence diverges to $+\infty$.
 2. A decreasing unbounded sequence diverges to $-\infty$.

Proof.

1. We claim for the sake of contradiction that (s_n) is unbounded but does not diverge. Then, for some $M > 0$, there exists s_n such that s_n
2. Similar argument.

■

2.4.2 Cauchy Sequences

Definition 2.24. A sequence (s_n) of real numbers is called a **Cauchy sequence** if

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } n, m > N \implies |s_n - s_m| < \epsilon.$$

In other words, the terms get closer and closer to each other.

Lemma 2.25. If a sequence is convergent, it's a Cauchy sequence.

Proof. Suppose (s_n) is convergent, say $s_n \rightarrow s$. Then, let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Then, there must exist an N such that $n > N \implies |s_n - s| < \epsilon/2$. However, for any $m > N$ we also have $s_m - s < \epsilon/2$. Then, it follows that $|s_n - s| + |s_m - s| < \epsilon$. Moreover, from the Triangle Inequality, $|s_n - s_m| = |s_n - s + s - s_m| \leq |s_n - s| + |s_m - s|$, so we have $|s_n - s_m| < \epsilon$. ■

And what about the other direction?

Lemma 2.26. Cauchy sequences are bounded.

The proof is similar for that of the proof that convergent sequences are bounded.

Proof. Let (s_n) be a Cauchy sequence. Then, taking $\epsilon = 1$, $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m, n > N \implies |s_n - s_m| < 1$. ■

We see that for bounded sequences that don't converge, taking the supremum of all elements $n > N$ for each N leads to a convergent sequence. So even when there's no limit, we can still find a way to get a sequence with a limit.

Definition 2.27 (\limsup). Let (s_n) be a sequence in \mathbb{R} . We define,

$$\limsup s_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup\{s_n : n > N\}.$$

\liminf can be defined similarly.

CHAPTER 3
WEEK 3

CHAPTER 4
WEEK 4

5.1 Lecture 14

5.2 Lecture 15

5.3 Lecture 16

Theorem 5.1 (Mean Value Theorem).

Theorem 5.2 (Cauchy's MVT).

5.4 Lecture 17

5.4.1 Riemann Integral

Definition 5.3. Let $[a, b]$ be a given interval. By a **partition** P of $[a, b]$ we mean a finite set of points x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n , where $a = x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_{n-1} \leq x_n = b$.

For any $i = 1, \dots, n$, we define $\Delta x_i = x_i - x_{i-1}$.

Then, we take Riemann sums.

Suppose $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded. Let P be a partition of $[a, b]$. We put $M_i = \sup f(x), x_{i-1} \leq x \leq x_i$, and $m_i = \inf f(x), x_{i-1} \leq x \leq x_i$.

Then, M_i gets too much area and m_i loses area. That is $U(P, f) = \sum_{i=1}^n M_i \Delta x_i$, and $L(P, f) = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \Delta x_i$.

The upper Riemann integrals of f are $\int_a^b f dx = \inf U(P, f)$. The lower Riemann integrals of f are $\int_a^b f dx = \sup L(P, f)$.

There must exist $m, M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $m \leq f(x) \leq M$. Thus, $m(b-a) \leq f(x)(b-a) \leq M(b-a)$. Thus, for every P , $m(b-a) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \Delta x \leq \sum_{i=1}^n M_i \Delta x \leq M(b-a)$.

If lower and upper integrals are equal, then we just have integral. Another name for lower/upper integrals are Darboux integrals.

Definition 5.4. Given a partition P , a partition P^* is called a **refinement** of P if $P \subseteq P^*$ (that is, if every point of P is a point of P^*).

Given two partitions P_1, P_2 , we call P^* the **common refinement** if $P^* = P_1 \cup P_2$.

Theorem 5.5. Let $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded and monotonic. Then, $f \in R[a, b]$.

This means f is a Riemann integrable function. This means it must have upper and lower Riemann integrals the same.

6.1 Lecture 18 - Metric Spaces

Definition 6.1. Let X be a set. A **metric** (distance function) d on X is a function $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (x, y) \rightarrow d(x, y)$.

