# PMATH351 — Real Analysis

CLASSNOTES FOR FALL 2018

by

Johnson Ng

# *Table of Contents*

Lis	st of Definitions	5
Lis	st of Theorems	7
1	Lecture 1 Sep 06th	9
	1.1 Course Logistics	9
	1.2 Preview into the Introduction	9
2	Lecture 2 Sep 10th	11
	2.1 Basic Set Theory	11
	2.2 Products of Sets	15
3	Lecture 3 Sep 12th	19
	3.1 Axiom of Choice	19
	3.2 Relations	20
4	Lecture 4 Sep 14th	25
	4.1 Zorn's Lemma	25
	4.2 Cardinality	28
	4.2.1 Equivalence Relation	28
5	Lecture 5 Sep 17th	31
	5.1 Cardinality (Continued)	31
6	Lecture 6 Sep 19th	37
	6.1 Cardinality (Continued 2)	37
7	Lecture 7 Sep 21st	41
	7.1 Cardinality (Continued 3)	41
	7.1.1 Cardinal Arithmetic	42
8	Lecture 8 Sep 24th	45
	81 Cardinality (Continued 4)	4 -

# 4 TABLE OF CONTENTS - TABLE OF CONTENTS

	8.1.1 Cardinal Arithmetic (Continued)	45
9	Lecture 9 Sep 26th	49
	9.1 Introduction to Metric Spaces	49
10	Lecture 10 Sep 28th	55
	10.1 Introduction to Metric Spaces (Continued)	55
11	Lecture 11 Oct 01st	61
	11.1 Introduction to Metric Spaces (Continued 2)	61
12	Lecture 12 Oct 03rd	67
	12.1 Introduction to Metric Spaces (Continued 3)	67
	12.2 Topology on Metric Spaces	68
13	Lecture 13 Oct 05th	71
	13.1 Topology on Metric Spaces (Continued)	71
14	Lecture 14 Oct 12th	75
	14.1 Topology on Metric Spaces (Continued 2)	75
15	Lecture 15 Oct 15th	81
	15.1 Topology on Metric Spaces (Continued 3)	81
	15.2 Convergences of Sequences	84
16	Lecture 16 Oct 17th	87
	16.1 Convergences of Sequences (Continued)	87
	Useful Theorems from Earlier Calculus	91
	bliography	95
Inc	dev	0.77

# List of Definitions

1	Universal Set	11
2	Union	12
3	Intersection	12
4	Set Difference	12
5	Symmetric Difference	12
6	Set Complement	12
7	Empty Set	13
8	Power Set	13
9	Product of Sets	15
10	Relation	15
11	Function	16
12	Choice Function	17
13	Relations	21
14	Partially Ordered Sets	22
15	Totally Ordered Sets / Chains	23
16	Bounds	23
17	Maximal Element	25
18	Well-Ordered	26
19	Equivalence Relation	28
20	Equivalence Class	28
21	Partition	20

# 6 TABLE OF CONTENTS - TABLE OF CONTENTS

22	Finite Sets	31
23	Cardinality	31
24	Infinite Sets	32
25	Countable	34
26	Smaller Cardinality	34
27	Uncountable	39
28	Sum of Cardinals	43
29	Multiplication of Cardinals	44
30	Exponentiation of Cardinals	45
31	Metric & Metric Space	49
32	Norm & Normed Linear Space	50
33	$\ \cdot\ _p$ -norm	55
34	Open & Closed	68
35	Topology	70
36	Closure	75
37	Interior	75
38	Neighbourhood	75
39	Boundary Point	76
40	Separable	78
41	Dense	79
42	Limit Points	81
40	Constançança	Q,

# List of Theorems

■ Theorem 1	De Morgan's Laws	14
<b>V</b> Axiom 2	Zermelo's Axiom of Choice	19
<b>Q</b> Axiom 3	Zermelo's Axiom of Choice v2	19
<b>V</b> Axiom 4	Zorn's Lemma	26
■ Theorem 5	★ Non-Zero Vector Spaces has a Basis	26
<b>V</b> Axiom 6	Well-Ordering Principle	27
■ Theorem 7	Axioms of Choice and Its Equivalents	27
♦ Proposition 8	Characterization of An Equivalence Relation	29
■ Theorem 9	Pigeonhole Principle	31
Corollary 10	Pigeonhole Principle (Finite Case)	32
♦ Proposition 11	${\mathbb N}$ is the Smallest Infinite Set	33
Corollary 12	Infinite Sets are Equivalent to Its Proper Sub-	33
• Proposition 13	Injectivity is Surjectivity Reversed	34
Theorem 14 (CSB)	★★★ Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein Theorem	37
Corollary 15	Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein Theorem - Resta-	38
• Proposition 16	Denumerability Check	38
■ Theorem 17	Cantor's Diagonal Argument	39
Corollary 18	Uncountability of $\mathbb{R}$	40
■ Theorem 19	★ Comparability of Cardinals	41

# 8 TABLE OF CONTENTS - TABLE OF CONTENTS

Theorem 20	Sums of Cardinals	43
■ Theorem 21	Multiplication of Cardinals	44
■ Theorem 22	Exponentiation of Cardinals	46
■ Theorem 23	$2^{\aleph_0}=c\ldots\ldots\ldots$	46
■ Theorem 24	Russell's Paradox	47
🕽 Axiom 25	Continuum Hypothesis	48
<b>V</b> Axiom 26	Generalized Continuum Hypothesis	48
♣ Lemma 27		55
■ Theorem 28	Hölder's Inequality	56
■ Theorem 29	Minkowski's Inequality	57
Theorem 30	Hölder's Inequality v2	63
Theorem 31	Minkowski's Inequality v2	64
Proposition 32	Properties of Open Sets	68
Corollary 33	Properties of Closed Sets	69
■ Theorem 34	Open Balls are Open	71
Proposition 35	Closed Sets Include Its Boundary Points	76
Proposition 36	Closures include the Boundary Points of a Set	t 76
Proposition 37	Closed Sets Include Its Limit Points	81
Proposition 38	Mixing the notions	82
Proposition 39	More on Closures and Interiors	83
■ Theorem 40	Uniqueness of Limits of Sequences	85
■ Theorem 41 Boundaries, and	Sequential Characterizations of Limit Points, d Closedness	88
■ Theorem 42	Monotone Convergence Theorem	01

# 1 Lecture 1 Sep 06th

#### 1.1 Course Logistics

No content is covered in today's lecture so this chapter will cover some of the important logistical highlights that were mentioned in class.

- Assignments are designed to help students understand the content.
- Due to shortage of manpower, not all assignment questions will be graded; however, students are encouraged to attempt all of the questions.
- To further motivate students to work on ungraded questions, the midterm and final exam will likely recycle some of the assignment questions.
- There are no required text, but the professor has prepared course notes for reading. The course note are self-contained.
- The approach of the class will be more interactive than most math courses.
- Due to the size of the class, students are encouraged to utilize Waterloo Learn for questions, so that similar questions by multiple students can be addressed at the same time.

#### **1.2** *Preview into the Introduction*

How do we compare the size of two sets?

- If the sets are finite, this is a relatively easy task.
- If the sets are infinite, we will have to rely on functions.

- Injective functions tell us that the domain is of size that is lesser than or equal to the codomain.
- Surjective functions tell us that the codomain is of size that is lesser than or equal to the domain.
- So does a bijective function tell us that the domain and codomain have the same size? Yes, although this is not as intuitive as it looks, as it relies on Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein Theorem.

Now, given two arbitrary sets, are we guaranteed to always be able to compare their sizes? It is tempting to immediately say yes, but to do that, one would have to agree on the **Axiom of Choice**. Fortunately, within the realm of this course, the Axiom of Choice is taken for granted.

# 2 Lecture 2 Sep 10th

#### 2.1 Basic Set Theory

We shall use the following notations for some of the common set of numbers that we are already familiar with:

- N denotes the set of natural numbers {1,2,3,...};
- $\mathbb{Z}$  denotes the set of integers  $\{\ldots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ ;
- Q denotes the set of rational numbers  $\left\{\frac{a}{b} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}, b \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ ; and
- $\mathbb{R}$  denotes the set of real numbers.

We shall start with having certain basic properties of  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}$ , and  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

WE WILL USE the notation  $A \subset B$  and  $A \subseteq B$  interchangably to mean that A is a subset of B with the possibility that A = B. When we wish to explicitly emphasize this possibility, we shall use  $A \subseteq B$ . When we wish to explicitly state that A is a **proper subset** of B, we will either specify that  $A \neq B$  or simply  $A \subseteq B$ .

#### Definition 1 (Universal Set)

A universal set, which we shall generally give the label X, is a set that contains all the mathematical objects that we are interested in.

With a universal set in place, we can have the following definitions:

Definition 2 (Union)

This is a hand-wavy definition, but it is not in the interest of this course to further explore on this topic.

Let X be a set. If  $\{A_{\alpha}\}_{{\alpha}\in I}$  such that  $A_{\alpha}\subset X$ , then the **union** for all  $A_{\alpha}$  is defined as

$$\bigcup_{\alpha\in I}A_{\alpha}:=\{x\in X\mid \exists \alpha\in I, x\in A_{\alpha}\}.$$

#### Definition 3 (Intersection)

Let X be a set. If  $\{A_{\alpha}\}_{{\alpha}\in I}$  such that  $A_{\alpha}\subset X$ , then the **intersection** for all  $A_{\alpha}$  is defined as

$$\bigcap_{\alpha\in I}A_{\alpha}:=\{x\in X\mid \forall \alpha\in I, x\in A_{\alpha}\}.$$

#### Definition 4 (Set Difference)

Let X be a set and A, B  $\subseteq$  X. The **set difference** of A from B is defined as

$$A \setminus B := \{ x \in X \mid x \in A, x \notin B \}.$$

On a similar notion:

#### Definition 5 (Symmetric Difference)

Let X be a set and A, B  $\subseteq$  X. The **symmetric difference** of A and B is defined as

$$A\Delta B := \{ x \in X \mid (x \in A \land x \notin B) \lor (x \notin A \land x \in B) \}.$$

We can also talk about the non-members of a set:

# In words, for an element in the symmetric difference of two sets, the element is either in A or B but not both. We can also think of the symmetric difference

$$(A \cup B) \setminus (A \cap B)$$

or

 $(A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A).$ 

#### Definition 6 (Set Complement)

Let X be a set and  $A \subset X$ . The set of all non-members of A is called the **complement** of A, which we denote as

$$A^c := \{ x \in X \mid x \notin A \}.$$

#### 66 Note

*Note that* 

$$(A^c)^c = \{x \in X \mid x \notin A^c\} = \{x \in X \mid x \in A\} = A.$$

Now taking a step away from that, we define the following:

# Definition 7 (Empty Set)

An *empty set*, denoted by  $\emptyset$ , is a set that contains nothing.

#### 66 Note

The empty set is set to be a subset of all sets.

#### Definition 8 (Power Set)

Let X be a set. The power set of X is the set that contains all subsets of X,

$$\mathcal{P}(X) := \{ A \mid A \subset X \}.$$

#### 66 Note

*A power set is always non-empty, since*  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{P}(\emptyset)$ *, and since*  $\emptyset \subset X$  *for* any set X, we have  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ .

#### Example 2.1.1

Let  $X = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ . There are several ways we can show that the size of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is  $2^n$ . One of the methods is by using a characteristic

function that maps from A to  $\{0,1\}$ , defined by

$$X_A: A \to \{0,1\}$$

$$X_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in A \\ 0 & x \notin A \end{cases}.$$

Using this function, each element in X have 2 states: one being in the subset, and the other being not in the subset, which are represented by 1 and 0 respectively. It is then clear that there are  $2^n$  of such configurations.

#### Theorem 1 (De Morgan's Laws)

Let X be a set. Given  $\{A_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha\in I}\subset \mathcal{P}(X)$ , we have

1. 
$$\left(\bigcup_{\alpha\in I}A_{\alpha}\right)^{c}=\bigcap_{\alpha\in I}A_{\alpha}^{c}$$
; and

2. 
$$\left(\bigcap_{lpha\in I}A_lpha
ight)^c=igcup_{lpha\in I}A_lpha^c$$
.

#### Proof

1. Note that

$$x \in \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in I} A_{\alpha}\right)^{c} \iff \nexists \alpha \in I \ x \in A_{\alpha}$$

$$\iff \forall \alpha \in I \ x \notin A_{\alpha}$$

$$\iff \forall \alpha \in I \ x \in A_{\alpha}^{c} \text{ by set complementation}$$

$$\iff x \in \bigcap_{\alpha \in I} A_{\alpha}^{c}.$$

2. Observe that, by part 1,

$$\left(\bigcap_{\alpha\in I}A_{\alpha}\right)^{c}=\left(\left(\bigcup_{\alpha\in I}A_{\alpha}^{c}\right)^{c}\right)^{c}=\bigcup_{\alpha\in I}A_{\alpha}^{c}.$$

Suppose  $I=\emptyset$ . Then what is  $\bigcup_{\alpha\in\emptyset}A_{\alpha}$ ? It is sensible to think that all we are left with is simply a union of empty sets, and so

$$\bigcup_{\alpha \in \emptyset} A_{\alpha} = \emptyset. \tag{2.1}$$

And what about  $\bigcap A_{\alpha}$ ? By  $\blacksquare$  Theorem 1, it is quite clear from Equation (2.1) that

$$\bigcap_{\alpha\in\emptyset}A_{\alpha}=X.$$

# 2.2 Products of Sets

#### Definition 9 (Product of Sets)

Given 2 sets X and Y, the **product** of X and Y is given by

$$X \times Y := \{(x, y) \mid x \in X, y \in Y\}.$$

We often refer to elements of  $X \times Y$  as **tuples**.

#### 66 Note

Now if

$$X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\},\$$
  
 $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m\},\$ 

then

$$X \times Y = \{(x_i, y_i) \mid i = 1, 2, ..., n, j = 1, 2, ..., m\}$$

and so the size of  $X \times Y$  is mn.

Consequently, we can think of tuples as two elements being in some "relation".

#### Definition 10 (Relation)

A **relation** on sets X and Y is a subset R of the product  $X \times Y$ . We write

$$xRy$$
 if  $(x,y) \in R \subset X \times Y$ .

We call

•  $\{x \in X \mid \exists y \in Y, (x,y) \in R\}$  as the domain of R; and

•  $\{y \in Y \mid \exists x \in X, (x,y) \in R\}$  as the range of R.

In relation to that, functions are, essentially, relations.

## Definition 11 (Function)

A function from X to Y is a relation R such that

$$\forall x \in X \exists ! y \in Y (x, y) \in R.$$

Suppose  $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n$  are non-empty<sup>1</sup> sets. We can define

$$X_1 \times X_2 \times \ldots \times X_n = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i := \{(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \mid x_i \in X_i\}.$$

Now if  $X_i = X_j = X$  for all i, j = 1, 2, ..., n, we write

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} X_i = \prod_{i=1}^{n} X = X^n.$$

And now comes the problem: given a collection  $\{X_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha\in I}$  of non-empty sets<sup>2</sup>, what do we mean by

$$\prod_{\alpha\in I}X_{\alpha}?$$

To motivate for what comes next, consider

$$\prod_{i=1}^n X_i = X_1 \times \ldots \times X_n = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \mid x_i \in X_i\}.$$

Choose  $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$ . This induces a function

$$f_{(x_1,\ldots,x_n)}:\{1,\ldots,n\}\to\bigcup_{i=1}^n X_i$$

<sup>1</sup> We are typically only interested in non-empty sets, since empty sets usually lead us to vacuous truths, which are not interesting.

