

Contents

Problem 1: Every convergent sequence is Cauchy	2
Problem 2: Give example or prove non-existence of sequences with certain properties	3
Problem 3: Direct proofs that the sum and product of two Cauchy sequences are Cauchy	5
Problem 4: Equivalence of different characterizations of completeness	7

Problem 1: Every convergent sequence is Cauchy

Proof idea

Get both x_n and x_m within $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ of the limit x , then apply the triangle inequality.

Proof

Theorem 1: Every convergent sequence is a Cauchy sequence.

Proof: Let (x_n) be a sequence of real numbers converging to a limit $x \in \mathbb{R}$. To prove that it's Cauchy, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$ we must find an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x_m - x_n| < \varepsilon$ whenever $m, n \geq N$.

By convergence of (x_n) there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x_n - x| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for every $n \geq N$. Then apply the triangle inequality to $x_n - x_m = x_n - x + x - x_m$:

$$|x_n - x_m| = |x_n - x + x - x_m| \leq |x_n - x| + |x - x_m| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon$$

whenever $m, n \geq N$. ■

Problem 2: Give example or prove non-existence of sequences with certain properties

(a) A Cauchy sequence that is not monotone

A cheap way to do this is to take a monotone sequence and just stick a number in front that makes it not monotone:

$$a_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 1 \\ \frac{1}{n} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

But we can also give a sequence that is not monotone even after dropping any finite prefix:

$$a_n = (-1)^n \frac{1}{n}$$

This sequence converges to 0 because

$$|a_n - 0| = \left| (-1)^n \frac{1}{n} \right| = \frac{1}{n}$$

so by taking $N = 1 + \lceil \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rceil$ in the definition of convergence, it converges to 0. And every convergent sequence is Cauchy, by Problem 1.

(b) A Cauchy sequence with an unbounded subsequence

No such sequence exists.

Theorem 2: Every subsequence of a Cauchy sequence is bounded.

Proof: Every Cauchy sequence is convergent, by the Cauchy criterion. Every subsequence of a convergent sequence converges to the same limit, proved two problem sets ago. And every convergent sequence is bounded, proved last problem set. Therefore every subsequence of a Cauchy sequence is bounded. ■

Actually we can avoid appealing to the difficult/deep Cauchy criterion:

Proof: Every Cauchy sequence is bounded (finite prefix + infinite tail that's within ε of x_N). And every subsequence of a bounded sequence is bounded, by definitions of bounded and subsequence. ■

(c) A divergent monotone sequence with a Cauchy subsequence

No such sequence exists.

Theorem 3: Every monotone sequence with a Cauchy subsequence converges.

Proof: We will prove that the parent sequence is bounded. Then by the Monotone Convergence Theorem, it converges.

Let (x_n) be a monotone sequence with a Cauchy subsequence (x_{n_k}) . Without loss of generality, let (x_n) be increasing. The subsequence is therefore bounded. Let $M = \sup\{x_{n_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Every term in the original sequence has a term in the subsequence that comes after it. More precisely, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can find a $n_k \geq n$ by taking $k = n$. Since the sequence is monotone increasing,

$$x_n \leq x_{n_n}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. But the subsequence is bounded, so

$$x_n \leq x_{n_n} \leq M.$$

So (x_n) is bounded, and therefore converges. ■

(d) An unbounded sequence containing a subsequence that is Cauchy

Take

$$a_n = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{1}{n} & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

so that the even indices form a Cauchy subsequence, while the odd indices are unbounded, making the sequence itself unbounded.

Problem 3: Direct proofs that the sum and product of two Cauchy sequences are Cauchy

(a) Sum

Proof idea

Get both sequences within $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ by taking the maximum of N_x and N_y , then apply the triangle inequality.

Proof

Theorem 4: Let (x_n) and (y_n) be two Cauchy sequences. Then $(x_n + y_n)$ is Cauchy.

