# **Title**

# D. Zack Garza

# August 21, 2019

# **Contents**

# 0.1 Exercises

### Problem 1.

Let C denote the Cantor set.

- 1. Show that C contains point that is not an endpoint of one of the removed intervals.
- 2. Show that C is nowhere dense, meager, and has measure zero.
- 3. Show that C is uncountable.

# Solution 1.

1. First we will characterize the endpoints of the removed intervals. Let  $C_n$  be the nTh stage of the deletion process that is used to define the Cantor set; then what remains is a union of intervals:

$$C_n = [0, \frac{1}{3^n}] \bigcup [\frac{2}{2^n}, \frac{3}{3^n}] \bigcup \cdots \bigcup [\frac{3^n - 1}{n}, 1],$$

and so the endpoints are precisely the numbers of the form  $\frac{k}{3^n}$  where  $0 \le k \le 3^n$ . Moreover, any endpoint appearing in  $C_n$  is never removed in any later step, and so all endpoints remaining in C are of this form where we allow  $0 \le n < \infty$ .

Thus, our goal is to produce a number  $x \in [0,1]$  such that  $x \neq \frac{k}{3^n}$  for any k or n, but also satisfies  $x \in C$ . So we will need a general characterization of all of the points in C.

Lemma: If  $x \in C$ , then one can find a ternary expansion for which all of the digits are either 0 or 2, i.e.

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k 3^{-k}$$
 where  $a_k \in \{0, 2\}$ .

Proof: By induction on the index k in  $a_k$ , first consider note that if  $x \in C$  then  $x \in C_1 = [0,1] \setminus [\frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3}] = [0,\frac{1}{3}] \bigcup [\frac{2}{3},1]$ . So if  $x \in C_1$ , then  $x \notin (\frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3})$ . But note that  $a_1$  is computed in the following way:

$$a_1 = \begin{cases} 0 & 0 \le x < \frac{1}{3}, \\ 1 & \frac{1}{3} \le x < \frac{2}{3}, \\ 2 & \frac{2}{3} \le x < 1. \end{cases}$$

Since the interval  $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$  is deleted in  $C_1$ , we find that  $a_1 = 1 \iff x = \frac{1}{3}$ . In this case, however, we claim that we can find a ternary expansion of x that does not contain a 1. We first write

$$x = \frac{1}{3} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k 3^{-k}$$
 where  $a_1 = 1, a_{k>1} = 0$ ,

and then define

$$x' = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k 3^{-k}$$
 where  $b_1 = 0, b_{k>1} = 2$ .

The claim now is that x = x', which follows from the fact that this is a geometric sum that can be written in closed form:

$$x' = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} (2)3^{-k}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (2)3^{-k}\right) - 2 - 2(3^{-1})$$

$$= 2\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 3^{-k}\right) - 2 - 2(3^{-1})$$

$$= 2\left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{3}}\right) - 2 - 2(3^{-1})$$

$$= 2\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) - 2 - 2(3^{-1})$$

$$= 1 - \frac{2}{3}$$

$$= \frac{1}{3} = x.$$

In short, we have  $\frac{1}{3} = (0.1)_3 = (0.222 \cdots)_3$  as ternary expansions, and a similar proof shows that such an expansion without 1s can be found for any endpoint.

For the inductive step, consider  $a_n$ : the claim is that if  $a_n = 1$ , then  $x \notin C_{n+1}$  – that is, it is contained in one of the intervals deleted at the n+1st stage. Writing the deleted interval at this stage as (a,b), we find that  $a_n = 1$  if and only if  $x \in [a,b)$ . Since  $x \in C$ , the only way  $a_n$  can be 1 is if x was in fact the endpoint a (since no previous digit was a 1, by hypothesis). However, as shown above, every such endpoint has a ternary expansion containing no 1s.  $\square$ 

Therefore, if we can produce an x that satisfies  $x \neq \frac{k}{3^n}$  for any k, n and x has no 1s in its ternary expansion, we will have an  $x \in C$  that is not an endpoint.

So take

$$x = (0.\overline{02})_3 = (0.020202 \cdots)_3.$$

This evidently has no 1s in its ternary expansion, and if we sum the corresponding geometric series, we find  $x = \frac{1}{4}$ . This is not of the form  $\frac{k}{3^n}$  for any k, n, and thus fulfills both conditions.

2. We first show that C is nowhere dense by showing that the interior of its closure is empty, i.e.  $(\overline{C})^{\circ} = \emptyset$ .