 $^{2}$  i.e. we now talk about arbitrary  $\alpha \in I$ .

with

$$f(1) = x_1 \in X_1$$

$$f(2) = x_2 \in X_2$$

$$\vdots$$

$$f(n) = x_n \in X_n$$

Now assume for a more general *f* such that

$$f:\{1,\ldots,n\}\to \bigcup_{i=1}^n X_i$$

is defined by

$$f(i) \in X_i$$
.

Then, we have

$$(f(1), f(2), \ldots, f(n)) \in \prod_{i=1}^{n} X_i,$$

which leads us to the following notion:

#### Definition 12 (Choice Function)

Given a collection  $\{X_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in I}$  of non-empty sets, let

$$\prod_{\alpha \in I} X_{\alpha} = \left\{ f : I \to \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} X_{\alpha} \right\}$$

such that  $f(\alpha) \in X_{\alpha}$ . Such an f is called a choice function.

And so we may ask a similar question as before: if each  $X_{\alpha}$  is nonempty, is  $\prod_{\alpha \in I} X_{\alpha}$  non-empty? Turns out this is not as easy to show. In fact, it is essentially impossible to show, because this is exactly the Axiom of Choice.

# 3 Lecture 3 Sep 12th

# 3.1 Axiom of Choice

Recall our final question of last lecture: If  $\{X_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in I}$  is a non-empty collection of non-empty sets, is

$$\prod_{\alpha\in I}X_{\alpha}\neq\emptyset$$
?

Turns out this is widely known (in the world of mathematics) as the Axiom of Choice.

#### **▼** Axiom 2 (Zermelo's Axiom of Choice)

If  $\{X_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha\in I}$  is a non-empty collection of non-empty sets, then

$$\prod_{\alpha\in I}X_{\alpha}\neq\emptyset.$$

An equivalent statement of the above axiom is:

# **▼** Axiom 3 (Zermelo's Axiom of Choice v2)

$$X \neq \emptyset \implies$$

$$\exists f: \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to X \ \forall A \in \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \ f(A) \in A$$

where f is the choice function.

#### Exercise 3.1.1

*Prove that*  $\mathbf{U}$  *Axiom 2 and*  $\mathbf{U}$  *Axiom 3 are equivalent.* 

#### Proof

#### From **U** Axiom 2 to **U** Axiom 3:

Since  $X \neq \emptyset$ , we have that  $\mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$  is a non-empty collection of non-empty sets. Therefore,

$$\prod_{A\in\mathcal{P}(X)\setminus\{\varnothing\}}A\neq\varnothing.$$

So we know that

$$\exists (x_A)_{A \in \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \in \prod_{A \in \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\}} A.$$

We then simply need to choose the choice function  $f: \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to X$  such that

$$f(A) = x_A \in A$$
.

#### From **□** Axiom 3 to **□** Axiom 2:

Let  $X_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  for  $\alpha \in I$ , where I is some index set. We know that not all  $X_{\alpha} = \emptyset$  since  $X \neq \emptyset$ . Choose  $J \subseteq I$  such that  $\{X_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in J}$  is a non-empty collection of non-empty sets. Let  $f : \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$  be any choice function. By  $\P$  Axiom 3,

$$\forall X_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \quad f(X_{\alpha}) \in X_{\alpha}.$$

Therefore,

$$(f(X_{\alpha}))_{\alpha\in J}\in\prod_{\alpha\in J}X_{\alpha}.$$

# 3.2 Relations

Now, it is in our interest to start talking about comparisons or relations between the mathematical objects that we have defined.

Definition 13 (Relations)

A relation R on a set X is 1

- (*Reflexive*)  $\forall x \in X \ xRx$ ;
- (Symmetric)  $\forall x, y \in X \ xRy \iff yRx$ ;
- (Anti-symmetric)  $\forall x, y \in X \ xRy \land yRx \implies x = y$ ;
- (Transitive)  $\forall x, y, z \in X \ xRy \land yRz \implies xRz$ .

#### Example 3.2.1

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ , and let  $xRy \iff x \le y$ , where  $\le$  is the notion of "less than or equal to", which we shall assume that it has the meaning that we know. Observe that  $\leq$  is:

- reflexive:  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \ x \leq x$  is true;
- anti-symmetric:  $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R} \ x \leq y \land y \leq x \implies x = y$ ; and
- transitive:  $\forall x, y, z \in \mathbb{R} \ x \le y \land y \le z \implies x \le z$ .

#### Example 3.2.2

Let  $Y \neq \emptyset$ ,  $X = \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , with  $ARB \iff A \subseteq B$ . Observe that  $\subseteq$  is:

- reflexive:  $\forall A \in \mathcal{P}(Y) \ ARA \iff A \subseteq A \text{ is true};$
- anti-symmetric:  $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{P}(Y) \ ARB \land BRA \iff A \subseteq B \land B \subseteq$  $A \implies A = B;$
- transitive:  $\forall A, B, C \in \mathcal{P}(Y) \ ARB \land BRC \iff A \subseteq B \land B \subseteq C \implies$  $A \subseteq C$ .

#### Example 3.2.3

Let  $Y \neq \emptyset$ ,  $X = \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , with  $ARB \iff A \supseteq B$ . Observe that  $\supseteq$  is:

- reflexive:  $\forall A \in \mathcal{P}(Y) \ ARA \iff A \subseteq A$ ;
- anti-symmetric:  $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{P}(Y) \ ARB \land BRA \iff A \supseteq B \land B \supseteq$  $A \implies A = B$ ;
- transitive:  $\forall A, B, C \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$   $ARB \land BRC \iff A \supseteq B \land B \supseteq C \implies$  $A \supseteq C$ .

All the above examples are also known as partially ordered sets.

- <sup>1</sup> We can look at this definition as  $R \subseteq X \times X$ . Under such a definition, we would have
- (Reflexive)  $\forall x \in X \ (x, x) \in R$ ;
- (Symmetric)  $\forall x, y \in X (x, y) \in$
- (Anti-symmetric)  $\forall x, y \in$
- (Transitive)  $\forall x, y, z \in$

#### Definition 14 (Partially Ordered Sets)

The set X with the relation R on X is called a partially ordered set (or a poset) if R is

- reflexive;
- anti-symmetric; and
- transitive.

We denote a poset by (X, R).

The "partial" in 'partially ordered" indicates that not every pair of elements need to be comparable, i.e. there may be pairs for which neither precedes the other (anti-symmetry).

#### 66 Note

If (X, R) is a poset, then if  $A \subseteq X$ , and  $R_1 = R \upharpoonright_{A \times A}$ , then  $(A, R_1)$  is also a poset.

#### Example 3.2.4

How many possible relations can we define on these sets to make them into posets?

1. 
$$X = \emptyset$$

#### Solution

We have that  $R = \emptyset \times \emptyset$ , and so the only relation we have is an empty relation. Then it is vacuously true that (X, R) a poset.

2. 
$$X = \{x\}$$

#### Solution

We have that  $R = X \times X = \{(x, x)\}$ . It it clear that (X, R) is a poset.

3. 
$$X = \{x, y\}$$

#### Solution

There are 3 possible relations:

- a relation where *xRx* and *yRy*;
- a relation where *xRy*; or
- a relation where yRx.


3 possibilities represented as graphs (known as Hasse diagram), separated by lines:



4. 
$$X = \{x, y, z\}$$

#### Solution

The following are all the possibilities represented by graphs, where the underlined numbers represent the number of ways we can rearrange the elements for unique relations:



Therefore, we see that there are a total of

$$1+3+3+6+6=19$$
 relations.

#### Exercise 3.2.1

How many possible relations can we define on a set of 6 elements to the set into a poset?

#### Solution

to be added

## Definition 15 (Totally Ordered Sets / Chains)

The set X with the relation R on X is called a **totally ordered set** (or a chain) if (X,R) is a poset with the exception that, for any  $x,y \in X$ , either xRy or yRx but not both.

#### Definition 16 (Bounds)

Let  $(X, \leq)$  be a poset. Let  $A \subset X$ . We say  $x_0 \in X$  is an upper bound for A if

$$\forall a \in A \quad a \leq x_0.$$

If A has an upper bound, we say that A is bounded above. If A is bounded above, then  $x_0$  is the least upper bound (or supremum) of A is for any  $x_1 \in X$  that is an upper bound of A, we have

$$x_0 \leq x_1$$
.

We write  $x_0 = \text{lub}(A) = \sup(A)$ . If  $\sup(A) \in A$ , then  $\sup(A) = \max(A)$  is the maximum of A.

We can analogously define for:

upper bound  $\rightarrow$  lower bound

bounded above  $\rightarrow$  bounded below

least upper bound, lub  $\rightarrow$  greatest lower bound, glb

supremum,  $sup \rightarrow infimum$ , inf

 $maximum, max \rightarrow minimum, min$ 

#### 66 Note

By anti-symmetry of posets, we have that max, sup, min, inf are all unique if they exists.

#### Example 3.2.5 (Least Upper Bound Property of R)

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\leq$  be the order that we have defined. Every bounded non-empty subset of X has a supremum.

#### Example 3.2.6

Let  $Y \neq \emptyset$ , and  $X = \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , and  $\subseteq$  the ordering by inclusion. We know that Y is the maximum element of  $(X, \subseteq)$ . Then the collection  $\{A_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in I} \subset \mathcal{P}(Y)$  is bounded above by Y, and we have that

$$\sup (\{A_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in I}) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} A_{\alpha}$$

$$\inf (\{A_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in I}) = \bigcap_{\alpha \in I} A_{\alpha}$$

Now if  $Y = \emptyset$ , we would end up having

$$\sup (\{A_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in I}) = \emptyset$$

$$\inf (\{A_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in I}) = X$$

This makes sense, since the empty set would be the least of upper bounds, and since  $X = \mathcal{P}(Y)$  would have to be the greatest of lower bounds.

# 4 Lecture 4 Sep 14th

# 4.1 Zorn's Lemma

# Definition 17 (Maximal Element)

Let  $(X, \leq)$  be a poset. An element  $x \in X$  is maximal if whenever  $y \in X$  is such that  $x \leq y$ , we must have y = x.

#### Example 4.1.1

Looking back at Example 3.2.4, on the set  $X = \{x, y, z\}$ , we have that the maximal element in each possible poset is/are:

This shows to us that the maximal element does not have to be unique.



#### Example 4.1.2

- Given  $X \neq \emptyset$ , the maximal element of the poset  $(\mathcal{P}(X), \subseteq)$  is X.
- Given  $X \neq \emptyset$ , the maximal element of the poset  $(\mathcal{P}(X), \supseteq)$  is  $\emptyset$ .
- The poset  $(\mathbb{R}, \leq)$  has no maximal element.

#### **■** Axiom 4 (Zorn's Lemma)

If  $(X, \leq)$  is a non-empty poset such that every chain  $S \subset X$  has an upper bound, then  $(X, \leq)$  has a maximal element.

## ■ Theorem 5 (★ Non-Zero Vector Spaces has a Basis)

Every non-zero vector space, V, has a basis.

#### Proof (★)

Let

$$\mathcal{L} := \{ A \subset V \mid A \text{ is linearly independent } \}.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$  since  $V \neq \{0\}$ . Now order elements of  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $\subseteq$ . It suffices to show that  $(\mathcal{L}, \subseteq)$  has a maximal element, since this maximal element must be a basis. Otherwise, we would contradict the maximality of such an element.<sup>1</sup>

Now let  $S = \{A_{\alpha}\}_{{\alpha} \in I}$  be a chain in  $\mathcal{L}$ . Let

$$A_0 = \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} A_{\alpha}.$$

Require clarification before proceeding...

The flow of this proof is a typical approach when Zorn's Lemma is involved.

<sup>1</sup> This is the key to this proof.

#### Definition 18 (Well-Ordered)

We say that a poset  $(X, \leq)$  is well-ordered if every non-empty subset  $A \subset X$  has a least/minimal element in A.

#### Exercise 4.1.1

Prove that well-ordered sets are chains.

#### Example 4.1.3

 $(\mathbb{N}, \leq)$  is well-ordered.

#### **▼** Axiom 6 (Well-Ordering Principle)

Every non-empty set can be well-ordered.

#### Theorem 7 (Axioms of Choice and Its Equivalents)

TFAE:

- 1. Axiom of Choice, **Ū** Axiom 2
- 2. Zorn's Lemma, **U** Axiom 4
- 3. Well-Ordering Principle,  $\mathbf{V}$  Axiom 6.

Exercise 4.1.2 Prove 👤 Theorem 7

#### Proof

 $(3) \implies (1)$  is simple; let the choice function be such that we pick the minimal element from each set among a non-empty collection of non-empty sets. It is clear that the product of these sets will always have an element, in particular the tuple where each component is the minimal element of each set.

The rest will be added once I've worked it out

#### Example 4.1.4

Let  $X = \mathbb{Q}$ . Let  $\phi : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{N}$  be defined such that

$$\phi\left(\frac{m}{n}\right) = \begin{cases} 2^m 5^n & m > 0\\ 1 & m = 1\\ 3^{-m} 7^n & m < 0 \end{cases}$$

By the unique prime factorization of natural numbers (or Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic), we have that  $\phi$  is injective. In fact,

$$r \leq s \iff \phi(r) \leq \phi(s)$$
,

showing to us that we have a well-ordering on Q.

# 4.2 Cardinality

# 4.2.1 Equivalence Relation

# Definition 19 (Equivalence Relation)

Let X be non-empty set. A relation  $\sim$  on X is an equivalence relation if it is

- reflexive;
- symmetric; and
- transitive.

# Definition 20 (Equivalence Class)

Let X be a non-empty set, and  $x \in X$ . An equivalence class of x under the equivalence relation  $\sim$  is defined as

$$[x] := \{ y \in X \mid x \sim y \}.$$

#### 66 Note

Note that we either have [x] = [y] or  $[x] \cap [y] = \emptyset$ . This is sensible, since if  $w \in [x]$ , then  $w \sim x$ . If  $w \in [y]$ , then we are done. If  $w \notin [y]$ , suppose  $\exists v \in [y]$  such that  $w \sim v$ , which then implies  $w \in [y]$  which is a contradiction.

This results shows to us that

$$X = \bigcup_{x \in X} [x],$$

or in words, equivalence classes partition the set.

#### Definition 21 (Partition)

*Let*  $X \neq \emptyset$ *. A partition of* X *is a collection*  $\{A_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in I} \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$  *such that* 

- 1.  $A_{\alpha} \neq \emptyset$ ;
- 2.  $A_{\alpha} \cap A_{\beta} = \emptyset$  if  $\alpha \neq \beta$  in I; and
- 3.  $X = \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} A_{\alpha}$ .

