

21-355: Real Analysis 1

Carnegie Mellon University
Professor Ian Tice - Fall 2013

Project L^AT_EX'd by Ivan Wang
Last Updated: December 4, 2013

Contents

1	The Number Systems	4
1.1	The Natural Numbers	4
1.1.1	Positivity	5
1.1.2	Order	5
1.1.3	Multiplication	6
1.2	The Integers	6
1.2.1	Properties of Integers	7
1.2.2	Algebraic Properties	7
1.3	The Rationals and Ordered Fields	8
1.3.1	Fields and Orders	8
1.4	Problems with \mathbb{Q}	9
1.4.1	Bounds (Infimum and Supremum)	9
1.5	The Real Numbers	10
1.5.1	Defining the Real Numbers: Dedekind Cuts	10
1.5.2	Defining the Real Numbers: The Least Upper Bound Property	11
1.5.3	Defining the Real Numbers: Addition	11
1.5.4	Defining the Real Numbers: Multiplication	12
1.5.5	Defining the Real Numbers: Distributivity	12
1.5.6	Defining the Real Numbers: Archimedean	13
1.6	Properties of \mathbb{R}	13
1.6.1	Absolute Value	14
2	Sequences	14
2.1	Convergence and Bounds	14
2.1.1	Squeeze Lemma	15
2.2	Monotonicity and \limsup , \liminf	16
2.3	Subsequences	16
2.3.1	Limsup Theorem	17
2.4	Special Sequences	18
3	Series	18
3.1	Convergence Results	19
3.1.1	Cauchy Criterion Theorem	19
3.1.2	Logarithm	20
3.2	The number e	21

3.3	More Convergence Results	22
3.4	Algebra of Series	22
3.5	Absolute Convergence and Rearrangements	23
4	Topology of \mathbb{R}	25
4.1	Open and Closed Sets	25
4.1.1	Open Sets	25
4.1.2	Closed Sets	25
4.1.3	Limit Points	26
4.1.4	Closure, Interior, and Boundary Sets	27
4.2	Compact Sets	28
4.2.1	Heine-Borel Theorem	29
4.3	Connected Sets	30
5	Continuity	31
5.1	Limits of Functions	31
5.1.1	Divergence Criteria	31
5.2	Continuous Functions	32
5.3	Compactness and Continuity	34
5.4	Continuity and Connectedness	35
5.5	Discontinuities	35
5.6	Monotone Functions	36
6	Differentiation	36
6.1	The Derivative	36
6.2	Mean Value Theorems	37
6.3	Darboux's Theorem	38
6.4	L'Hôpital's Rule	39
6.5	Higher Derivatives and Taylor's Theorem	39
7	Riemann-Stieltjes Integration	40
7.1	The R-S Integral	40
7.2	Integrability Criteria	41
7.3	Properties of $\mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$	43
7.4	Integration and Order	43
7.5	Fundamental Theorem of Calculus	43
7.6	Advanced Results in R-S Integration	45

8	Sequences and Series of Functions	46
8.1	Convergence	46
8.1.1	Big Questions	47
8.2	The Cauchy Condition and the Weierstrass M-Test	48

1 The Number Systems

1.1 The Natural Numbers

Theorem (existence of \mathbb{N}): There exists a set \mathbb{N} satisfying the following properties, known as the Peano Axioms:

PA1 $0 \in \mathbb{N}$

PA2 There exists a function $S : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ called the successor function. In particular, $S(n) \in \mathbb{N}$.

PA3 $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}. S(n) \neq 0$

PA4 $S(n) = S(m) \implies n = m$ (S is injective, one-to-one)

PA5 [Axiom of Induction] Let $P(n)$ be a property associated to each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $P(0)$ is true, and $P(n) \implies P(S(n))$, then $P(n)$ is true $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition: **PA1** $\implies 0 \in \mathbb{N}$. **PA2** $\implies S(0) \in \mathbb{N}$.

Define $1 = S(0), 2 = S(1), 3 = S(2)$, etc.

PA2 guarantees that $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$.

PA3 prevents “wraparound”: no successor can map to a “negative” number.

