Math 185 Notes
Complex Analysis

Professor: Christopher Ryba
Scribe: Kelvin Lee

Contents

Lecture 1

Complex Numbers

1.1 Intro

Suppose we have the a Taylor series as follows:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n, \quad a_n \in \mathbb{R}$$

which happens to converge absolutely for $|x| < r$, where r is the *radius of convergence*, i.e.

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n||x|^n < \infty \quad \text{when } |x| < r, \quad \text{i.e. } x \in (-r, r).$$

Example 1.1.1. The series

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

converges absolutely for $|x| < 1$.

Question. Now what if we replace the real variable x by the complex variable z?

Answer. If $|z| < r$, then

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n||z|^n < \infty.$$

so the sum converges absolutely for $z \in D(0, r)$ (disc of radius r centered at zero). This gives a wider range than the real case.

So in this situation, our real-valued series can be extended to a complex-valued series.

Example 1.1.2. Let

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} e^{-1/z^2} & z \neq 0, \\ 0 & z = 0. \end{cases}$$

When viewed as a function $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $f(z)$ is infinitely differentiable at $z = 0$, and all derivatives of $f(z)$ are zero at $z = 0$. Hence, the Taylor series is

$$f(0) + f'(0) \cdot x + \frac{f"(0)}{2} \cdot x^2 + \cdots = 0 + 0 + 0 + \cdots = 0.$$

So the Taylor series converges to a function different from $f(z)$!

Example 1.1.3. Consider the same example as above, but with z as a complex number. Let $z = it$ where $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$e^{-1/z^2} = e^{1/t^2},$$

and so

$$f(it) = \begin{cases} e^{1/t^2} & t \neq 0, \\ 0 & t = 0 \end{cases}$$

which is not continuous at $z = 0$ and thus not complex-differentiable at $z = 0$.

Example 1.1.4. Now let's set $z = x + iy$ where $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider a suitable power series

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n,$$

which we may view as a function $\mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ (instead of $\mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$). Let's differentiate with respect to x:

$$\frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z} \cdot \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} = f'(z)$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 f(z)}{\partial x^2} = \frac{\partial f'(z)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f'(z)}{\partial z} \cdot \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} = f''(z).$$

Now with respect to y:

$$\frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z} \cdot \frac{\partial z}{\partial y} = if'(z)$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 f(z)}{\partial y^2} = i\frac{\partial f'(z)}{\partial y} = i\frac{\partial f'(z)}{\partial z} \cdot \frac{\partial z}{\partial y} = -f''(z).$$

We observe that

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}\right) f(z) = 0,$$

which means (the real and imaginary parts of) $f(z)$ satisfy the two-dimensional *Laplace equation.*

Thus, complex analysis is a very powerful tool for solving the 2D Laplace equation.

Example 1.1.5. Consider the integral

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+x^2} dx &= \arctan(\infty) - \arctan(-\infty) \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2} - \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}\right) \\ &= \pi.\end{aligned}$$

But what about

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\cos(ax)}{1+x^2} dx, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}$$

It turns out that this would be quite tricky to compute this with real-valued techniques. But it would be easier using complex techniques (contour integration). Thus, complex analysis is also a powerful too for computing integrals.

Lecture 2

Complex Differentiation

2.1 Derivatives

Definition 2.1.1 (Derivative)**.** The *derivative* of a complex-valued function is

$$f'(z) = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(z+h) - f(z)}{h}$$

just as in the real-valued case.

Recall that for real valued $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{x \to a} f(x) = L$$

means for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$$

whenever $0 < |x - a| < \delta$. (For any "tolerance" ϵ, we can guarantee $f(x)$ is within ϵ of L by forcing x to be close enough to a.)

Remark. Note that $x = a$ doesn't satisfy $0 < |x - a|$, so the value of f at $x = a$ has no bearing on whether $\lim_{x \to a} f(x)$ exists.

2.1.1 Continuity

Definition 2.1.2 (Continuous)**.** If $\lim_{x \to a} f(x) = f(a)$, then we say f is *continuous* at a.

Remark. Setting $L = f(a)$ in the limit, $0 < |x - a| < \delta$ implies $|f(x) - f(a)| < \epsilon$ (even when $x = a$) when talking about continuity, we leave out the $0 < |x - a|$ part for convenience because $x - a = 0$ automatically works.

Now let's consider a function $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$, $\lim_{z\to a} f(z) = L$ means for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$0 < |z - a| < \delta \implies |f(z) - L| < \epsilon.$$

Remark. Now the z's that we worry about form an open disc with radius δ instead of an interval from the real case.

Similarly, if $\lim_{z\to a} f(z) = f(a)$, we say f is *continuous* at $z = a$.

Example 2.1.3. $f(z) = z$ is continuous at any point $a \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. For $\epsilon > 0$, let $\delta = \epsilon$, then

$$|z - a| < \delta = \epsilon \implies |f(z) - f(a)| < \epsilon.$$

□

Example 2.1.4. $\lim_{z\to 0} \overline{z}/z$ (although this is undefined at $z = 0$, this has no bearing on whether the limit exists).