With this, we have ourselves another method to show that  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation.

# • Proposition 8 (Characterization of An Equivalence Relation)

If  $\{A_{\alpha}\}_{{\alpha}\in I}$  is a partition of X and  $x\sim y\iff x,y\in A_{\alpha}$ , then  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation.

The proof of this statement has been stated above.

Similar to when we defined partial orders, we can ask ourselves the following question:

#### Example 4.2.1

How many equivalence relations are there on the set  $X = \{1, 2, 3\}$ ?

#### Solution

Note that we can partition *X* as

$$\{\{1\},\{2\},\{3\}\},\{\{1,2,3\}\},$$

and

which we can rearrange in 3 different ways. Therefore, there are 5 different equivalence relations that we can define on *X*.

#### Example 4.2.2

Let *X* be any set. Consider  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . Define  $\sim$  on  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  by

$$A \sim B \iff \exists f : A \to B$$

such that f is surjective<sup>3</sup>. It is easy to verify that  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation.

<sup>2</sup> By **6** Proposition 8, this question is equivalent to asking for the number of partitions we can create from the set X. The study of counting partitions is what

is covered by Bell's Number.

 $<sup>^{3} \</sup>sim$  partitions *X* into sets that have the same number of elements.

# 5 Lecture 5 Sep 17th

# 5.1 Cardinality (Continued)

#### Definition 22 (Finite Sets)

A set X is finite if  $X = \emptyset$  or if  $X \sim \{1, 2, ..., n\}$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\sim$  is the equivalence relation defined in Example 4.2.2.

# Definition 23 (Cardinality)

If  $X \sim n$ , we say X has cardinality n and write |X| = n. We also let  $|\emptyset| = 0$ .

Now a good question here is: if  $n \neq m$ , is  $\{1,2,\ldots,n\} \sim \{1,2,\ldots,m\}$ ?

#### **■** Theorem 9 (Pigeonhole Principle)

*The set*  $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$  *is not equivalent to any of its proper subset.* 

#### Proof

We shall prove this by induction on n.

Base case:  $\{1\} \nsim \emptyset$ .

This is a **proof by contradiction**, using the fact that we cannot find an injective function from a "larger" set to a "smaller" set.

We can assume that the function f is not surjective, since if the larger set is indeed equivalent to the smaller set, then it should not matter if f is surjective or not. In particular, we only require that there be an injective function.

Requires clarification and confirmation

Assume that the statement holds for  $\{1, ..., k\}$ . Suppose we have an injective function

$$f: \{1, 2, \dots, k, k+1\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, k, k+1\}$$

that is not surjective.

**Case 1**:  $k + 1 \notin \text{Range}(f)$ , where Range(f) is the range of f. Then we have

Note: ↑ is the restriction sign.

$$f \upharpoonright_{\{1,\ldots,k\}} : \{1,\ldots,k\} \to \{1,\ldots,k\} \setminus \{f(k+1)\}.$$

However, f is an injective function and clearly

$$\{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{f(k+1)\}\subseteq\{1,\ldots,k\},$$

a contradition.

**Case 2**:  $k + 1 \in \text{Range}(f)$ . Then  $\exists j_0 \in \{1, ..., k, k + 1\}$  such that  $f(j_0) = k + 1$ , and since f is not surjective,  $\exists m \in \{1, ..., k\}$  such that  $m \notin \text{Range}(f)$ . Then consider a new function  $g : \{1, ..., k, k + 1\} \rightarrow \{1, ..., k\}$  such that

$$g(a) = \begin{cases} m & a = k+1 \\ f(k+1) & a = j_0 \\ f(a) & a \neq j_0, k+1 \end{cases}$$

#### ► Corollary 10 (Pigeonhole Principle (Finite Case))

If the set X is finite, then X is not equivalent to any proper subset.

#### Exercise 5.1.1

*Prove* **→** *Corollary* 10.

# Sketch of proof:

$$\{1,\ldots,n\}\longrightarrow\{1,\ldots,n\}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \uparrow f & & \uparrow f \\
X & & \xrightarrow{\text{onto}} A \subsetneq X
\end{array}$$

#### Definition 24 (Infinite Sets)

*X* is *infinite* if it is not finite.

#### Example 5.1.1

¹ **Ū** Axiom 3 ahoy!

Observe that we can construct a function  $f: N \to \{2,3,\ldots\}$  by f(n) = n + 1. It is clear that f is a bijective function, and so  $\mathbb{N} \sim$  $\{2,3,\ldots\}.$ 

#### • Proposition 11 (N is the Smallest Infinite Set)

Every infinite set contains a subset  $A \sim \mathbb{N}$ .

#### Proof

Suppose X is infinite. Let

$$f: \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to X$$

such that for  $S \subset X$  where  $S \neq \emptyset$ ,  $f(S) \in S^1$ . Let  $x_1 = f(X)$ . Let  $x_2 = f(X \setminus \{x_1\})$ . Recursively, define

$$x_n = f(X \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\}).$$

This gives us a sequence

$$X\supset S=\{x_1,\ldots,x_n,\ldots\}$$

which is equivalent to  $\mathbb{N}$  via the map  $n \mapsto x_n$ .

# Corollary 12 (Infinite Sets are Equivalent to Its Proper Subsets)

Every infinite set X is equivalent to a proper subset of X.

#### Proof

Given such an X, we construct a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  as in the previous proof. Define  $f: X \to X \setminus \{x_n\}$  by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} x_{n+1} & x \in \{x_n\} \\ x & x \notin \{x_n\}. \end{cases}$$

Clearly so, f is injective.

#### Definition 25 (Countable)

We say that a set is **countable** (or **denumerable**) is either X is finite or if  $X \sim \mathbb{N}$ . If  $X \sim \mathbb{N}$ , we can say that X is **countably infinite** and write  $|X| = |\mathbb{N}| = \aleph_0$ .

# Definition 26 (Smaller Cardinality)

*Given 2 sets X,Y, we write* 

$$|X| \leq |Y|$$

*if*  $\exists f: X \rightarrow Y$  *injective.* 

#### • Proposition 13 (Injectivity is Surjectivity Reversed)

**TFAE** 

- 1.  $\exists f: X \to Y \text{ injective}$
- 2.  $\exists g: Y \to X \ \overline{surjective}$

#### Proof

 $(1) \implies (2)$ : Define

$$g(y) = \begin{cases} x & \exists x \in X \ f(x) = y \\ x_0 & \text{any } x_0 \in X \end{cases}$$

Clearly *g* is surjective.

(2)  $\implies$  (1): Since *g* is surjective, for each  $x \in X$ , we have that<sup>2</sup>

$$g^{-1}(|x|) = \{y \in Y : g(y) = x\} \neq \emptyset.$$

By the Axiom of Choice, there exists a choice function  $h: \mathcal{P}(Y) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to Y$  such that for each  $A \subset Y$ ,  $h(A) \in A$ . Then, let  $f: X \to Y$  such that

$$f(x) = h(g^{-1}(\{x\})).$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The idea here is to collect the preimages into a set, and use the choice function as an injective map.

Clearly so, f is injective.

# 66 Note

Note that we have  $|\mathbb{N}| \leq |\mathbb{Q}|$ , since we can define an injective function  $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $f(n) = \frac{n}{1}$ .

We have also shown that  $|Q| \leq |\mathbb{N}|$  using our injective function  $g: \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{N}$ , given by

$$g\left(\frac{m}{n}\right) = \begin{cases} 2^{m}3^{n} & m > 0\\ 1 & m = 0\\ 5^{-m}7^{n} & m < 0 \end{cases}$$

Question: Is  $|\mathbb{N} = |\mathbb{Q}||$ ? In other words, given  $|X| \leq |Y| \wedge |Y| \leq |X|$ ,

# 6 Lecture 6 Sep 19th

# 6.1 Cardinality (Continued 2)

Before delving into resolving our last question in the previous lecture, note the following:

### 66 Note

Suppose  $f: X \to Y$  is bijective. Let  $A \subseteq B$ , then

$$f(B \setminus A) = f(B) \setminus f(A).$$

Prove this observation as an exercise:

# Exercise 6.1.1 Prove the note on the left.

■ Theorem 14 (★★★ Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein Theorem (CSB))

Let  $A_2 \subset A_1 \subset A_0 = A$ . Assume that  $A_2 \sim A_0$ . Then  $A_0 \sim A_1$ .

#### Proof

Let  $\phi: A_0 \to A_2$  be bijective, by assumption. Since  $A_1 \subset A_1$ , let  $A_3 = \phi(A_1) \subset A_2$ , and since  $A_2 \subset A_0$ , let  $A_4 = \phi(A_2) \subset A_3$ . Recursively so, let

$$A_{n+2} = \phi(A_n)$$

Notice that

$$A_0 = (A_0 \setminus A_1) \cup (A_1 \setminus A_2) \cup (A_2 \setminus A_3) \cup (A_3 \setminus A_4) \cup \dots \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n$$
$$A_1 = (A_1 \setminus A_2) \cup (A_2 \setminus A_3) \cup (A_3 \setminus A_4) \cup (A_4 \setminus A_5) \cup \dots \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$$




Figure 6.1: The core idea of the proof for Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein Theorem

Observe that

$$\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n.$$

<sup>1</sup>Define  $f: A \to A_1$  by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} x & x \in \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n \\ x & x \in A_{2k+1} \setminus A_{2k+2}, \ k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \\ \phi(x) & x \in A_{2k} \setminus A_{2k+1}, \ k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \end{cases}$$

<sup>1</sup> Here, we employ the idea from Figure 6.1.

### Corollary 15 (Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein Theorem - Restated)

If 
$$A_1 \subset A \wedge B_1 \subset B \wedge A \sim B_1 \wedge B \sim A_1$$
, then  $A \sim B$ .<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> This is equivalent to the statement  $|A| \le |B| \land |B| \le |A| \implies |A| = |B|.$ 

### Proof

By assumption, let  $f:A\to B_1$  be bijective, and let  $g:B\to A_1$  be bijective. Let  $A_2=g(B_1)\subseteq A_1\subset A$  Let  $A_2=g(B_1)\subseteq A_1\subset A$ . Then the composite function  $g\circ f:A\to A_2$  is bijective, and so  $A\sim A_2$ . By  $\blacksquare$  Theorem 14, we have

$$A \sim A_2 \sim A_1 \sim B$$
.

### Example 6.1.1

Our question from last lecture now has an answer: by  $\blacksquare$  Theorem 14, we have that  $|\mathbb{Q}| = |\mathbb{N}|.^3$ 

<sup>3</sup> Now that we know that they have the same cardinality:

### • Proposition 16 (Denumerability Check)

*If X is infinite*, *then* 

$$|X| = |\mathbb{N}| = \aleph_0 \iff \exists f : X \to \mathbb{N} \text{ bijective.}$$

#### Exercise 6.1.2

Find a bijection between  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\mathbb{N}$ .

### Proof

(
$$\Longrightarrow$$
) is immediate. For ( $\Longleftrightarrow$ ), suppose  $f:X\to\mathbb{N}$ , which implies that  $|X|\leq |\mathbb{N}|$ . By  $\bullet$  Proposition 11,  $|\mathbb{N}|\leq |X|$ . Therefore,  $|X|=|bbN|=\aleph_0$ .

### Example 6.1.2

 $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  is countable. The function

$$f: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$$
 given by  $f(m, n) = 2^n 3^m$ 

is injective.

# Definition 27 (Uncountable)

A set X is **uncountable** if it is not countable.

### **■** Theorem 17 (Cantor's Diagonal Argument)

(0,1) is uncountable.

### Proof

Suppose, for contradiction, that (0,1) is countable. Then we can write

$$a_1 = .a_{11}a_{12}a_{13}...$$
  
 $a_2 = .a_{21}a_{22}a_{23}...$   
 $\vdots$   
 $a_n = .a_{n1}a_{n2}a_{n3}...$ 

in (0,1). This representation is unique if we do not allow the representation to end in a string of 9's. Let  $b \in (0, 1)$ , expressed as  $b = .b_1b_2b_3 \dots$  such that

$$b_i = \begin{cases} 5 & a_i \neq 5 \\ 2 & a_i = 5 \end{cases}$$

Then  $b \notin (0,1)$ , a contradiction<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Require more explanation.

► Corollary 18 (Uncountability of ℝ)

 $\mathbb{R}$  is uncountable.

# Proof

Let  $f:(0,1)\to\mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$f(x) = \tan\left(\pi x - \frac{\pi}{2}\right).$$

Clearly so, (0,1) is bijective.

66 Note

We denote  $|\mathbb{R}| = c$ .

QUESTION: Given sets X, Y, is it always true that either<sup>5</sup>

- 1. |X| = |Y|;
- 2. |X| < |Y|: or
- 3. |Y| < |X|.

 $^5$  As compare to  $\leq$ , < implies that there is no surjection from the set on the LHS to the RHS.

# 7 Lecture 7 Sep 21st

# 7.1 Cardinality (Continued 3)

# ■ Theorem 19 (★ Comparability of Cardinals)

*If X and Y are non-empty, then either* 

$$|X| \le |Y| \lor |Y| \le |X|.$$

### Proof

Let

$$S = \{(A, B, f) \mid A \subseteq X, B \subseteq Y, f : A \rightarrow B \text{ bijective } \}.$$

Note that  $S \neq \emptyset$ , since X and Y are non-empty, and so we can have f(a) = b for  $A = \{a\} \subset X$  and  $B = |b| \subset Y$ . We order S as follows: we say

$$(A_1, B_1, f_1) \le (A_2, B_2, f_2)$$

if

$$A_1 \subseteq A_2$$
,  $B_1 \subseteq B_2$ ,  $f_1 = f_2 \upharpoonright_{A_1}$ .

Let  $C = \{(A_{\alpha}, B_{\alpha}, f_{\alpha})\}_{\alpha \in I}$  be a chain in  $(S, \leq)$ . Let  $A_0 = \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} A_{\alpha}$ ,  $B_0 = \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} B_{\alpha}$ , and define  $f_0 : A_0 \to B_0$  by

$$f_0(x) = f_{\alpha_0}(x)$$
 if  $x \in A_{\alpha_0}$ .

Now if  $x \in A_{\alpha_1}$ ,  $x \in A_{\alpha_2}$  and

$$(A_{\alpha_1}, B_{\alpha_1}, f_{\alpha_1}) \leq (A_{\alpha_2}, B_{\alpha_2}, f_{\alpha_2}),$$

<sup>1</sup> We want to use the maximal element to obtain our result. To that end, we need Zorn's Lemma. So we need *S* to build this up.

we have that

$$f_{\alpha_1}(x) = f_{\alpha_2} \upharpoonright_{A_{\alpha_1}} (x) = f_{\alpha_2}(x)$$

i.e.  $f_0$  is well-defined.

Claim 1:  $f_0: A_0 \rightarrow B_0$  is injective.