To do so, we note that C is itself closed and so  $C = \overline{C}$ . To see why this is, consider  $C^c$ ; we'll show that it is open. By construction,  $C_1^c$  is the open interval  $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$  that is deleted, and similarly  $C_n^c$  is the finite union of the open intervals that are deleted at the nth stage. But then

$$C^c = \left(\bigcap C_n\right)^c = \bigcup C_n^c$$

is an infinite union of open sets, which is also open. So C is closed.

It is also the case that C has empty interior, so  $C^{\circ} = \emptyset$ . Towards a contradiction, suppose  $x \in C$  is an interior point; then there is some neighborhood  $N_{\varepsilon}(x) \subset C$ . Since we are on the real line, we can write this as an interval  $(x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon)$ , which has length  $2\varepsilon > 0$ . Moreover, we have the containment

$$(x-\varepsilon,x+\varepsilon)\subset C\subset C_n$$

for every n.

Claim: The length of  $C_n$  is  $(\frac{2}{3})^n$  where we define  $C_0 = [0, 1]$ . Letting  $L_n$  be the length of  $C_n$ , one easy way to see that this is the case is to note that  $L_n$  satisfies the recurrence relation

$$L_{n+1} = \frac{2}{3}L_n,$$

since an interval of length  $\frac{1}{3}L_n$  is removed at each stage. With the initial conditions  $L_0 = 1$ , it can be checked that  $L_n = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n$  solves this relation.

Now, since  $x \in C = \bigcap C_n$ , it is in every  $C_n$ . So we can choose n large enough such that

$$\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n \le 2\varepsilon.$$

Letting  $\mu(X)$  denote the length of an interval, we always have  $C \subseteq C_n$  and so  $\mu(C) \le \mu(C_n)$ . Using the subadditivity of measures, we now have

$$(x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon) \subset C \subset C_n$$

$$\implies \mu(x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon) \leq \mu(C) \leq \mu(C_n)$$

$$\implies 2\varepsilon \leq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n,$$

a contradiction. So C has no interior points.

But this means that

$$(\overline{C})^{\circ} = C^{\circ} = \emptyset,$$

and so C is nowhere dense.

To see that  $\mu(C) = 0$ , we can use the fact that for any sets, measures are additive over disjoint sets and we have

$$\mu(A) + \mu(X \setminus A) = \mu(X) \implies \mu(X \setminus A) = \mu(X) - \mu(A).$$

Here we will take X = [0, 1], so  $\mu(X) = 1$ , and A = C the Cantor set.

By tracing through the construction of the Cantor set, letting  $B_n$  be the length of the interval that is removed at each stage, we can deduce

$$B_1 = \frac{1}{3}$$

$$B_2 = \frac{2}{9}$$

$$\dots$$

$$B_n = \frac{2^n}{3^{n+1}}.$$

We can identify  $B_n = \mu(C_n^c)$ , and using the fact that  $C_n^c \cap C_{>n}^c = \emptyset$  and the fact that measures are additive over disjoint sets, we can compute

$$\mu(C) = 1 - \mu(C^c)$$

$$= 1 - \mu((\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n)^c)$$

$$= 1 - \mu(\coprod_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n^c)$$

$$= 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mu(C_n^c)$$

$$= 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^n}{3^{-n}}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{3} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{2}{3}}\right)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{3}(3) = 0,$$

which is what we wanted to show.  $\Box$ 

3. Let  $y \in [0,1]$  be arbitrary, we will construct an element  $x \in C$  such that y = f(x). We first note that every number has a binary expansion, and we can write

$$y = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} y_k 2^{-k}$$
 where  $y_k \in \{0, 1\}$ .

Now we construct

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k 3^{-k}$$
 where  $a_k = 2y_k \implies a_k \in \{0, 2\}$ .

By the characterization given in part (1), we see that  $x \in C$  because it has no 1s in its ternary expansion. Moreover, under f, we have  $a_k \mapsto \frac{1}{2}a_k = \frac{1}{2}(2a_k) = a_k$ , and so f(x) = y by construction.

This shows that C surjects onto [0,1], and in particular,  $\#C \ge \#[0,1]$  holds for the cardinalities of these sets. Since [0,1] is uncountable (say, by Cantor's diagonalization argument), this shows that C is uncountable.

#### Problem 2.

- 1. Show that X is  $G_{\delta}$  iff  $X^c$  is  $F_{\sigma}$ .
- 2. Show that X closed  $\implies X$  is  $G_{\delta}$  and X open  $\implies X$  is  $F_{\sigma}$ .
- 3. Give an example of an  $F_{\sigma}$  set that is not  $G_{\delta}$ , and a set that is neither.