Proof. Suppose $\lim_{z\to 0} \overline{z}/z = L$ for some L. Let's take $\epsilon = 1$. There is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$0 < |z - 0| < \delta \implies \left|\frac{\overline{z}}{z} - L\right| < \epsilon = 1.$$

Let $z = \delta/2$ and so does $z = i\delta/2$. Then for $z = \delta/2$:

$$\frac{\overline{z}}{z} = \frac{\delta/2}{\delta/2} = 1 \implies |1 - L| < 1,$$

and for $z = i\delta/2$:

$$\frac{\overline{z}}{z} = \frac{-i\delta/2}{i\delta/2} = -1 \implies |-1 - L| < 1.$$

Thus, we see that the L must lie in the intersection of the two open unit discs centered at -1 and 1. However, since they are open discs, these two discs do not overlap and so L does not exist. □

Remark. This implies that there is no way to extend $\overline{z}/z$ to a continuous function at $z = 0$.

2.1.2 Properties of Limits

If $\lim_{x\to a} f(x) = L_1$, $\lim_{x\to a} g(x) = L_2$, then

(i)
$$\lim_{x\to a}(f(x)+g(x)) = L_1 + L_2.$$

(ii)
$$\lim_{x\to a} f(x)g(x) = L_1 L_2.$$

(iii)
$$\lim_{x\to a} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = \frac{L_1}{L_2}, \quad L_2 \neq 0.$$

Remark. These implies that the sum/product/quotient of continuous functions are continuous.

Proposition 2.1.5 (Composite function of continuous functions is continuous)**.** *If $f(x)$ is continuous at $x = a$, and $g(x)$ is continuous at $x = f(a)$, then $g(f(x))$ is continuous at $x = a$.*

Proof. We want $|g(f(x)) - g(f(a))| < \epsilon$. By continuity of g at $x = f(a)$, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that
$$|w - f(a)| < \delta_1 \implies |g(w) - g(f(a))| < \epsilon.$$
We want to take $w = f(x)$, so we need
$$|f(x) - f(a)| < \delta_1.$$
But by continuity of f at $x = a$, we know that δ_1 will be our ϵ when $|x - a| < \delta_2$ for some $\delta_2 > 0$. Then for such x,
$$|g(f(x)) - g(f(a))| < \epsilon.$$
□

2.2 Derivatives (Cont'd)

Definition 2.2.1 (Differentiable)**.** We say that $f(z)$ is differentiable at $z = a$ iff $\frac{f(z)-f(a)}{z-a}$ extends to a continuous function at $z = a$ (the value there is $f'(a)$).

Example 2.2.2. $f(z) = z$ is differentiable with $f'(z) = 1$.

Proof.

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{f(z+h)-f(z)}{h}=\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{z+h-z}{h}=\lim_{h\to 0}1=1.$$

□

Example 2.2.3 (Interesting one)**.** $f(z)=\overline{z}$ is not differentiable but is continuous.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{f(z+h)-f(z)}{h}&=\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{\overline{z+h}-\overline{z}}{h}\\&=\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{\overline{z}+\overline{h}-\overline{z}}{h}\\&=\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{\overline{h}}{h}\\&=\text{DNE}\qquad\text{(proved in previous example)}\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2.2.4 (Differentiability implies continuity)**.** *$f(z)$ differentiable at $z=a$ implies that $f(z)$ is continuous at $z=a$.*

Proof. We want to show that $\lim_{z\to a}f(z)=f(a)$.

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{z\to a}f(z)-f(a)&=\lim_{z\to a}\frac{f(z)-f(a)}{z-a}\cdot(z-a)\\&=\lim_{z\to a}\frac{f(z)-f(a)}{z-a}\cdot\lim_{z\to a}(z-a)\qquad\text{(assume both limits exist)}\\&=f'(a)\cdot 0\\&=0.\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark. This is a common technique to show continuity by showing the limit of the difference is zero.

2.2.1 Properties of complex-derivatives

(i)

$$\frac{d}{dz}cf(z)=cf'(z),\qquad\forall c\in\mathbb{C}.$$

(ii)
$$\frac{d}{dz}(f+g) = f'(z) + g'(z).$$

(iii)
$$\frac{d}{dz}(fg) = f'g + fg'.$$

(iv)
$$\frac{d}{dz}\left(\frac{f}{g}\right) = \frac{f'g - fg'}{g^2}.$$

(v)
$$\frac{d}{dz}f(g(z)) = g'(z)f'(g(z)).$$

Proposition 2.2.5 (Power rule)**.**
$$\frac{d}{dz}z^n = nz^{n-1}$$

for all integers n.

Proof. We induct on n. For $n \geq 0$, when $n = 0$,
$$\frac{d}{dz}z^0 = \frac{d}{dz}1 = 0 = 0z^{-1}.$$

By the product rule,
$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dz}z^n &= \frac{d}{dz}(z \cdot z^{n-1}) \\ &= 1 \cdot z^{n-1} + z \cdot (n-1)z^{n-2} && \text{(inductive hypothesis)} \\ &= nz^{n-1}.\end{aligned}$$

For $n < 0$, simply apply quotient rule. □

Lecture 3

Holomorphic Functions and Cauchy-Riemann Equations

Recall

$$f'(z) = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(z+h) - f(z)}{h}.$$

Being differentiable at a point says little about how "nice" a function is.

Example 3.0.1. Consider $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in \mathbb{Q} \\ 0 & x \in \mathbb{R} \backslash \mathbb{Q}. \end{cases}$$

This is nowhere continuous, and thus nowhere differentiable. But if we consider $x^2 f(x)$, it is differentiable at $x = 0$:

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{h^2 f(h) - 0^2 f(0)}{h} = \lim_{h \to 0} h f(h) = 0.$$

Nevertheless, it's still not a very "nice" function.

3.1 Holomorphic Functions

Definition 3.1.1 (Holomorphic)**.** A function $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ is *holomorphic* at a point a if it is differentiable at z for all z within distance r of a for some $r > 0$. In other words, $f(z)$ is differentiable everywhere sufficiently close to a.