Let  $x_1, x_2 \in A_0$  such that  $x_1 \neq x_2$ .

$$\implies \exists \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in I \ x_1 \in A_{\alpha_1} \land x_2 \in A_{\alpha_2} \land A_{\alpha_1} \subseteq A_{\alpha_2} \text{ (wlog)}$$

$$\implies x_1.x_2 \in A_{\alpha_2}$$

$$\implies (:: f_{\alpha_2} \text{ injective } \implies f_{\alpha_2}(x_1) \neq f_{\alpha_2}(x))$$

$$\implies f_0(x_1) \neq f_0(x_2) \implies f_0 \text{ injective.}$$

Claim 2:  $f_0: A_0 \to B_0$  is surjective.

Let  $y_0 \in B_0$ 

$$\implies \exists \alpha_0 \in I \ y_0 \in B_{\alpha_0}$$

$$\implies \exists x_0 \in A_{\alpha_0} \ f_{\alpha_0}(x_0) = y_0 \ (\because f_{\alpha_0} \ \text{surjective})$$

$$\implies f_0(x_0) = y_0$$

 $\therefore$   $(A_0, B_0, f_0)$  is an upper bound for C. Then by Zorn's Lemma,  $(S, \leq)$  has a maximal element (A, B, f).

<u>Case 1:</u> If A = X, then injectivity of f implies  $|X| \leq |Y|$ .

Case 2: If B = Y, then surjectivity of f implies  $|Y| \le |A| \le |X|$ .

Case 3: If  $A \neq X \land B \neq Y$ , then  $X \setminus A \neq \emptyset \land Y \setminus B \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $x_0 \in X \setminus A$ ,  $y_0 \in Y \setminus B$ . Let  $A^* = A \cup \{x_0\}$ ,  $B^* = B \cup \{y_0\}$ , and  $f^* : A^* \to B^*$  such that

$$f^*(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & x \in A \\ y_0 & x = x_0 \end{cases}$$

Then  $(A, B, f) \le (A^*, B^*, f^*)$ , contradicting maximality.

### 7.1.1 Cardinal Arithmetic

Sum of Cardinals Observe that if  $X = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ ,  $Y = \{y_1, ..., y_m\}$ , and  $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ , then |X| = n, |Y| = m and  $|X \cup Y| = n + m$ . This motivates us to provide the following definition:

*Assume that X and Y are such that X*  $\cap$  *Y* =  $\emptyset$ *. We define* 

$$|X| + |Y| = |X \cup Y|.$$

Question: So what about  $\aleph_0 + \aleph_0$ ?

A thought that motivates us to give the following answer lies in the observation that: if *X* is the set of even natural numbers and *Y* the odd natural numbers, then  $X \cup Y$  is the set of all natural numbers. All three sets are countably infinite, i.e. they have cardinality  $\aleph_0$ .

QUESTION: What about c + c?

A similar motivation comes from the observation that: given X =(0,1) and Y = (1,2), we have

$$c = |X| \le |X| + |Y| \le |R| = c$$
,

and so 
$$|X| = |Y| = c \implies |X \cup Y| = c$$
.

### Theorem 20 (Sums of Cardinals)

Given sets X and Y, if X is infinite, then

1. 
$$|X| + |X| = |X|$$

2. 
$$|X| + |Y| = \max(|X|, |Y|)$$

Multiplication of Cardinals Given

$$X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$$
  
 $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m\}$ 

$$X \times Y = \{(x_i, y_i) \mid i = 1, 2, ..., n, j = 1, 2, ..., m\}$$

and so

we have that

$$|X \times Y| = nm$$
.

Exercise 7.1.1

Prove Prove Theorem 20 as an exercise.

# Definition 29 (Multiplication of Cardinals)

Given sets X and Y, define

$$|X||Y| = |X \times Y|.$$

# Example 7.1.1

We have  $|\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}| = \aleph_0$  since the function  $f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  given by

$$f(n,m) = 2^n 3^m$$

is injective.

Question: What about  $c \cdot c$ ?

# ■ Theorem 21 (Multiplication of Cardinals)

*If* X *is infinite and*  $Y \neq \emptyset$ *, then* 

- $|X \times X| = |X| \implies |X| |X| = |X|$ ;
- $|X \times Y| = \max(|X|, |Y|)$ .

Exercise 7.1.2

Prove Prove Theorem 21 as an exercise.

# 8 Lecture 8 Sep 24th

# 8.1 Cardinality (Continued 4)

# 8.1.1 Cardinal Arithmetic (Continued)

*Exponentiation of Cardinals* Recall if  $\{Y_x\}_{x\in X}$  is a collection of nonempty sets, we have<sup>1</sup>

$$\prod_{x \in X} Y_x = \{ f : X \to \bigcup_{x \in X} Y_x \mid f(x) \in Y_x \}.$$

Now if  $Y = Y_x$  for all  $x \in X$ , we have

$$Y^X = \prod_{x \in X} = \{f : X \to Y\}.$$

# Example 8.1.1

Given

$$Y = \{1, ..., m\}$$
  $X = \{1, ..., n\}$ 

we have

$$Y^X = \{f : \{1, \dots, n\} \to \{1, \dots, m\}\}.$$

Observe that  $Y^X$  is similar to  $Y^n$ . So  $|Y^X| = m^n$ .

<sup>1</sup> This should remind you of **♥** Axiom 3

<sup>2</sup> Need better explanation.

### Definition 30 (Exponentiation of Cardinals)

Given sets X and Y, define

$$\left|Y\right|^{\left|X\right|}:=\left|Y^{X}\right|.$$

■ Theorem 22 (Exponentiation of Cardinals)

If  $X, Y, \overline{Z}$  are non-empty sets, then

• 
$$|Y|^{|X|} \cdot |Y|^{|Z|} = |Y|^{|X|+|Z|}$$
;

$$\bullet \ \left( |Y|^{|X|} \right)^{|Z|} = |Y|^{|X| \cdot |Z|}$$

# $\blacksquare$ Theorem 23 (2<sup> $\aleph_0$ </sup> = c)

We have that  $2^{\aleph_0} = c$ .

#### Exercise 8.1.1

Prove Prove Prove 22.

### Proof

Note that  $2^{\aleph_0} = |\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}|$ , where<sup>3</sup>

$$|\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}| = |\{f : \mathbb{N} \to \{0,1\}| = |\{\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \mid a_i = 0,1\}|$$

Given a sequence  $\{a_n\} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ , define  $\phi : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to (0,1)$  such that<sup>4</sup>

$$\phi\left(\left\{a_n\right\}\right) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{3^n}.$$

which is injective since there are no trailing 2's. Therefore  $2^{\aleph_0} \le c$ .

Given  $\alpha \in (0,1)$ , let<sup>5</sup>

$$\alpha = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n}{2^n},$$

where  $b_n = 0, 1$ . Let  $\psi : (0, 1) \to \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  such that

$$\psi(\alpha) = \psi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n}{2^n}\right) = \{b_n\}$$

Then  $\psi$  is injective, and so  $c \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ . Thus  $2^{\aleph_0} = c$  as required.

This requires closer studying.

<sup>3</sup> Explain 2nd equality.

<sup>4</sup> This is a base 3 representation (of what?)

<sup>5</sup> This is a base 2 representation.

### Example 8.1.2

Find  $\left|\aleph_0^{\aleph_0}\right|$  and  $c^{\aleph_0}$ .

### Solution

We have that

$$c = 2^{\aleph_0} \le \aleph_0^{\aleph_0} \le c^{\aleph_0} = \left(2^{\aleph_0}\right)^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_0 \cdot \aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_0} = c$$

### Example 8.1.3

Show  $|\mathcal{P}(X)| = 2^{|X|} = |2^X|$ .

### Solution

Given  $f: X \to \{0, 1\}$ , let<sup>6</sup>

$$A = \{x \in X \mid f(x) = 1\} \subset X.$$

Define  $\Gamma: 2^X \to \mathcal{P}(X)$  by

$$\Gamma(f) = f^{-1}(|1|)$$

 $\Gamma$  is injective<sup>7</sup>.

Conversely, given  $A \subset X$ , define the characteristic function

$$\chi_A(x) = egin{cases} 1 & x \in A \ 0 & x 
otin A \end{cases} \in 2^{\mathrm{X}}.$$

Then define  $\Phi: P(A) \to 2^X$  such that

$$\Phi(A) = \chi_A$$
.

Clearly so,  $\Phi$  is injective.

### Theorem 24 (Russell's Paradox)

For any X, we have  $|X| < |\mathcal{P}(X)| = 2^{|X|}$ .

### Proof

Let  $f: X \to \mathcal{P}(X)$  be  $f(X) = \{x\}$ . Clearly, f is injective, and so  $|X| < |\mathcal{P}(X)|$ .

Claim:  $\nexists g: X \to \mathcal{P}(X)$  surjective.

Suppose not. Let<sup>8</sup>

$$A = \{ x \in X \mid x \notin g(x) \}$$

Pick  $x_0 \in X$  with  $g(x_0) = A$ . Now if  $x_0 \in A$ , then  $x_0 \in g(x_0)$ , but this implies that  $x \notin A$ , a contradiction.

So  $x_0 \notin A$ , i.e.  $x \notin g(x_0)$ , which in turn implies that  $x \in A$ , yet

<sup>6</sup> *A* is a collection of all *x*'s that gets mapped to f.

7 Why?

<sup>8</sup> By the Bounded Separation Axiom (see ZF Set Theory), this is a set, and since it is a subset of *X*, it is a valid element of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . Thus, we can consider such a set.

48 Lecture 8 Sep 24th - Cardinality (Continued 4)

another contradiction. Therefore such a function g cannot exist, as claimed.

Therefore, we have  $|X| < |\mathcal{P}(X)|$  as required.

QUESTION: Is there anything between  $\aleph_0$  and c?

# **■** Axiom 25 (Continuum Hypothesis)

If  $\aleph_0 \leq \gamma \leq c$ , then either  $\gamma = \aleph_0$  or  $\gamma = c$ .

### **■** Axiom 26 (Generalized Continuum Hypothesis)

If 
$$|X| \le \gamma \le 2^{|X|}$$
, then either  $\gamma = |X|$  or  $\gamma = 2^{|X|}$ .

In this course, we shall assume that the Continuum Hypothesis is true.

# 9 Lecture 9 Sep 26th

# 9.1 Introduction to Metric Spaces

# **■** Definition 31 (Metric & Metric Space)

Given a set X, a *metric* on X is a function  $d: X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$  such that

- 1. (positive definiteness)  $d(x,y) \ge 0$  and  $d(x,y) = 0 \iff x = y$ ;
- 2. (symmetry) d(x,y) = d(y,x); and
- 3. (triangle inequality)  $d(x,y) \le d(x,z) + d(z,y)$ .

The pair (X, d) is called a metric space.

### Example 9.1.1 (Standard Metric on $\mathbb{R}$ )

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ , and let d(x, y) = |x - y|.

Clearly so, the first 2 criterias are satisfied:

- $|\cdot| \ge 0$  and  $|x-y| = 0 \iff x = y$ ; and
- |x y| = |y x|

The triangle inequality property is the usual triangle inequality of the absolute value function, i.e.

$$|x-y| \le |x| + |y|.$$

QUESTION: For an arbitrary set X, can we define a metric on X? The following example shows that we can,

### Example 9.1.2 (Discrete Metric)

#### Remark

A metric is an abstract notion of distance.

Let *X* be any set. We can simply define

$$d(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \neq y \\ 0 & x = y \end{cases}$$

This metric clearly satisfies all 3 criterias of being a metric:

- $d: X \times X \to \{0,1\}$  and so  $d(x,y) \ge 0$ , and by definition, we have  $d(x,y) = 0 \iff x = y$ ;
- By definition, d(x,y) = d(y,x) as it does not matter how the pair is ordered; and
- Since  $d(x,y) \ge 0$ , we have that  $d(x,y) \le d(x,z) + d(y,z)$ .

### Example 9.1.3 (Euclidean Metric / 2-metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$ )

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $\vec{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  and  $\vec{y} = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$ . Define

$$d_2(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i)^2}$$

Note that in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , this is our regular (Euclidean) distance between two points.

It is not difficult to see that  $d_2$  satisfies the first 2 criterion to being a metric:

- $d_2$  is the square root of the sum of squares, and so  $d_2(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \ge 0$  for any  $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $d_2(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = 0 \iff \forall i \in \{1, ..., n\} \ x_i = y_i \iff \vec{x} = \vec{y}$ :
- Since  $(x_i y_i)^2 = (y_i x_i)^2$  for any  $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have that  $d_2(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = d_2(\vec{y}, \vec{x})$ .

However, it is not immediately clear that  $d_2$  satisfies the triangle inequality criterion, especially if  $n \geq 3$ . If n = 2, heuristically, the triangle inequality simply tells that the length of any one side of a triangle is less than or equal to the sum of the other two, e.g. Figure 9.1.

# $\vec{x} + \vec{y}$ $\vec{x} \rightarrow x$

Figure 9.1: A visualization of the triangle inequality in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

### Remark

Many of the important examples of metric spaces are vector spaces with an abstract length function, or norm.

# Definition 32 (Norm & Normed Linear Space)

Given a vector space V (usually over  $\mathbb{R}$ ), a **norm** on V is a function

$$\|\cdot\|:V\to\mathbb{R}$$

such that

- 1. (positive definiteness)  $||v|| \ge 0$  and  $||v|| = 0 \iff v = 0$ ;
- 2. (scalar multiplication)  $\|\alpha \cdot v\| = |\alpha| \|v\|$ ; and
- 3. (triangle inequality)  $||v + w|| \le ||v|| + ||w||$ .

The pair  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$  is called a **normed linear space**.

### Remark

Given a normed linear space  $(V,\|\cdot\|)$ , a natural metric,  $d_{\|\cdot\|}$ , on V induced by  $\|\cdot\|$  can be defined as

$$d_{\|.\|}(x,y) = \|x - y\|.$$

Exercise 9.1.1

*Prove that*  $d_{\|.\|}$  *is indeed a metric.* 

Proof (Exercise 9.1.1)

- 1. (positive definiteness) It is clear from the definition of a norm that  $d_{\|\cdot\|}(x,y) = \|x-y\| \ge 0$ , and  $d_{\|\cdot\|}(x,y) = 0 \iff x-y = 0$
- 2. (symmetry) Symmetry follows simply from definition, as ||x y|| =
- 3. (triangle inequality) For  $x, y, z \in V$ , we have

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(x,y) = \|x-y\| = \|x-z+z-y\|$$
  
 $\leq \|x-z\| + \|z-y\|$  : triangle inequality of norms  
 $= \|x-z\| + \|y-z\|$  : symmetry  
 $= d_{\|\cdot\|}(x,z) + d_{\|\cdot\|}(y,z)$ 

Example 9.1.4 (Euclidean Norm)

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . Define  $\|\cdot\|_2$  such that

$$\|(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}$$

From Example 9.1.3, we are given the triangle inequality property, in

which we have yet to prove. Positive definiteness is clear. For scalar multiplication, let  $\vec{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ , and notice that

$$\|\alpha \cdot \vec{x}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha x_i)^2} = \sqrt{\alpha^2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2} = |\alpha| \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2} = |\alpha| \|\vec{x}\|_2.$$

Thus  $\|\cdot\|_2$  is indeed a norm. We call  $\|\cdot\|_2$  the **2-norm** or the **Euclidean** norm.