PA4 prevents “stagnation”: the cycle does not terminate.

Theorem: $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$

Proof: We know that $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, so it suffices to prove that $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.

Let $P(n)$ denote the proposition that $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Clearly $P(0)$ is true.

Suppose $P(n)$ is true; then $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \implies S(n) \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ by construction.

Hence, $P(S(n))$ is true. By induction, **PA5** guarantees that $P(n)$ is true $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

It follows that $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.

Definition: For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $0 + m = m$.

Then if $n + m$ is defined for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $S(n) + m = S(n + m)$.

Proposition (Properties of Addition):

1. $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}. n + 0 = n$ (0 is the additive identity)
2. $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}. n + S(m) = S(n + m)$
3. $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}. m + n = n + m$ (commutativity)
4. $\forall k, m, n \in \mathbb{N}. k + (m + n) = (k + m) + n$ (associativity)
5. $\forall k, m, n \in \mathbb{N}. n + k = n + m \implies k = m$ (cancellation)

Proof:

1. Let $P(n)$ be $n + 0 = n$.
 $P(0)$ is true because $0 + 0 = 0$ by definition.
 Note $P(n) \implies S(n) + 0 = S(n + 0) = S(n)$, so $P(S(n))$ is true. By induction, (1) is true.

2. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $P(n)$ denote $n + S(m) = S(n + m)$.
 $P(0)$ is true because $0 + S(m) = S(m) = S(0 + m)$.
 $P(n) \implies S(n) + S(m) = S(n + S(m)) = S(S(n + m)) = S(S(n) + m)$, so $P(S(n))$ is true. By induction, since $m \in \mathbb{N}$ was arbitrary, (2) is true.
3. Let m be fixed and $P(n)$ denote $n + m = m + n$.
 $P(0)$ is true since $0 + m = m$ by definition, and $m + 0 = m$ by 1, so $0 + m = m = m + 0$.
Suppose $P(n)$; then $S(n) + m = S(n + m) = S(m + n) = m + S(n)$, so $P(S(n))$ is true. By induction and arbitrary choice of m , (3) is true.
4. Fix $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $P(n)$ denote $k + (m + n) = (k + m) + n$.
 $P(0)$ is true as $k + (m + 0) = k + m = (k + m) + 0$.
Suppose $P(n)$; then $k + (m + S(n)) = k + S(m + n) = S(k + (m + n)) = S(k + m) + n = (k + m) + S(n)$ by (2). By induction and arbitrary choice, (4) is true.
5. Fix $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $P(k)$ denote proposition 5.
 $P(0)$ is true because $n + 0 = n = n + m \implies m = 0 \implies k = m$.
Suppose $P(k)$; also, suppose $m + S(k) = n + S(k)$. Then $S(m + k) = m + S(k) = n + S(k) = S(n + k) \implies m + k = n + k \implies m = n$ (by 4). By the axiom of induction, (5) is true.

1.1.1 Positivity

Definition: We say that $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is *positive* if $n \neq 0$.

Proposition (Properties of Positivity):

1. $\forall n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, if m is positive, then $m + n$ is positive.
2. $\forall n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, if $m + n = 0$, then $m = n = 0$.
3. $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, if n is positive, then there exists a unique $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n = S(m)$.

1.1.2 Order

Definition: For all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \leq n$ or $n \geq m$ iff $n = m + p$ for some $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

$m < n$ or $n > m$ iff $m \leq n \wedge m \neq n$. The relation \leq provides what is called an *order* on \mathbb{N} .

Proposition (Properties of Order):

Let $j, k, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then:

1. $n \geq n$ (reflexivity)
2. $m \leq n \wedge k \leq m \implies k \leq n$ (transitivity)
3. $m \geq n \wedge m \leq n \implies m = n$ (anti-symmetry)
4. $j \leq k \wedge m \leq n \implies j + m \leq k + n$ (order preservation)
5. $m < n \iff S(m) \leq n$
6. $m < n \iff n = m + p$ for some positive $p \in \mathbb{N}$.
7. $n \geq m \iff S(n) > m$
8. $n = 0 \oplus 0 < n$

Theorem (Trichotomy of Order): Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then exactly one of the following is true:

$$m < n \quad \oplus \quad m = n \quad \oplus \quad m > n$$

Proof: Show that no two can be true simultaneously (by definition of $<$ and $>$), and then at least one must be true (by induction on n).