Definition 6.2 (Metric Space). A metric space is comprised of a set X , distance function $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We have multiple properties to make (X, d) a metric space:

1. **Positivity.** $d(x, y) > 0$ if $x \neq y, x, y \in X$ or $d(x, x) = 0$.
2. **Symmetry.** $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$, for all $x, y \in X$.
3. **Triangle Inequality.**

Example 6.1. (\mathbb{R}, d) is a metric space with $d(x, y) := |x - y|$.

Clearly, d is a metric on \mathbb{R} , as $d : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This satisfies:

1. $d(x, y) = |x - y| > 0, d(x, x) = |x - x| = 0$ for all $x \neq y, x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.
2. $d(y, x) = |y - x| = |-(x - y)| = |x - y| = d(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.
3. $d(x, y) = |x - y| = |x - z + z - y| \leq |x - z| + |z - y| = d(x, z) + d(z, y)$ for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 6.3 (Euclidean Space). For $n \geq 1$, define n -dimensional Euclidean space:

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \{\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) | x_j \in \mathbb{R}, 1 \leq j \leq n\}.$$

Example 6.2 (Discrete Metric). Let x be any set. Define $d_d(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \neq y \\ 0 & x = y \end{cases}$.

1. Positivity holds by definition.
2. $d_d(x, y) = d_d(y, x) = 1$ for $x \neq y$.
3. $d_d(x, y) \leq d_d(x, z) + d_d(z, y)$

Definition 6.4 (balls). Let (X, d) be a metric space.

For any $x \in X, r > 0$,

1. The subset $B_r(x) := \{y \in X | d(x, y) < r\}$ is called the **open ball** centered at x with radius r .
2. The subset $\overline{B_r(x)} := \{y \in X | d(x, y) \leq r\}$ is called the **closed ball** centered at x with radius r .
3. An open ball centered at x is also a **neighborhood** of x .

In \mathbb{R} , each open/closed ball is equivalent to a finite open/closed interval.

Definition 6.5 (Openness). Let (X, d) be a metric space. A subset $A \subset X$ is called **open** if $A = \emptyset$ or if for every $x \in A$, there exists some open ball $B_r(x) \subset A$ for some $r > 0$.

Theorem 6.6. Any open ball is open.

6.2 Lecture 20

Theorem 6.7. If X is a metric space and $E \subset X$:

1. \overline{E} is closed.
2. $E = \overline{E} \iff E$ is closed.
3. $\overline{E} \subset F$ for every closed set $F \subset X$ s.t. $\overline{E} \subset F$.

Proof. If $E = X$, then we see that it must be closed by definition. If not, then for any $X \in \overline{E}^C$, we show that there must be some open ball $B_r(x) \subset \overline{E}^C$.

Suppose this is false. Then, for

Theorem 6.8. Let E be a nonempty set of real numbers which is bounded above. Let $Y = \sup E$. Then, $y \in \overline{E}$. Hence, $Y \in E$ if E is closed.

Theorem 6.9 (Bolzano-Weierstrass). Every bounded sequence in \mathbb{R}^k has a convergent subsequence.

6.3 Lecture 21

6.3.1 Compactness

First, we need to define a couple of terms before we define compactness. A **family** of sets is a collection of subsets of X .

Definition 6.10 (Open Cover). An **open cover** of $E \in (X, d)$, which we will call $\{G_\alpha\}$, is a family of sets such that $E \subset \bigcup_\alpha G_\alpha$.

In other words, each point in E must also be in one of the sets G_α .

Definition 6.11 (Compact). A set E is considered **compact** if any open cover of E has a finite subcover.

Theorem 6.12 (Heine-Borel). A set E is compact if and only if it is closed and bounded.

Proof. Suppose E is compact. Then, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let U_m consist of all x in \mathbb{R}^k such that $\max\{|x_j| : j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, k\} < m$.

The family $\mathcal{U} = \{U_m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an open cover of E , so a finite subfamily of \mathcal{U} covers E . If U_{m_0} is the largest member of the subfamily, then we see that $E \subseteq U_{m_0}$. Thus, E must be bounded, as each U_m is bounded for finite m .

