

# Mathematics Bootcamp Lecture Notes

Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Toronto

Emma Kroell

Last updated: July 20, 2022

# Preface

These lecture notes were prepared for the Mathematics course at the inaugural Department of Statistical Sciences Graduate Student Bootcamp at the University of Toronto. The course teaches an overview of necessary mathematics prerequisites to incoming statistics graduate students, with an emphasis on proofs.

These lectures are based on the following books or lecture notes:

1. *An Introduction to Mathematical Structures and Proofs* by Larry J. Gerstein
2. *The Tools of Mathematical Reasoning* by Tamara J. Lakins
3. *A Taste of Topology* by Volker Runde
4. *Real Mathematical Analysis* by Charles C. Pugh
5. *Linear Algebra Done Right* by Sheldon Axler
6. *Linear Algebra Done Wrong* by Sergei Treil
7. *Lecture notes in Mathematics for Economics and Statistics* by Piotr Zwiernik
8. *Real Analysis Lecture Notes* by Laurent Marcoux

Chapter 1 of Gerstein (2012) and the first three chapters of Lakins (2016) are used as references for the proof technique section. Runde (2005) is the main text for the sections on set theory, metric spaces, and topology, which follow chapters 1, 2, and 3 of his book, respectively. Some additional topics come from Pugh (2015). The linear algebra content comes mostly from Axler (2015), with Treil (2017) used in some sections for an alternate perspective.

Most of the material in these notes belongs to these texts. All of these texts are available online to University of Toronto users (some to everyone).

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Jesse Gronsbell, Stanislav Volgushev, Piotr Zwiernik, and Robert Zimmerman in developing the list of topics for the course.

Please notify me of any typos or corrections at [emma.kroell@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:emma.kroell@mail.utoronto.ca).

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Review of proof techniques</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Propositional logic . . . . .	4
1.1.1	Truth values . . . . .	4
1.1.2	Logical equivalence . . . . .	5
1.1.3	Quantifiers . . . . .	5
1.2	Types of proof . . . . .	6
1.2.1	Direct proof . . . . .	6
1.2.2	Proof by contrapositive . . . . .	7
1.2.3	Proof by contradiction . . . . .	7
1.2.4	Summary . . . . .	8
1.2.5	Induction . . . . .	8
1.3	Exercises . . . . .	9
1.4	References . . . . .	9
<b>2</b>	<b>Set theory</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	Basics . . . . .	10
2.2	Ordered sets . . . . .	11
2.3	Functions . . . . .	12
2.4	Cardinality . . . . .	13
2.5	Exercises . . . . .	15
2.6	References . . . . .	16
<b>3</b>	<b>Metric spaces and sequences</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1	Metric spaces . . . . .	16
3.2	Sequences . . . . .	18
3.2.1	Cauchy sequences . . . . .	19
3.2.2	Subsequences . . . . .	20
3.3	Continuity . . . . .	20
3.4	Equivalence of metrics . . . . .	22
3.5	Extra properties of $\mathbb{R}$ . . . . .	22
3.6	Exercises . . . . .	25
3.7	References . . . . .	26
<b>4</b>	<b>Topology</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1	Basic definitions . . . . .	26
4.2	Compactness . . . . .	28
4.3	Continuity . . . . .	29
4.4	Exercises . . . . .	30
4.5	References . . . . .	31

## A short note on notation:

$\mathbb{N}$  denotes the whole numbers, i.e.  $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$

$\mathbb{N}_0$  denotes the non-negative integers, i.e.  $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$

$\mathbb{Z}$  denotes the integers, i.e.  $\mathbb{Z} = \{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$

$\mathbb{Q}$  denotes the rational numbers, i.e.  $\mathbb{Q} = \{\frac{p}{q} \mid p, q \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } q \neq 0\}$

$\mathbb{R}$  denotes the real numbers

$\mathbb{C}$  denotes the complex numbers

# 1 Review of proof techniques

## 1.1 Propositional logic

*Propositions* are statements that could be true or false. They have a corresponding *truth value*. We will use capital letters to denote propositions. For example, “ $n$  is odd” and “ $n$  is divisible by 2” are propositions. Let’s call them  $P$  and  $Q$ . Whether they are true or not (i.e. their truth value) depends on what  $n$  is.

We can negate statements:  $\neg P$  is the statement “ $n$  is not odd”.

We can combine statements:

- $P \wedge Q$  is the statement “ $n$  is odd and  $n$  is divisible by 2”.
- $P \vee Q$  is the statement “ $n$  is odd or  $n$  is divisible by 2”.

We always assume the inclusive or unless specifically stated otherwise.

**Example 1.1** Here are some statements, which we want to write in propositional logic.

- If it’s not raining, I won’t bring my umbrella.
- I’m a banana or Toronto is in Canada.
- If I pass this exam, I’ll be both happy and surprised.

For the first one, let  $A$  be the statement “it’s raining” and  $B$  be the statement “I will bring my umbrella”. In logic, the statement is  $\neg A \implies \neg B$ .

For the second, let  $C$  be the statement “I’m a banana” and let  $D$  be the statement “Toronto is in Canada”. We write this as  $C \vee D$ .

For the third, let  $P$  be the statement “I pass this exam”, let  $Q$  be the statement “I am happy”, and let  $R$  be the statement “I am surprised”. This one is written  $P \implies (Q \wedge R)$ .

### 1.1.1 Truth values

**Example 1.2** Write the following using propositional logic:

If it is snowing, then it is cold out.

It is snowing.

Therefore, it is cold out.

*Solution.*

$P \implies Q$

$P$

Conclusion:  $Q$

To examine if a statement is true or not, we use a truth table, where we write out all the possibilities.

**Example 1.3** The truth table for  $P \implies Q$  where  $P, Q$  are propositions is:

$P$	$Q$	$P \implies Q$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$F$
$F$	$T$	$T$
$F$	$F$	$T$

### 1.1.2 Logical equivalence

We say that two statements are *logically equivalent* if they have the same truth tables.

**Example 1.4** Let  $P, Q$  be propositions.  $P \implies Q$  is logically equivalent to  $\neg P \vee Q$ .

$P$	$Q$	$P \implies Q$
$T$	$T$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$F$
$F$	$T$	$T$
$F$	$F$	$T$

$P$	$Q$	$\neg P$	$\neg P \vee Q$
$T$	$T$	$F$	$T$
$T$	$F$	$F$	$F$
$F$	$T$	$T$	$T$
$F$	$F$	$T$	$T$

**Theorem 1.5** (De Morgan's Laws) Let  $P, Q$  be propositions.

(i)  $\neg(P \wedge Q)$  is logically equivalent to  $\neg P \vee \neg Q$ .

(ii)  $\neg(P \vee Q)$  is logically equivalent to  $\neg P \wedge \neg Q$ .

Proving this is your first exercise.

The following fact is often useful.

**Example 1.6**  $\neg(P \implies Q)$  is logically equivalent to  $P \wedge \neg Q$ . This follows from Example 1.4 and Theorem 1.5.

### 1.1.3 Quantifiers

There are two important logical operators that we have not yet discussed. They are denoted using the following symbols:  $\forall$ , read as “for all” or “for each”, and  $\exists$ , read as “there exists”. We will explore their meanings, how they can help us simplify statements we need to prove, and how we prove such statements.

#### For all

“for all”,  $\forall$ , is also called the universal quantifier. If  $P(x)$  is some property that applies to  $x$  from some domain, then  $\forall x P(x)$  means that the property  $P$  holds for every  $x$  in the domain. An example is the statement “Every real number has a non-negative square.” We write this as  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x^2 \geq 0$ . In logic, people often use brackets to separate parts of the logical expression, ex.  $(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})(x^2 \geq 0)$ .

How do we prove a for all statement? We need to take an arbitrary element of the domain, and show the property holds for that element.

#### There exists

“there exists”,  $\exists$ , is also called the existential quantifier. If  $P(x)$  is some property that applies to  $x$  from some domain, then  $\exists x P(x)$  means that the property  $P$  holds for some  $x$  in the domain. An example is the statement that 4 has a square root in the reals. We write this as  $\exists x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x^2 = 4$  or in proper logic notation,  $(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(x^2 = 4)$ .

How do we prove a there exists statement? We need to find an element in the domain for which the property holds (find an example).

There is also a special way of writing when there exists a unique element. We use  $\exists!$  for this case. For example, the statement “there exists a unique positive integer such that the integer squared is 64” is written  $\exists! z \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $z^2 = 64$ .

## Combining quantifiers

Often we will need to prove statements where we combine quantifiers. Here are some examples:

Statement	Logical expression
Every non-zero rational number has a multiplicative inverse	$\forall q \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}, \exists s \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ such that } qs = 1$
Each integer has a unique additive inverse	$\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}, \exists! y \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } x + y = 0$
$f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$	$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0 \text{ such that whenever }  x - x_0  < \delta,  f(x) - f(x_0)  < \epsilon$

The order of quantifiers is important! Changing the order changes the meaning. Consider the following example. Which are true? Which are false?

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \forall y \in \mathbb{R} \ x + y &= 2 \\ \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \exists y \in \mathbb{R} \ x + y &= 2 \\ \exists x \in \mathbb{R} \forall y \in \mathbb{R} \ x + y &= 2 \\ \exists x \in \mathbb{R} \exists y \in \mathbb{R} \ x + y &= 2 \end{aligned}$$

It's also important to know how to negate logical statements that include quantifiers, as it will often help us prove or disprove the statements. The results are intuitive, but things can get complicated when we have more complex statements. The negation of a statement being true for all  $x$  is that is isn't true for at least one  $x$ . The negation of a statement being true for at least one  $x$  is that is isn't true for any  $x$ .

In summary,

$$\begin{aligned} \neg \forall x P(x) &= \exists x (\neg P(x)) \\ \neg \exists x P(x) &= \forall x (\neg P(x)) \end{aligned}$$

The negations of the statements above are:

Logical expression	Negation
$\forall q \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}, \exists s \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ such that } qs = 1$	$\exists q \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\} \text{ such that } \forall s \in \mathbb{Q}, qs \neq 1$
$\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}, \exists! y \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } x + y = 0$	$\exists x \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } (\forall y \in \mathbb{Z}, x + y \neq 0) \vee (\exists y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge x + y_1 = 0 \wedge x + y_2 = 0)$
$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0 \text{ such that whenever }  x - x_0  < \delta,  f(x) - f(x_0)  < \epsilon$	$\exists \epsilon > 0 \text{ such that } \forall \delta > 0,  x - x_0  < \delta \text{ and }  f(x) - f(x_0)  \geq \epsilon$

Note that we use De Morgan's laws (Theorem 1.5), as well as the negation of an implication (Example 1.6). What do these negations mean in English?

## 1.2 Types of proof

### 1.2.1 Direct proof

In a direct proof, our approach is to use the definition and known results.

**Example 1.7** *The product of an even number with another integer is even.*

To prove this statement, we will use the definition of even. First we state that definition.

**Definition 1.8** *We say that an integer  $n$  is even if there exists another integer  $j$  such that  $n = 2j$ . We say that an integer  $n$  is odd if there exists another integer  $j$  such that  $n = 2j + 1$ .*

Now we prove the example directly.

*Proof.* Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , with  $n$  even. By definition, there  $\exists j \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $n = 2j$ . Then

$$nm = (2j)m = 2(jm)$$

Therefore  $nm$  is even by definition. □

Here is another example, which uses the concept of divisibility.

**Definition 1.9** Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We say that “ $a$  divides  $b$ ”, written  $a|b$ , if the remainder is zero when  $b$  is divided by  $a$ , i.e.  $\exists j \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $b = aj$ .

**Example 1.10** Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $a \neq 0$ . Prove that if  $a|b$  and  $b|c$ , then  $a|c$ .