1.1.3 Multiplication

Definition: Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $0 \cdot m = 0$. Now, if $n \cdot m$ is defined for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $S(n) \cdot m = n \cdot m + m$.

Proposition (Properties of Multiplication):

Fix $k, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then:

1. $m \cdot n = n \cdot m$ (commutativity)
2. m, n are positive $\implies mn$ is positive
3. $m \cdot n = 0 \iff m = 0 \vee n = 0$ (no zero divisors)
4. $k \cdot (m \cdot n) = (k \cdot m) \cdot n$ (associativity)
5. $k \cdot m = k \cdot n \wedge k$ is positive $\implies m = n$ (cancellation)
6. $k \cdot (m + n) = (m + n) \cdot k = k \cdot m + k \cdot n$ (distributivity)
7. $m < n \wedge k \leq l \wedge k, l$ are positive $\implies m \cdot k < n \cdot l$

1.2 The Integers

Consider the following relation on the set $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$:

$$(m, n) \simeq (m', n') \iff m + n' = m' + n$$

Lemma: \simeq is an equivalence relation.

Proof:

Reflexivity: $m + n = m + n \implies (m, n) \simeq (m, n)$

Symmetry: $(m, n) \simeq (m', n') \implies m + n' = m' + n \implies m' + n = m + n' \implies (m', n') \simeq (m, n)$

Transitivity: Suppose $(m, n) \simeq (m', n') \wedge (m', n') \simeq (m'', n'')$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} m + n' &= m' + n \wedge m' + n'' = m'' + n' \\ \implies m + n'' &= m'' + n \\ \implies (m, n) &\simeq (m'', n'') \end{aligned}$$

Definition: Write the *equivalence class* of (m, n) as $[(m, n)] = \{(p, q) \mid (p, q) \simeq (m, n)\}$. Define the *integers* $\mathbb{Z} = \{[(m, n)]\}$.

Lemma: Suppose $(m, n) \simeq (m', n'), (p, q) \simeq (p', q')$. Then:

1. $(m + p, n + q) \simeq (m' + p', n' + q')$

$$2. (mp + nq, mq + np) \simeq (m'p' + n'q', m'q' + n'p')$$

Proof: Consider equalities (a) : $m + n' = m' + n$ and (b) : $p + q' = p' + q$ (by definition of \simeq).

Using linear combinations of (a) and (b), we derive the two rules of the lemma:

1. (a) + (b)
2. (a)(p' + q') + (b)(m + n)

Definition: Let $[(m, n)], [(p, q)] \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then:

1. $[(m, n)] + [(p, q)] = [(m + p, n + q)]$ (addition of integers)
2. $[(m, n)] \cdot [(p, q)] = [(mp + nq, mq + np)]$ (multiplication of integers)

By the lemma, these are well-defined operations.

Note that for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} [(m, 0)] &= [(n, 0)] \iff m + 0 = n + 0 \iff m = n \\ [(m, 0)] + [(n, 0)] &= [(m + n, 0)] \\ [(m, 0)] \cdot [(n, 0)] &= [(mn, 0)] \end{aligned}$$

As such, the set $\{[(n, 0)] \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ behaves exactly like a copy of \mathbb{N} .

Definition: For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ to be $n := [(n, 0)]$.

For $x = [(m, n)] \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define $-x = [(n, m)]$.

1.2.1 Properties of Integers

(We can see that every integer $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ can be represented as $x := m - n$ where $x = [(m, n)]$.)

Theorem: Every $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfies exactly one of the following:

1. $x = n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$
2. $x = 0$
3. $x = -n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$

Proof: Write $x = [(p, q)]$ for some $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$. By trichotomy of order on \mathbb{N} we know that $p < q$ or $p = q$ or $p > q$. Each of these correlates to one of the three properties.