To show that E is closed, we prove that its complement is open. Consider a point $x_0 \in E^C$. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $V_m = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : d(x, x_0) > \frac{1}{m}\}$. Then, each V_m is open in \mathbb{R}^k , and $\mathcal{V} = \{V_m\}$ covers E since the union of all V_m is $\mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{x_0\}$. Since E can be covered by finitely many V_m , we see that $E \subset \{X \in \mathbb{R}^k : d(x, x_0) > \frac{1}{m_0}\}$. Then, $\{X \in \mathbb{R}^k : d(x, x_0) < \frac{1}{m_0}\} \subset E^C$. Thus, x_0 must be interior E^C for any $x_0 \in E^C$, so E^C must be open and E must be closed. ■

Now, suppose E is closed and bounded. Since E is bounded, E is the subset of a set having the form $F = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : |x_j| \leq m \forall j \in [1, k]\}$.

Note that F is a k -cell, or a rectangle in k dimensions. We define the **diameter** of a k -cell to be

$$\sup\{d(x, y) \mid x, y \in F\}.$$

Now, we have the following lemma:

Lemma 6.13. Every k -cell F in \mathbb{R}^k is compact.

Proof. We assume for the sake of contradiction that F is not compact. Then, there must be some open cover \mathcal{U} of F such that there is no finite subcover that covers F .

Let the diameter of F be δ . We see that if F cannot be covered by a finite subcover, then it must contain a k -cell F_1 of diameter $\frac{\delta}{2}$ such that F_1 is also not able to be contained by any finite subcover.

Repeating this logic infinitely, we have that $F \supset F_1 \supset F_2 \supset F_3 \supset \dots$, and no F_n is able to be fit into a finite subcover. However, we see that $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i = x_0$ for some x_0 . This contradicts the claim we initially made because x_0 can fit into a finite subcover by definition. ■

This lemma concludes our proof. ■

CHAPTER 7

WEEK 7

7.1 Lecture 22

Problem 7.1. Let X be the set of continuous functions from $[a, b]$ to \mathbb{R} . For all $x, y \in X$ let $d(x, y)$ be

$$d(x, y) = \max\{|x(t) - y(t)|\}.$$

Show that (X, d) is a metric space.

Proof. We only need to confirm that d is a valid metric in X . ■

Problem 7.2. Let (X, d) be a metric space. Suppose ρ is defined as

$$\rho(x, y) = \frac{d(x, y)}{1 + d(x, y)}.$$

Show that ρ is a metric on X . (Note that the new metric ρ is bounded because $\rho(x, y) < 1$ for all $x, y \in X$.)

Proof. Once again, we only need to prove that this is a metric.

Positivity. Note that $d(x, y) \geq 0$, so for any nonnegative $d(x, y)$, we find $\rho(x, y)$ to have a nonnegative numerator and positive denominator. Furthermore, $\rho(x, y)$ only equals 0 when $d(x, y) = 0$, or $x = y$. Therefore, positivity must be satisfied.

Commutativity. $\rho(y, x) = \frac{d(y, x)}{1 + d(y, x)} = \frac{d(x, y)}{1 + d(x, y)} = \rho(x, y)$.

Triangle Inequality. $\rho(x, y) + \rho(y, z) = \frac{d(x, y)}{1 + d(x, y)} + \frac{d(y, z)}{1 + d(y, z)}$. ■

Problem 7.3. Let A be a subset of (M, D) . Prove that

1. $A = \cap\{C : A \subset C, C \text{ closed}\}$.
2. $A = \overline{A}$ if and only if A is closed.

7.1.1 Back to Compactness

Definition 7.1. Assume (X, d) is a metric space. A subset $K \subset X$ is called **sequentially compact**, if every sequence of points in K has a convergent subsequence converging to a point in K .

It follows that if a subset K is compact, then it is sequentially compact.

7.1.2 Continuity and Limits

Let $(X, d_X), (Y, d_Y)$ be metric spaces.

Definition 7.2. Let $E \subset X$ and $f : E \rightarrow Y$.

1. If $x_0 \in E'$, we say $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = y_0$ if $\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0$ such that

$$d_X(x, x_0) < \delta \implies d_Y(f(x), y_0) < \epsilon,$$

for any $x \in E \setminus \{x_0\}$.

2. f is said to be **continuous** at $x_0 \in E$ if $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = f(x_0) \iff \forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0$ such that

$$d_X(x, x_0) < \delta \implies d_Y(f(x), f(x_0)) < \epsilon.$$

7.2 Lecture 23

7.2.1 Continuity and Limits, continued

Definition 7.3 (Pointwise Convergence). A sequence of functions f_n is **pointwise convergent** to a particular function f if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$ for every x in the domain of f .