Definition 3.1.2 (Open/closed disk)**.** The *open disk* of radius r centered at $a \in \mathbb{C}$ is

$$D(a, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z - a| < r\}.$$

The *closed disk* is

$$\overline{D}(a, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z - a| \leq r\}.$$

Thus, we can say $f(z)$ is holomorphic at $a \in \mathbb{C}$ if $f(z)$ is differentiable on an open disk centered at a. (if the point is not specified, it means that f is holomorphic everywhere.)

Example 3.1.3 (Polynomials are holomorphic)**.** We saw last time that z^n is differentiable everywhere for $n \geq 0$. Then the linear combinations

$$a_d z^d + a_{d-1} z^{d-1} + \cdots + a_1 z + a_0,$$

which is a polynomial, is differentiable (since multiplying by constants and summing preserves differentiability).

Example 3.1.4. $f(z) = |z|^2 = z\overline{z}$ is differentiable at zero.

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(h) - f(0)}{h} &= \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{h\overline{h} - 0}{h} \\ &= \lim_{h \to 0} \overline{h} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

However, this is not differentiable elsewhere (exercise). Thus, f is not holomorphic.

3.2 The Cauchy-Riemann Equations

Question. How to tell if a function is complex-differentiable?

Answer. We'll reduce this to a question about real derivatives.

Let $x + iy$, where $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. If $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(z) &= \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(z+h) - f(z)}{h} \\ &= \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(x+h+iy) - f(x+iy)}{h}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that h is real. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(z) &= \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(z+h) - f(z)}{h} \\ &= \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(x+i(y+h)) - f(x+iy)}{h}. \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.2.1. $f(z) = z^2$. Then

$$f(x+iy) = (x+iy)^2 = x^2 - y^2 + 2ixy.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(z) &= \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{(x+h)^2 - y^2 + 2i(x+h)y - (x^2 - y^2 + 2ixy)}{h} \\
&= \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{2xh + h^2 + 2ihy}{h} \\
&= \lim_{h\to 0} 2x + h + 2iy \\
&= 2x + 2iy \\
&= 2z \\
&= f'(z).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(z) &= \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{x^2 - (y+h)^2 + 2ix(y+h) - (x^2 - y^2 + 2ixy)}{h} \\
&= \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{-2yh - h^2 + 2ixh}{h} \\
&= \lim_{h\to 0} -2y - h + 2ix \\
&= -2y + 2ix \\
&= 2i(x+iy) \\
&= if'(z).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{i}\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = -i\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}.$$

Theorem 3.2.2.

(i) If $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ is complex-differentiable, then $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}$ and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}$ exist and they satisfy

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = -i\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}.$$

(ii) If $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a function and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}$ exist and are continuous on some open disk centered at z, and if

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = -i\frac{\partial f}{\partial y},$$

then f is complex-differentiable at z.

Proof.

(i) Since f is complex-differentiable, we have

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{f(z+h) - f(z)}{h} = f'(z).$$

This is equivalent to the statement that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|h - 0| < \delta \implies \left| \frac{f(z+h) - f(z)}{h} - f'(z) \right| < \epsilon.$$

Suppose h is real. Then

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{f(z+h) - f(z)}{h} = f'(z)$$

and since h is real, we get $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}$ and thus

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(z) = f'(z).$$

Now suppose h is purely imaginary: $h = ik$ for $k \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\frac{f(z+h) - f(z)}{h} = \frac{f(x + iy + ik) - f(x + iy)}{ik}.$$

Then $h \to 0$ is equivalent to $k \to 0$ since $|h| = |k|$. Thus we have

$$\lim_{k \to 0} \frac{f(z+ik) - f(z)}{ik} = \frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = f'(z).$$

Hence, we have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = -i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}.$$

$\square$

Let $f(z) = u(z) + iv(z)$. If we choose real values for h, then the imaginary part y is kept constant, and the derivative becomes a partial derivative with respect to x. Thus we have

$$f'(z) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + i \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}.$$

Similarly, if we substitute purely imaginary values ik for h, we obtain

$$f'(z) = \lim_{k \to 0} \frac{f(z+ik) - f(z)}{ik} = -i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = -i \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y}.$$

Since we have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = -i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y},$$

this resolves into the following equations

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial y}, \qquad \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} = -\frac{\partial u}{\partial y},$$

or simply

$$u_x = v_y, \qquad v_x = -u_y.$$

These are known as the *Cauchy-Riemann* equations.

Example 3.2.3. Consider $f(z) = z^2$. Then

$$f(x + iy) = x^2 + y^2 + 2ixy.$$

Here $u(x, y) = x^2 - y^2$ and $v(x, y) = 2xy$. We have

$$u_x = 2x = v_y \qquad v_x = 2y = -u_y.$$

Example 3.2.4. Consider $f(z) = |z|^2$. Then $f(x + iy) = x^2 + y^2$ where $u(x, y) = x^2 + y^2$ and $v(x, y) = 0$. But here we have

$$u_x = 2x \neq v_y = 0 \qquad v_x = 0 \neq -u_y = -2y.$$

Thus, the Cauchy-Riemann equations only hold at $(x, y) = (0, 0)$ and as we saw previously that this function is only differentiable at $z = 0$ and nowhere else.