Corollary: $\mathbb{Z} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{-1, -2, -3, \dots\}$

1.2.2 Algebraic Properties

Proposition: Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then the following hold:

1. $x + y = y + x$
2. $x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z$
3. $x + 0 = 0 + x = x$
4. $x + (-x) = (-x) + x = 0$
5. $xy = yx$

6. $(xy)z = x(yz)$
7. $x \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot x = x$
8. $x(y + z) = xy + xz$

Definition: Define $x - y = x + (-y)$. The usual properties hold.

Definition: For $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$, we say $x \leq y$ or $y \geq x$ if $y - x = n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We say $x < y$ if $x \leq y \wedge x \neq y$.

1.3 The Rationals and Ordered Fields

Let a relation on $\mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\})$ be given by $(m, n) \simeq (m', n') \iff mn' = m'n$.

Lemma: \simeq is an equivalence relation. Proof follows from properties of \mathbb{Z} .

Definition: $\mathbb{Q} = \{[(m, n)]\}$

1. $[(m, n)] + [(p, q)] = [(mq + np, nq)]$ (addition)
2. $[(m, n)] \cdot [(p, q)] = [(mp, nq)]$ (multiplication)
3. $-[(m, n)] = [(-m, n)]$ (negation)
4. If $m \neq 0$ we set $[(m, n)]^{-1} = [(n, m)]$

Remark: the heuristic here is that $\frac{m}{n} = [(m, n)]$.

Definition: If $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we write $m = [(m, 1)] \in \mathbb{Q}$; and thus $\mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{Q}$.

1. For $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}$, we define $x - y = x + (-y) \in \mathbb{Q}$
2. For $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}, y \neq 0$ we define $\frac{x}{y} = x(y)^{-1}$. This is well defined because $y = 0 \iff y = [(0, n)]$.

Proposition: $\mathbb{Q} = \{\frac{m}{n} \mid m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \neq 0\}$.

We define and propose the trichotomy of order on \mathbb{Q} , as per the integers.

1.3.1 Fields and Orders

Definition: A field is a set \mathbb{F} endowed with two binary operations, $+, \cdot$, satisfying the following axioms:

- (A1, M1) $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{F}. x + y \in \mathbb{F}, xy \in \mathbb{F}$ (closure)
- (A2, M2) $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{F}. x + y = y + x, xy = yx$ (commutativity)
- (A3, M3) $\forall x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}. x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z, x(yz) = (xy)z$ (associativity)
- (A4, M4) $\exists (0, 1) \in \mathbb{F}. \forall x \in \mathbb{F}. 0 + x = x + 0 = x, 1 \cdot x = x \cdot 1 = x$ (identity)
- (A5, M5) $\forall x \in \mathbb{F}. \exists (-x). x + (-x) = 0; \exists x^{-1} \in \mathbb{F}. xx^{-1} = x^{-1}x = 1$ (inverse)
- (D1) $\forall x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}. x(y + z) = xy + xz$ (distributivity)

Remark: Field must have at least 2 elements $(0, 1)$ by (A/M4). To prove field, must prove 5 properties of addition and multiplication (closure, commutativity, associativity, identity, inverse) as well as distributivity.

Definition: Let E be a set; an *order* on E is a relation $<$ satisfying the following:

1. $\forall x, y \in E$ exactly one of the following is true: $x < y$ or $x = y$ or $y < x$ (trichotomy)
2. $\forall x, y, z \in E, x < y \wedge y < z \implies x < z$ (transitivity)

Definition: Let \mathbb{F} be a field. Then we define $x - y = x + (-y)$ and $\frac{x}{y} = xy^{-1}$ (for $y \neq 0$).

Theorem: \mathbb{Q} is an ordered field with order $<$.

Proof: Follows from definitions and properties of \mathbb{Z} .

1.4 Problems with \mathbb{Q}

Theorem: There does not exist a $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $q^2 = 2$.

Proof: Suppose not; i.e. there does exist such a $q \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Consider the set $S(q) = \{n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \mid q = \frac{m}{n} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Clearly $|S(q)| > 0$. Then the well-ordering principle implies that $\exists! n \in S(q)$. $n = \min S(q)$.