We observe that, in comparison with Example 9.1.3, we have that

$$d_2(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \|\vec{x} - \vec{y}\|_2$$
.

### Example 9.1.5 (1-norm)

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ . Define

$$\|\vec{x}\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|.$$

Clearly so,  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is a norm:

- (positive definiteness) This is true by the absolute value function, i.e. every  $|x_i| \ge 0$ , and so the sum over these  $x_i$ 's is also nonnegative, and  $\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| = 0 \iff \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \ x_i = 0 \iff \vec{x} = 0$ .
- (scalar multiplication) This uses a similar argument as in the previous example.
- (triangle inequality) This is true by, again, the triangle inequality on absolute values.

We call  $\|\cdot\|_1$  the **1-norm**.

Thus, we can define

$$d_1(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = ||\vec{x} - \vec{y}||_1$$

and it can easily be verified that  $d_1$  is indeed a metric.

### Example 9.1.6

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ . Define

$$\|\vec{x}\|_{\infty} = \max\{|x_i|\}$$

Again, it is easy to see that  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$  is a norm;

- (positive definiteness)  $\because \forall i \in \{1,...,n\} |x_i| \geq 0 \implies$  $\max\{|x_i| \ge 0 | \text{ and } \max\{|x_i|\} = 0 \iff x_i = 0 \iff \vec{x} = 0.$
- (scalar multiplication) Notice that

$$\|\alpha \cdot \vec{x}\|_{\infty} = \max\{|\alpha x_i|\} = |\alpha| \max\{|x_i|\} = |\alpha| \|\vec{x}\|_{\infty}.$$

• (triangle inequality) This is once again true by the triangle inequality on the absolute value function, i.e.

We can then define

$$d_{\infty}(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \max\{|x_i - y_i|\},\,$$

which we can easily verify that it is indeed a metric<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Symmetry holds by the property of the absolute value function.

HERE's an interesting notion: let

$$S_i = \{ \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid ||\vec{x}||_i = 1 \}, \quad i = 1, 2, \infty$$

Notice that we would then have the following graph: In fact, it is true




Figure 9.2: Unit ball depending on  $\|\vec{x}\|_i$ 

that if we let  $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ , as suggested by Figure 9.2, we would see that the "diamond" would grow into a "circle" as in  $S_2$ , and as  $i \ge 3$ , the unit ball will expand and approach the "square", which is  $S_{\infty}$ .

Another observation that we can make is if we can show that a set

is open for a "smaller"  $S_i$ , then the same set is open for any  $S_j$  for  $j \ge i$ .

If we apply these norms into metrics, we have

$$d_{\infty} \leq d_2 \leq d_1$$

where we say that  $d_{\infty}$  is the least sensitive, and  $d_1$  being the most sensitive<sup>2</sup>.

### Example 9.1.7

For  $1 , define on <math>\mathbb{R}^n$ 

$$\|\vec{x}\|_p = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

Continuing with the same idea as in previous examples, we can let

$$d_p(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i - y_i|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

In the next lecture, we will go into proving that this is indeed a norm, and so we can define a metric using this norm.

Note that if we allow for 0 < i < 1, then we would have a graph that looks like the following, which is a convex graph, i.e. we cannot create well-defined norms.




Figure 9.3:  $\|\cdot\|_p$  for 0

 $^2$  For sufficently close points, we see that  $d_\infty$  would reflect the least change, while we can see change in  $d_1$  for every two points that we take.

# 10 Lecture 10 Sep 28th

# 10.1 Introduction to Metric Spaces (Continued)

# **Definition** 33 ( $\|\cdot\|_p$ -norm)

Given  $\vec{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we define, for  $1 , the <math>\|\cdot\|_p$ -norm to be

$$\|\vec{x}\|_p = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

We asked the question: why is  $\|\cdot\|_p$  a norm?

# ♣ Lemma 27

If 
$$1 ,$$

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1,$$

and if  $\alpha$ , beta > 0, then

$$\alpha \cdot \beta \le \frac{\alpha^p}{p} + \frac{\beta^q}{q}.$$

#### Proof

Motivated by Figure 10.1, using notions from calculus, we have from calculus,



Figure 10.1: Motivation for Lemma 27.

$$\alpha\beta \le \int_0^\alpha t^{p-1} dt + \int_0^\beta u^{q-1} du$$
$$= \frac{t^p}{p} \Big|_0^\alpha + \frac{u^q}{q} \Big|_0^\beta$$
$$= \frac{\alpha^p}{p} + \frac{\beta^q}{q},$$

where we note that

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$$

$$\frac{q}{p} = q - 1$$

$$\frac{p}{q} = p - 1$$

$$1 = (p - 1)(q - 1)$$

### Theorem 28 (Hölder's Inequality)

For  $1 , let <math>\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$  1. Let

$$\vec{x}=(x_1,\ldots,x_n),\quad \vec{y}=(y_1,\ldots,y_n).$$

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i y_i| \le \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

### 66 Note

*Note that* p = 2 *is just the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality:* 

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i y_i| \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Longrightarrow \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i y_i|\right)^2 \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^2\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i|^2\right)$$

<sup>1</sup> We also call q the conjugate of p.

### Proof

Since if either  $\vec{x}$  or  $\vec{y}$  is zero, then we have that the inequality is trivially true, we can suppose that  $\vec{x} \neq 0 \neq \vec{y}$ . Now, note that for  $\alpha, \beta \neq 0$ , we have that<sup>2</sup>

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i y_i| \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

$$\updownarrow$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha x_i \cdot \beta y_i| \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha x_i|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\beta y_i|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

So we can assume that

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = 1 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}},\tag{10.1}$$

and if not, we can simply choose  $\alpha, \beta \neq 0$  to scale these values to become one. By Lemma 27, we have

$$|x_i y_i| \le \frac{|x_i|^p}{p} + \frac{|y_i|^q}{q}$$

Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i y_i| \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|x_i|^p}{p} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|y_i|^q}{q} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \quad \therefore Equation (10.1)$$

$$= 1 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

as required.

We are now ready to prove our long-awaited result.

### Theorem 29 (Minkowski's Inequality)

Let 
$$1 . If$$

$$\vec{x}=(x_1,\ldots,x_n), \quad \vec{y}=(y_1,\ldots,y_n)$$

<sup>2</sup> In the second inequality, notice that we can easily get back to the first equation by dividing both sides by  $\alpha\beta$ .

in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|x_{i}+y_{i}|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\leq\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|x_{i}|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}+\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|y_{i}|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

i.e.

$$\|\vec{x} + \vec{y}\|_{p} \le \|\vec{x}\|_{p} + \|\vec{y}\|_{p}.$$

### Proof

Let

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1.$$

Once again, we may assume that  $\vec{x} \neq 0 \neq \vec{y}$ , as otherwise the inequality is true trivially so. Now, notice that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_{i} + y_{i}|^{p} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_{i} + y_{i}| |x_{i} + y_{i}|^{p-1}$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_{i}| |x_{i} + y_{i}|^{p-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_{i}| |x_{i} + y_{i}| \quad \text{triangle}$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_{i}|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_{i} + y_{i}|^{(p-1)q}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

$$+ \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_{i}|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_{i} + y_{i}|^{(p-1)q}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

where the last step is by Hölder's Inequality. Note that  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1 \implies p = q(p-1)$ . Thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i + y_i|^p \le \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right] \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i + y_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

$$\implies \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i + y_i|^p \right)^{1 - \frac{1}{q}} \le \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

#### SS Note

With this we have that  $\|\cdot\|_p$  satisfies the triangle inequaltiy condition, and so  $\|\cdot\|_v$  is a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

### 66 Note

Given  $1 \le p \le q < \infty$ , we have<sup>3</sup>

$$\|\cdot\|_{\infty} \le \|\cdot\|_{a} \le \|\cdot\|_{n} \le \|\cdot\|_{1}$$
.

<sup>3</sup> For a visual representation of this result, see Figure 9.2.

### Proof

It is quite clear that  $\forall p \geq 1$ ,

$$\|\cdot\|_{\infty} = \max\{|\cdot|\} \le \left(\sum |\cdot|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \|\cdot\|_{p}.$$

For  $1 \le p \le q < \infty$ , consider Holder's Inequality, where we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |a_i| |b_i| \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |a_i|^r\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |b_i|^{\frac{r}{r-1}}\right)^{1-\frac{1}{r}}.$$

Let  $|a_i| = |x_i|^p$ ,  $|b_i| = 1$  and  $r = \frac{q}{p} \ge 1$  4. Then we have

<sup>4</sup> Note that this is true by  $p \le q$ .

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^p \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^q\right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} 1^{\frac{q}{q-p}}\right)^{1-\frac{p}{q}}$$
$$= n^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|^q\right)^{\frac{p}{q}}$$

Therefore, for  $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vec{x}\|_{p} &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_{i}|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(n^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_{i}|^{q}\right)^{\frac{p}{q}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_{i}|^{q}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} = n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} \cdot \|\vec{x}\|_{q}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\left\|\cdot\right\|_q \leq \left\|\cdot\right\|_p.$$

The chain of inequality follows.

1. Let 
$$\ell_1 = \left\{ \left\{ x_i \right\} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i| < \infty \right\}$$
. Define

$$\|\{x_i\}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|$$

Let  $\{x_i\}$ ,  $\{y_i\} \in \ell_1$ . Observe that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i + y_i| \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i| \le ||\{x_i\}||_1 + ||\{y_i\}||_1.$$

Then by the Monotone Convergence Theorem, we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i + y_i| \le \|\{x_i\}\|_1 + \|\{y_i\}\|_1.$$

Thus  $\{x_i + y_i\} \in \ell_1$  and

$$\|\{x_i+y_i\}\|_1 \le \|\{x_i\}\|_1 + \|\{y_i\}\|_1$$
.

Let  $\{x_n\} \in \ell_1$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\alpha x_i| = |\alpha| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|.$$

Therefore  $\{\alpha x_n\} \in \ell_1$  and  $\|\{\alpha x_n\}\|_1 = |\alpha| \|\{x_n\}\|_1$ .

Thus, we have that  $\ell_1$  is a vector space, and  $(\ell_1, \|\cdot\|_1)$  is a normed linear space.

2. Let  $\ell_{\infty}(\mathbb{N}) = \ell_{\infty} = \{\{x_i\} \mid \{x_i\} \text{ is bounded }\}$ . Define

$$\|\{x_i\}\|_{\infty} = \sup\{|x_1| \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Observe that  $\forall \{x_i\}, \overline{\{y_i\}} \in \ell_{\infty}$ , then  $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$|x_i + y_i| \le |x_i| + |y_i| \le ||\{x_i\}||_{\infty} + ||\{y_i\}||_{\infty}.$$

So  $\{x_i + y_i\} \in \ell_{\infty}$ , and

$$\|\{x_i+y_i\}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\{x_i\}\|_{\infty} + \|\{y_i\}\|_{\infty}.$$

Consequently so,  $\{\alpha x_i\} \in \ell_{\infty}$  and

$$\|\{\alpha x_i\}\|_{\infty} = |\alpha| \|\{x_i\}\|_{\infty}.$$

QUESTION: What about  $\ell_p(\mathbb{R})$ ?

# 11 Lecture 11 Oct 01st

# 11.1 Introduction to Metric Spaces (Continued 2)

We wondered about  $\ell_p(\mathbb{R})$  in the last lecture but let us consider a case that is even more general.

QUESTION: Can we define  $\ell_p(\Gamma)$  for any set  $\Gamma$ ?

### Example 11.1.1

Let 
$$\ell_{\infty}(\Gamma)=\{f:\Gamma \to \mathbb{R} \mid f(\Gamma) \text{ is bounded }\}.$$
 If  $f\in \ell_{\infty}(\Gamma)$ , define

$$||f||_{\infty} = \sup\{|f(x)| \mid x \in \Gamma\}.$$

Notice that for  $f,g\in\ell_\infty(\Gamma)$ , and  $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}$ , then we have, by the Triangle Inequality,

$$||f + g||_{\infty} = \sup\{|(f + g)(x)| \mid x \in \Gamma\}$$

$$= \sup\{|f(x) + g(x)| \mid x \in \Gamma\}$$

$$\leq \sup\{|f(x)| \mid x \in \Gamma\} + \sup\{|g(x)| \mid x \in \Gamma\}$$

$$= ||f||_{\infty} ||g||_{\infty}.$$

So  $f + g \in \ell_{\infty}(\Gamma)$ , and

$$||f + g||_{\infty} \le ||f||_{\infty} + ||f||_{\infty}.$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha f\|_{\infty} &= \sup\{|(\alpha f)(x)| \mid x \in \Gamma\} \\ &= \sup\{|\alpha| \mid f(x)| \mid x \in \Gamma\} \\ &= |\alpha| \sup\{|f(x)| \mid x \in \Gamma\} \\ &= |\alpha| \mid \|f\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

So  $\alpha f \in \ell_{\infty}(\Gamma)$ , and  $\|\alpha f\|_{\infty} = |\alpha| \|f\|$ .

Therefore,  $(\ell_{\infty}(\Gamma), \|\cdot\|_{\infty})$  is a normed linear space.

### Example 11.1.2

Let  $\ell_1(\Gamma) = \{ f : \Gamma \to \mathbb{R} \mid P(f) \}$ , where P(f) is the statement

$$||f||_1 = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n |f(x_i)| \mid x_1, \dots, x_n \in \Gamma, n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \right\} < \infty.$$

It is clear that  $\ell_1(\Gamma) \subseteq \ell_{\infty}(\Gamma)$ , where  $\ell_{\infty}(\Gamma)$  is from Example 11.1.1. Consequently,  $(\ell_1(\Gamma), \|\cdot\|_1)$  is a normed linear space.

We can extend the same idea onto  $\ell_p$  spaces.

### Example 11.1.3

Let  $X = C[a,b] = \{f : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R} \mid f \text{ is continuous on } [a,b]\}$ , and define<sup>1</sup>

$$||f||_{\infty} = \sup\{|f(x)| \mid x \in [a, b]\}$$
  
= \text{max}\{|f(x)| \crit x \in [a, b]\}

By (regular) Triangle Inequality, for any  $f,g \in C[a,b]$ , we have

$$||f + g||_{\infty} = \max\{|f(x) + g(x)| \mid x \in [a, b]\}$$

$$\leq \max\{|f(x)| \mid x \in [a, b]\} + \max\{|g(x)| \mid x \in [a, b]\}$$

$$= ||f||_{\infty} + ||g||_{\infty},$$

and, for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\|\alpha f\|_{\infty} = \max\{|\alpha f(x)| \mid x \in [a, b]\}$$
  
=  $|\alpha| \max\{|f(x)| \mid x \in [a, b]\}$   
=  $|\alpha| \|f\|_{\infty}$ .

Thus  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$  is a norm on C[a,b], and  $(C[a,b],\|\cdot\|_{\infty})$  is a normed linear space<sup>2,3</sup>.