However, pointwise convergence is weak in a number of scenarios, and uniform convergence provides a stronger definition of convergence.

Definition 7.4 (Uniform Convergence). A sequence of functions f_n is **uniformly convergent** on S to a function f if for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a number N such that $|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$ for all $x \in S$ and all $n > N$.

Consider the example $f_n(x) = x^n$ over the domain $[0, 1]$.

We see that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1)$ and 1 for $x = 1$. Therefore (f_n) is pointwise convergent to

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in [0, 1) \\ 1 & x = 1 \end{cases}.$$

Each x^n is continuous, so even for large n there must be x that are infinitesimally close to 1. However, for uniform convergence to $f(x)$, we need all values that are not 1 to converge to 0. As this is impossible for any function x^n , this sequence cannot be universally convergent.

The professor says to compare pointwise and uniform convergence to getting in A+ in one versus all classes.

Theorem 7.5. The uniform limit of continuous functions is continuous.

7.3 Lecture 24

Remark 7.6. If f_n uniformly converges to f , then in particular f_n pointwise converges to f .

Theorem 7.7. Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $f_n : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. f_n is uniformly convergent to f if and only if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists N such that $m, n \geq N$ implies $|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| < \epsilon$.

Proof. Suppose f_n is uniformly convergent to f on E . Then $\exists N$ such that $n \geq N, x \in E$ implies that $|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, so that $|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| \leq |f_n(x) - f(x)| + |f(x) - f_m(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon$.

We don't need to use N_1, N_2 because we are using the same sequence.

Conversely, let $x \in E$. Since (f_n) is uniformly Cauchy, in particular $(f_n(x))$ is a Cauchy set. So $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x)$ exists. Let $f(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x)$, i.e., $f_n \rightarrow f$ pointwise.

We claim that f_n is uniformly convergent to f on E . Let $\epsilon > 0$. There exists N such that $n, m > N$ and $x \in E$ implies $|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Let $m \rightarrow \infty$. Since absolute value is continuous, it follows that $|f_n(x) - f(x)| = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon$.

Therefore, f_n is uniformly convergent to f . ■

In other words, we now have that the Cauchy property implies uniform convergent.

Theorem 7.8. Suppose $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x), x \in E$. Let $M_n = \sup_{x \in E} |f_n(x) - f(x)|$. Then, f_n is uniformly convergent to f on E if and only if $M_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Suppose (f_n) is uniformly convergent to f . Let $\epsilon > 0, \exists N$ such that $\forall n > N, x \in E |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$. Then, $\forall n > N, 0 \leq M_n = \sup |f_n(x) - f(x)| \leq \epsilon$. Thus, $0 \leq |M_n| \leq \epsilon$ for all $n > N$, so $M_n \rightarrow 0$.

Conversely, let $\epsilon > 0$. Then, there exists N such that $n > N \implies M_n < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, that is, $\forall x \in E |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Now, let $n, m > 0$ ■

Theorem 7.9. Let $f_n : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous at $x \in E$. If f_n uniformly converges to f on E , then f is continuous at x .

We can generalize this theorem for the following statement on interchanging limits:

Let $f_n : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and f_n uniformly converges to f on E . Suppose x_0 is a limit point of E and $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f_n(x) = A_n$. Then, (A_n) converges, $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)$ exists.

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f_n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n.$$

7.4 Lecture 25

7.4.1 Integration

Theorem 7.10. Let $f_n \in R[a, b]$ and f_n uniformly converges to f on $[a, b]$. Then, $f \in R[a, b]$. Moreover,

$$\int_a^b f(t) dt = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(t) dt.$$

7.4.2 Differentiation

Theorem 7.11 (Rudin 7.17). Suppose (f_n) is a set of differentiable functions on $[a, b]$ such that

1. $f_n \rightarrow f$ pointwise on $[a, b]$.
2. $f'_n \rightarrow g$ uniformly on $[a, b]$.

Then, $f_n \rightarrow f$ uniformly on $[a, b]$, and f is differentiable on $[a, b]$. Moreover $f'(x) = g(x)$ for all $x \in [a, b]$, that is, $f'(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f'_n(x) \forall a \leq x \leq b$.