Since $n \in S(q)$, we know that $q = \frac{m}{n}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $q^2 = (\frac{m}{n})^2 = \frac{m^2}{n^2} \implies m^2 = 2n^2 \implies m^2$ is even. We claim that m is also even (proof is exercise to reader).

Then $\exists l \in \mathbb{Z}$. $m = 2l$. Then $4l^2 = (2l)^2 = m^2 = 2n^2 \implies n^2 = 2l^2 \implies n^2$ is even $\implies n$ is even $\implies n = 2p$ for some $p \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

Hence $q = \frac{m}{n} = \frac{2l}{2p} = \frac{l}{p} \implies p \in S(q)$. But clearly $p < n$, which contradicts the fact that n is the minimal element. By contradiction, the theorem must be true.

1.4.1 Bounds (Infimum and Supremum)

Informally, \mathbb{Q} has “holes”:

Definition: Let E be an ordered set with order $<$.

1. We say $A \subseteq E$ is bounded above iff $\exists x \in E. \forall a \in A. a \leq x$. We say x is an upper bound of A .
2. We say $A \subseteq E$ is bounded below iff $\exists x \in E. \forall a \in A. x \leq a$. We say x is a lower bound of A .
3. We say $A \subseteq E$ is bounded iff it's bounded above and below.
4. We say x is a minimum of A iff $x \in A$ and x is a lower bound of A .
5. We say x is a maximum of A iff $x \in A$ and x is an upper bound of A .

Remark: If a min or max exists, then it is unique.

Definition: Let E be an ordered set and $A \subseteq E$.

1. We say $x \in E$ is the least upper bound (*supremum*) of A , written $x = \sup A$, iff x is an upper bound of A and $y \in E$ is an upper bound of $A \implies x \leq y$.
2. We say $x \in E$ is the greatest lower bound (*infimum*) of A , written $x = \inf A$, iff x is a lower bound of A and $y \in E$ is a lower bound of $A \implies y \leq x$.

Remark: If $x = \min(A)$, then $x = \inf(A)$. If $x = \max(A)$, then $x = \sup(A)$. But the converse is false; some sets have a supremum but no maximum, others a infimum but no minimum.

Definition: Let \mathbb{F} be an ordered field. We say that \mathbb{F} has the *least upper bound property* iff every $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ that is bounded above has a least upper bound.

Theorem: \mathbb{Q} does not satisfy the least upper bound property.

Proof: Consider the set $A = \{x \in \mathbb{Q} \mid x > 0, x^2 \leq 2\}$.

Note that $0 < 1 = 1^2 \leq 2 \implies 1 \in A$, so A is non-empty. Also, $2 \leq 4 = 2^2$ implies $(x \in A \implies 0 < x^2 < 2 < 2^2) \implies x < 2$. Then 2 is an upper bound of A .

Assume for sake of contradiction that \mathbb{Q} has the least upper bound property. Then A has a supremum. Let $x = \sup A \in \mathbb{Q}$ and write $x = \frac{p}{q}$ for $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$.

By trichotomy, $x^2 < 2$ or $x^2 = 2$ or $x^2 > 2$. We know $x^2 \neq 2$.

Case 1: Suppose $x^2 < 2$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ we have $(\frac{p}{q} + \frac{1}{n})^2 = \frac{p^2}{q^2} + \frac{2p}{qn} + \frac{1}{n^2} \leq \frac{p^2}{q^2} + \frac{1}{n}(\frac{2p+q}{q})$. From algebra, we derive $(\frac{p}{q} + \frac{1}{n})^2 < 2$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

Clearly $x > 0$ since otherwise $x \leq 0 < 1 \in A$. Hence $0 < x = \frac{p}{q} < \frac{p}{q} + \frac{1}{n} \in A$. But then x is not an upper bound \implies contradiction.

Case 2: Suppose $x^2 > 2$. Considering $(\frac{p}{q} - \frac{1}{n})^2 > 2$ and using the same logic as before, we can choose n large enough such that $\frac{p}{q} - \frac{1}{n}$ is an upper bound of A . But $\frac{p}{q} - \frac{1}{n} < \frac{p}{q} = x$, which contradicts the fact that $x = \sup A$.