Also, observe that

$$C[a,b] \subset \ell_{\infty}([a,b]).$$

### **Example 11.1.4**

Let X = C[a, b] 4 have the same definition as the previous example,

**Require clarification** Notice that  $\forall f \in \ell_1(\Gamma)$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$A_n = \{x \in \Gamma \mid |f(x)| \ge \frac{1}{n}\}$$
 is finite

S

$$A_0 = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$$
 is countable.

and

$$A_0 = \{ x \in \Gamma \mid |f(x)| \neq \emptyset \}$$

<sup>1</sup> Note in this case sup is also max, since we are on a closed interval.

<sup>4</sup> Some authors also write this as L'[a, b].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This space is complete.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> This space is important for us for the purpose of this course.

but this time define

$$||f||_1 = \int_a^b |f(t)| dt$$

By linearity of integration, both the triangle equality and scalar multiplication hold, and so  $(C[a,b], \|\cdot\|_1)$  is a normed linear space<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Compared to the last example, this is not a complete space.

### Example 11.1.5

Let X = C[a, b], and 1 . Define

$$||f||_p = \left(\int_a^b |f(x)|^p dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

Again, by linearity of integration, scalar multiplication holds. However, it is not as easy to show for the triangle inequality; we are now asking the same question as we did before for  $\ell_p$ , which we solved using Hölder's Inequality and Minkowski's Inequality. But now, instead of summations, we have integrations.

### Theorem 30 (Hölder's Inequality v2)

Let  $1 and <math>\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{a} = 1$ . For each  $f, g \in C[a, b]$ , we have

$$\int_a^b |f(t)g(t)| dt \le \left(\int_a^b |f(t)|^p dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_a^b |g(t)|^q dt\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

### Proof

If either f(x) = 0 or g(x) = 0 for all  $x \in [a, b]$ , then the inequality holds trivially so. Thus, we may assume that  $\forall x \in [a, b], f(x) \neq 0$  $0 \neq g(x)$ . By the linearity of integration, we can apply the same reasoning as we did in **P** Theorem 28, and assume that

$$\int_{a}^{b} |f(t)|^{p} dt = 1 = \int_{a}^{b} |g(t)|^{q} dt$$

By Lemma 27, we have

$$|f(t)g(t)| \le \frac{|f(t)|^p}{p} + \frac{|g(t)|^q}{q}.$$

Thus

$$\int_{a}^{b} |f(t)g(t)| dt \le \int_{a}^{b} \left( \frac{|f(t)|^{p}}{p} + \frac{|g(t)|^{q}}{q} \right) dt$$

$$= \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$$

$$= \left( \int_{a}^{b} |f(t)|^{p} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \int_{a}^{b} |g(t)|^{q} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

as required.

### Theorem 31 (Minkowski's Inequality v2)

Let  $1 . If <math>f, g \in C[a, b]$ , then

$$\left(\int_{a}^{b} |(f+g)(t)|^{p} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(|f(t)|^{p} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \left(\int_{a}^{b} |g(t)|^{p} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

### Proof

The proof is similar to the one we had in  $\blacksquare$  Theorem 29; if  $\forall x \in [a,b]$ , either f(x)=0 or g(x)=0, then the inequality holds trivially so. Thus we may assyme that  $\forall x \in [a,b]$ ,  $f(x) \neq 0 \neq g(x)$ . Now, notice that by (regular) Triangle Inequality and, later on,

Theorem 30,

$$\int_{a}^{b} |(f+g)(t)|^{p} dt 
= \int_{a}^{b} |(f+g)(t)| |(f+g)(t)|^{p-1} dt 
\leq \int_{a}^{b} |f(t)| |(f+g)(t)|^{p-1} dt + \int_{a}^{b} |g(t)| |(f+g)(t)| dt 
\leq \left(\int_{a}^{b} |f(t)|^{p} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_{a}^{b} |(f+g)(t)|^{q(p-1)} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} 
+ \left(\int_{a}^{b} |g(t)|^{p} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_{a}^{b} |(f+g)(t)|^{q(p-1)} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} 
= \left[\left(\int_{a}^{b} |f(t)|^{p} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_{a}^{b} |g(t)|^{p} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right] 
\cdot \left(\int_{a}^{b} |(f+g)(t)|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

$$\left(\int_{a}^{b} |(f+g)(t)|^{p} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(|f(t)|^{p} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \left(\int_{a}^{b} |g(t)|^{p} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

as required.

This shows that our definition of  $\|\cdot\|_p$  on C[a,b] is indeed a norm, and so  $(C[a,b],\|\cdot\|_p)$  is a normed linear space.

### Example 11.1.6 (Bounded Operator)

Let  $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$  and  $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$  be normed linear spaces. Let  $T: X \to Y$  be linear. Define

$$||T|| = \sup\{||T_X||_Y \mid ||x||_X < 1\}.$$

We say that *T* is bounded if  $||T|| < \infty$ . Let

$$B(X,Y) = \{T : X \rightarrow Y \mid T \text{ is bounded } \}.$$

In the next lecture, we shall show that  $(B(X,Y), \|\cdot\|)$  is a normed linear space.

Question: Consider the transformation  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}: \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ . What is a norm  $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\|$  that works?

#### Exercise 11.1.1

Show that there exists an injection from  $(C[a,b], \|\cdot\|_2)$  to  $\ell_2(\mathbb{N})$ . Note that this does not work for  $p \geq 3$ .

# 12 Lecture 12 Oct 03rd

# **12.1** *Introduction to Metric Spaces (Continued 3)*

# Example 12.1.1 (Bounded Operator)

Let  $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$  and  $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$  be normed linear spaces. Let  $T: X \to Y$  be linear. Define

$$||T|| = \sup\{||T(x)||_Y \mid ||x||_X < 1\}.$$

We say that *T* is bounded if  $||T|| < \infty$ . Let

$$B(X,Y) = \{T : X \rightarrow Y \mid T \text{ is bounded } \}.$$

To show that B(X,Y) is a normed linear space, let  $S,T\in B(X,Y)$ , and let  $\|x\|_X\leq 1$ . Then

$$\|(S+T)(x)\|_{Y} = \|S(x)+T(x)\|_{Y}$$
  
 $\leq \|S(x)\|_{Y} + \|T(x)\|_{Y} \quad \therefore \|\cdot\|_{Y} \text{ is a norm}$   
 $\leq \|S\| + \|T\|$ 

and so  $S + T \in B(X, Y)$  and  $||S + T|| \le ||S|| + ||T||$ . For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\begin{split} \|\alpha S\| &= \sup \{ \|(\alpha S)(x)\|_Y \mid \|x\|_X \leq 1 \} \\ &= |\alpha| \sup \{ \|S(x)\|_Y \mid \|x\|_X \leq 1 \} \quad \because \|\cdot\|_Y \text{ is a norm} \\ &= |\alpha| \, \|S\| \, . \end{split}$$

So  $(\alpha S) \in B(X,Y)$  and  $\|\alpha S\| = |\alpha| \|S\|$ . It is clear that due to  $\|\cdot\|_Y$  being a norm, and so  $\|\cdot\|$  is also positive definite. Thus B(X,Y) is a normed linear space as claimed.

In this example, we look at how we can apply a translation of norms from X to Y that preserves the norm.

# 12.2 Topology on Metric Spaces

### Definition 34 (Open & Closed)

Let X(d) be a metric space. If  $x_0 \in X$ , then

$$B(x_o, \varepsilon) = \{ y \in X \mid d(x, y) < \varepsilon \}$$

is called the **open ball** centered at  $x_0$  with radius  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

$$B[x_0, \varepsilon] = \{ y \in X \mid d(x, y) \le \varepsilon \}$$

is called the closed ball centered at  $x_0$  with radius  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

We say that  $U \subset X$  is open if

$$\forall x \in U \ \exists \varepsilon_0 > 0 \ B(x_0, \varepsilon_0) \subset U.$$

We say that  $F \subset X$  is **closed** if  $F^C$  is open.

# • Proposition 32 (Properties of Open Sets)

Let (X, d) be a metric space.

- 1.  $X, \emptyset$  are open,
- 2. If  $\{U_{\alpha}\}_{{\alpha}\in I}$  is a collection of open sets, then  $U=\bigcup_{{\alpha}\in I}$  is open.
- 3. If  $\{U_1, \ldots, U_n\}$  is a collection of open sets, then  $U = \bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i$  is open.

### Proof

- 1. If  $x_0 \in X$ , then  $B(x_0, 1) \subseteq X$ , and so X is open. The empty set is open vacuously so.
- 2. Let  $U = \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} U_{\alpha}$  and  $x_0 \in U$ . Then  $\exists \alpha_0 \in I$  such that  $x_0 \in U_{\alpha_0}$ . Then  $\exists \epsilon_0 > 0$  such that

$$B(x_0, \varepsilon_0) \subset U_{\alpha_0} \subset U$$
.

3. Let  $x_0 \in U = \bigcap_{i=1}^n$ . Then for each  $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ ,  $\exists \varepsilon_i > 0$  such

that  $B(x_0, \varepsilon_i) \subset U_i$ . Let

$$\varepsilon_0 = \min\{\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n\}.$$

Then we have that  $\forall i \in \{1, ..., n\}, \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_i$ . Thus

$$B(x_0, \varepsilon_0) \subset B(x_0, \varepsilon_i) \subset U_i$$

for each *i*. Therefore  $B(x_0, \varepsilon_0) \subset U$ .

# **→** Corollary 33 (Properties of Closed Sets)

Let (X,d) be a metric space.

- 1.  $X, \emptyset$  are closed.
- 2. If  $\{F_{\alpha}\}_{{\alpha}\in I}$  is a collection of closed sets, then  $F=\bigcap_{{\alpha}\in I}F_{\alpha}$  is closed.
- 3. If  $\{F_1, \ldots, F_n\}$  is a collection of closed sets, then  $F = \bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i$  is closed.

### Proof

The proof follows from De Morgan's Laws, ♠ Proposition 32, and by taking set complements. □

### Example 12.2.1

Let *X* be any set and *d* the discrete metric

$$d(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \neq y \\ 0 & x = y \end{cases}$$

We want to know what sets are open on X under d. Notice that any set of just a singleton is open, since

$$B\left(x_0,\frac{1}{2}\right)\subset X.$$

#### Exercise 12.2.1

Write out the full proof for ► Corollary 33 as an exercise.

Consequently, any  $A \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  is an arbitrary union of open sets, i.e.

$$A = \bigcup_{x \in A} \{x\}.$$

Thus by ♠ Proposition 32, *A* is open.

### 66 Note

On  $\mathbb{R}$ , only  $\emptyset$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  itself are both open and closed. This can be proven using the Intermediate Value Theorem.

### Definition 35 (Topology)

Given any X, a set  $\tau \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$  is called a **topology** on X is

- 1.  $X,\emptyset \in \tau$
- 2. If  $\{U_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha\in I}$  such that for each  $\alpha\in I$ ,  $U_{\alpha}\in \tau$ , then

$$U=\bigcup_{lpha\in I}U_lpha\in au.$$

3. If  $\{U_1, \ldots, U_n\}$  such that  $U_i \in \tau$  for each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ , then

$$U = \bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i \in au.$$

*If* (X, d) *is a metric space, then* 

$$\tau_d = \{ U \subset X \mid U \text{ open in } (X, d) \}$$

is called a metric topology, or d-topology, associated with the metric d. We call  $(X, \tau)$  a topological space.

### **Example 12.2.2**

Given X,

- 1. P(X) is a topology on X, and it is called the **discrete topology**;
- 2.  $\{\emptyset, X\}$  is a topology on X, and it is called the **indiscrete topology**.

# 13 Lecture 13 Oct 05th

# 13.1 Topology on Metric Spaces (Continued)

### **■** Theorem 34 (Open Balls are Open)

- 1.  $B(x_0, \varepsilon)$  is open.
- 2.  $B[x_0, \varepsilon]$  is closed.
- 3. Every open set is the union of open balls.
- 4.  $\forall x \in X, \{x\} \text{ is closed.}$

### Proof

1. Consider  $x \in B(x_0, \varepsilon)$  and let  $r = d(x, x_0)$ .

Let  $\alpha = \varepsilon - r$ . Assume that  $y \in B(x, \alpha)$ . By the Triangle Inequality.

$$d(x_0, y) \le d(x_0, x) + d(x, y) < r + \alpha = \varepsilon.$$

2. Let  $y \in B[x_0, \varepsilon]^C$ , and let  $r = d(x_0, y)$ .

Let  $\alpha = r - \varepsilon$ . Assume  $z \in B(y, \alpha)$ , and suppose, for contradiction, that  $z \in B[x_0, \varepsilon]$ . Then

$$r = d(x_0, y) \le d(x_0, z) + d(z, y) < \varepsilon + \alpha = r$$

but r < r contradicts the fact that r = r.

3. Let  $U \subset X$  be open.  $\forall x \in U$ , let  $\varepsilon_x > 0$  be such that  $B(x, \varepsilon_x) \subset U$ . Then

$$U=\bigcup_{x\in U}B(x,\varepsilon_x).$$



Figure 13.1: Idea of proof for 1. in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .




Figure 13.2: Idea of proof for 2. in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

4. Let  $y \in X$  such that  $y \neq x$ . Let r = d(y, x). Then  $x \notin B\left(y, \frac{r}{2}\right)$ , and so

$$B\left(y,\frac{r}{2}\right)\subset\{x\}^{C}.$$

### Example 13.1.1 (Open Intervals are Open)

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ , and d(x,y) = |x-y|, the standard metric. Let I = (a,b), for some  $a,b \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm \infty\}$ . Let  $x \in I$ . Now let

$$\varepsilon = \min\{1, |x-a|, |x-b|\}.$$

Then, clearly so,  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subset I$ .

If  $U \subset \mathbb{R}$  is open, and if we define  $\sim$  on U by  $x \sim y^{-1}$ . if  $(x,y), (y,x) \subset {}^{-1}$  This is what we did in Q1. U. We proved that  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation. Let  $I_x = [x]$  be the interval defined by  $\sim$ . We proved that  $I_x$  is an open interval.

Consequently, if we have U being open in  $\mathbb{R}$ , then U can be expressed as the union of a countable collection  $\{I_{\alpha}, \alpha \in I\}$  of open intervals, which are pairwise disjoint.

QUESTION: Given  $U = \{(x,y) \mid |x|, |y| < 1\}$ , can we do the same as above, i.e. can we use a countable collection of disjoint open sets to express U, or, in other words, cover U?

### Example 13.1.2 (Cantor Set)

Let's consider the closed interval [0,1], of which we shall label as  $P_0$ .




Figure 13.3: Cantor set showing up to n = 2, with the excluded interval in n = 3 shown.