# Solution 2.

1. To show the forward direction, suppose X is a  $F_{\sigma}$ , so  $X = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A_i$  with each  $A_i$  an closed set. By definition, each  $A_i^c$  is open, and we have

$$X^{c} = \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A_{i}\right)^{c} = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A_{i}^{c},$$

which exhibits  $X^c$  as a countable intersection of closed sets, making it an  $G_\delta$ .

The reverse direction proceeds analogously: supposing  $X^c$  is  $G_{\delta}$ , we can write  $X^c = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} B_i$  with each  $B_i$  open, where  $B_i^c$  is closed by definition, and

$$X = (X^c)^c = (\bigcap B_i)^c = \bigcup B_i^c$$

which exhibits X as a union of closed sets, and thus an  $F_{\sigma}$ .

2. Suppose X is closed, we want to then write X as a countable intersection of open sets. For every  $x \in X$  and every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$B_n(x) = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \ni |x - y| \le \frac{1}{n} \right\},$$

$$V_n = \bigcup_{x \in X} B_n(x),$$

$$W = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n.$$

Explicitly, we have

$$W = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{x \in X} B_n(x),$$

and the claim is that W is a  $G_{\delta}$  and W = X.

To see that the  $V_n$  are open, note that n is fixed and each  $B_n(x)$  is an open ball around a point x. Any union of open sets is open, and thus so is  $V_n$ . By construction, W is then a countable intersection of open sets, and thus W is a  $G_{\delta}$  by definition.

We show W = X in two parts. To see that  $X \subseteq W$ , note that if  $x \in X$ , then  $x \in B_n(x)$  for every n and thus  $x \in V_n$  for every n as well. But this means that  $x \in \bigcap_n V_n$ , and so  $x \in W$ .

To see that  $W \subseteq X$ , let  $w \in W$  be arbitrary. If  $w \in X$ , there is nothing to check, so suppose  $w \notin X$  towards a contradiction.

Since  $w \in \bigcap_n V_n$ , it is in  $V_n$  for every n. But this means that there is some particular  $x_0$  such that  $w \in B_n(x_0)$  for every n as well, and moreover since we assumed  $w \notin X$ , we have  $w \neq x_0$ .

Then, letting  $N_{\varepsilon}(w)$  be an arbitrary neighborhood of w, we can find an n large enough such that  $B_n(x) \subset N_{\varepsilon}(w)$ . This means that  $x_0 \neq w$  can be found in every neighborhood of w, which makes w a limit point of X. However, since we assumed X was closed, it contains all of its limit points, which would force  $w \in X$ , a contradiction.  $\square$ 

Now suppose X is an open set, we want to show it is an  $F_{\sigma}$  and can thus be written as a countable union of closed sets. We can use the fact that  $X^c$  is closed, and by the previous result,  $X^c$  is thus a  $G_{\delta}$ . But by an earlier result,  $X^c$  is a  $G_{\delta} \iff (X^c)^c = X$  is an  $F_{\sigma}$ , and we are done.

3. We want to construct a set that can be written as a countable union of closed sets, but not as a countable intersection of open sets. Note that in  $\mathbb{R}$  with the usual topology, singletons are closed, and so  $\{p\}^c$  is an open set for any point p.

With this motivation, consider  $X = \mathbb{Q}$  and  $X^c = \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ . We can write

$$\mathbb{Q}=\bigcup_{q\in\mathbb{Q}}\left\{ q\right\} ,$$

which exhibits X as a countable union of closed sets because  $\mathbb{Q}$  itself is countable. So  $\mathbb{Q}$  is an  $F_{\sigma}$  set. Suppose towards a contradiction that  $\mathbb{Q}$  is also  $G_{\delta}$ , so we have  $\mathbb{Q} = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} O_i$  with each  $O_i$  open. So each  $O_i$  covers  $\mathbb{Q}$ , i.e.  $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq O_i$ , which (importantly!) forces each  $O_i$  to be dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

But now note that we can also write

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{R} \setminus \bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \left\{q\right\} = \bigcap_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \setminus \left\{q\right\},$$

where we can note that  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{q\}$  is an open, dense subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  for each q. We can appeal to the Baire category theorem twice, which tells us that any countable intersection of *open* dense sets will also be dense. This first tells us that the above intersection, and thus  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ , is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then, writing

$$\left(\bigcap_{i\in\mathbb{N}}O_i\right)\bigcap\left(\bigcap_{q\in\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{R}\setminus\{q\}\right)=\mathbb{Q}\bigcap\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}=\emptyset,$$

we produce what is still just a countable intersection of open dense sets, and by Baire, the result would need to be dense as well. Since the empty set is *not* dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ , so we arrive at a contradiction.

