

# Infinitesimal Calculus 3

Lecture 7, Sunday November 13, 2022  
Ari Feiglin

## 7.1 Complete Metric Spaces

### Definition 7.1.1:

A metric space  $(X, \rho)$  is **complete** if every Cauchy sequence in  $X$  is convergent.

For example,  $\mathbb{R}$  is complete but  $\mathbb{Q}$  is not.

### Proposition 7.1.2:

If  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a Cauchy sequence, it is bounded. And if  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  has a convergent subsequence, it itself is convergent.

### Proof:

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  then there exists a  $N$  such that for every  $n, m \geq N$ :  $\rho(x_n, x_m) < \varepsilon$ . Let  $x = x_N$ , and we define

$$M = \max_{1 \leq n < N} \{\rho(x_n, x), \varepsilon\}$$

then for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have that  $\rho(x_n, x) \leq M$  since if  $n < N$  then by definition  $\rho(x_n, x) \leq M$  since  $M$  is the maximum distance. And if  $n \geq N$  then  $\rho(x_n, x) < \varepsilon \leq M$ . So  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is bounded.

Suppose  $x_{n_k}$  is a convergent subsequence which converges to  $x \in X$ . Then let  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and so there exists an  $N$  which satisfies the definition of Cauchy sequences for  $\varepsilon$ . Let  $n \geq N$ , and there must be a  $k$  such that  $n_k \geq N$  and  $\rho(x_{n_k}, x) < \varepsilon$  (since it converges to  $x$ ). So for every  $n \geq N$  by the definition of a Cauchy sequence:

$$\rho(x_n, x) \leq \rho(x_n, x_{n_k}) + \rho(x_{n_k}, x) < 2\varepsilon$$

And so for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is an  $N$  such that for every  $n \geq N$ :  $\rho(x_n, x) < 2\varepsilon$ , so  $x_n$  converges to  $x$  as required. ■

### Proposition 7.1.3:

$\mathbb{R}^n$  is complete.

### Proof:

Suppose  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then it is bounded, and by Weierstrauss it has a convergent subsequence. So by above since it is a Cauchy sequence with a convergent subsequence, it itself is convergent. So  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is complete. ■

### Proposition 7.1.4:

If  $(X, \rho)$  is a compact metric space, it is complete.

### Proof:

Suppose  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $X$ , then since  $X$  is a compact space  $x_n$  has a convergent subsequence. And since it is Cauchy,  $x_n$  is therefore convergent. So  $X$  is complete. ■

**Proposition 7.1.5:**

If  $(X, \rho)$  is a complete metric space and  $S \subseteq X$ , then  $S$  is closed if and only if  $(S, \rho)$  is complete (we restrict  $\rho$  to  $S \times S$ ).

**Proof:**

Suppose  $S$  is closed and  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a cauchy sequence in  $S$ , then it is cauchy in  $X$  and therefore converges to some  $x \in X$ . Therefore since  $x_n \rightarrow x$  and  $x_n \in S$ ,  $x \in \bar{S}$ . Because  $S$  is closed,  $\bar{S} = S$  and therefore  $x \in S$ . So  $x_n$  converges to a value in  $S$ , that is it is convergent in  $S$ . So every cauchy sequence in  $S$  is convergent, and therefore  $S$  is complete. Suppose  $S$  is complete and  $x \in S'$  then there exists a sequence  $x_n \in S$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow x$ . Since  $\{x_n\}$  is convergent in  $X$ , it is cauchy in  $S$ , and therefore converges to a value in  $S$ . Therefore  $x \in S$ , that is  $S' \subseteq S$ , so  $S$  is closed. ■

## 7.2 Continuous Mappings Between Metric Spaces

**Definition 7.2.1:**

If  $(X, \rho)$  and  $(Y, \sigma)$  are metric spaces, a **mapping** (or a **function**)  $f$  between them is a function:

$$f: X \longrightarrow Y$$

And a **restriction** of  $f$  onto  $E \subseteq X$  is a mapping  $f|_E$  between  $(E, \rho)$  and  $(Y, \sigma)$  such that for every  $x \in E$ :  $f|_E(x) = f(x)$ .

**Definition 7.2.2:**

If  $f$  is a mapping between  $X$  and  $Y$  and  $p$  is a limit point of  $X$ , we say

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$$

if for every sequence  $p \neq x_n \rightarrow p$  in  $X$ ,  $f(x_n) \rightarrow q$ .

**Theorem 7.2.3:**

Suppose  $f$  is a mapping between metric space, then the following are equivalent:

- $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$
- For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $p \neq x \in B_\delta(p)$ ,  $f(x) \in B_\varepsilon(q)$ .
- For every  $K \subseteq Y$  where  $p$  is a limit point of  $X$ :  $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f|_K(x) = q$  in  $K$ .

**Proof:**

Suppose  $\lim f(x) = q$  and assume for the sake of a contradiction that there is an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for every  $\delta > 0$  there is a  $p \neq x \in B_\delta(p)$  such that  $f(x) \notin B_\varepsilon(q)$ . Take  $\delta_n = \frac{1}{n}$  and  $x_n$  to be the  $x_n$  which satisfies the above for  $\delta_n$ . Then  $p \neq x_n \rightarrow p$ , but  $\rho(x_n, q) \geq \varepsilon$ , so  $x_n$  doesn't converge to  $q$  in contradiction.

To prove the converse, suppose  $p \neq x_n \rightarrow p$ . Then let  $\varepsilon > 0$ , so there exists a  $\delta > 0$  which satisfies the  $\varepsilon - \delta$  criterion, and since  $x_n \rightarrow p$ , there exists an  $N$  such that for every  $n \geq N$  we have that  $x_n \in B_\delta(p)$ , so  $f(x_n) \in B_\varepsilon(q)$ . So for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is an  $N$  such that for every  $n \geq N$  we have  $\rho(f(x_n), q) < \varepsilon$  so  $f(x_n)$  converges to  $q$ .

We will now show that 1 is equivalent to 3. If we assume 1 then 3 is trivial. Now assume 3, suppose  $p \neq x_n \rightarrow p$ , then  $p$  is a limit point of  $K = \{x_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , and so:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f|_K(x) = q$$

and since  $\{x_n\}$  is a sequence in  $K$  which converges to  $p$  in  $X$  and isn't equal to  $p$ :

$$p = \lim_{x \rightarrow p} f|_K(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p} f|_K(x_n) = \lim f(x_n)$$

as required. ■

**Example:**

We define the function  $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by:

$$f(x, y) = \frac{xy}{x^2 + y^2}$$

and we'd like to compute the limit

$$\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow (0,0)} f(x, y)$$

If we take  $K_k = \{(x, xk) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}\}$  then  $(0,0)$  is a limit point of every  $K_k$ . But the limit in  $K$  is equal to:

$$\lim_{(x,xk) \rightarrow (0,0)} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{kx^2}{x^2(1+k^2)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{k}{1+k^2} = \frac{k}{1+k^2}$$

which is different for every  $k$ , and therefore the limit doesn't exist.

**Example:**

$$\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow (0,0)} \frac{x^2 y}{x^4 + y^2}$$

What happens on  $y = kx$ ? We get:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{kx^3}{x^2(x^2 + k^2)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{kx}{x^2 + k^2} = 0$$

So if the limit exists, it is 0. But if we take  $y = kx^2$  then the limit:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x, kx^2) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{kx^4}{x^4(1+k^2)} = \frac{k}{1+k^2}$$

which is not equal to 0 if  $k \neq 0$ , and therefore the limit doesn't exist.