*Proof.* Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Suppose  $a|b$  and  $b|c$ . Then by definition, there exists  $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $b = aj$  and  $c = kb$ . Combining these two equations gives  $c = k(aj) = a(kj)$ . Thus  $a|c$  by definition. □

### 1.2.2 Proof by contrapositive

Sometimes instead of proving an implication  $P \implies Q$  directly, it is easier to prove  $\neg Q \implies \neg P$ . This is called the contrapositive. First, we show that these two statements are logically equivalent using truth tables.

$$P \implies Q$$

$$\neg Q \implies \neg P$$

$P$	$Q$	$P \implies Q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$P$	$Q$	$\neg P$	$\neg Q$	$\neg Q \implies \neg P$
T	T	F	F	T
T	F	F	T	T
F	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	T	T

Note that  $\neg P \implies \neg Q$  is *not* logically equivalent to  $P \implies Q$  (can you think of an example?). This is a common mistake.

Here is an example of a statement that is easier to prove using the contrapositive as opposed to directly.

**Example 1.11** If an integer squared is even, then the integer is itself even.

*Proof.* We prove the contrapositive. Let  $n$  be odd. Then there exists  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $n = 2k + 1$ . We compute

$$n^2 = (2k + 1)^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1.$$

Thus  $n^2$  is odd. □

### 1.2.3 Proof by contradiction

Another proof technique is to assume something we know to be (or think to be) false, and then try to derive a contradiction. A contradiction is something that is impossible, like  $0=1$  or showing that a number is both odd and even.

In sum, to prove that a statement  $P$  is true by contradiction, we assume  $\neg P$  is true, derive a contradiction, and conclude that  $P$  is true. Here is an example.

**Example 1.12** The sum of a rational number and an irrational number is irrational.

*Proof.* Let  $q \in \mathbb{Q}$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ . Suppose in order to derive a contradiction that their sum is rational, i.e.  $r + q = s$  where  $s \in \mathbb{Q}$ . But then  $r = s - q \in \mathbb{Q}$ . Contradiction. Therefore the sum of a rational number and an irrational number is irrational. □

### 1.2.4 Summary

In sum, to prove  $P \implies Q$ :

- Direct proof: assume  $P$ , prove  $Q$
- Proof by contrapositive: assume  $\neg Q$ , prove  $\neg P$
- Proof by contradiction: assume  $P \wedge \neg Q$  and derive something that is impossible

### 1.2.5 Induction

Finally, we consider a special proof technique for proving statements about the natural numbers (or subsets of them of certain forms). It is based on the following theorem, which we state without proof.

**Theorem 1.13** (Well-ordering principle for  $\mathbb{N}$ ) *Every nonempty set of natural numbers has a least element.*

Because of the well-ordering principle, we can prove something holds for the natural numbers by proving it holds for the smallest one, and then creating a logical ladder linking them together as follows:

**Theorem 1.14** (Principle of mathematical induction) *Let  $n_0$  be a non-negative integer. Suppose  $P$  is a statement about positive integers  $n$  such that*

1. (base case)  $P(n_0)$  is true
2. (induction step) For every integer  $k \geq n_0$ , if  $P(k)$  is true, then  $P(k+1)$  is true.

*Then  $P(n)$  is true for every integer  $n \geq n_0$*

Here is an example of a proof by induction.

**Example 1.15**  $n! > 2^n$  if  $n \geq 4$ .

*Proof.* We prove this by induction on  $n$ .

*Base case:* Let  $n = 4$ . Then  $n! = 4! = 24 > 16 = 2^4$ .

*Inductive hypothesis:* Suppose for some  $k \geq 4$ ,  $k! > 2^k$ .

Then

$$(k+1)! = (k+1)k! > (k+1)2^k > 2(2^k) = 2^{k+1}.$$

Thus the statement holds by induction on  $n$ . □

Sometimes we use a different version of induction, called strong induction.

**Theorem 1.16** (Principle of strong mathematical induction) *Let  $n_0$  be a non-negative integer. Suppose  $P$  is a statement about positive integers  $n$  such that*

1. (base case)  $P(n_0)$  is true
2. (induction step) For every integer  $k \geq n_0$ , if  $P(m)$  is true for every integer  $m$  with  $n_0 \leq m \leq k$ , then  $P(k+1)$  is true.

*Then  $P(n)$  is true for every integer  $n \geq n_0$ .*

Next, we will consider an example where it is much simpler to use the strong version of induction than the regular one. First, we recall the definition of a prime number.

**Definition 1.17** *A positive integer  $p$  is prime if  $p$  has exactly two positive integer factors: 1 and  $p$ . Note that 1 is not prime. We can write this as*

$$p > 1 \text{ is prime if } \forall a, b \in \mathbb{N}, p = ab \implies (a = 1 \text{ or } b = 1).$$

We want to prove the existence part of the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic, that every integer greater than or equal to 2 has a prime factorization. The fact that such a factorization is unique is left as an exercise.



**Example 1.18** Every integer  $n \geq 2$  can be written as the product of primes.

*Proof.* We prove this using the Principle of Strong Mathematical Induction on  $n$ .

*Base case:*  $n = 2$  is prime.

*Inductive hypothesis:* Suppose for some  $k \geq 2$  that one can write every integer  $n$  such that  $2 \leq n \leq k$  as a product of primes.

We must show that we can write  $k + 1$  as a product of primes.

*Case 1:* if  $k + 1$  is prime, then we are done.

*Case 2:* if  $k + 1$  is not prime, then by Definition 1.17, there exists  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $k + 1 = ab$  where  $a, b \neq 1$ . Then it must also be the case that  $a, b \leq k$ .

By the inductive hypothesis, we can write  $a$  and  $b$  as products of primes, i.e.  $\exists p_1, \dots, p_\ell, q_1, \dots, q_m$ , all prime, such that

$$a = p_1 \cdots p_\ell, \quad b = q_1 \cdots q_m.$$

Then

$$k + 1 = ab = p_1 \cdots p_\ell q_1 \cdots q_m,$$

therefore we can write  $k + 1$  as a product of primes.

Thus the claim holds by strong induction. □

The Principle of Strong Mathematical Induction and the Principle of Mathematical Induction are logically equivalent, but sometimes it is easier to use one or the other, as we saw.

### 1.3 Exercises

1. Prove De Morgan's Laws for propositions:  $\neg(P \wedge Q) = \neg P \vee \neg Q$  and  $\neg(P \vee Q) = \neg P \wedge \neg Q$  (Hint: use truth tables).
2. Write the following statements and their negations using logical quantifier notation and then prove or disprove them:
  - (i) Every odd integer is divisible by three.
  - (ii) For any real number, twice its square plus twice itself plus six is greater than or equal to five. (*You may assume knowledge of calculus.*)
  - (iii) Every integer can be written as a unique difference of two natural numbers.
3. Prove the following statements:
  - (i) If  $a|b$  and  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  (positive integers), then  $a \leq b$ .
  - (ii) If  $a|b$  and  $a|c$ , then  $a|(xb + yc)$ , where  $a, b, c, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
  - (iii) Let  $a, b, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . If  $n$  does not divide the product  $ab$ , then  $n$  does not divide  $a$  and  $n$  does not divide  $b$ .
4. Prove that for all integers  $n \geq 1$ ,  $3|(2^{2n} - 1)$ .
5. Prove the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic, that every integer  $n \geq 2$  has a unique prime factorization (i.e. prove that the prime factorization from the last proof is unique).

### 1.4 References

Most of this content may be found in Chapter 1 of [Ger12], though many of the examples are my own. [Lak16] is also a great resource. In particular, the content on induction comes from there. Unfortunately the latter text is not freely available online or at U of T.

## 2 Set theory

### 2.1 Basics

For our purposes, we define a *set* to be a collection of mathematical objects. If  $S$  is a set and  $x$  is one of the objects in the set, we say  $x$  is an element of  $S$  and denote it by  $x \in S$ . The set of no elements is called empty set and is denoted by  $\emptyset$ .

**Definition 2.1** (Subsets, Union, Intersection) *Let  $S, T$  be sets.*

- We say that  $S$  is a subset of  $T$ , denoted  $S \subseteq T$ , if  $s \in S$  implies  $s \in T$ .
- We say that  $S = T$  if  $S \subseteq T$  and  $T \subseteq S$ .
- We define the union of  $S$  and  $T$ , denoted  $S \cup T$ , as all the elements that are in either  $S$  or  $T$ .
- We define the intersection of  $S$  and  $T$ , denoted  $S \cap T$ , as all the elements that are in both  $S$  and  $T$ .
- We say that  $S$  and  $T$  are disjoint if  $S \cap T = \emptyset$ .

**Example 2.2**  $\mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{N}_0 \subset \mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{C}$

**Example 2.3** Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $a < b$ .

Open interval:  $(a, b) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a < x < b\}$  ( $a, b$  may be  $-\infty$  or  $+\infty$ )

Closed interval:  $[a, b] := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a \leq x \leq b\}$

We can also define half-open intervals.

**Example 2.4** Let  $A = \{x \in \mathbb{N} : 3|x\}$  and  $B = \{x \in \mathbb{N} : 6|x\}$  Show that  $B \subseteq A$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in B$ . Then  $6|x$ , i.e.  $\exists j \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $x = 6j$ . Therefore  $x = 3(2j)$ , so  $3|x$ . Thus  $x \in A$ .  $\square$

**Definition 2.5** Let  $A, B \subseteq X$ . We define the set-theoretic difference of  $A$  and  $B$ , denoted  $A \setminus B$  (sometimes  $A - B$ ) as the elements of  $X$  that are in  $A$  but not in  $B$ .

The complement of a set  $A \subseteq X$  is the set  $A^c := X \setminus A$ .

We extend the definition of union and intersection to an arbitrary family of sets as follows:

**Definition 2.6** Let  $S_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in A$ , be a family of sets.  $A$  is called the index set. We define

$$\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha := \{x : \exists \alpha \text{ such that } x \in S_\alpha\},$$

$$\bigcap_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha := \{x : x \in S_\alpha \text{ for all } \alpha \in A\}.$$

**Example 2.7**

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [-n, n] = \mathbb{R}$$

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right) = \{0\}$$

**Theorem 2.8** (De Morgan's Laws) Let  $\{S_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$  be an arbitrary collection of sets. Then

$$\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha\right)^c = \bigcap_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha^c \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha\right)^c = \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha^c$$

*Proof.* For the first part: Let  $x \in \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha\right)^c$ . This is true if and only if  $x \notin \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha\right)$ , or in other words  $x \in S_\alpha^c$  for all  $\alpha \in A$ . This is true if and only if  $x \in \bigcap_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha^c$ , which gives the result.

The second part is similar and is left as an exercise.  $\square$

Since a set is itself a mathematical object, a set can itself contain sets.

**Definition 2.9** The power set  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  of a set  $S$  is the set of all subsets of  $S$ .

**Example 2.10** Let  $S = \{a, b, c\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}(S) = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, c\}, S\}$ .

Another way of building a new set from two old ones is the Cartesian product of two sets.

**Definition 2.11** Let  $S, T$  be sets. The Cartesian product  $S \times T$  is defined as the set of tuples with elements from  $S, T$ , i.e

$$S \times T = \{(s, t) : s \in S \text{ and } t \in T\}.$$

This can also be extended inductively to a finite family of sets.

## 2.2 Ordered sets

**Definition 2.12** A relation  $R$  on a set  $X$  is a subset of  $X \times X$ . We say that  $x \leq y$  if  $(x, y) \in R$ . A relation  $\leq$  is called a partial order on  $X$  if it satisfies

1. Reflexivity:  $x \leq x$  for all  $x \in X$
2. Transitivity: for  $x, y, z \in X$ ,  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq z$  implies  $x \leq z$
3. Anti-symmetry: for  $x, y \in X$ ,  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq x$  implies  $x = y$

The pair  $(X, \leq)$  is called a partially ordered set.