Define  $P_1$  by removing an open interval of length  $\frac{1}{3}$  sitting in the middle of  $P_0$ , i.e.

$$P_1 = [0,1] \setminus \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\right) = \left[0, \frac{1}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{2}{3}, 1\right]$$

Define  $P_2$  by removing an open interval of length  $\frac{1}{3^2}$  sitting in the

middle of each of the 2 closed intervals in  $P_1$ , ie.

$$P_2 = \left[0, \frac{1}{9}\right] \cup \left[\frac{2}{9}, \frac{1}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{2}{3}, \frac{7}{9}\right] \cup \left[\frac{8}{9}, 1\right]$$

Recursively so, define  $P_{n+1}$  by removing an open interval of length  $\frac{1}{3^{n+1}}$  sitting in the middle of each of the 2<sup>n</sup> closed intervals in  $P_n$ .

Let P, the Cantor Set (or Cantor Ternary Set), be defined as

$$P = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n.$$

The following are some properties of *P*:

- 1. *P* is closed, since it is closed under an arbitrary number of closed sets (see > Corollary 33).
- 2. We have

$$x \in P \iff x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_i}{3^n}$$

where  $a_n = 0,2$ . In other words, every element of P is a ternary number.

- 3.  $|P| = 2^{\aleph_0} = c$ .
- 4.  $P_n$  does not contain any interval of length greater than or equal to
- 5. Consequently, the length of *P* is 0.

## 14 Lecture 14 Oct 12th

#### 14.1 Topology on Metric Spaces (Continued 2)

#### **■** Definition 36 (Closure)

*Let*  $A \subseteq (X, d)$ *. We define the closure*  $\overline{A}$  *of* A *to be* 

$$\overline{A} = \bigcap \{ F \subset X \mid F \text{ is closed }, A \subset F \}.$$

 $\overline{A}$  is the smallest closed set that contains A.

#### Definition 37 (Interior)

*Let*  $A \subseteq (X,d)$ *. We define the interior*  $A^{\circ}$  *of* A *to be* 

$$A^{\circ} = \bigcup \{ U \subset X \mid U \text{ is open }, U \subset A \}.$$

 $A^{\circ}$  is the largest open set contained in A.

#### Remark

We have that

$$A^{\circ} \subset A \subset \overline{A}$$

#### Definition 38 (Neighbourhood)

We say that a set A is a neighbourhood of a point  $x \in X$  if  $x \in A^{\circ,1}$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A neighbourhood is **not necessarily open**; the definition applies to elements in the interior after all.

#### 66 Note

*A* is a neighbourhood of  $x \in X$  if and only if  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subset A$ .

#### Definition 39 (Boundary Point)

Given  $A \subset (X, d)$ , a point x is called a **boundary point** for A if

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \quad B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A \neq \emptyset \wedge B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A^{C} \neq \emptyset.$$

We denote the collection of all boundary points of A by bdy(A).

#### • Proposition 35 (Closed Sets Include Its Boundary Points)

Let (X,d) be a metric space and  $A \subset X$ . Then A is closed  $\iff$  bdy $(A) \subset A$ .

#### Proof

- (1)  $\implies$  (2): Suppose  $x \in A^C$ , which is open. Then  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x,\varepsilon) \subset A^C$ . Then  $x \notin \mathrm{bdy}(A)$ , i.e.  $\mathrm{bdy}(A) \subset A$ .<sup>2</sup>
- (2)  $\Longrightarrow$  (3):  ${}^{3}\text{Let }x \in A^{C}$ . Then, by assumption,  $x \notin \text{bdy}(A)$ . Then  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  such that either  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subset A$  or  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subset A^{C}$ . But since  $x \notin A$ , we must have  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subset A^{C}$ , i.e.  $A^{C}$  is open.
- <sup>2</sup> The idea of this proof is to show that it is impossible for the boundary to be in  $A^{C}$ .
- $^{3}$  To show that A is closed, we should show that  $A^{C}$  is open.

#### • Proposition 36 (Closures include the Boundary Points of a Set)

Given  $A \subset (X, d)$ , we have  $\overline{A} = A \cup bdy(A)$ .

#### Proof

By definition,  $A \subseteq \overline{A}$ , so it suffices to show that  $\operatorname{bdy}(A) \subset \overline{A}$  to show that  $A \cup \operatorname{bdy}(A) \subseteq \overline{A}$ .

<sup>4</sup>Assume that  $x \notin \overline{A}$ , i.e.  $x \in \overline{A}^C$ , which is open since  $\overline{A}$  is closed by definition. Then  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subset \overline{A}^C$ . Since

<sup>4</sup> Here, we employ the same proof as the previous proposition.

 $x \notin A \subset \overline{A}$ , we have that  $B(x, \varepsilon) \cap A = \emptyset$ , i.e.  $x \notin \text{bdy}(A)$ . Therefore  $bdy(A) \subset \overline{A}$ , and so  $A \cup bdy(A) \subseteq \overline{A}$  as claimed.

 $^{5}$ Let *x* ∈ bdy( $A \cup$  bdy(A)). Then ∀ε > 0, we have

$$B(x,\varepsilon) \cap (A \cup \text{bdy}(A)) \neq \emptyset$$
 (14.1)

$$\wedge B(x,\varepsilon) \cap (A \cup \mathrm{bdy}(A))^C \neq \emptyset. \tag{14.2}$$

Note that by De Morgan's Laws, we have that

$$(A \cup \text{bdy}(A))^{C} = A^{C} \cap \text{bdy}(A)^{C}.$$

Then (14.2) would be

$$B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A^{C} \cap \text{bdy}(A)^{C} \neq \emptyset$$
,

and so

$$B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A^{C} \neq \emptyset \tag{14.3}$$

$$\wedge B(x,\varepsilon) \cap \mathrm{bdy}(A)^{C} \neq \emptyset. \tag{14.4}$$

From (14.1), we have

$$B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A \neq \emptyset \lor B(x,\varepsilon) \cap \text{bdy}(A) \neq \emptyset.$$

If  $B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ , then : (14.3),  $x \in bdy(A)$ , and so

$$bdv(A \cup bdv(A)) \subseteq (A \cup bdv(A)). \tag{\dagger}$$

If  $B(x,\varepsilon) \cap \text{bdy}(A) \neq \emptyset$ , let  $z \in B(x,\varepsilon) \cap \text{bdy}(A)$ .  $\therefore z \in B(x,\varepsilon)$ , let r = d(x, z), and  $\alpha = \varepsilon - r > 0$ . Let  $z_0 \in B(z, \alpha)$ . Then by the Triangle Inequality

$$d(x,z_0) < d(x,z) + d(z,z_0) < r + \alpha = \varepsilon$$
.

Thus  $z_0 \in B(x, \varepsilon) \implies (B(z, \alpha) \subseteq B(x, \varepsilon))$ . Then  $z \in \operatorname{bdy}(A)$ , we have  $B(z,\alpha) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ , and so  $B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ . Then we can just follow the argument we did in (†) and arrive as the same conclusion. Consequently, by  $\bullet$  Proposition 35,  $A \cup \text{bdy}(A)$  is closed as claimed.  <sup>5</sup> For this part, if we can show that  $A \cup bdy(A)$  is closed, then by definition,  $\overline{A} \subseteq A \cup \text{bdy}(A)$  since  $\overline{A}$  is the smallest such set that contains *A*. To show that  $A \cup \text{bdy}(A)$  is closed, we can either show that  $(A \cup bdy(A))^{C}$  is open, or use 6 Proposition 35 to show that  $bdy(A \cup bdy(A)) \subset (A \cup bdy(A))$ . We shall show for the more complicated expression.

#### Example 14.1.1

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$  and A = [0, 1). We have that

- $bdy(A) = \{0, 1\};$
- $A^{\circ} = (0,1)$ ; and
- $\overline{A} = [0,1]$ .

#### **Example 14.1.2**

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$  and  $A = \mathbb{Q}$ . We have that

- bdy(A) = ℝ since every open ball around a ∈ A will always contain elements in ℚ and ℚ<sup>C</sup>;
- $A^{\circ} = \emptyset$  since  $A^{\circ} = A \setminus bdy(A)$ ; and
- $\overline{A} = \mathbb{R}$  since  $\overline{A} = A \cup \text{bdy}(A)$ .

#### Definition 40 (Separable)

A metric space (X,d) is **separable** if there exists a countable set  $A \subset X$  such that  $\overline{A} = X$ , and call the metric space **non-separable** otherwise.

#### Example 14.1.3

Every finite metric space (X, d) is separable.

This is true since every subset A of X is countable since X itself is countable. Consequently, if we pick A to be a subset that takes every other element in X, then it is clear that  $\overline{A} = X$ , and so (X, d) is separable.

#### **Example 14.1.4**

R is separable as shown in Example 14.1.2.6

#### **Example 14.1.5**

 $\mathbb{R}^n$  is separable if  $d_p$  for all  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ . We can apply the same argument that we had for Example 14.1.2 and apply it componentwise. Consequently,  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}^n} = \mathbb{R}^n$ . In other words, for any  $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^n, d_p)$ , we can pick a  $(r_1, \ldots, r_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$  that is as close to  $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$  as possible.

Exercise 14.1.1 Prove that  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{R}$  using the Archimedean Property of  $\mathbb{R}$ .

#### Remark

*Notice that* 

$$\overline{A} = X \iff \forall x \in X \forall \ \varepsilon > 0 \ B(x, \varepsilon) \cap A \neq \emptyset.$$

#### Definition 41 (Dense)

A is dense in (X, d) if  $\overline{A} = X$ .

Question: Is  $(\ell_1,\|\cdot\|_1)$  separable? Is  $(\ell_\infty,\|\cdot\|_\infty)$  separable?

Recall Example 10.1.1.

## 15 Lecture 15 Oct 15th

#### 15.1 Topology on Metric Spaces (Continued 3)

#### Definition 42 (Limit Points)

Let (X,d) be a metric space, and  $A \subset X$ . We say that  $x_0$  is a **limit point** for A if for any neighbourhood of  $x_0$ , we have that

$$N \cap (A \setminus \{x_0\}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Equivalently,  $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists x \in A$ , where  $x \neq x_0$ , such that  $x \in B(x_0, \varepsilon)$ . We sometimes call limit points as **cluster points**. We denote the set of limit points of A as  $\text{Lim}(A) \subset X^2$ 

# ¹ This also means that $B(x_0, \varepsilon)$ must have infinitely many points close to $x_0$ , for otherwise, we would be able to find some $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $B(x_0, \varepsilon_0) \cap A = \emptyset$ .

 $^{2}$  Note that the set of limit points is not necessarily a subset of A.

#### **Example 15.1.1**

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ , and  $A = [0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ . We have that

$$Lim[0,1) = [0,1].$$

#### Example 15.1.2

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$  and  $A = \mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Since  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \exists \varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$  such that  $\forall m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{n\}$ , we have that  $m \notin B\left(n, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ , we have

$$Lim\,\mathbb{N}=\emptyset.$$

#### • Proposition 37 (Closed Sets Include Its Limit Points)

Let  $A \subset (X, d)$ . Then

- 1. A is closed  $\iff$  Lim(A)  $\subset$  A;
- 2.  $\overline{A} = A \cup \text{Lim}(A)$ .

#### Proof

- 1. For the ( $\Longrightarrow$ ) direction, suppose A is closed.  ${}^{3}\text{Let }x_{0} \in A^{\mathbb{C}}$ . Then  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x_{0}, \varepsilon) \cap A = \emptyset$ . Thus, by definition, we have that  $x_{0} \notin \text{Lim}(A)$   ${}^{4}$ . Therefore,  $\text{Lim}(A) \subset A$ .
  - For the (  $\iff$  ) direction, suppose  $\text{Lim}(A) \subset A$ . Let  $x_0 \in A^C$ . Then  $x_0 \notin \text{Lim}(A)$ , which means that  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x_0, \varepsilon) \cap A = \emptyset$ , i.e.  $B(x_0, \varepsilon) \subset A^C$ . Thus A is closed.
- 2. <sup>5</sup>It is clear that  $A \subset \overline{A}$ . Let  $x_0 \in \overline{A}^C$ . Then  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x_0, \varepsilon) \subset \overline{A}^C$ . In particular, we have that  $B(x_0, \varepsilon) \cap A = \emptyset$ , i.e.  $x_0 \notin \text{Lim}(A)$ . Thus  $\text{Lim}(A) \subset \overline{A}$ .

Again, it suffices to show that  $A \cup \text{Lim}(A)$  is closed to CTP. Let  $x_0 \in (A \cup \text{Lim}(A))^C$  6. Then  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x_0, \varepsilon) \cap A = \emptyset$ . If  $z \in \text{Lim}(A)$  and  $z \in B(x_0, \varepsilon)$ , then we have  $B(x_0, \varepsilon)$  is a neighbourhood of z, and so we must have that  $B(x_0, \varepsilon) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ , which is a contradiction. Thus  $(A \cup \text{Lim}(A))^C$  is open, and so  $A \cup \text{Lim}(A)$  is closed, as required.

- <sup>3</sup> This uses a reversed way of thinking: if we want to show that  $Lim(A) \subset A$ , then instead of trying to directly show the containment, we show that all elements in  $A^C$  are in fact not limit points due to A being closed. <sup>4</sup> Notice there that there are no element
- <sup>4</sup> Notice there that there are no elements in *A* that are close to  $x_0$ , and so it's not a limit point.
- <sup>5</sup> This proof is similar to that ofProposition 36.
- <sup>6</sup> It is clear by De Morgan's Law that  $x_0 \in A^C$  and  $x_0 \notin \text{Lim}(A)$ , which implies that  $\text{Lim}(A) \subset A$ . But this does not give us a clear geometrical picture of the notion.

#### • Proposition 38 (Mixing the notions)

Let  $A \subseteq B \subseteq (X, d)$ .

- 1.  $\overline{A} \subset \overline{B}$ ;
- 2.  $A^{\circ} \subset B^{\circ}$ ;
- 3.  $A^{\circ} = A \setminus bdy(A)$ ;
- 4.  $bdy(A) = bdy(A^C)$ ;
- 5.  $A^{\circ} = \left(\overline{A^{C}}\right)^{C}$ .

#### Exercise 15.1.1

Prove 6 Proposition 38.

#### Proof

1. It is clear that  $A \subset B \subset \overline{B}$ . Suppose Lim(A) is not a subset of  $\overline{B}$ .

- 2.  $a \in A^{\circ} \implies \exists \varepsilon > 0 \ B(a, \varepsilon) \subset A \subset B \implies a \in B^{\circ} \dashv$
- 3.  $x \in A \setminus \mathrm{bdy}(A) \implies \exists \varepsilon > 0 \ B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A^C = \varnothing \implies x \in A^\circ \dashv x \in A^\circ \implies \exists \varepsilon_0 > 0 \ B(x,\varepsilon_0) \subset A$  Sps  $x \in \mathrm{bdy}(A)$ . Then  $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \ B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A^C \neq \varnothing \implies B(x,\varepsilon_0) \cap A^C = \varnothing \not\downarrow B(x,\varepsilon_0) \subset A \dashv$
- 4.  $x \in \text{bdy}(A) \implies \forall \varepsilon > 0 \ B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A \neq \emptyset \land B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A^C \neq \emptyset$   $x \notin \text{bdy}(A^C) \implies \exists \varepsilon_0 > 0 \ B(x,\varepsilon_0) \cap A = \emptyset \lor B(x,\varepsilon_0) \cap A^C = \emptyset$ But  $B(x,\varepsilon_0) \cap A = \emptyset \not \in \forall \varepsilon > 0 \ B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A^C \neq \emptyset$ and  $B(x,\varepsilon_0) \cap A^C = \emptyset \not \in \forall \varepsilon > 0 \ B(x,\varepsilon) \cap A^C \neq \emptyset$   $\implies x \in \text{bdy}(A^C) \dashv \text{. The converse is a similar argument.}$
- 5.  $\left(\overline{A^{C}}\right)^{C} = \left(A^{C} \cup \text{bdy}(A^{C})\right)^{C} = A \cap \text{bdy}(A)^{C} = A \setminus \text{bdy}(A) = A^{C} \cup \text{bdy}(A)$

#### • Proposition 39 (More on Closures and Interiors)

Let  $A, B \subset (X, d)$ .