Proof: We are given $\varepsilon > 0$ and must produce $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x_n + y_n - (x_m + y_m)| < \varepsilon$ whenever $m, n \geq N$.

Let $N_x \in \mathbb{N}$ be the index such that $|x_n - x_m| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ whenever $m, n \geq N_x$, and similarly N_y . Let $N = \max(N_x, N_y)$. Then, whenever $n, m \geq N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |x_n + y_n - (x_m + y_m)| \\ &= |(x_n - x_m) + (y_n - y_m)| \\ &\leq |x_n - x_m| + |y_n - y_m| \\ &< \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\ &= \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

as desired. ■

(b) Product

Proof idea

Add and subtract $x_n y_m$, factor out, then use the fact that Cauchy sequences are bounded to replace variable terms with the bounds.

Proof

Theorem 5: Let (x_n) and (y_n) be two Cauchy sequences. Then $(x_n y_n)$ is Cauchy.

Proof: Cauchy sequences are bounded (finite prefix + infinite tail that's within ε of x_N), so let M_x and M_y be any bounds for (x_n) and (y_n) respectively. We may assume that the bounds are nonzero because otherwise at least one of the sequences would be identically zero and the theorem is trivial.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. By definition of Cauchy sequence, there exists $N_x \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x_n - x_m| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2|M_y|}$ whenever $m, n \geq N_x$. Similarly, take N_y to get terms of (y_n) within $\frac{\varepsilon}{2|M_x|}$ of each other.

Let $N = \max(N_x, N_y)$.

Then, whenever $m, n \geq N$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |x_n y_n - x_m y_m| \\
&= |x_n y_n - x_n y_m + x_n y_m - x_m y_m| \\
&\leq |x_n y_n - x_n y_m| + |x_n y_m - x_m y_m| \\
&= |x_n| |y_n - y_m| + |y_m| |x_n - x_m| \\
&\leq |M_x| |y_n - y_m| + |M_y| |x_n - x_m| \\
&< |M_x| \frac{\varepsilon}{2|M_x|} + |M_y| \frac{\varepsilon}{2|M_y|} \\
&= \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\
&= \varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. ■

Problem 4: Equivalence of different characterizations of completeness

(a) Bolzano-Weierstrass \Rightarrow Monotone Convergence without using Archimedean Property

Proof idea

Use Bolzano-Weierstrass to get a convergent subsequence, then sandwich every term x_n of the sequence between two terms of the subsequence: the first one after which the subsequence is within ε of its limit, and some term of the subsequence that comes after x_n .

Proof

Theorem 6: If a sequence is monotone and bounded, then it converges.

Proof: Let (x_n) be a monotone and bounded sequence. Without loss of generality, let it be an increasing sequence.

By Bolzano-Weierstrass (*every bounded sequence contains a convergent subsequence*), it contains a convergent subsequence (x_{n_k}) , converging to some $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $k \geq N$ we have $|x_{n_k} - x| < \varepsilon$.

Then for every $k \geq N$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x_{n_k} - x| &< \varepsilon \\ \Rightarrow -\varepsilon &< x_{n_k} - x < \varepsilon \\ \Rightarrow x - \varepsilon &< x_{n_k} < x + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We will use the left and right sides of this bound below, with different terms x_{n_k} . We will bound each term of (x_n) between the first term of (x_{n_k}) after N , and any term of (x_{n_k}) that comes after x_n .

Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be the index of N in the original sequence, i.e., $M = n_N$ and $x_M = x_{n_N}$. Since (x_n) is monotone increasing, every term of (x_n) after x_M satisfies

$$x - \varepsilon < x_M \leq x_n.$$

But for every term x_n there is some term x_{n_n} of (x_{n_k}) that comes after it, so, again because the sequence is monotone increasing,

$$x_n \leq x_{n_n} < x + \varepsilon.$$

Putting these together, we get

$$|x_n - x| < \varepsilon$$

so the sequence converges. ■

(b) Cauchy Criterion \Rightarrow Bolzano-Weierstrass, using Archimedean Property

Proof idea

Recursively split the interval $[-M, M]$ that contains the sequence, always picking a half which has an infinite number of terms. After enough splittings, the size of the interval is less than ε , and all

subsequent terms are trapped within it. The Archimedean property is used to justify that there is a natural number bigger than $\log_2\left(\frac{M}{\varepsilon}\right)$.

Proof

Lemma 1: If $x, y \in [a, b]$ then $|x - y| \leq b - a$.

Proof:

$$x \leq b$$

and

$$a \leq y \Rightarrow -y \leq -a$$

so

$$x - y \leq b - a.$$

Similarly,

$$y \leq b$$

and

$$a \leq x \Rightarrow -x \leq -a$$

so

$$y - x \leq b - a$$

so

$$-(b - a) \leq x - y.$$

Putting these together,

$$-(b - a) \leq x - y \leq b - a$$

so

$$|x - y| \leq b - a.$$

■

Theorem 7: Every bounded sequence contains a convergent subsequence.

Proof: Let (a_n) be a bounded sequence so that there exists $M > 0$ satisfying $|a_n| < M$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Bisect the closed interval $[-M, M]$ into the two closed intervals $[-M, 0]$ and $[0, M]$. (The midpoint is included in both halves.) At least one of these closed intervals contains an infinite number of the terms of the sequence (a_n) . Select a half for which this is the case and label that interval as I_1 . Then, let a_{n_1} be some term in the sequence (a_n) satisfying $a_{n_1} \in I_1$.

Next, we bisect I_1 into closed intervals of equal length, and let I_2 be a half that again contains an infinite number of terms of the original sequence. Because there are an infinite number of terms from (a_n) to choose from, we can select an a_{n_2} from the original sequence with $n_2 >$

n_1 and $a_{n_2} \in I_2$. In general, we construct the closed interval I_k by taking a half of I_{k-1} containing an infinite number of terms of (a_n) and then select $n_k > n_{k-1} > \dots > n_2 > n_1$ so that $a_{n_k} \in I_k$.

The length of I_k is $\frac{\text{len}(I_{k-1})}{2}$ for each $k > 1$ and the length of I_1 is M , so

$$\text{len}(I_k) = \frac{M}{2^{k-1}}.$$

Given an $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$t > \frac{M}{\varepsilon}.$$

Such a t exists by the Archimedean Property and because both M and ε are positive real numbers.

Since t is a natural number there is some power of 2 bigger than it; in other words, the sequence of powers of 2 is unbounded (this is a fact about the natural numbers, not real analysis, and I think we can prove by induction that $2^n \geq n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$).

Therefore pick some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$2^{N-1} \geq t > \frac{M}{\varepsilon}$$

so that

$$\varepsilon > \frac{M}{2^{N-1}} = \text{len}(I_N).$$

Then for every $i, j \geq N$, the terms $a_{n_i}, a_{n_j} \in I_N$ so by the lemma proved above,

$$|a_{n_i} - a_{n_j}| < \varepsilon,$$

so by the Cauchy Criterion, the subsequence (a_{n_k}) converges. ■

(c) Archimedean Property \nRightarrow Axiom of Completeness

The field \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers also has the Archimedean property: for every rational $\frac{p}{q}$, by the Euclidean division algorithm we have

$$p = qd + r$$

where $0 \leq r < q$, so $|d| + 1 > \frac{p}{q}$.

Even more trivially, $|p| + 1 > \frac{p}{q}$.

But we know the rationals do not satisfy the Axiom of Completeness, because the set $\{x \in \mathbb{Q} : x^2 < 2\}$ does not have a least upper bound in \mathbb{Q} , because $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational. So it cannot be possible to prove the Axiom of Completeness from the Archimedean property.