A chain or totally ordered set  $C \subseteq X$  is a subset with the property  $x \leq y$  or  $y \leq x$  for any  $x, y \in C$ .

**Example 2.13** The real numbers with the usual ordering,  $(\mathbb{R}, \leq)$ , are totally ordered.

**Example 2.14** The power set of a set  $X$  with the ordering given by subsets,  $(\mathcal{P}(X), \subseteq)$  is partially ordered set.

**Example 2.15** Let  $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ . What is  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ ? Find a chain in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ .

$$\mathcal{P}(X) = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{d\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{c, d\}, \{b, d\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{b, c, d\}, \{a, b, d\}, \{a, c, d\}, X\}$$

An example of a chain  $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is  $C = \{\emptyset, \{b\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}, X\}$

**Example 2.16** Consider the set  $C([0, 1], \mathbb{R}) := \{f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : f \text{ is continuous}\}$ .

For two functions  $f, g \in C([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ , we define the ordering as  $f \leq g$  if  $f(x) \leq g(x)$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Then  $(C([0, 1], \mathbb{R}), \leq)$  is a partially ordered set. Can you think of a chain that is a subset of  $(C([0, 1], \mathbb{R}), \leq)$ ?

**Definition 2.17** A non-empty partially ordered set  $(X, \leq)$  is well-ordered if every non-empty subset  $A \subseteq X$  has a minimum element.

Recall that we already saw that  $\mathbb{N}$  is well-ordered, as we used it to prove the principle of mathematical induction.  $\mathbb{R}$  with the usual order does not have this property.

Having a partially ordered set allows us to talk about upper and lower bounds.

**Definition 2.18** Let  $(X, \leq)$  be a partially ordered set and  $S \subseteq X$ . Then  $x \in X$  is an upper bound for  $S$  if for all  $s \in S$  we have  $x \leq s$ . Similarly  $y \in X$  is a lower bound for  $S$  if for all  $s \in S$ ,  $y \leq s$ . If there exists an upper bound for  $S$ , we call  $S$  bounded above and if there exists a lower bound for  $S$ , we call  $S$  bounded below. If  $S$  is bounded above and bounded below, we say  $S$  is bounded.

We can also ask if there exists a least upper bound or a greatest lower bound.

**Definition 2.19** Let  $(X, \leq)$  be a partially ordered set and  $S \subseteq X$ . We call  $x \in X$  least upper bound or supremum, denoted  $x = \sup S$ , if  $x$  is an upper bound and for any other upper bound  $y \in X$  of  $S$  we have  $x \leq y$ . Likewise  $x \in X$  is the greatest lower bound or infimum for  $S$ , denoted  $x = \inf S$ , if it is a lower bound and for any other lower bound  $y \in X$ ,  $y \leq x$ .

Note that the supremum and infimum of a bounded set do not necessarily need to exist. However, if they do exist they are unique, which justifies the article *the* (see Exercise 4). Nevertheless, the reals have a remarkable property, which we will take as an axiom.

**Axiom 2.20** [Completeness Axiom] *Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be bounded above. Then there exists  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $r = \sup S$ , i.e.  $S$  has a least upper bound.*

By setting  $S' = -S := \{-s : s \in S\}$  and noting  $\inf S = -\sup S'$ , we obtain a similar statement for infima if  $S$  is bounded below. As mentioned above, this property is fairly special, for example it fails for the rationals.

**Example 2.21** *Let  $S = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} : q^2 < 7\}$ . Then  $S$  is bounded above in  $\mathbb{Q}$ , but there exists no least upper bound in  $\mathbb{Q}$ .*

There is a nice alternative characterization for suprema in the real numbers.

**Proposition 2.22** *Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be bounded above. Then  $r = \sup S$  if and only if  $r$  is an upper bound and for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists an  $s \in S$  such that  $r - \epsilon < s$ .*

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) We will prove the forward direction ( $\Rightarrow$ ) by contrapositive. Suppose  $r$  is either not an upper bound or there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $s \in S$ ,  $r - \epsilon \geq s$ . In the first case,  $r$  is not the supremum by definition. In the second case,  $r - \epsilon$  is an upper bound which is smaller than  $r$ . Thus  $r \neq \sup S$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) For the backward direction we will proceed by contradiction. Suppose  $r$  is an upper bound and for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists an  $s \in S$  such that  $r - \epsilon < s$ , but  $r \neq \sup S$ . Then  $\sup S < r$  or equivalently  $r - \sup S > 0$ . Then by assumption there exists an  $s \in S$  such that  $\sup S = r - (r - \sup S) < s$ , which contradicts the definition of supremum.  $\square$

Using the same trick, we may obtain a similar result for infima.

**Proposition 2.23** *Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be bounded below. Then  $r = \inf S$  if and only if  $r$  is a lower bound and for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists an  $s \in S$  such that  $r + \epsilon > s$ .*

**Example 2.24** *Consider  $S = \{1/n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Then  $\sup S = 1$  and  $\inf S = 0$ .*

## 2.3 Functions

One way to define a function is as follows :

**Definition 2.25** ([Run05, Definition 1.1.14]) *A function  $f$  from a set  $X$  to a set  $Y$  is a subset of  $X \times Y$  with the properties:*

1. *For every  $x \in X$ , there exists a  $y \in Y$  such that  $(x, y) \in f$*
2. *If  $(x, y) \in f$  and  $(x, z) \in f$ , then  $y = z$ .*

$X$  is called the domain of  $f$ .

How does this connect to other descriptions of functions you may have seen? Instead of writing  $f \subseteq X \times Y$ , we often write  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $x \mapsto y$ , where  $(x, y) \in f$ .

**Example 2.26** *For a set  $X$ , the identity function is:*

$$1_X : X \rightarrow X, \quad x \mapsto x$$

**Definition 2.27** (Image and pre-image) *Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $A \subseteq X$  and  $B \subseteq Y$ . The image of  $f$  is the set  $f(A) := \{f(x) : x \in A\}$  and the pre-image of  $f$  is the set  $f^{-1}(B) := \{x : f(x) \in B\}$*

The following re-statements of the above may be helpful way to think about it for proofs:

If  $y \in f(A)$ , then  $y \in Y$ , and there exists an  $x \in A$  such that  $y = f(x)$ .

If  $x \in f^{-1}(B)$ , then  $x \in X$  and  $f(x) \in B$ .

**Definition 2.28** (Surjective, injective and bijective) Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , where  $X$  and  $Y$  are sets. Then

- $f$  is injective if  $x_1 \neq x_2$  implies  $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$
- $f$  is surjective if for every  $y \in Y$ , there exists an  $x \in X$  such that  $y = f(x)$
- $f$  is bijective if it is both injective and surjective

**Example 2.29** Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $x \mapsto x^2$ .

If  $X = \mathbb{R}$  and  $Y = [0, \infty)$ :  $f$  is surjective.

If  $X = [0, \infty)$  and  $Y = \mathbb{R}$ :  $f$  is injective.

If  $X = Y = [0, \infty)$ :  $f$  is bijective.

If  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}$ , then  $f$  is neither surjective nor injective.

**Proposition 2.30** Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $A \subseteq X$ . Prove that  $A \subseteq f^{-1}(f(A))$ , with equality if  $f$  is injective.

*Proof.* First we show  $A \subseteq f^{-1}(f(A))$ . Let  $x \in A$ . Let  $B = f(A)$ ,  $B \subseteq Y$ . By definition,  $f(x) \in B$ . So then again by definition,  $x \in f^{-1}(B)$ . Thus  $x \in f^{-1}(f(A))$ .

Next, suppose  $f$  is injective. We have already shown that  $A \subseteq f^{-1}(f(A))$ , so it remains to show that  $f^{-1}(f(A)) \subseteq A$ . Let  $x \in f^{-1}(f(A))$ . Then  $f(x) \in f(A)$  by the definition of the pre-image. This means that there exists a  $\tilde{x} \in A$  such that  $f(x) = f(\tilde{x})$ . Since  $f$  is injective, we have  $x = \tilde{x}$ , and hence  $x \in A$ .  $\square$

## 2.4 Cardinality

Intuitively, the *cardinality* of a set  $A$ , denoted  $|A|$ , is the number of elements in the set. For sets with only a finite number of elements, this intuition is correct. We call a set with finitely many elements finite.

We say that the empty set has cardinality 0 and is finite.

**Proposition 2.31** If  $X$  is finite set of cardinality  $n$ , then the cardinality of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is  $2^n$ .

*Proof.* We proceed by induction. First, suppose  $n = 0$ . Then  $X = \emptyset$ , and  $\mathcal{P}(X) = \{\emptyset\}$  which has cardinality  $1 = 2^0$ .

Next, suppose that the claim holds for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Let  $X$  have  $n + 1$  elements. Let's call them  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}\}$ . Then we can split  $X$  up into subsets  $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  and  $B = \{x_{n+1}\}$ . By the inductive hypothesis,  $\mathcal{P}(A)$  has cardinality  $2^n$ . Any subset of  $X$  must either be a subset of  $A$  or contain  $x_{n+1}$ . How many subsets are there for the latter form? Let's count them out. Each subset will be formed by taking elements from  $A$  and combining them with  $x_{n+1}$ . We start with no elements from  $A$  and count up to all of them:

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 + \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} + \binom{n}{n} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \\ &= 2^n \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the total number of elements in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is the number of subsets of  $A$  ( $2^n$ ) plus the number of mixed subsets ( $2^n$ ), i.e. the cardinality of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is  $2^n + 2^n = 2^{n+1}$ .

Thus the claim holds by induction.  $\square$

Note: you do not need to prove this by induction. There are other ways to do it. You can try to prove it without using induction as an exercise.

**Definition 2.32** Two sets  $A$  and  $B$  have same cardinality,  $|A| = |B|$ , if there exists bijection  $f : A \rightarrow B$ .

**Example 2.33** Which is bigger,  $\mathbb{N}$  or  $\mathbb{N}_0$ ?

Intuitively, it seems that  $\mathbb{N}_0$  should be bigger, since it includes exactly one more element than  $\mathbb{N}$ , namely 0. However, clearly the function  $f : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  defined by  $n \mapsto n + 1$  is a bijection. Therefore  $\mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  have the same cardinality! One way to think about this is that  $\mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  are the “same size” of infinity.

It may sometimes be difficult to find such a bijection. However you can also use the following definition and theorem to instead show that two sets have the same cardinality by finding two injective functions between them.

**Definition 2.34** We say that the cardinality of a set  $A$  is less than the cardinality of a set  $B$ , denoted  $|A| \leq |B|$  if there exists an injection  $f : A \rightarrow B$ .

**Theorem 2.35** (Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein) Let  $A, B$ , be sets. If  $|A| \leq |B|$  and  $|B| \leq |A|$ , then  $|A| = |B|$ .

Proof is omitted. See [Run05, Theorem 1.2.7]

**Example 2.36**  $|\mathbb{N}| = |\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}|$

*Proof.* First, we show  $|\mathbb{N}| \leq |\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}|$ . The function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  defined by  $n \mapsto (n, 1)$  is an injection, thus  $|\mathbb{N}| \leq |\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}|$ .