- 1.  $\overline{A \cup B} = \overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$ :
- 2.  $(A \cap B)^{\circ} = A^{\circ} \cap B^{\circ}$ .

#### Exercise 15.1.2

Prove Item 2 for **♦** Proposition 39.

#### Proof

1. We have that  $A \subset \overline{A}$  and  $B \subset \overline{B}$ , so  $A \cup B \subset \overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$ . Since  $\overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$  is closed, we must have that  $\overline{A \cup B} \subseteq \overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$ . Similarly so, we have

$$A \subseteq A \cup B \implies \overline{A} \subseteq \overline{A \cup B}$$
$$B \subseteq A \cup B \implies \overline{B} \subseteq \overline{A \cup B}$$

and so  $\overline{A} \cup \overline{B} \subseteq \overline{A \cup B}$ .

2. Since  $A^{\circ} \subseteq A$  and  $B^{\circ} \subseteq B$ , and  $A^{\circ} \cap B^{\circ}$  is open, we must have that  $A^{\circ} \cap B^{\circ} \subseteq (A \cap B)^{\circ}$ . On the other hand, since  $(A \cap B)^{\circ} \subseteq (A \cap B)^{\circ} \subseteq (A \cap B)^{\circ}$ 

 $A^{\circ}$  and  $(A \cap B)^{\circ} \subset B^{\circ}$ , we have that  $(A \cap B)^{\circ} \subseteq A^{\circ} \cap B^{\circ}$ .

Question: Is  $\overline{A \cap B} = \overline{A} \cap \overline{B}$ ? No.

#### Example 15.1.3

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $A = \mathbb{Q}$  and  $B = \mathbb{Q}^{C}$ . We know that  $\overline{A} = \mathbb{R} = \overline{B}$ . But, observe that

$$\overline{A \cap B} = \emptyset$$
 while  $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B} = \mathbb{R}$ .

However, we do have that  $\overline{A \cap B} \subseteq \overline{A} \cap \overline{B}$ .

QUESTION: Given (X,d) a metric space, is

$$B(x_0, \varepsilon) = B[x_0, \varepsilon]$$

true? Again, no.

#### Example 15.1.4

Let *X* be a set with  $|X| \ge 2$ , and *d* the discrete metric. We have that

$$B(x_0, 1) = \{x_0\}$$
 but  $B[x_0, 1] = X$ .

#### 15.2 Convergences of Sequences

#### Definition 43 (Convergence)

Given a sequence  $\{x_n\} \subset (X, d)$  and  $x_0 \in X$ , we say that the sequence converges to  $x_0$  if

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \ \exists N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \ \forall n \geq N_0 \ d(x_n, x_0) < \varepsilon.$$

This is equivalent to saying that the sequence  $\{d(x_n, x_0)\}$  converges to 0 in X. We denote this by

$$x_0 = \lim_{n \to \infty} x_n \text{ or } x_n \to x_0.$$

*If no such*  $x_0$  *exists, we say that the sequence diverges.* 

#### **■** Theorem 40 (Uniqueness of Limits of Sequences)

If  $\{x_n\}$  is a sequence in (X, d) with  $x_n \to x_0$  and  $x_n \to y_0$ , then

#### Proof

$$x_0 \neq y_0 \implies \exists \varepsilon = d(x_0, y_0) \implies B\left(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \cap B\left(y_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) = \emptyset$$

However,  $\exists N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \ \forall n \geq N_0$ 

$$x_n \in B\left(x_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \land x_n \in B\left(y_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)$$

which is impossible. Thus  $x_0 = y_0$ .




Figure 15.1: A geometric representation of the proof for **P** Theorem 40.

## 16 Lecture 16 Oct 17th

#### **16.1** Convergences of Sequences (Continued)

#### **Example 16.1.1**

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $d = d_p$ , for  $1 \le p \le \infty$ , and  $\vec{x}_k = \{(x_{k,1}, x_{k,2}, ..., x_{k,n})\}$ .

Claim:

$$\vec{X}_k \stackrel{\ell_p}{\to} \vec{x}_0 = (x_{0,1}, x_{0,2}, \dots, x_{0,n}) \iff \forall j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \ x_{k,j} \to x_{0,j}.$$

Note: In general, we have

$$\left|x_{k,j}-x_{0,j}\right|\leq \left\|\vec{x}_k-\vec{x}_0\right\|_p$$

So it is clear that the  $(\Longrightarrow)$  direction is true, i.e.

$$\vec{X}_k \to \vec{x}_0 \implies \forall j \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \ x_{k,j} \to x_{0,j}.$$

For the other direction, we look at the different p's to see how it works differently: in all cases, assume that  $x_{k,j} \to x_{0,j}$  for all j, and that  $\varepsilon > 0$ 

 $p = \infty$ : we have that  $\exists k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall k \geq k_0$ ,

$$\left|x_{k,j}-x_{0,j}\right|<\varepsilon \text{ for } j\in\{1,\ldots,n\},$$

and so

$$\|\vec{x}_k - \vec{x}_0\|_{\infty} = \max\left\{ \left| x_{k,j} - x_{0,j} \right| : 1 \le j \le n \right\} < \varepsilon.$$

p = 1: if we assume that for each j,

$$\left|x_{k,j}-x_{0,j}\right|<\frac{\varepsilon}{n}$$

then

$$\|\vec{x}_k - \vec{x}_0\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^n |x_{k,j} - x_{0,j}| < \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon}{n} = \varepsilon.$$

1 : this time, we assume that for each*j*,

$$\left|x_{k,j}-x_{0,j}\right|<\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt[p]{n}}$$

Then

$$\|\vec{x}_k - \vec{x}_0\|_p = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \left| x_{k,j} - x_{0,j} \right|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt[p]{n}} \right)^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \varepsilon.$$

This completes the proof of our claim.

#### **Example 16.1.2**

Let  $X = (C[a, b], \|\cdot\|_{\infty})$ . Then

$$f_n \to f \iff ||f_n - f||_{\infty} \to 0.$$

Notice that for the  $(\Longrightarrow)$  direction,<sup>1</sup>

$$(\forall \varepsilon > 0 \ \exists N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \ \forall n \ge N_0 \ |f_n - f| < \varepsilon)$$

$$\implies \|f_n - f\|_{\infty} = \max\{|f_n(x) - f(x)| : x \in [a, b]\} < \varepsilon.$$

The  $(\longleftarrow)$  direction is easy, since

$$|f_n(x) - f(x)| \le \max\{|f_n(x) - f(x)| : x \in [a, b]\} < \varepsilon.$$

### <sup>1</sup> Note that this is uniform convergence, which implies pointwise convergence.

# ■ Theorem 41 (Sequential Characterizations of Limit Points, Boundaries, and Closedness)

Given  $A \subset (X, d)$ ,

1. 
$$x_0 \in \text{Lim}(A) \iff \exists \{x_n\} \subset A \ (x_n \neq x_0) \land (x_n \rightarrow x_0);$$

2. 
$$x_0 \in \text{bdy}(A) \iff \exists \{x_n\} \subset A, \{y_n\} \subset A^{\mathcal{C}} (x_n \to x_0) \land (y_n \to x_0);$$

3. A is closed 
$$\iff$$
  $(\forall \{x_n\} \subset A \ x_n \to x_0 \in X \implies x_0 \in A)$ 

Proof

1. 
$$x_0 \in \text{Lim}(A) \implies \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \ x_n \in B\left(x_0, \frac{1}{n}\right) \setminus \{x_0\} \implies d(x_n, x_0) < \frac{1}{n} \implies x_n \to x_0 \dashv$$

$$\{x_n\} \subset A \ (x_n \to x_0) \land (x_n \neq x_0) \Longrightarrow$$
  
 $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \ \exists N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \ \forall n \geq N_0 \ x_n \in B(x_0, \varepsilon) \dashv$ 

2. 
$$x \in \text{bdy}(A) \implies$$

$$(\because \forall \varepsilon > 0 \ A \cap B(x, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset) \ \exists x_n \in A \cap B\left(x, \frac{1}{n}\right) \land \land \land \forall \varepsilon > 0 \ A^C \cap B(x, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset) \ \exists y_n \in A^C \cap B\left(x, \frac{1}{n}\right) \implies (\{x_n\} \subset A \land x_n \to x_0) \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \dashv \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to x_0) \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^C \land y_n \to$$

$$(\{x_n\} \subset A \land x_n \to x_0) \land (\{y_n\} \subset A^{\mathbb{C}} \land y_n \to x_0)$$

$$\implies \forall \varepsilon > 0 \; \exists N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \; \forall n \ge N_0 \; x_n, y_n \in B(x, \varepsilon)$$

$$\implies x_0 \in \mathrm{bdy}(A) \dashv$$

3. Sps 
$$A$$
 is closed and  $(\{x_n\} \subset A) \land (x_n \to x_0 \in X)$ .  
 $x_0 \in A^C \implies \exists \varepsilon > 0 \ B(x_0, \varepsilon) \subset A^C \implies x_n \notin B(x_0, \varepsilon) \notin x_n \to x_0$   
 $\implies x_0 \in A$ 

Sps 
$$A$$
 is  $\neg$  closed  $\implies$  ( $\cdot$ :  $\bullet$  Proposition 37)  $\exists x_0 \in \text{Lim}(A) \setminus A$   $\implies$  ( $\cdot$ : Item 1)  $\exists \{x_n\} \subset A \ (x_n \neq_0) \land (x_n \rightarrow x_0 \notin A)$ , showing that RHS is false  $\dashv$ 

Example 16.1.3

Let *X* be a set and *d* a discrete metric. Then

$$x_n \to x_0 \iff \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \ ln \ge N \ x_n = x_0.$$

**Example 16.1.4** 

Let 
$$c_0 = \{\{x_n\} \mid \lim_{n \to \infty} x_n = 0\} \subset \ell_{\infty}$$
.

Claim :  $c_0$  is closed in  $\ell_{\infty}$ .

Assume  $\vec{x}_k = \{x_{k,j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset c_0$ , and let

$$\vec{x}_k \stackrel{\|\cdot\|_{\infty}}{\to} \vec{x}_0 = \{x_{0,j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset \ell_{\infty},$$

i.e.

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \ \exists N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \ \forall k \ge N_0 \ \|\vec{x}_k - \vec{x}_0\|_{\infty} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

Let  $k_0 \ge N_0$ .  $\vec{x}_{k_0} \in c_0$ ,  $\exists J_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall j \ge J_0$ , we have  $\left|x_{k_0,j}\right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ , and so

$$|x_{0,j}| \leq |x_{k_0,j} - x_{0,j}| + |x_{k_0,j}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

Thus we have that

$$\lim_{j\to\infty}x_{0,j}=0$$

and so  $\vec{x}_0 \in c_0$ . Therefore, by  $\blacksquare$  Theorem 41 Item 3,  $c_0$  is closed in  $\ell_{\infty}$ .

Note, however, that  $c_0 0 \subset \ell_1 \subset c_0$  is not closed. Also  $\ell_p$  is not closed in  $c_0$ .

# A Useful Theorems from Earlier Calculus

#### **■** Theorem 42 (Monotone Convergence Theorem)

Let  $\{x_k\}$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

- 1. Suppose  $\{x_k\}$  is increasing.
  - If  $\{x_k\}$  is bounded above, then  $x_k \to \sup\{x_k\}$  as  $k \to \infty$ .
  - If  $\{x_k\}$  is not bounded above, then  $x_k \to \infty$  as  $k \to \infty$ .
- 2. Suppose  $\{x_k\}$  is decreasing.
  - If  $\{x_k\}$  is bounded below, then  $x_k \to \inf\{x_k\}$  as  $k \to \infty$ .
  - If  $\{x_k\}$  is not bounded below, then  $x_k \to -\infty$ .

# Bibliography

Forrest, B. E. (2018). Pmath351, real analysis.

## Index

$\ \cdot\ _{p}$ -norm, 55	domain, 16	Minkowski's Inequality v2, 64
d-topology, 70		Monotone Convergence Theorem, 91
1-norm, 52	Empty Set, 13	Multiplication of Cardinals, 44
2-metric, 50	Equivalence Class, 28	
2-norm, 52	Equivalence Relation, 28	Neighbourhood, 75
	Euclidean Metric, 50	Norm, 50
Anti-symmetric, 21	Euclidean norm, 52	Normed Linear Space, 50
Axiom of Choice, 19	Exponentiation of Cardinals, 45	
		open, 68
Boundary Point, 76	Finite Sets, 31	open ball, 68
bounded above, 23	Function, 16	
		Partially Ordered Sets, 22
Cantor Set, 73	Generalized Continuum Hypothesis,	Partition, 29
Cantor Ternary Set, 73	48	Pigeonhole Principle, 31
Cantor's Diagonal Argument, 39		Poset, 22
Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein Theorem,	Hölder's Inequality, 56	Power Set, 13
37	Hölder's Inequality v2, 63	Product of Sets, 15
Cardinality, 31	Hasse diagram, 22	
Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality, 56		range, 16
Chains, 23	indiscrete topology, 70	Reflexive, 21
Choice Function, 17	Infinite Sets, 32	Relation, 15
closed, 68	Interior, 75	Relations, 21
closed ball, 68	Intermediate Value Theorem, 70	Russell's Paradox, 47
Closure, 75	Intersection, 12	
cluster points, 81		Separable, 78
Continuum Hypothesis, 48	least upper bound, 23	Sequence Spaces, 59
Convergence, 84	Least Upper Bound Property of $\mathbb{R}$ , 24	Set Complement, 12
Countable, 34	Limit Points, 81	Set Difference, 12
		Standard Metric, 49
De Morgan's Laws, 14	Maximal Element, 25	Sum of Cardinals, 43
Dense, 79	maximum, 24	supremum, 23
denumerable, 34	Metric, 49	Symmetric, 21
Discrete Metric, 50	Metric Space, 49	Symmetric Difference, 12
discrete topology, 70	metric topology, 70	
diverges, 84	Minkowski's Inequality, 57	topological space, 70

Topology, 70
Totally Ordered Sets, 23
Transitive, 21
tuples, 15

Uncountable, 39 Union, 12 Universal Set, 11 upper bound, 23 Well-Ordered, 26 Well-Ordering Principle, 27

Zermelo's Axiom of Choice, 19 Zorn's Lemma, 26