As all cases are false, we contradict trichotomy, and hence \mathbb{Q} cannot have the least upper bound property.

1.5 The Real Numbers

We now construct an ordered field satisfying the least upper bound property using \mathbb{Q} .

Definition: We say \mathbb{Q} is Archimedean iff $\forall(x \in \mathbb{Q}). x > 0 \implies \exists(n \in \mathbb{N}). x < n$.

Lemma: If \mathbb{Q} is Archimedean, then $\forall(p < q \in \mathbb{Q}). \exists(r \in \mathbb{Q}). p < r < q$.
(Proofs in HW 2.)

1.5.1 Defining the Real Numbers: Dedekind Cuts

Definition: We say that $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q})$ is a *cut* (Dedekind cut) iff the following hold:

- (C1) $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C} \neq \mathbb{Q}$
- (C2) If $p \in \mathcal{C}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $q < p$, then $q \in \mathcal{C}$.
- (C3) If $p \in \mathcal{C}, \exists(r \in \mathbb{Q}). p < r \wedge r \in \mathcal{C}$.

Lemma: Suppose \mathcal{C} is a cut. Then:

1. $p \in \mathcal{C}, q \notin \mathcal{C} \implies p < q$
2. $r \notin \mathcal{C}, r < s \implies s \notin \mathcal{C}$
3. \mathcal{C} is bounded above

Lemma: Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then $\{p \in \mathbb{Q} \mid p < q\}$ is a cut.

Proof: Call the set \mathcal{C} . We prove the 3 properties of a cut:

- (C1) $q - 1 \in \mathcal{C} \implies \mathcal{C} \neq \emptyset; q + 1 \notin \mathcal{C} \implies \mathcal{C} \neq \mathbb{Q}$.
- (C2) If $p \in \mathcal{C}$ and $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $r < p$, then $r < p < q \implies r < q \implies r \in \mathcal{C}$.
- (C3) Let $p \in \mathcal{C}$ where $p < q$. Since \mathbb{Q} is Archimedean, $\exists(r \in \mathbb{Q}). p < r < q \implies r \in \mathcal{C}$.

Definition: Given $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ we write $\mathcal{C}_q = \{p \in \mathbb{Q} \mid p < q\}$. By the above lemma, \mathcal{C}_q is a cut.

Definition: We write $\mathbb{R} = \{\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q}) \mid \mathcal{C} \text{ is a cut}\} \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma: The following hold:

1. $\forall \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}$, exactly one of the following holds: $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$.
2. $\forall \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B} \wedge \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \implies \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}$.

Definition: If $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}$ we say that $\mathcal{A} < \mathcal{B} \iff \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{A} \leq \mathcal{B} \iff \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. This defines an order on \mathbb{R} by the above lemma.

1.5.2 Defining the Real Numbers: The Least Upper Bound Property

Lemma: Suppose $\emptyset \neq E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is bounded above. Then $\mathcal{B} := \bigcup_{\mathcal{A} \in E} \mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem: \mathbb{R} satisfies the least upper bound property.

Proof: Let $\emptyset \neq E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be bounded above and set $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{A} \in E} \mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}$. We claim $\mathcal{B} = \sup E$.

First, we show that \mathcal{B} is an upper bound of E . Let $\mathcal{A} \in E$. Then $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \implies \mathcal{A} \leq \mathcal{B}$ (by definition). This is true for all $\mathcal{A} \in E$, so \mathcal{B} is an upper bound.

We claim that for $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{C} < \mathcal{B} \implies \mathcal{C}$ is not an upper bound of E . If $\mathcal{C} < \mathcal{B}$, then $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}$. This implies $\exists b \in \mathcal{B}$. $b \notin \mathcal{C} \implies \exists (\mathcal{A} \in E)$. $b \in \mathcal{A} \wedge b \notin \mathcal{C}$. Then $\mathcal{A} > \mathcal{C}$ since otherwise $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \implies b \in \mathcal{C}$, $b \notin \mathcal{C}$. Hence $\mathcal{C} < \mathcal{A}$ and \mathcal{C} is not an upper bound of E .