We can generalize the Cauchy-Riemann equations further to second order. Suppose we have $f = u + iv$. Then

$$u_{xx} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} u_x = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v_y = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\frac{\partial}{\partial y} v = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} v = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v_x = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}(-u_y) = -u_{yy}.$$

Thus, we have

$$u_{xx} + u_{yy} = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} = 0.$$

Similarly, we also have

$$v_{xx} = (v_x)_x = (-u_y)_x = -u_{yx} = -u_{xy} = -(u_x)_y = -(v_y)_y = -v_{yy},$$

which gives

$$v_{xx} + v_{yy} = 0, \text{or} \quad \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2} = 0.$$

These are the *Laplace's equations* in 2D we saw earlier.

For $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, we know that $f'(x) = 0$ implies that f is constant. But for $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$, we can use the Cauchy-Riemann equations. Since $f'(z) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}$,

$$f'(z) = 0 \implies u_x + iv_x = 0 \implies u_x = 0, v_x = 0.$$

By Cauchy-Riemann, we also have $u_y = v_y = 0$. Since $u_x = 0$, we know that for fixed y, $u(x, y)$ is some constant that could depend on y. Thus, we have

$$u(x, y) = g(y).$$

But $u_y = 0$, so $g'(y) = 0$, which means g is actually a constant independent of y. Thus, u is globally constant. Similar argument applies to v as well.

Lecture 4

Möbius Transformation

Definition 4.0.1 (Möbius transformation)**.** A *Möbius transformation* is a function of the form

$$f(z) = \frac{az+b}{cz+d},$$

where $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy $ad - bc \neq 0$.

Remark. If $ad = bc$, then $\det \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = 0$, so rows are linearly dependent: $\lambda(a, b) + \mu(c, d) = (0, 0)$, which implies that

$$a = \frac{-\mu}{\lambda} c \qquad b = \frac{-\mu}{\lambda} d.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= \frac{az+b}{cz+d} \\ &= \frac{-\frac{\mu}{\lambda}(cz+d)}{cz+d} \\ &= -\frac{\mu}{\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a constant independent of z.

Proposition 4.0.2 (Composite Möbius transforms is Möbius)**.** *If $f_1(z), f_2(z)$ are Möbius transforms, then then $f_1(f_2(z))$ is also a Möbius transform.*

Proof. Suppose

$$f_1(z) = \frac{a_1 z + b_1}{c_1 z + d_1} \qquad f_2(z) = \frac{a_2 z + b_2}{c_2 z + d_2}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(f_2(z)) &= \frac{a_1 \frac{a_2 z + b_2}{c_2 z + d_2} + b_1}{c_1 \frac{a_2 z + b_2}{c_2 z + d_2} + d_1} \\ &= \frac{a_1(a_2 z + b_2) + b_1(c_2 z + d_2)}{c_1(a_2 z + b_2) + d_1(c_2 z + d_2)} \\ &= \frac{(a_1 a_2 + b_1 c_2)z + (a_1 b_2 + b_1 d_2)}{(c_1 a_2 + d_1 c_2)z + (c_1 b_2 + d_1 d_2)}, \end{aligned}$$

which is another Möbius transform. $\square$

Remark. Note that

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & b_1 \\ c_1 & d_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_2 & b_2 \\ c_2 & d_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 a_2 + b_1 c_2 & a_1 b_2 + b_1 d_2 \\ c_1 a_2 + d_1 c_2 & c_1 b_2 + d_1 d_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the entries coincide with the composite Möbius transform. If we denote $f_M(z)$ to be a transform associated with a 2×2 matrix M, then we have just shown that

$$f_M(f_N(z)) = f_{MN}(z).$$

Remark. Since $f_I(z) = \frac{1 \cdot z + 0}{0 \cdot z + 1} = z$, the inverse of f_M is $f_{M^{-1}}$.

Remark. Note that

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \implies f_M = \frac{az + b}{cz + d}.$$

Meanwhile,

$$\lambda M = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a & \lambda b \\ \lambda c & \lambda d \end{pmatrix} \implies f_{\lambda M} = \frac{\lambda a z + \lambda b}{\lambda c z + \lambda d} = \frac{az + b}{cz + d} = f_M.$$

Thus, scaling the matrices doesn't affect the resulting Möbius tranformation.

4.1 Inverse of Möbius transformation

Recall that

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \frac{1}{ad - bc} \begin{pmatrix} d & -b \\ -c & a \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the scaling part is redundant, we simply ignore it and obtain the inverse Möbius transform as follows:

$$f(z) = \frac{az + b}{cz + d} \implies f^{-1}(z) = \frac{dz - b}{-cz + a}.$$

Remark. Since Möbius transforms have inverses, they should be bijections. However, some details should be noted. If $c \neq 0$, then $\frac{az+b}{cz+d}$ is undefined at $z = -\frac{d}{c}$.

Let's consider the value at $z = -\frac{d}{c}$ to be infinity. It turns out that we can evaluate $\frac{az+b}{cz+d}$ at ∞:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{z\to\infty}\frac{az+b}{cz+d} &= \lim_{z\to\infty}\frac{a+\frac{b}{z}}{c+\frac{d}{z}}\\ &= \frac{a}{c}.\end{aligned}$$

When $c = 0$, we view $\frac{a}{c}$ as ∞. So now we view Möbius transformations as functions from $\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}$ to $\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}$. This makes all Möbius transformations into bijections. Here, we call $\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}$ the *extended complex plane* (also called *Riemann sphere*).

Remark. For real functions, there are multiple notions of going to infinity: $x \to +\infty$ and $x \to -\infty$. But for complex functions, we work with only one infinite point.