Next, we show  $|\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}| \leq |\mathbb{N}|$ . We define the function  $g : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  by  $(n, m) \mapsto 2^n 3^m$ . Why is this an injection? Assume we have  $n_1, n_2, m_1, m_2$  such that  $2^{n_1} 3^{m_1} = 2^{n_2} 3^{m_2}$ . We need to show  $n_1 = n_2$  and  $m_1 = m_2$ . By the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic, every natural number greater than 1 has a unique prime factorization, so therefore the result must hold.  $\square$

**Definition 2.37** Let  $A$  be a set.

1.  $A$  is finite if there exists an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and a bijection  $f : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow A$
2.  $A$  is countably infinite if there exists a bijection  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$
3.  $A$  is countable if it is finite or countably infinite
4.  $A$  is uncountable otherwise

**Example 2.38** The rational numbers are countable, and in fact  $|\mathbb{Q}| = |\mathbb{N}|$ .

Let's look at  $\mathbb{Q}^+ := \{x \in \mathbb{Q} : x > 0\}$ . The fact that the rationals are countable relies on this famous way of listing the rational numbers:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} & \dots \\
 2 & \frac{2}{2} & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{4} & \frac{2}{5} & \dots \\
 3 & \frac{3}{2} & \frac{3}{3} & \frac{3}{4} & \frac{3}{5} & \dots \\
 4 & \frac{4}{2} & \frac{4}{3} & \frac{4}{4} & \frac{4}{5} & \dots \\
 \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots
 \end{array}$$

This is a map from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $\mathbb{Q}^+$ . As long as we skip any fraction that is already in our list as we go along, it is injective. Since we can find an injection from  $\mathbb{Q}^+$  to  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  (take  $q/p \mapsto (q, p)$ ), and  $|\mathbb{N}| = |\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}|$  by Example 2.36, we have that  $|\mathbb{Q}^+| = |\mathbb{N}|$ .

We can extend this to  $\mathbb{Q}$ . To do so, let  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^+$  be a bijection (which exists by the previous part). Then we can define another bijection  $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  by setting  $g(1) = 0$  and

$$g(n) = \begin{cases} f(n) & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ -f(n) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

for  $n > 1$ .

Next we show that  $\mathbb{N}$  is “smaller” than  $(0, 1)$ .

**Theorem 2.39** *The cardinality of  $\mathbb{N}$  is smaller than that of  $(0, 1)$ .*

*Proof.* First, we show that there is an injective map from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $(0, 1)$ . The map  $n \rightarrow \frac{1}{n}$  fulfils this.

Next, we show that there is no surjective map from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $(0, 1)$ . We use the fact that every number  $r \in (0, 1)$  has a binary expansion of the form  $r = 0.\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots$  where  $\sigma_i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Now we suppose in order to derive a contradiction that there does exist a surjective map  $f$  from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $(0, 1)$ , i.e. for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $f(n) = 0.\sigma_1(n)\sigma_2(n)\sigma_3(n)\dots$ . This means we can list out the binary expansions, for example like

$$\begin{aligned} f(1) &= 0.\textcolor{red}{0}0000000\dots \\ f(2) &= 0.\textcolor{red}{1}1111111\dots \\ f(3) &= 0.01\textcolor{red}{0}1010101\dots \\ f(4) &= 0.101\textcolor{red}{0}101010\dots \end{aligned}$$

We will construct a number  $\tilde{r} \in (0, 1)$  that is not in the image of  $f$ . Define  $\tilde{r} = 0.\tilde{\sigma}_1\tilde{\sigma}_2\dots$ , where we define the  $n$ th entry of  $\tilde{r}$  to be the the opposite of the  $n$ th entry of the  $n$ th item in our list:

$$\tilde{\sigma}_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sigma_n(n) = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma_n(n) = 1. \end{cases}$$

Then  $\tilde{r}$  differs from  $f(n)$  at least in the  $n$ th digit of its binary expansion for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence,  $\tilde{r} \notin f(\mathbb{N})$ , which is a contradiction to  $f$  being surjective. This technique is often referred to as Cantor’s diagonal argument.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.40**  *$(0, 1)$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  have the same cardinality.*

*Proof.* The map  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$  defined by  $x \mapsto \frac{1}{\pi} (\arctan(x) + \frac{\pi}{2})$  is a bijection.  $\square$

We have shown that there are different sizes of infinity, as the cardinality of  $\mathbb{N}$  is infinite but still smaller than that of  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $(0, 1)$ . In fact, we have

$$|\mathbb{N}| = |\mathbb{N}_0| = |\mathbb{Z}| = |\mathbb{Q}| < |\mathbb{R}|.$$

Because of this, there are special symbols for these two cardinalities: The cardinality of  $\mathbb{N}$  is denoted  $\aleph_0$ , while the cardinality of  $\mathbb{R}$  is denoted  $\mathfrak{c}$ .

## 2.5 Exercises

1. Let  $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x < 100\}$ ,  $B = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} : |x| \geq 20\}$ , and  $C = \{y \in \mathbb{N} : y \text{ is prime}\}$  ( $A, B, C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ). Find  $A \cap B$ ,  $B^c \cap C$ ,  $B \cup C$ , and  $(A \cup B)^c$ .
2. Is  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  with the ordering  $(x_1, y_1) \preceq (x_2, y_2)$  if  $x_1 \leq x_2$  a partially ordered set?
3. [Run05, Exercise 1.3.1] Let  $S$  be a non-empty set. A relation  $R$  on  $S$  is called an equivalence relation if it is
  - (i) Reflexive:  $(x, x) \in R$  for all  $x \in S$
  - (ii) Symmetric: if  $(x, y) \in R$  then  $(y, x) \in R$  for all  $x, y \in S$
  - (iii) Transitive: if  $(x, y), (y, z) \in R$  then  $(x, z) \in R$  for all  $x, y, z \in S$

Given  $x \in S$ , the equivalence class of  $x$  (with respect to a given equivalence relation  $R$ ) is defined to consist of those  $y \in S$  for which  $(x, y) \in R$ . Show that two equivalence classes are either disjoint or identical.

4. Let  $(X, \leq)$  be a partially ordered set and  $S \subseteq X$  be bounded. Show that the infimum and supremum of  $S$  are unique (if they exist).
5. Let  $S, T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and suppose both are bounded above. Define  $S + T = \{s + t : s \in S, t \in T\}$ . Show that  $S + T$  is bounded above and  $\sup(S + T) = \sup S + \sup T$ .
6. Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be defined by the map  $x \mapsto \sin(x)$ . For what choices of  $X$  and  $Y$  is  $f$  injective, surjective, bijective, or neither?
7. Show that for sets  $A, B \subseteq X$  and  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $f(A \cap B) \subseteq f(A) \cap f(B)$ .
8. Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $B \subseteq Y$ . Prove that  $f(f^{-1}(B)) \subseteq B$ , with equality iff  $f$  is surjective.
9. Prove that :
  - (a)  $f(\cup_{i \in I} A_i) = \cup_{i \in I} f(A_i)$ , where  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $A_i \subseteq X \forall i \in I$
  - (b)  $f^{-1}(\cup_{i \in I} B_i) = \cup_{i \in I} f^{-1}(B_i)$ , where  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $B_i \subseteq Y \forall i \in I$
10. Show that  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}$  have the same cardinality.
11. Show that  $|(0, 1)| = |(1, \infty)|$ .

## 2.6 References

The content in this section mostly follows [Run05], but is supplemented by [Mar19] (ordered sets) and [Zwi22] (introductory set theory).

## 3 Metric spaces and sequences

### 3.1 Metric spaces

**Definition 3.1** A metric on a set  $X$  is a function  $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that satisfies:

- (a) *Positive definiteness:*  $d(x, y) \geq 0$  for  $x, y \in X$  and  $d(x, y) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = y$
- (b) *Symmetry:* for  $x, y \in X$ ,  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$
- (c) *Triangle inequality:* for  $x, y, z \in X$ ,  $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$

A set together with a metric is called a metric space.

**Example 3.2**  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with the Euclidean distance

$$d(x, y) = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - y_j)^2} \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

is a metric space.

Many metric spaces we know are in fact normed spaces, which have more structure than metric spaces. We will briefly discuss normed spaces. This assumes some knowledge of vector spaces, which we will discuss in a further section. In particular, we denote a field by  $\mathbb{F}$ . For now, we can think of this as  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ .

**Definition 3.3** A norm on an  $\mathbb{F}$ -vector space  $E$  is a function  $\|\cdot\| : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that satisfies:

- (a) *Positive definiteness:*  $\|x\| \geq 0$  for  $x \in E$  and  $\|x\| = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = 0$
- (b) *Homogeneity:* for  $x \in E$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$ ,  $\|\alpha x\| = |\alpha| \|x\|$



(c) *Triangle inequality*: for  $x, y \in E$ ,  $\|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\|$

A vector space with a norm is called a *normed space*. A normed space is a metric space using the metric  $d(x, y) = \|x - y\|$ .

**Example 3.4** The  $p$ -norm is defined for  $p \geq 1$  for a vector  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  as

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

The infinity norm is the limit of the  $p$ -norm as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ , defined as

$$\|x\|_\infty = \max_{i=1, \dots, n} |x_i|.$$

If we look at the space of continuous functions  $C([0, 1]; \mathbb{R})$ , the  $p$ -norm is

$$\|f\|_p = \left( \int_0^1 |f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p}$$

and the  $\infty$ -norm (or sup norm) is

$$\|f\|_\infty = \max_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x)|.$$

**Definition 3.5** A subset  $A$  of a metric space  $(X, d)$  is *bounded* if there exists  $M > 0$  such that  $d(x, y) < M$  for all  $x, y \in A$ .

**Definition 3.6** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. We define the *open ball* centred at a point  $x_0 \in X$  of radius  $r > 0$  as

$$B_r(x_0) := \{x \in X : d(x, x_0) < r\}.$$

**Example 3.7** In  $\mathbb{R}$  with the usual norm (absolute value), open balls are symmetric open intervals, i.e.  $B_r(x_0) = (x_0 - r, x_0 + r)$ .

**Example 3.8** Consider  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with the taxicab or Manhattan metric (1-norm)  $d(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^2 |x_i - y_i|$ , the usual Euclidean distance (2-norm)  $d(x, y) = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^2 (x_j - y_j)^2}$ , and the  $\infty$ -norm  $d(x, y) = \max_{j=1, 2} |x_j - y_j|$ . The open ball  $B_r(0)$  in these three metric spaces is shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 1:  $B_r(0)$  for different metrics

**Definition 3.9** (Open and closed sets) *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space.*

- A set  $U \subseteq X$  is open if for every  $x \in U$  there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $B_\epsilon(x) \subseteq U$ .
- A set  $F \subseteq X$  is closed if  $F^c := X \setminus F$  is open.

We note that  $\emptyset$  and  $X$  are both open and closed!

**Proposition 3.10** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space.*

- (i) *Let  $A_1, A_2 \subseteq X$ . If  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are open, then  $A_1 \cap A_2$  is open.*
- (ii) *If  $A_i \subseteq X$ ,  $i \in I$  are open, then  $\cup_{i \in I} A_i$  is open.*

*Proof.* (i) Since  $A_1$  is open, for each  $x \in A_1$ , there exists an  $\epsilon_1 > 0$  such that  $B_{\epsilon_1}(x) \subseteq A_1$ . Since  $A_2$  is open, for each  $x \in A_2$ , there exists an  $\epsilon_2 > 0$  such that  $B_{\epsilon_2}(x) \subseteq A_2$ . Let  $x \in A_1 \cap A_2$ . Choose  $\epsilon = \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2\}$ . Then  $B_\epsilon(x) \subseteq A_1 \cap A_2$  as required.

(ii) Let  $x \in \cup_{i \in I} A_i$ . Then there exists  $i \in I$  such that  $x \in A_i$ , and since  $A_i$  is open there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $B_\epsilon(x) \subseteq A_i$ . Since  $A_i \subseteq \cup_{i \in I} A_i$ , we are done.  $\square$

Using DeMorgan, we immediately have the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.11** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space.*

- (i) *Let  $A_1, A_2 \subseteq X$ . If  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are closed, then  $A_1 \cup A_2$  is closed.*
- (ii) *If  $A_i \subseteq X$ ,  $i \in I$  are closed, then  $\cap_{i \in I} A_i$  is closed.*

**Definition 3.12** (Interior and closure) *Let  $A \subseteq X$  where  $(X, d)$  is a metric space.*

- The closure of  $A$  is  $\bar{A} := \{x \in X : \forall \epsilon > 0, B_\epsilon(x) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$
- The interior of  $A$  is  $\overset{\circ}{A} := \{x \in X : \exists \epsilon > 0 \text{ s.t. } B_\epsilon(x) \subseteq A\}$
- The boundary of  $A$  is  $\partial A := \{x \in X : \forall \epsilon > 0, B_\epsilon(x) \cap A \neq \emptyset \text{ and } B_\epsilon(x) \cap A^c \neq \emptyset\}$

The closure of a set is the smallest closed set that contains it while the interior of a set is the largest open set contained by it.