By the contrapositive: if \mathcal{C} is an upper bound, $\mathcal{C} \geq \mathcal{B}$. Thus, \mathcal{B} is the least upper bound, and the theorem holds.

1.5.3 Defining the Real Numbers: Addition

Definition: Given $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}$, set $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} = \{a + b \mid a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}\}$.

Lemma: If $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem: Define $-\mathcal{A} = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \exists (p > q). -p \notin \mathcal{A}\}$. Then $\mathbb{R}, +, 0_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathcal{C}_0 = \{p \in \mathbb{Q} \mid p < 0\}$ satisfy the field axioms.

Proof:

- (A1) $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}$ by previous lemma.
- (A2) $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} = \{a + b\} = \{b + a\} = \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{A}$.
- (A3) $\mathcal{A} + (\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C}) = \{a + (b + c)\} = \{(a + b) + c\} = (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}) + \mathcal{C}$.
- (A4) Show $\forall \mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}$. $0_{\mathbb{R}} + \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$.
- (A5) Show that $-\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\mathcal{A} + (-\mathcal{A}) = 0_{\mathbb{R}}$ using Archimedean property.

Theorem (Ordered Field): Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\mathcal{A} < \mathcal{B}$ then $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{C} < \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C}$.

Proof: It's trivial to see that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \implies \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C} \implies \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{C} \leq \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C}$.

If $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C}$, we can add $-\mathcal{C}$ to both sides and use the last theorem to see that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$, a contradiction. Hence, $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{C} < \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C}$.

1.5.4 Defining the Real Numbers: Multiplication

Lemma: Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} > 0_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then $\mathcal{C} = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q \leq 0\} \cup \{a \cdot b \mid a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}, a, b > 0\} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof:

- (C1) $0 \in \mathcal{C} \implies \mathcal{C} \neq \emptyset$. \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} are bounded above by, say M_1, M_2 , so $M_1 \cdot M_2 + 1 \notin \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C} \neq \mathbb{Q}$.
- (C2) Let $p \in \mathcal{C}$ and $q < p$. If $q \leq 0$ then $q \in \mathcal{C}$ by definition. If $q > 0$ then $0 < q < p$, but then $0 < p \implies p = a \cdot b$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}, a, b > 0$. Then $0 < q < a \cdot b \implies \frac{q}{a} < b \implies 0 < \frac{q}{a} \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $q = a(\frac{q}{a}) \in \mathcal{C}$.
- (C3) Let $p \in \mathcal{C}$. If $p \leq 0$ then any $a \cdot b$ with $a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}, a, b > 0$ satisfies $p < a \cdot b \in \mathcal{C}$, so $r = a \cdot b$ is the desired element of \mathcal{C} . However, if $p > 0$, then $p = a \cdot b$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}, a, b > 0$. Choose $s \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $a < s, t \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $t > b$. Then $p = a \cdot b < s \cdot t \in \mathcal{C}$, so $r = s \cdot t$ proves the claim.

Definition of Multiplication: Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}$.

1. If $\mathcal{A} > 0, \mathcal{B} > 0$ we set $\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q \leq 0\} \cup \{a \cdot b \mid a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}, a, b > 0\} \in \mathbb{R}$.
2. If $\mathcal{A} = 0$ or $\mathcal{B} = 0$, we set $\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} = 0_{\mathbb{R}}$.
3. If $\mathcal{A} > 0$ and $\mathcal{B} < 0$, let $\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} = -(\mathcal{A} \cdot (-\mathcal{B}))$.
4. If $\mathcal{A} < 0$ and $\mathcal{B} > 0$, let $\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} = -((- \mathcal{A}) \cdot \mathcal{B})$.
5. If $\mathcal{A} < 0$ and $\mathcal{B} < 0$, let $\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} = (-\mathcal{A}) \cdot (-\mathcal{B})$.