Fact. If we apply a Möbius transformation to a line or a circle in the complex plane, we would get a line or a circle again (circles can turn into lines and vice versa).

Example 4.1.1. Consider $f(z) = \frac{z-1}{iz+i}$, let's apply this to the unit circle, i.e. take $z = e^{i\theta}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}f(e^{i\theta}) = \frac{e^{i\theta}-1}{i(e^{i\theta}+1)} &= \frac{\cos\theta - 1 + i\sin\theta}{i(\cos\theta + 1 + i\sin\theta)}\\ &= \frac{-2\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2} + i2\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\cos\frac{\theta}{2}}{i\left(2\cos^2\frac{\theta}{2} + i2\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\right)}\\ &= \frac{2i(\cos\frac{\theta}{2} + i\sin\frac{\theta}{2})\sin\frac{\theta}{2}}{2i\left(\cos\frac{\theta}{2} + i\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\cos\frac{\theta}{2}}\\ &= \tan\frac{\theta}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi)$ and we have $\tan -\frac{\pi}{2} = -\infty$ and $\tan\frac{\pi}{2} = -+\infty$. We have mapped a unit circle to a line (real line).

Fact. f sends the interior of the unit disk to the interior of the upper half-plane. If $g(z)$ is holomorphic on the upper half-plane, then $g(f(z))$ is a holomorphic function on the unit disk. Taking real and imaginary parts gives a solution to the Laplace equation.

Remark. Stereographic projection φ is a bijection that maps a sphere to the extended complex plane. It doesn't preserve distance, but it preserves functions being holomorphic.

Proposition 4.1.2. *Suppose $f(z) = \frac{az+b}{cz+d}$ is a Möbius transformation. If $c = 0$ then*

$$f(z) = \frac{a}{d}z + \frac{b}{d},$$

and if $c \neq 0$, then

$$f(z) = \frac{bc - ad}{c^2} \frac{1}{z + \frac{d}{c}} + \frac{a}{c}.$$

In particular, every Möbius transformation is a composition of translations, dilations, and inversions.

Proof. Simplify. $\square$

Theorem 4.1.3. *Möbius transformations map circles and lines into circles and lines.*

Proof. Translations and dilations certainly map circles and lines into circles and lines, so by the previous proposition, we only have to prove the statement of the theorem for the inversion $f(z) = \frac{1}{z}$.

The equation for a circle centered at $x_0 + iy_0$ with radius r is $(x - x_0)^2 + (y - y_0)^2 = r^2$, which we can transform to

$$\alpha \left(x^2 + y^2\right) + \beta x + \gamma y + \delta = 0$$

for some real numbers α, β, γ, and δ that satisfy $\beta^2 + \gamma^2 > 4\alpha\delta$. The above expression is more convenient for us, because it includes the possibility that the equation describes a line (precisely when $\alpha = 0$).

Suppose $z = x + iy$ satisfies the above expression; we need to prove that $u + iv := \frac{1}{z}$ satisfies a similar equation. Since

$$u + iv = \frac{x - iy}{x^2 + y^2},$$

we can rewrite the transformed equation as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \alpha + \beta \frac{x}{x^2 + y^2} + \gamma \frac{y}{x^2 + y^2} + \frac{\delta}{x^2 + y^2} \\ &= \alpha + \beta u - \gamma v + \delta \left(u^2 + v^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

But this equation says that $u + iv$ lies on a circle or line. $\square$

Fact. The stereographic projection of a circle on the sphere (intersection of a plane and a sphere) is a circle in the plane. Möbius transformations take circles on the sphere to other circles of the sphere (some of these stereographically project to lines in the plane).

Lecture 5

Exponential,Trigonometric, and Logarithmic Functions

5.1 Exponential Functions

$$e^{x+iy} = e^x e^{iy} = e^x \cos y + ie^x \sin y \implies e^z = u(x,y) + iv(x,y)$$

where

$$u(x,y) = e^x \cos y$$
$$v(x,y) = e^x \sin y$$

5.2 Trigonometric Functions

For $z \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\sin z = \frac{e^{iz} - e^{-iz}}{2i}$$
$$\cos z = \frac{e^{iz} + e^{-iz}}{2}.$$

Remark. $\sin z, \cos z$ are holomorphic since e^z is holomorphic and so is e^{iz} and e^{-iz}.

Trigonometric identities hold for complex numbers.

$$\sin^2 z + \cos^2 z = 1$$

$$\sin(2z) = 2 \sin z \cos z$$

5.3 Logarithmic Functions

We want $\log z$ to be the unique inverse to the exponential function, i.e. we want $e^{\log z} = z$, but then we would also have

$$e^{\log z + 2\pi i k} = z.$$

Definition 5.3.1 (Principal logarithm). The *principal logarithm* is the function defined by

$$\log\left(re^{i\theta}\right) = \log r + i\theta.$$

where $-\pi < \theta \leq \pi$.

Let's check if $\log z$ is differentiable. If

$$z = x + iy = re^{i\theta},$$

then $r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$ and $\theta = \tan^{-1}(y/x)$ when $x \neq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}\log x + iy &= \frac{1}{2}\log\left(x^2 + y^2\right) + i\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)\\ &= u(x,y) + iv(x,y).\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}u_x &= \frac{1}{2}\cdot\frac{2x}{x^2+y^2} = \frac{x}{x^2+y^2}\\ u_y &= \frac{1}{2}\cdot\frac{2y}{x^2+y^2} = \frac{y}{x^2+y^2}\\ v_x &= \frac{-y}{x^2}\cdot\frac{1}{1+\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^2} = -\frac{y}{x^2+y^2}\\ v_y &= \frac{1}{x}\cdot\frac{1}{1+\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^2} = \frac{x}{x^2+y^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see that the Cauchy-Riemann equations hold for logarithms.