**Example 3.13** *Let  $X = (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  with the ordinary (Euclidean) metric. Then  $\bar{X} = [a, b]$ ,  $\overset{\circ}{X} = (a, b)$  and  $\partial X = \{a, b\}$ .*

**Proposition 3.14** *Let  $A \subseteq X$  where  $(X, d)$  is a metric space. Then  $\overset{\circ}{A} = A \setminus \partial A$ .*

*Proof.* First, we show  $\overset{\circ}{A} \subseteq A \setminus \partial A$ . Let  $x \in \overset{\circ}{A}$ . Then by definition  $\exists \epsilon > 0$  s.t.  $B_\epsilon(x) \subseteq A$ . Clearly  $x \in A$  and also  $\exists \epsilon > 0$  such that  $B_\epsilon(x) \cap A^c = \emptyset$ . Thus by definition,  $x \notin \partial A$ . Thus  $x \in A \setminus \partial A$ .

Next, we show  $A \setminus \partial A \subseteq \overset{\circ}{A}$ . Let  $x \in A \setminus \partial A$ . Then  $x \in A$  and  $x \notin \partial A$ . The latter means that  $\exists \epsilon > 0$  such that  $B_\epsilon(x) \cap A = \emptyset$  or  $B_\epsilon(x) \cap A^c = \emptyset$ . Since  $x \in A$ ,  $x \in B_\epsilon(x) \cap A$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , so the former cannot be true. Therefore  $\exists \epsilon > 0$  such that  $B_\epsilon(x) \cap A^c = \emptyset$ , i.e.  $B_\epsilon(x) \subseteq A$ . Thus  $x \in \overset{\circ}{A}$ .  $\square$

## 3.2 Sequences

**Definition 3.15** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. A sequence is an ordered list of points  $x_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , in  $X$ , denoted  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . We say that a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to a point  $x \in X$  if*

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists n_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } d(x_n, x) < \epsilon \text{ for all } n \geq n_\epsilon.$$

**Proposition 3.16** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space, and let  $A \subseteq X$ . Then  $\bar{A}$  is equal to the set of points in  $X$  which are limits of a sequence in  $A$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \bar{A}$ . Then by definition, for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $B_\epsilon(x) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ . In particular this is true for  $\epsilon = 1/n$ . Thus, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we can choose an  $x_n \in A$  such that  $x_n \in B_{1/n}(x)$ , which means  $d(x, x_n) < \frac{1}{n}$  by the definition of an open ball. Since  $1/n$  decreases monotonically to zero, we must have  $x_n \rightarrow x$ .

Let  $x \in X$  be the limit of a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in A$ . Then for  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists n_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $d(x_n, x) < \epsilon$  for all  $n \geq n_\epsilon$ . This means  $x_n \in B_\epsilon(x)$ , and since  $x_n \in A$ ,  $B_\epsilon(x) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ . Thus  $x \in \bar{A}$ .  $\square$

Combining this result with the fact that  $A \subseteq X$  is closed if and only if  $A = \bar{A}$  (exercise), gives the following useful way to characterize closed sets.

**Corollary 3.17** *A set  $F \subseteq X$ , where  $(X, d)$  is a metric space, is closed if and only if every sequence in  $F$  which converges in  $X$  converges to a point in  $F$ .*

We also define a concept related to the closure of a set: a cluster or accumulation point.

**Definition 3.18** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and  $A \subseteq X$ . A point  $x \in X$  is a cluster point of  $A$  (also called accumulation point) if for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $B_\epsilon(x)$  contains infinitely many points in  $A$ .*

**Proposition 3.19**  *$x \in X$  is a cluster point of  $A \subseteq X$  where  $(X, d)$  is a metric space if and only if there exists a sequence of points  $x_n \in A$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that  $x_n \rightarrow x$ .*

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose there exists a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $A$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow x$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , by the definition of a convergent sequence,  $B_\epsilon(x)$  contains infinitely many elements of the sequence  $x_n$  (in particular,  $\exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x_n \in B_\epsilon(x)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ ). Since each  $x_n \in A$ ,  $x$  is a cluster point of  $A$ .

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose  $x$  is a cluster point of  $A$ . Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists x_\epsilon \in A$  such that  $x_\epsilon \in B_\epsilon(x)$ . In particular, take  $\epsilon = 1/n$ . Then  $\exists x_n \in A$  such that  $x_n \in B_{1/n}(x)$ . By construction, such  $x_n$  form a sequence in  $A$  that converges to  $x$ .  $\square$

Combining Proposition 3.16 and Proposition 3.19 gives the following:

**Corollary 3.20** *For  $A \subseteq X$ ,  $(X, d)$  a metric space, we have  $\bar{A} = A \cup \{x \in X : x \text{ is a cluster point of } A\}$ .*

### 3.2.1 Cauchy sequences

**Definition 3.21** (Cauchy sequence) *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. A sequence denoted  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in X$  is called a Cauchy sequence if*

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists n_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } d(x_n, x_m) < \epsilon \text{ for all } n, m \geq n_\epsilon.$$

**Proposition 3.22** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space, and let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a convergent sequence in  $X$ . Then  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy.*

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be arbitrary. Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a convergent sequence in a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then there exists  $n_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $d(x_n, x) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$  for all  $n \geq n_\epsilon$ . Then for  $n, m \geq n_\epsilon$ , using the triangle inequality we have

$$d(x_n, x_m) \leq d(x_n, x) + d(x, x_m) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon.$$

Thus  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy.  $\square$

**Definition 3.23** *A metric space where every Cauchy sequence converges (to a point in the space) is called complete.*

In addition, a normed space that is complete with respect to the metric induced by the norm is called a *Banach space*.  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with the Euclidean distance is complete (and is, in fact, a Banach space).

**Proposition 3.24** ([Run05, Proposition 2.4.5]) *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space, and let  $Y \subseteq X$ .*

(i) *If  $X$  is complete and if  $Y$  is closed in  $X$ , then  $Y$  is complete.*

(ii) If  $Y$  is complete, then it is closed in  $X$ .

*Proof.* (i) Let  $X$  be a complete metric space and  $Y$  be a closed subset of  $X$ . Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $Y$ . Since  $Y \subseteq X$ ,  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is also a Cauchy sequence in  $X$ . Therefore  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to an  $x \in X$  since  $X$  is complete. But since  $Y$  is closed, by Proposition 3.16, we must have  $x \in Y$ . Therefore  $Y$  is complete.

(ii) Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and let  $Y \subseteq X$  be complete. Let  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $Y$  that converges to some point  $y \in X$ . By Proposition 3.22,  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in  $X$  and therefore also in  $Y$ . Since  $Y$  is complete,  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to a point  $y' \in Y$ . Since sequences in metric spaces converge to unique points (see exercises),  $y = y'$ . Thus  $Y$  is closed by Corollary 3.17.  $\square$

### 3.2.2 Subsequences

**Definition 3.25** Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Let  $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of natural numbers with  $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ . The sequence  $(x_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is called a subsequence of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . If  $(x_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $x \in X$ , we call  $x$  a subsequential limit.

**Example 3.26** The sequence  $((-1)^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  diverges but the subsequences  $((-1)^{2n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $((-1)^{2n-1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converge to subsequential limits 1 and  $-1$ , respectively.

**Proposition 3.27** A sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in a metric space  $(X, d)$  converges to  $x \in X$  if and only if every subsequence of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  also converges to  $x$ .

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ) If every subsequence of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $x \in X$ , then  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  must converge to it as well, since a sequence is a subsequence of itself.

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $x \in X$  and let  $(x_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an arbitrary subsequence of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be arbitrary. There exists  $n_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $d(x_n, x) < \epsilon$  for all  $n \geq n_\epsilon$ . Choose  $k_\epsilon$  such that  $n_{k_\epsilon} \geq n_\epsilon$ , which must exist since  $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is strictly increasing. Then for all  $k \geq k_\epsilon$ ,  $d(x_{n_k}, x) < \epsilon$ . Thus  $(x_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $x$ .  $\square$

## 3.3 Continuity

**Definition 3.28** Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be metric spaces, let  $x_0 \in X$ , and let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ .  $f$  is continuous at  $x_0$  if for every sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $X$  that converges to  $x_0$ , we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = f(x_0)$ . We say that  $f$  is continuous if it is continuous at every point in  $X$ .

**Theorem 3.29** ([Run05, Theorem 2.3.7.]) Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be metric spaces, let  $x_0 \in X$ , and let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . The following are equivalent:

- (i)  $f$  is continuous at  $x_0$
- (ii) for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $d_Y(f(x), f(x_0)) < \epsilon$  for all  $x \in X$  with  $d_X(x, x_0) < \delta$
- (iii) for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  such that  $B_\delta(x_0) \subseteq f^{-1}(B_\epsilon(f(x_0)))$

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) We prove the contrapositive. Assume

$$\exists \epsilon_0 \text{ such that } \forall \delta > 0 \text{ there exists an } x_\delta \in X \text{ with } d_X(x_\delta, x_0) < \delta \text{ and } d_Y(f(x_\delta), f(x_0)) \geq \epsilon_0 \quad (\star)$$

We need to find a sequence in  $X$  that converges to  $x_0$  but the sequence of images does not converge. Let's construct such a sequence.

Let  $\delta = \frac{1}{n}$  in  $(\star)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then we can pick a sequence  $x_n := x_{1/n}$  given by  $(\star)$  which converges to  $x_0$ . However, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $d_Y(f(x_n), f(x_0)) \geq \epsilon_0$ , so we cannot have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = f(x_0)$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) Follows from the definitions of the pre-image and open balls.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $X$  that converges to  $x_0$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then by (iii), there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $B_\delta(x_0) \subseteq f^{-1}(B_\epsilon(f(x_0)))$ , i.e. if  $x$  is such that  $d_X(x, x_0) < \delta$ , then  $x$  is such that

$d_Y(f(x), f(x_0)) < \epsilon$ . By the definition of convergence, there exists an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $d(x_n, x_0) < \delta$  for all  $n \geq N$ . Then by (iii),  $d(f(x_n), f(x_0)) < \epsilon$  for all  $n \geq N$ . Thus  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = f(x_0)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.30** *Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be metric spaces and let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $f$  is continuous
- (ii) if  $U \subseteq Y$  is open, then  $f^{-1}(U)$  is open
- (iii) if  $F \subseteq Y$  is closed, then  $f^{-1}(F)$  is closed

*Note: the following proof uses the following results, which you may wish to prove as an exercise using techniques from the set theory section if they are not clear to you: Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be sets and  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . Let  $A, B \subseteq Y$ . Then*

1.  $A \subseteq B \implies f^{-1}(A) \subseteq f^{-1}(B)$
2.  $f^{-1}(Y \setminus A) = X \setminus f^{-1}(A)$

*Proof.* Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be metric spaces and let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ .

(i)  $\implies$  (ii): Suppose  $f$  is continuous (on every point in  $X$ ) and let  $U \subseteq Y$  be open. Let  $x \in f^{-1}(U)$ , then  $f(x) \in U$ , and since  $U$  is open, there exists  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  such that  $B_{\epsilon_0}(f(x)) \subseteq U$ . By Theorem 3.29(iii), there exists a  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that  $B_{\delta_0}(x) \subseteq f^{-1}(B_{\epsilon_0}(f(x)))$ . Since  $B_{\epsilon_0}(f(x)) \subseteq U$ ,  $f^{-1}(B_{\epsilon_0}(f(x))) \subseteq f^{-1}(U)$ . Thus for each  $x \in f^{-1}(U)$ , there exists  $\delta_0$  such that  $B_{\delta_0}(x) \subseteq f^{-1}(B_{\epsilon_0}(f(x))) \subseteq f^{-1}(U)$ , so  $f^{-1}(U)$  is open.

(ii)  $\implies$  (i): We want to prove that  $f$  is continuous at every  $x \in X$  using the definition from Theorem 3.29(iii), i.e. we must show that for  $x \in X$ , for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  such that  $B_\delta(x) \subseteq f^{-1}(B_\epsilon(f(x)))$ .

Let  $x \in X$  and let  $\epsilon > 0$  be arbitrary. Since  $B_\epsilon(f(x))$  is an open set, by (ii),  $f^{-1}(B_\epsilon(f(x)))$  is also open. Since  $x \in f^{-1}(B_\epsilon(f(x)))$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $B_\delta(x) \subseteq f^{-1}(B_\epsilon(f(x)))$  by the definition of a set being open, so we are done.

(ii)  $\implies$  (iii): Let  $F \subseteq Y$  be closed. Then  $Y \setminus F$  is open, so by (ii),  $f^{-1}(Y \setminus F)$  is open as well. Since  $f^{-1}(Y \setminus F) = X \setminus f^{-1}(F)$ ,  $f^{-1}(F)$  is closed.

(iii)  $\implies$  (ii) follows from the above, exchanging “open” and “closed”.

$\square$

**Definition 3.31** *Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be metric spaces and let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ .*

- $f$  is uniformly continuous if for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  with  $d_X(x_1, x_2) < \delta$ , we have  $d_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) < \epsilon$
- $f$  is Lipschitz continuous if there exists a  $K > 0$  such that for every  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  we have  $d_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \leq K d_X(x_1, x_2)$

**Proposition 3.32** *Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be metric spaces and let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ .*

$f$  is Lipschitz continuous  $\implies f$  is uniformly continuous  $\implies f$  is continuous

The proof is left as an exercise.

**Definition 3.33** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and let  $f : X \rightarrow X$ . We say that  $x^* \in X$  is a fixed point of  $f$  if  $f(x^*) = x^*$ .*

**Definition 3.34** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and let  $f : X \rightarrow X$ .  $f$  is a contraction if there exists a constant  $k \in [0, 1)$  such that for all  $x, y \in X$ ,  $d(f(x), f(y)) \leq k d(x, y)$ .*

Observe that a function is a contraction if and only if it is Lipschitz continuous with constant  $K < 1$ .

**Theorem 3.35** *Suppose that  $f : X \rightarrow X$  is a contraction and the metric space  $X$  is complete. Then  $f$  has a unique fixed point  $x^*$ .*

We omit the proof here; see [Pug15, p.240] for the proof as well as more details on how to find the fixed point.

**Example 3.36** Let  $f : [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}] \rightarrow [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}]$  be defined by the mapping  $x \mapsto x^2$ . Assume we use the standard Euclidean metric,  $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ .  $f$  has a unique fixed point because  $[-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}]$  is a complete metric space (see Proposition 3.24) and  $f$  is a contraction with Lipschitz constant  $2/3$ .

To see that it is a contraction, let  $x, y \in [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}]$ . Then

$$|x^2 - y^2| = |x + y||x - y| \leq \frac{2}{3}|x - y|.$$

### 3.4 Equivalence of metrics

**Definition 3.37** (Equivalent metrics) Two metrics  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  on a set  $X$  are equivalent if the identity maps from  $(X, d_1)$  to  $(X, d_2)$  and from  $(X, d_2)$  to  $(X, d_1)$  are continuous.

The following result follows from the definition and Corollary 3.30:

**Proposition 3.38** Two metrics  $d_1, d_2$  on a set  $X$  are equivalent if and only if they have the same open sets or the same closed sets.

So, in a certain sense, equivalent metrics induce the same structure.

**Definition 3.39** Two metrics  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  on a set  $X$  are strongly equivalent if for every  $x, y \in X$ , there exists constants  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$  such

$$\alpha d_1(x, y) \leq d_2(x, y) \leq \beta d_1(x, y).$$

If two metrics are strongly equivalent then they are equivalent. The proof of this is part of the exercises.

**Example 3.40** We show that the Euclidean distance (induced by 2-norm) and the metric induced by the  $\infty$ -norm are equivalent on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Let  $\|x - y\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - y_j)^2}$  be the Euclidean metric and  $\|x - y\|_\infty = \max_{j=1, \dots, n} |x_j - y_j|$  be the metric induced by the  $\infty$ -norm. We have

$$\|x - y\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - y_j)^2} \leq \sqrt{n \max_{j=1, \dots, n} (x_j - y_j)^2} = \sqrt{n} \max_{j=1, \dots, n} |x_j - y_j| = \sqrt{n} \|x - y\|_\infty$$

and

$$\|x - y\|_\infty = \max_{j=1, \dots, n} |x_j - y_j| = \sqrt{\max_{j=1, \dots, n} (x_j - y_j)^2} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - y_j)^2} = \|x - y\|_2.$$

Thus the two metrics are strongly equivalent.

### 3.5 Extra properties of $\mathbb{R}$

Using the definition of continuity in terms of  $\epsilon$ -balls and equipping  $\mathbb{R}$  with the metric induced by the absolute value, i.e.  $d(x, y) = |x - y|$  for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ , we obtain the usual  $\epsilon - \delta$  definition of continuity. Hence, a function  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous at  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  if for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|x_0 - y| < \delta$  implies  $|f(x_0) - f(y)| < \epsilon$ . Since  $\mathbb{R}$  is also totally ordered we can also talk about left and right continuity, by separating  $B_\epsilon(x) = (x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon) = (x - \epsilon, x] \cup [x, x + \epsilon)$ .

**Definition 3.41** Let  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

- $f$  is left continuous at  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  if for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\delta > 0$ , such  $|f(x_0) - f(x)| < \epsilon$  whenever  $x_0 - \delta < x < x_0$ .

- $f$  is right continuous at  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  if for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\delta > 0$ , such  $|f(x_0) - f(x)| < \epsilon$  whenever  $x_0 < x < x_0 + \delta$ .

We say that  $f$  is left continuous if it is left continuous at all points in the domain, and similar for right continuous.

Similar to the ordinary sense of continuity, one can describe left and right continuity in terms of sequences.

**Proposition 3.42** *A function  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous if and only if it is left and right continuous.*

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is both right and left continuous. Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be arbitrary. Then by the definition of left continuous, there exists a  $\delta_1 > 0$ , such  $|f(x_0) - f(x)| < \epsilon$  whenever  $x_0 - \delta_1 < x < x_0$ , and by the definition of right continuous, there exists a  $\delta_2 > 0$ , such  $|f(x_0) - f(x)| < \epsilon$  whenever  $x_0 < x < x_0 + \delta_2$ .

Let  $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ . Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|x_0 - x| < \delta$ . Then  $x_0 - \delta < x < x_0 + \delta$ .

Case 1: Suppose  $x < x_0$ . Then  $x_0 - \delta_1 < x < x_0$ , so  $|f(x_0) - f(x)| < \epsilon$ , so  $f$  is continuous.

Case 2: Suppose  $x > x_0$ . Then  $x_0 < x < x_0 + \delta_2$ , so  $|f(x_0) - f(x)| < \epsilon$ , so  $f$  is continuous.

If  $x = x_0$ , the result is trivial, so we conclude that  $f$  is continuous.

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Let  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be continuous. Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists \delta_0 > 0$  such that when  $x$  is such that  $|x - x_0| < \delta$ , then  $|f(x) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon$ .

For  $\epsilon > 0$  arbitrary, take  $\delta_0$  from the definition of  $f$  being continuous. Take  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x_0 < x < x_0 + \delta_0$ . Then  $x_0 - \delta_0 < x < x_0 + \delta_0$ , which implies  $|x - x_0| < \delta_0$ . Thus  $|f(x) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon$ , so  $f$  is right-continuous.

The proof for left-continuity is similar.  $\square$

Using the least upper bound property of sets, we can introduce the concepts of limit inferior and limit superior as the limit of infima and suprema when we view the sequence as a set. First, we recall what it means for a sequence to be bounded.

**Definition 3.43** *Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ . We call  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  bounded if there exists an  $M > 0$  such that  $|x_n| < M$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

This definition is equivalent to the set of sequence elements being bounded in the metric space setting. Similarly, one can talk about a sequence being bounded above or below in the order theoretic setting (see Section 2.2), by looking at the set of sequence elements. The next theorem is useful.

**Theorem 3.44** (Monotone convergence theorem)

- (i) *Suppose  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an increasing sequence, i.e.  $x_n \leq x_{n+1}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and that it is bounded (above). Then the sequence converges. Furthermore,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x_n$ , where  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x_n := \sup\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .*
- (ii) *Suppose  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a decreasing sequence, i.e.  $x_n \geq x_{n+1}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , which is bounded (below). Then the sequence converges and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x_n := \inf\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .*

The proof is omitted. We call increasing or decreasing sequences monotone, hence the theorem name.

If the sequence is increasing but not bounded above, then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \infty$ , and if it is decreasing but not bounded below, then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = -\infty$ .

We would like to use the monotone convergence theorem for arbitrary sequences. We do so by building an increasing sequence (or decreasing) sequence from an arbitrary one. First, we recall some facts about infima and suprema and introduce the convention that  $\sup A = \infty$  if  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is not bounded above and  $\inf A = -\infty$  if  $A$  is not bounded below.

**Lemma 3.45** *If  $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is non-empty, then  $\inf A \leq \sup A$ ,  $\sup A \leq \sup B$ , and  $\inf A \geq \inf B$ .*

The proof of this follows from the definition of greatest lower and least upper bound.

**Definition 3.46** Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ . We define the limit superior of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  as

$$\limsup x_n := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq n} x_k.$$

Similarly we define the limit inferior of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  as

$$\liminf x_n := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{k \geq n} x_k.$$

**Proposition 3.47** Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

- The sequence of suprema,  $s_n = \sup_{k \geq n} x_k$ , is decreasing and the sequence of infima,  $i_n = \inf_{k \geq n} x_k$ , is increasing.
- The limit superior and the limit inferior of a bounded sequence always exist and are finite.

*Proof.* The first part is true by Lemma 3.45. The second bullet point follows by the Monotone Convergence Theorem.  $\square$

Conceptually, we can think of the limit superior as the greatest cluster point of a sequence, and of the limit inferior as the least. If the sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is not bounded above, then  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \infty$ . Similarly, if the sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is not bounded below, then  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = -\infty$ . This is in line with our convention that  $\sup A = \infty$ , if  $A$  is not bounded above and  $\inf A = -\infty$ , if  $A$  not bounded below.

**Theorem 3.48** Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then the sequence converges to  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  if and only if  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$ .

*Proof.* For convenience, denote  $i_n := \inf_{k \geq n} x_k$  and  $s_n := \sup_{k \geq n} x_k$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since the sequence converges, there exists an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $|x - x_n| < \epsilon$ , i.e.  $x - \epsilon < x_n < x + \epsilon$ , for all  $n \geq N$ .

In particular,  $x - \epsilon < x_n$  for all  $n \geq N$ , so  $x - \epsilon$  is a lower bound for the set  $\{x_n : n \geq N\}$ . Therefore  $x - \epsilon \leq i_N$ .

Similarly, since  $x_n < x + \epsilon$  for all  $n \geq N$ ,  $x + \epsilon$  is an upper bound for the set  $\{x_n : n \geq N\}$ . Therefore  $s_N \leq x + \epsilon$ .