#### Problem 3.

- 1. Let  $r_n$  be an enumeration of the rationals, define  $f(r_n) = \frac{1}{n}$  and f(x) = 0 for  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ . Show that  $\lim_{x \to c} f(x) = 0$  for every  $c \in I$ , and  $D_f = \mathbb{Q} \cap I$ .
- 2. Supposing f is bounded, show that  $\omega_f$  is (in general) well-defined, and that f is continuous at  $x \iff \omega_f(x) = 0$ .
- 3. Show that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the set  $A(\varepsilon) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \ni \omega_f(x) > \varepsilon\}$  is closed, and thus  $D_f$  is an  $F_{\sigma}$  set.

# Solution 3.

1. We need to show that

$$\forall c \in I, \ \forall \varepsilon > 0, \ \exists \delta \ni |x - c| \le \delta \implies |f(x) - 0| \le \varepsilon.$$

To that end, let  $\{r_n\}$  be an arbitrary enumeration of  $\mathbb{Q} \cap I$ , let  $\varepsilon$  be fixed, and let  $c \in I$  be arbitrary. If  $c \in I \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ , then  $f(c) = 0 < \varepsilon$  and there's nothing to prove. Otherwise,  $c \in \mathbb{Q}$ , so  $c = r_n$  for some n, and  $f(c) = \frac{1}{n}$ . Let  $S = \{r_i \ni i \in \mathbb{N}, \frac{1}{i} > \varepsilon\} \subset \mathbb{Q}$ , and note that S is finite by the archimedean property of  $\mathbb{R}$ . So choose

$$\delta < \min \{ |c - s| \ni s \in S \},$$

so that  $S \cap B_{\delta}(c) = \emptyset$ .

This means that if  $x \in B_{\delta}(c) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ , then  $x = r_m$  where  $\frac{1}{m} < \varepsilon$  by construction. But then  $|f(x)| = \frac{1}{m} < \varepsilon$ , and we are done.

By the sequential definition of continuity, f is continuous iff  $\lim_{x\to c} f(x) = f(c)$ . As we have shown, if  $c \in I \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ , then  $\lim_{x\to c} f(x) = 0 = f(c)$ , and so f is continuous there. However, for  $c \in I \cap \mathbb{Q}$ , since  $\lim_{x\to r_n} f(x) = 0 \neq \frac{1}{n}$ , f fails to be continuous there. Taken together, this says that  $D_f = I \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  as desired.

2. To show that this is well-defined, we need to prove that the limit exists. By definition, since f is bounded, there exists some M that is independent of x such that  $x \in \mathbb{R} \implies |f(x)| \leq M$ . In particular, for any fixed  $\delta$ , it is certainly the case that  $B_{\delta}(x) \subset \mathbb{R}$ , and so  $x \in B_{\delta}(x) \implies |f(x)| \leq M$  as well.

We can then say that if  $y, z \in B_{\delta}(x)$ , then

$$|f(y) - f(z)| < |f(y)| + |f(z)| < 2M$$

and thus the set  $\{|f(y) - f(z)| \ni y, z \in B_{\delta}(x)\}$  is bounded above and thus has a least upper bound (since  $\mathbb{R}$  has the least upper bound property). Thus the following supremum exists:

$$S(x, \delta) = \sup_{y, z \in B_{\delta}(x)} |f(y) - f(z)|.$$

We now just need to show that  $\lim_{\delta \to 0^+} S(x, \delta)$  exists. To this end, we can note that if  $\delta_1 < \delta_2$ , then  $B_{\delta_1} \subset B_{\delta_2}$ , and so S is a monotonically decreasing function of  $\delta$  that is bounded below by 0 (since  $B_0(x) = \{x\} \implies y = z = x$  are the only choices), and is thus convergent by the monotone convergence theorem. So  $\omega_f$  is well-defined.

To see that f continuous at  $x \Longrightarrow \omega_f(x) = 0$ , let  $\varepsilon$  be arbitrary; we will show that  $\omega_f(x) < \varepsilon$ . Since f is continuous, we can pick a  $\delta$  such that  $y, z \in B_{\delta}(x) \Longrightarrow f(y), f(z) \in B_{\varepsilon}(f(x))$ . Thus we have

$$|y - x| < \delta \implies |f(y) - f(x)| < \varepsilon$$
  
 $|z - x| < \delta \implies |f(z) - f(x)| < \varepsilon$ 

Moreover, we can write

$$|f(y) - f(z)| = |f(y) - f(x)| + |f(x) - f(z)| \le |f(y) - f(x)| + |f(x) - f(z)| \le 2\varepsilon$$

and thus we also have

$$\sup_{y,z\in B_{\delta}(x)}|f(y)-f(z)|<2\varepsilon.$$