Lecture 6

Complex Integration

6.1 Definition and Basic Properties

If $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$, define

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx = \int_a^b \Re f(x)dx + i\int_a^b \Im f(x)dx.$$

Question. But how to integrate a function $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$?

For real functions, going from a point $\gamma(a)$ to $\gamma(b)$ can only happen one way (follow the real axis) but in $\mathbb{C}$, we will have to specify the path from $\gamma(a)$ to $\gamma(b)$.

Definition 6.1.1 (Path/curve)**.** A *path/curve* is the image of a function $\gamma : [a, b] \to \mathbb{C}$.

Definition 6.1.2 (Integral)**.** The *integral* of the function $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ along the path parametrized by $\gamma : [a, b] \to \mathbb{C}$ is

$$\int_a^b f(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t)dt.$$

This is the integral of a function $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$, so we already have a definition for it.

Aside,

$$\int_{g(a)}^{g(b)} f(x)dx = \int_a^b f(g(x))g'(x)dx.$$

Suppose we have a different parametrization of the image of $\gamma(t)$. Write this parametrization as $\gamma(\theta(t))$ where $\theta : [a, b] \to [a, b]$ is a continuous reparametrization of the interval $[a, b]$ satisfying $\theta(a) = a$, $\theta(b) = b$ and θ is increasing. Then

$$\int_a^b f(\gamma(\theta(t)))\gamma'(\theta(t))\theta'(t)dt = \int_{\theta(a)}^{\theta(b)} f(\gamma(u))\gamma'(u)du$$

where $u = \theta(t)$ and $du = \theta'(t)dt$. So the integrals for $\gamma(\theta(t))$ and $\gamma(t)$ are the same, thus the integral depends on the curve in $\mathbb{C}$, not how we parametrize it.

We will use

$$\int_\gamma f(z)dz$$

to denote the integral.

Example 6.1.3. If $\gamma(t) = t$, then $\gamma'(t) = 1$ and

$$\int_\gamma f(z)dz = \int_a^b f(t)dt.$$

Example 6.1.4. If $\gamma(t) = t + it^2$ and $f(z) = 1$, then $\gamma'(t) = 1 + 2it$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_a^b f(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t)dt &= \int_a^b (1+2it)dt \\ &= \int_a^b 1dt + i\int_a^b 2tdt \\ &= b - a + i(b^2 - a^2) \\ &= (b + ib^2) - (a + ia^2) \\ &= \gamma(b) - \gamma(a).\end{aligned}$$

Example 6.1.5 (Very important example)**.** Consider $\gamma(t) = e^{it}$ where $0 \le t \le 2\pi$. So $\gamma(t)$ is the counterclockwise unit circular path. If $f(z) = z^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\gamma f(z)dz &= \int_0^{2\pi} f(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t)dt \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} e^{int} \cdot ie^{it}dt \\ &= i\int_0^{2\pi} e^{it(n+1)}dt.\end{aligned}$$

If $n \neq -1$, then $n + 1 \neq 0$, the integral evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} i\left.\frac{e^{it(n+1)}}{i(n+1)}\right|_{t=0}^{2\pi} &= i\left(\frac{1}{i(n+1)} - \frac{1}{i(n+1)}\right) \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

If $n+1=0$, then $n=-1$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} i\int_0^{2\pi} e^{it(n+1)}dt &= i\int_0^{2\pi} 1dt \\ &= 2\pi i, \end{aligned}$$

which is not zero.

Lecture 7

Complex Integration (Cont'd)

7.1 Basic Properties

(i) If $\mu, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\gamma \lambda f(z) + \mu g(z) dz &= \int_a^b (\lambda f(\gamma(t) + \mu g(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t)dt \\
&= \lambda \int_a^b f(\gamma(t)\gamma'(t)dt + \mu \int_a^b g(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t)dt \\
&= \lambda \int_\gamma f(z)dz + \mu \int_\gamma g(z)dz.
\end{aligned}$$

(ii)

$$\int_{\gamma_1\gamma_2} f = \int_{\gamma_1} f + \int_{\gamma_2} f$$

(iii)

$$\int_{-\gamma} f = -\int_\gamma f$$

(iv)

$$\left|\int_\gamma f\right| \leq \max{}_{z\in\gamma}|f(z)| \cdot \text{length}(\gamma),$$

where

$$\text{length}(\gamma) = \int_a^b |\gamma'(t)|dt.$$

View $|\gamma'(t)|$ as the speed a particle is travelling at and $\gamma(t)$ as the position of that particle at time t. Then integrating it gives the total distance.

(v) **(Triangle Inequality)**

$$\left|\int_a^b f(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t)dt\right| \leq \int_a^b \left|f(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t)\right| dt$$

(vi) **(ML-Lemma)**

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_a^b f(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t)dt\right| &\leq \int_a^b |f(\gamma(t))| \cdot |\gamma'(t)|dt \\ &= ML\end{aligned}$$

where $M = \max_{a \leq t \leq b} |f(\gamma(t))|$ and $L = \int_a^b |\gamma'(t)|dt$.