By Proposition 3.47 the sequence of infima is increasing and by the Monotone Convergence Theorem, its limit is given by the supremum of the sequence. Hence, we obtain

$$x - \epsilon \leq i_N \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} i_n = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n.$$

Similarly, since the sequence of suprema is decreasing and using the Monotone Convergence theorem again, we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq s_N < x + \epsilon.$$

Now observe that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$ , since  $i_n \leq s_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  by Lemma 3.45 (exercise:  $x_n \leq y_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  implies  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n$ ). Thus we have

$$x - \epsilon \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq x + \epsilon.$$

Since this holds for any  $\epsilon$ , the desired result follows.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Now suppose  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$ . We need to show that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$ .

Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then since  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = x$ , there exists an  $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $|s_n - x| < \epsilon$  for all  $n \geq N_1$ . In particular,

$$x_k \leq s_{N_1} < x + \epsilon \quad \text{for all } k \geq N_1.$$



Similarly, there exists  $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $|i_n - x| < \epsilon$  for all  $n \geq N_2$  giving

$$x - \epsilon < i_{N_2} \leq x_k \quad \text{for all } k \geq N_2.$$

Hence, by setting  $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$  we see  $x - \epsilon < x_k < x + \epsilon$  or equivalently  $|x_k - x| < \epsilon$  for all  $k \geq N$ , which proves the result.  $\square$

Note that we only talked about limit superior and limit inferior for real sequences. However, we can extend this easily to a sequence of functions  $f_n: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by setting  $f = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n$  to be the function defined pointwise by  $f(x) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (f_n(x))$  and similar for the limit inferior. There also exists a set theoretic version in terms of unions and intersections which you will encounter in probability.

### 3.6 Exercises

1. Show that the infinity norm  $\|x\|_\infty$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , defined in Example 3.4 is a norm.
2. Let  $(X, d)$  be any metric space, and define  $\tilde{d}: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) = \frac{d(x, y)}{1 + d(x, y)}, \quad x, y \in X.$$

Show that  $\tilde{d}$  is a metric on  $X$ .

3. Let  $X$  be a set and define  $d: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $d(x, x) = 0$  and  $d(x, y) = 1$  for  $x \neq y \in X$ . Prove that  $d$  is a metric on  $X$ . What do open balls look like for different radii  $r > 0$ ? What does an arbitrary open set look like?
4. Following up on Proposition 3.10 and Corollary 3.11: Show that the infinite intersection of open sets may not be open and that the infinite union of closed sets may not be closed.
5. Find the closure, interior, and boundary of the following sets using Euclidean distance:
  - (i)  $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y < x^2\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$
  - (ii)  $[0, 1) \times [0, 1) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$
  - (iii)  $\{0\} \cup \{1/n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$
6. Prove the following: Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in a metric space  $(X, d)$  that converges to a point  $x \in X$ . Then  $x$  is unique.
7. Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be sequences in  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow x$  and  $y_n \rightarrow y$ , with  $\alpha, x, y, \in \mathbb{R}$ .
  - (i) Show that  $\alpha x_n \rightarrow \alpha x$ .
  - (i) Show that  $x_n + y_n \rightarrow x + y$ .
8. Let  $(x_n), (y_n)$  be two convergent sequences in  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $x_n \leq y_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Show that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n$ .
9. Show that discrete metric spaces (i.e. those with the metric from exercise 3) are complete.
10. Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be metric spaces and let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ . Prove that

$$f \text{ is Lipschitz continuous} \Rightarrow f \text{ is uniformly continuous} \Rightarrow f \text{ is continuous.}$$

Provide examples to show that the other directions do not hold.

11. Show that the function  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left(x + \frac{5}{x}\right)$  has a unique fixed point on a subset of  $(0, \infty)$ . What is it? (Hint: you will have to restrict the interval in such a way that  $f$  is a contraction.)
12. Prove the following: If two metrics are strongly equivalent then they are equivalent.
13. Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Show that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0$  if and only if  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |x_n| = 0$ .

### 3.7 References

The content in this section comes mostly from [Run05]. [Pug15] is used to supplement, and in particular the content on accumulation points and contractions comes from there. For  $\limsup$  and  $\liminf$ , see [Leb22].

## 4 Topology

### 4.1 Basic definitions

Let  $X$  be a set. If  $X$  is not a metric space, can we still have open and closed sets? This question motivates the concept of a topology. One can think of a topology on  $X$  as a specification what of subsets of  $X$  are open. In the metric space section we already saw some properties of open and closed sets, which motivates the following definition.

**Definition 4.1** Let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . We call  $\mathcal{T}$  a topology on  $X$  if the following holds:

- (i)  $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{T}$
- (ii) Let  $A$  be an arbitrary index set. If  $U_\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$  for  $\alpha \in A$ , then  $\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} U_\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$  ( $\mathcal{T}$  is closed under taking arbitrary unions)
- (iii) Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $U_1, \dots, U_n \in \mathcal{T}$ , then  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i \in \mathcal{T}$  ( $\mathcal{T}$  is closed under taking finite intersections)

If  $U \in \mathcal{T}$ , we call  $U$  open. We call  $U \subseteq X$  closed, if  $U^c \in \mathcal{T}$ . We call  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  a topological space.

Alternatively we could have specified closed sets, and obtained similar axioms using De Morgan's rules.

**Example 4.2** For a set  $X$ , the following  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  are examples of topologies on  $X$ .

- Trivial topology:  $\mathcal{T} = \{\emptyset, X\}$ ,
- Discrete topology:  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{P}(X)$ ,
- Topology induced by a metric: i.e. if  $d$  is a metric on  $X$  we can define

$$\mathcal{T}_d = \{U \subseteq X \mid \forall x \in U \exists \epsilon > 0 \text{ such that } B_\epsilon(x) \subseteq U\}.$$

The discrete topology is also induced by a metric, can you guess which one?

- Let  $X$  be an infinite set. Then,  $\mathcal{T} = \{U \subseteq X : U^c \text{ is finite}\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$  defines a topology on  $X$ .

Given a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a subset  $Y \subseteq X$ , we can restrict the topology on  $X$  to  $Y$  which leads to the next definition.

**Definition 4.3** (Relative topology) Given a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and an arbitrary non-empty subset  $Y \subseteq X$ , we define the relative topology on  $Y$  as follows

$$\mathcal{T}|_Y = \{U \cap Y : U \in \mathcal{T}\}.$$

Recall that in the metric space setting, we had set theoretic descriptions of closures and interiors of sets. We will generalize this in the next definition.

**Definition 4.4** Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space and let  $A \subseteq X$  be any subset.

- The interior of  $A$  is  $\overset{\circ}{A} := \{a \in A : \exists U \in \mathcal{T} \text{ s.t. } U \subseteq A \text{ and } a \in U\}$ .
- The closure of  $A$  is  $\overline{A} := \{x \in X : \forall U \in \mathcal{T} \text{ with } x \in U, U \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$ .
- The boundary of  $A$  is  $\partial A := \{x \in X : \forall U \in \mathcal{T} \text{ with } x \in U, U \cap A \neq \emptyset \text{ and } U \cap A^c \neq \emptyset\}$ .

One can see that the definitions are taken fairly verbatim from the metric space setting, except that we are now looking at arbitrary open sets given by the topology instead of balls of the form  $B_\epsilon(x)$ .

**Example 4.5** Let  $X = \{a, b, c\}$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}, X\}$ . Then the following holds

- $\overset{\circ}{\{a\}} = \{a\}$ ,
- $\overset{\circ}{\{c\}} = \emptyset$ ,
- $\overline{\{a\}} = \{a, c\}$ ,
- $\overline{\{c\}} = \{c\}$ .

Note that even though we do not necessarily have a characterization of closures in terms of limits of sequences as in metric spaces for arbitrary topological spaces, there exists an alternative characterization that still holds in this general setting (and thus in particular also for metric spaces).

**Proposition 4.6** (Proposition 3.1.18 in [Run05]) Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space and  $A \subseteq X$ . Then,

$$\overline{A} = \bigcap \{F : F \text{ is closed and } A \subseteq F\}.$$

*Proof.* For convenience define  $A' = \bigcap \{F : F \text{ is closed and } A \subseteq F\}$ . We will show  $\overline{A} \subseteq A'$  by showing that  $(A')^c \subseteq \overline{A}^c$  (contrapositive). Suppose  $x \notin A'$ . Then, since an arbitrary intersection of closed sets is closed,  $(A')^c$  is an open set containing  $x$ . But since  $A \subseteq A'$  we have  $A \cap (A')^c = \emptyset$ , showing that  $x \notin \overline{A}$ .

Conversely, assume  $x \notin \overline{A}$ . Then there exists an open set  $U$  with  $x \in U$  such that  $U \cap A = \emptyset$ . Thus,  $A \subseteq U^c$ . Since  $U^c$  is closed, we have by the definition of closure  $\overline{A} \subseteq U^c$  and since  $x \notin U^c$ , we have  $x \notin \overline{A}$ . Thus,  $\overline{A} \subseteq A'$ .  $\square$

Similarly, one can show  $\overset{\circ}{A} = \bigcup \{U : U \text{ is open and } U \subseteq A\}$ . Hence, we see that the interior of  $A$  is the largest open set contained in  $A$  and the closure is the smallest closed set that contains  $A$ .

Another important concept in topology (and thus also in metric spaces) is density.

**Definition 4.7** Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space. A subset  $A \subseteq X$  is called dense if  $\overline{A} = X$ .

Using the definition of closure, we see that  $A \subseteq X$  is dense if and only if for all non-empty  $U \in \mathcal{T}$ ,  $U \cap A \neq \emptyset$ .

**Example 4.8**

- The rationals  $\mathbb{Q}$  are dense in the reals  $\mathbb{R}$ .
- The only dense subset in  $(X, \mathcal{P}(X))$  is  $X$  itself.
- Any non-empty subset is dense in  $(X, \{\emptyset, X\})$ .

The concept of a dense subset allows us in a way to look at that set instead of the whole space. In the metric space setting, this means that elements in  $X$  can be approximated arbitrarily well with elements from the dense subset.

**Definition 4.9** A topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is separable if it contains a countable dense subset.

As stated in the previous example,  $\mathbb{Q}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and since  $\mathbb{Q}$  is countable,  $\mathbb{R}$  is separable. We could extend this example to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . However, if we look at all bounded real-valued sequences with the metric induced by the supremum norm, this space fails to be separable.

**Example 4.10** Define  $\ell_\infty = \{(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} : x_n \in \mathbb{R}, \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |x_n| < \infty\}$ , the space of bounded real valued sequences. We can endow  $\ell_\infty$  with a metric induced by the supremum norm, namely  $d((x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |x_n - y_n|$ . Then  $\ell_\infty$  is not separable with respect to the topology induced by this metric.

To see this, for each  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  define

$$e_n^M = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \in M, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Then if  $M_1, M_2 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  are non-empty with  $M_1 \neq M_2$ ,  $d((e_n^{M_1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (e_n^{M_2})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) = 1$ . Thus the open balls  $B_{1/3}((e_n^{M_1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$ ,  $B_{1/3}((e_n^{M_2})_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$  are disjoint for all non-empty  $M_1, M_2 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  with  $M_1 \neq M_2$  (check using contradiction and triangle inequality).

Now suppose towards contradiction that there exists  $A \subseteq \ell^\infty$  is dense and countable. Then by density, for all non-empty open sets  $U \subseteq \ell^\infty$ ,  $U \cap A \neq \emptyset$ . In particular for all  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ ,  $B_{1/3}((e_n^M)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ .

However, there are uncountably many such  $M$  (see the cardinality of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  in the set theory section), but only countably many elements in  $A$ . Since the balls are disjoint, this is a contradiction.

## 4.2 Compactness

We will start off by giving the definition of an important separation axiom.