7.1.1 Antiderivatives

Theorem 7.1.1 (Fundamental Theorem of Calculus)**.** *If F is holomorphic on some subset $G \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and $\frac{d}{dz}F(z) = f(z)$. Then*

$$\int_\gamma f(z)dz = F(\gamma(b)) - F(\gamma(a)).$$

Proof. Let $F(x+iy) = u(x,y) + iv(x,y)$ and $\gamma(t) = \alpha(t) + i\beta(t)$. Then

$$F(\gamma(t)) = u(\alpha(t), \beta(t)) + iv(\alpha(t), \beta(t)).$$

By chain rule,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}F(\gamma(t)) &= u_x\alpha'(t) + u_y\beta'(t) + iv_x\alpha'(t) + iv_y\beta'(t) \\ &= u_x(\alpha'(t) + i\beta'(t)) + iv_x(\alpha'(t) + i\beta'(t)) \qquad (u_x = v_y \text{ by CR}) \\ &= F(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t).\end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 7.1.2 (Closed curve)**.** A *closed curve* is a curve where the start and end points are the same, i.e. $\gamma(a) = \gamma(b)$.

So if $f(z) = \frac{d}{dz}F(z)$, the integral of $f(z)$ around a closed curve is zero:

$$\int_\gamma f(z)dz = F(\gamma(b)) - F(\gamma(a)) = 0.$$

Example 7.1.3. Let γ be the path of unit circle counterclockwise. Then

$$\int_\gamma \frac{1}{z} dz = 2\pi i$$

which is not zero, implying that there is no holomorphic function $F(z)$ defined on the whole unit circle, having derivative $\frac{1}{z}$.

However, consider the principal logarithm $\log(re^{i\theta}) = \log(r) + i\theta$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dz}\log(x+iy) = \frac{x}{x^2+y^2} + \frac{-y}{x^2+y^2} = \frac{\overline{z}}{z\overline{z}} = \frac{1}{z}.$$

So $\frac{1}{z}$ does have an antiderivative on $\mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$.

It turns out that if $f(z)$ is continuous and $\int_\gamma f(z)dz = 0$ for any closed curve, then $f(z)$ has an antiderivative, i.e. there's $F(z)$ such that $F'(z) = f(z)$.

We know that by fundamental theorem of calculus

$$\frac{d}{dx}\int_a^x f(t)dt = f(x).$$

By analogy, we want

$$F(w) = \int_\gamma f(z)dz$$

where γ is a curve from a fixed basepoint q to w.

First let's check that this doesn't depend on the choice of path from q to w. Suppose δ_1, δ_2 are two paths from q to w. Observe that the reverse of δ_2 is a curve from w to q, and the path obtained by following δ_1, then the reverse of δ_2 goes from q to w to q, so it is a closed curve.

Write $\delta_1 - \delta_2$ for the closed curve above. Then by assumption, we have

$$\int_{\delta_1-\delta_2} f(z)dz = 0.$$

This implies that

$$\int_{\delta_1} f(z)dz + \int_{-\delta_2} f(z)dz = \int_{\delta_1} f(z)dz - \int_{\delta_2} f(z)dz = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\int_{\delta_1} f(z)dz = \int_{\delta_2} f(z)dz.$$

Thus, the choice of path doesn't matter and so the formula $F(w) = \int_\gamma f(z)dz$ where γ is any path from q to w makes sense. Let's now check $\frac{d}{dw}F(w) = f(w)$.

$$\frac{d}{dw}F(w) = \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{F(w+h) - F(w)}{h}.$$

To evaluate $F(w+h)$, we can choose the path of integration from q to $w+h$ arbitrarily. Let's choose one that goes from q to w then to $w+h$ along a line segment (only from w to $w+h$). This line segment has length $|h|$.

If our function is holomorphic at a point w, it is differentiable on a disk $D(w,\epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. So if $|h| < \epsilon$, then the line segment ℓ from w to $w+h$ is contained in $D(w,\epsilon)$ and hence in a region where the function is differentiable.

Now $F(w+h) - F(w)$ is simply the integral of $f(z)$ from w to $w+h$. We want

$$\lim_{h\to\infty} \frac{1}{h} \int_\ell f(z)dz - f(w) = 0.$$

Note that $f(w)$ is a constant independent of z. Thus,

$$\int_\ell f(w)dz = f(w)\int_\ell 1dz = f(w)h.$$

$$\lim_{h\to\infty} \frac{\int_\ell f(z)dz - \int_\ell f(w)dz}{h} = \lim_{h\to\infty} \frac{\int_\ell (f(z) - f(w))dz}{h}.$$

By ML-lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{\int_\ell (f(z) - f(w))dz}{h}\right| &= \frac{\left|\int_\ell (f(z) - f(w))dz\right|}{|h|} \\
&\leq \max{}_{z\in\ell}|f(z) - f(w)| \cdot \frac{\text{length}(\ell)}{|h|} \\
&= \max{}_{z\in\ell}|f(z) - f(w)|.
\end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \max{}_{z\in\ell}|f(z) - f(w)| = 0.$$

Since $f(z)$ is continuous at w, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $|z - w| < \delta$ implies $|f(z) - f(w)| < \epsilon$. So when $|h| < \delta$, any $z \in \ell$ obeys $|z - w| < \delta$. Then also $|f(z) - f(w)| < \epsilon$. So for $|h| < \delta$,

$$\left|\frac{F(w+h) - F(w)}{h} - f(w)\right| < \epsilon.$$

Hence,

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{F(w+h)-F(w)}{h}=f(w).$$

as needed.

7.2 Cauchy's Theorem

Question. How do we check that $\int_\gamma f(z)dz=0$ for any closed curve γ?