**Definition 4.11** A topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is called Hausdorff if for all  $x \neq y \in X$  there exist open sets  $U_x, U_y$  with  $x \in U_x$  and  $y \in U_y$  such that  $U_x \cap U_y = \emptyset$ .

So in a Hausdorff space, we can separate any two elements using open sets.

**Example 4.12** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. Then  $(X, \mathcal{T}_d)$  is Hausdorff, where  $\mathcal{T}_d$  is the topology induced by the metric  $d$ .

*Proof.* If  $x \neq y \in X$ , then choose  $\epsilon := d(x, y) > 0$ . Then  $U_x = B_{\epsilon/2}(x)$  and  $U_y = B_{\epsilon/2}(y)$  are disjoint. (If this is not clear, prove using contradiction.)  $\square$

**Example 4.13** Let  $X$  be an infinite set and  $\mathcal{T} = \{U \subseteq X : U^c \text{ is finite}\} \cup \emptyset$ . Then  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is not Hausdorff.

*Proof.* Suppose in order to derive a contradiction that it is Hausdorff and take  $x \neq y \in X$ . Then there exist open sets  $U_x, U_y$  with  $x \in U_x$  and  $y \in U_y$  such that  $U_x \cap U_y = \emptyset$ .

Then  $X \setminus \emptyset^c = (U_x \cap U_y)^c = U_x^c \cap U_y^c$ . But since  $U_x$  and  $U_y$  are open and nonempty,  $U_x^c$  and  $U_y^c$  are both finite. The union of two finite sets is again finite, so this gives us that  $X$  is finite, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Definition 4.14** (Compact) Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space and  $K \subseteq X$ . A collection  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$  of open sets is called open cover of  $K$  if  $K \subseteq \cup_{i \in I} U_i$ . The set  $K$  is called compact if for all open covers  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$  there exists a finite subcover, meaning there exists an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \subseteq \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$  such that  $K \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^n U_i$ .

**Example 4.15** Let  $S \subseteq X$  where  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is a topological space. If  $S$  is finite, then it is compact.

*Proof.* Since  $S$  is finite, we can write  $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ . For any open cover  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, n$  there exists  $U_j \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $x_j \in U_j$ . Thus  $S \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^n U_j$ , so  $S$  is compact.  $\square$

**Example 4.16**  $(0, 1)$  is not compact.

*Proof.* The set  $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  where  $U_n = (\frac{1}{n}, 1)$  is an open cover for  $(0, 1)$  since  $(0, 1) \subseteq \cup_{n=1}^\infty (\frac{1}{n}, 1)$ . Suppose in order to derive a contradiction that there exists a finite subcover, i.e. there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(0, 1) \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^N (\frac{1}{n_j}, 1)$ . Since  $(\frac{1}{n}, 1) \subseteq (\frac{1}{m}, 1)$  for  $m \geq n$  (the sets are nested), this means  $(0, 1) \subseteq (\frac{1}{n_N}, 1)$ . But clearly there exists an  $x \in (0, 1)$  such that  $0 < x < \frac{1}{n_N}$  for any finite  $n_N$ . Contradiction. Therefore  $(0, 1)$  is not compact.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.17** ([Run05, Proposition 3.3.6]) Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space and take a non-empty subset  $K \subseteq X$ . The following holds:

1. If  $X$  is compact and  $K$  is closed, then  $K$  is compact (i.e. closed subsets of compact sets are compact).
2. If  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is Hausdorff, then  $K$  being compact implies that  $K$  is closed.

*Proof.* 1. We need to show that any open cover of  $K$  has a finite subcover. Let  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$  be an open cover of  $K$ . Then, since  $K^c$  is open,  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I} \cup K^c$  is an open cover of  $X$ . Since  $X$  is compact there exists a finite subcover. There are two possibilities, the finite subcover is either of the form  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n, K^c\}$  or  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\}$ . In either case,  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\}$  is a finite subcover for  $K$  since  $K \subseteq X$ . Hence,  $K$  is compact.

2. We will show that  $K^c$  is open. We do this by showing that there exist open sets  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  such that  $K^c = \bigcup_{i \in I} U_i$ .

For each  $x \in K^c$ , we construct an open set in  $K^c$  that contains  $x$ .

Let  $x \in K^c$ . Since  $X$  is Hausdorff, for all  $y \in K$  there exist disjoint open sets  $U_{x,y}$  and  $U_y$  with  $x \in U_{x,y}$  and  $y \in U_y$ . Since  $K$  is compact and  $\{U_y\}_{y \in K}$  is an open cover of  $K$ , there exist  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  such that  $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_{y_i}$ .

Then  $\tilde{U}_x := \bigcap_{i=1}^n U_{x,y_i}$  is an open set that contains  $x$  by definition, and it is a subset of  $K^c$  since each set in the intersection is disjoint from a set that forms the open cover for  $K$ .

Since each  $\tilde{U}_x \subseteq K^c$ ,  $\bigcup_{x \in K^c} \tilde{U}_x \subseteq K^c$ . Since by construction for any  $x \in K^c$  there exists a  $\tilde{U}_x$  such that  $x \in \tilde{U}_x$ ,  $K^c \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in K^c} \tilde{U}_x$ . Thus  $K^c = \bigcup_{x \in K^c} \tilde{U}_x$ , so  $K^c$  is open, and thus  $K$  is closed.  $\square$

In undergraduate math classes you may have seen an equivalent definition for compactness on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . This is a nice feature of Euclidean space.

**Theorem 4.18** (Heine-Borel Theorem) *Let  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then  $K$  is compact with respect to the topology induced by the Euclidean distance if and only if it is closed and bounded.*

The proof is omitted. See [Run05, Corollary 2.5.12].

Just as we had a sequential characterization of the closure of a set in metric spaces, we similarly have a sequential characterization of compactness.

**Theorem 4.19** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. Then  $K \subset X$  is compact with respect to the metric induced by  $d$  if and only if every sequence in  $K$  admits a subsequence converging to some point in  $K$ .*

Again the proof is omitted. See [Run05, Theorem 2.5.10]. A corollary of this statement together with Heine-Borel is the Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem.

**Corollary 4.20** (Bolzano-Weierstrass) *Any bounded sequence in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  has a convergent subsequence.*

### 4.3 Continuity

Lastly, we will discuss continuity in this general setting.

**Definition 4.21** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$  be topological spaces. A map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is called continuous if for all  $U \in \mathcal{T}_Y$ ,  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{T}_X$ , i.e. the preimage of open sets is open.*

We can also specify continuity at a point  $x_0 \in X$ .

**Definition 4.22** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$  be topological spaces. A map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is called continuous at  $x_0 \in X$  if for all  $U \in \mathcal{T}_Y$  with  $f(x_0) \in U$ ,  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{T}_X$ , i.e. the preimage of open sets containing  $f(x_0)$  is open (and contains  $x_0$ ).*

The next proposition is, in a certain sense, a generalization of the extreme value theorem to topological spaces.

**Proposition 4.23** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$  be topological spaces. Suppose  $K \subset X$  is compact and let  $f: K \rightarrow Y$  be continuous. Then  $f(K)$  is compact.*

*Proof.* Let  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$  be an open cover of  $f(K)$ , i.e.  $f(K) \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} U_i$ . Then  $f^{-1}(f(K)) \subseteq f^{-1}(\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i)$ .

By Exercise 9 in ??, we have  $f^{-1}(\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} f^{-1}(U_i)$  and by Proposition 2.30, we have  $K \subseteq f^{-1}(f(K))$ . Hence, we obtain  $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} f^{-1}(U_i)$ .

Since  $f$  is continuous, each  $f^{-1}(U_i)$  is open and thus  $\{f^{-1}(U_i)\}_{i \in I}$  is an open cover of  $K$ . Since  $K$  is compact, there exist  $f^{-1}(U_1), \dots, f^{-1}(U_n)$  such that  $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n f^{-1}(U_i)$ .

Then  $f(K) \subseteq f(\bigcup_{i=1}^n f^{-1}(U_i)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n f(f^{-1}(U_i)) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i$ , where we use that images preserve set inclusions (check!), and Exercises 8 and 9 in ???. Thus,  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\}$  is a finite subcover for  $f(K)$  and  $f(K)$  is compact.  $\square$

As you can see, a lot of results from introductory real analysis or calculus have extensions to a more general topological setting. However, topology is a large field with many powerful tools that we do not have time to cover. The final result in this section is an important result in topology.

**Definition 4.24** A topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is normal if the following hold:

- (i) For all  $x \in X$ ,  $\{x\}$  is closed.
- (ii) For all (non-empty) disjoint closed sets  $F_1, F_2 \subseteq X$  there exist disjoint open sets  $U_1, U_2$  such that  $F_1 \subseteq U_1$  and  $F_2 \subseteq U_2$ .

**Example 4.25**

- Any metric space  $(X, d)$  is normal.
- Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be Hausdorff and compact. Then  $X$  is normal.
- If  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is normal, then it is Hausdorff.

**Theorem 4.26** (Urysohn's Lemma) Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be normal and  $F_1, F_2 \subseteq X$  be closed with  $F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset$ . Then there exists a continuous function  $f: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(F_1) = \{0\}$  and  $f(F_2) = \{1\}$ . (Here the topology on  $[0, 1]$  is the relative topology inherited from the usual metric topology on  $\mathbb{R}$ .)

Proof omitted. See [Run05, Theorem 4.1.2].

## 4.4 Exercises

1. Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space. Prove that  $A \subseteq X$  is closed if and only if  $\overline{A} = A$ .
2. Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space and  $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a collection of subsets of  $X$ . Show that

$$\bigcup_{i \in I} \overline{A_i} \subseteq \overline{\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i}.$$

Show that if the collection is finite, the two sets are equal.

3. Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space and  $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a collection of subsets of  $X$ . Prove that

$$\overline{\bigcap_{i \in I} A_i} \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I} \overline{A_i}.$$

Find a counterexample that shows that equality is not necessarily the case.

4. Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space and  $A \subseteq X$  be dense. Show that if  $A \subseteq B \subseteq X$ , then  $B$  is dense as well.
5. Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a Hausdorff topological space. Show that the singleton  $\{x\}$  is closed for all  $x \in X$ . Hint: Show that the complement is open.
6. Let  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$ ,  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$  and  $(Z, \mathcal{T}_Z)$  be topological spaces and let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $g: Y \rightarrow Z$  be continuous. Show that  $g \circ f: X \rightarrow Z$  is continuous as well.
7. Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and  $K \subset X$  compact. Show that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\} \subseteq K$  such that for all  $y \in K$  we have  $d(y, x_i) < \epsilon$  for some  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

## 4.5 References

The content in this section comes mostly from [Run05], with additional examples inspired by [Mar19].

## References

- [Ger12] Larry J. Gerstein. *Introduction to Mathematical Structures and Proofs*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. 2012. URL: <https://link-springer-com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/book/10.1007/978-1-4614-4265-31>.
- [Lak16] Tamara J. Lakins. *The Tools of Mathematical Reasoning*. Pure and Applied Undergraduate Texts. 2016.
- [Leb22] Jiří Lebl. *Basic Analysis I*, volume 1 of *Introduction to Real Analysis*. 2022. URL: <https://www.jirka.org/ra/realanal.pdf>.
- [Mar19] Laurent W. Marcoux. Pmath 351 notes, 2019. URL: <https://www.math.uwaterloo.ca/~lwmarcou/notes/pmath351.pdf>.
- [Pug15] Charles C. Pugh. *Real Mathematical Analysis*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. 2015. URL: <https://link-springer-com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/book/10.1007/978-3-319-17771-7>.
- [Run05] Volker Runde. *A Taste of Topology*. Universitext. 2005. URL: <https://link-springer-com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/book/10.1007/0-387-28387-0>.
- [Zwi22] Piotr Zwiernik. Lecture notes in mathematics for economics and statistics, 2022. URL: <http://84.89.132.1/~piotr/docs/RealAnalysisNotes.pdf>.