Theorem 7.2.1 (Cauchy's Theorem)**.** *Suppose $\gamma:[a,b]\to\mathbb{C}$ is a closed curve and $f(z)$ is holomorphic on γ and in the region enclosed by the curve γ. Then*

$$\int_\gamma f(z)dz=0.$$

Proof. Recall that a vector field is a function $\vec{F}:\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{R}^2$ where

$$\vec{F}(x,y)=(F_1(x,y),F_2(x,y)).$$

The line integral of $\vec{F}$ along a curve γ is

$$\int_\gamma \vec{F}\cdot d\vec{\ell}=\int_a^b F(\gamma(t))\cdot\gamma'(t)dt$$

where $\gamma(t)=(\alpha(t),\beta(t))$ and $\gamma'(t)=(\alpha'(t),\beta'(t))$ and so

$$\int_\gamma \vec{F}\cdot\vec{\ell}=\int_a^b F_1(\alpha(t),\beta(t))\alpha'(t)+F_2(\alpha(t),\beta(t))\beta'(t)dt.$$

Now recall the Stokes' theorem

$$\int_\gamma \vec{F}\cdot d\vec{\ell}=\int_{\text{region enclosed by }\gamma}\vec{\nabla}\times\vec{F}dA$$

where

$$\vec{\nabla}\times\vec{F}=\frac{\partial F_2}{\partial dx}-\frac{\partial F_1}{\partial y}.$$

Then

$$\int_\gamma(\vec{F}\cdot\hat{n})d\ell=\int_a^b F_1(\alpha(t),\beta(t))\beta'(t)+F_2(\alpha(t),\beta(t))(-\alpha'(t))dt.$$

The divergence theorem says that

$$\int_\gamma(\vec{F}\cdot\hat{n})d\ell=\int_{\text{area enclosed by }\gamma}\vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{F}dA$$

where
$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{F} = \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial y}.$$
Let $f(x+iy) = u(x,y) + iv(x,y)$ and $\gamma(t) = \alpha(t) + i\beta(t)$.
$$\begin{aligned}\int_\gamma f(z)dz &= \int_a^b (u+iv)(\alpha'(t) + i\beta'(t))dt \\ &= \int_a^b u\alpha'(t) - v\beta'(t)dt + i\int_a^b v\alpha'(t) + u\beta'(t)dt.\end{aligned}$$
Note that $u' - v\beta' = (u, -v) \cdot (\alpha', \beta')$ and $v\alpha' + u\beta' = (u, -v) \cdot (\beta', \alpha')$. Now let $\vec{F}(x,y) = (u(x,y), -v(x,y))$. Then
$$\int_\gamma f(z)dz = \int_\gamma \vec{F} \cdot d\vec{\ell} + i\int_\gamma (\vec{F} \cdot \hat{n})d\ell.$$

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{F} &= \frac{\partial - v}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} = -v_x - u_y = 0 \qquad (u_y = -v_x \text{ by CR}), \\ \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{F} &= \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial - v}{\partial y} = u_x - v_y = 0 \qquad (u_x = v_y \text{ by CR}).\end{aligned}$$

So by Stokes' theorem and the divergence theorem
$$\int_\gamma f(z)dz = \int_{\text{area enclosed by } \gamma} 0dA + i\int_{\text{area enclosed by } \gamma} 0dA = 0 + i0 = 0.$$
□

Remark. The example of $\int_\gamma \frac{1}{z}dz = 2\pi i$ does not contradict the Cauchy's theorem because $\frac{1}{z}$ is not holomorphic at $z = 0$.

Remark. Checking that closed curves have well-defined interior regions is not a triviality: it is the content of the Jordan Curve Theorem (out of scope).

Remark. There are several formulations of Cauchy's Theorem. We will assume that $f'(z)$ is continuous. Some formulations remove the concept of interior region and instead use the notion of a homotopy.

7.2.1 Cauchy Integral

Theorem 7.2.2 (Cauchy integral formula (1st version))**.** *Suppose $f(z)$ is holomorphic on the closed disk of radius R centered at $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$\int_{\gamma} \frac{f(z)}{z-a} dz = 2\pi i f(a)$$

where γ is the anticlockwise circle of radius R centered at a.

Proof. $\frac{f(z)}{z-a}$ may not be holomorphic at $z = a$, so to apply Cauchy's theorem we need a curve that doesn't enclose a. We can create such curve by traversing a donut-like path obtained by traversing a clockwise small circle with radius r centered at a after we reached the endpoint of the original curve and then traverse back to the endpoint. Then the enclosed area will not include a.

This curve of integration has 4 parts:

1. γ_1 : big circle of radius R, anticlockwise,
2. γ_2 : line segment connecting from the big circle to the small circle,
3. γ_3 : small circle of radius r, clockwise,
4. γ_4 : line segment connecting from the small circle to the big circle.

Note that the integrations of the two line segments cancel out each other. Then Cauchy's theorem tells us that

$$\int_{\gamma_1} + \int_{\gamma_2} + \int_{\gamma_3} + \int_{\gamma_4} = 0 \implies \int_{\gamma_1} + \int_{\gamma_3} = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\int_{\gamma_1} = -\int_{\gamma_3} = \int_{-\gamma_3},$$

which implies that the integral of the big circle anticlockwise is equal to the integral of the small circle anticlockwise. Hence,

$$\int_{\gamma_1} \frac{f(z)}{z-a} dz = \int_{-\gamma_3} \frac{f(z)}{z-a} dz.$$

for any $r < R$, and so we can take $r \to 0$. $\square$