Theorem: \mathbb{R}, \cdot satisfies (M1-M5) with $1_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathcal{C}_1$, and

$\mathcal{A} > 0 \implies \mathcal{A}^{-1} = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q \leq 0\} \cup \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q > 0, \exists p > q. p^{-1} \notin \mathcal{A}\} \in \mathbb{R};$

$\mathcal{A} < 0 \implies \mathcal{A}^{-1} = -(-\mathcal{A})^{-1}$.

Proof: HW3 (similar to addition).

Theorem: If $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} > 0$, then $\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} > 0$.

Proof: By definition $\mathcal{C}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} \implies 0 \leq \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B}$. Equality is impossible since $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} > 0$.

1.5.5 Defining the Real Numbers: Distributivity

Theorem: Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\mathcal{A} \cdot (\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{C}$.

Proof: We prove the case where all are positive. The other cases are in HW.

Let $p \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C})$. If $p \leq 0$ then $p \in \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{C}$ is trivial (both products contain the interval less than 0).

If $p > 0$, $p = a(b + c)$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}, c \in \mathcal{C}$ for $a > 0, b + c > 0$.

Regardless of sign of b or c , $a \cdot b \in \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B}, a \cdot c \in \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{C}$. Hence $p = a(b + c) = a \cdot b + a \cdot c \in \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{C}$. So $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{C}$.

Finally, we show the converse is true; let $p \in \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{C} \implies p = r + s$ for $r \in \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B}, s \in \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{C}$. Case on positivity of p, r, s to show $p \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C})$.

1.5.6 Defining the Real Numbers: Archimedean

Theorem: For $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$, the following are true:

1. $\mathcal{C}_{p+q} = \mathcal{C}_p + \mathcal{C}_q$
2. $\mathcal{C}_{-p} = -\mathcal{C}_p$
3. $\mathcal{C}_{pq} = \mathcal{C}_p \mathcal{C}_q$
4. If $p \neq 0$ then $\mathcal{C}_{p^{-1}} = (\mathcal{C}_p)^{-1}$
5. $p < q \in \mathbb{Q} \iff \mathcal{C}_p < \mathcal{C}_q \in \mathbb{R}$

Proof: HW.

Definition: For $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ we say $\mathcal{C}_q \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem: There exists an ordered field satisfying the least upper bound property; \mathbb{R} is unique (for any ordered field \mathbb{F} satisfying these properties, $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ up to isomorphism; and \mathbb{R} is Archimedean.

Proof: The basic assertion is Steps (0)-(4). Step (5) proves 1, Step (6) proves 3.

1.6 Properties of \mathbb{R}

Notation: think of \mathbb{R} as numbers, not cut notation.

Proposition: \mathbb{R} satisfies the following:

Theorem: For $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$, the following are true:

1. \mathbb{R} is Archimedean: $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x > 0. \exists n \in \mathbb{N}. x < n$
2. $\mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is not bounded above
3. $\inf\{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1\} = 0$
4. $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ the set $B(x) = \{m \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x < m\}$ has a minimum in \mathbb{Z} .
5. $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}, x < y. \exists q \in \mathbb{Q}. x < q < y$

Remarks:

1. (5) is interpreted as “the density of $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ”. Any element $x \in \mathbb{R}$ can be approximated to arbitrary accuracy by elements of \mathbb{Q} .
2. (4) allows us to define the integer part of any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We can set $\lfloor x \rfloor = \min B(x) - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\lfloor x \rfloor \leq x < \lfloor x \rfloor + 1$.

Next we show that \mathbb{R} does not have the “holes” we saw in \mathbb{Q} .

Theorem: Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $x > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1$. Then $\exists! y \in \mathbb{R}. y > 0 \wedge y^n = x$.

Proof: The case $n = 1$ is trivial so assume $n \geq 2$.

Set $E = \{z \in \mathbb{R} \mid z > 0 \wedge z^n < x\}$. We want to show $E \neq \emptyset$ and is bounded above. Set $t = \frac{x}{1+x}$; then $0 < t < 1$ and $t < x$. Hence $0 < t^n < t < x$, and so $t \in E$ and $E \neq \emptyset$.

Set $s = 1 + x$. Then $1 < s \wedge x < s \implies x < s < s^n$; so if $z \in E$ then $z^n < x < s^n \implies z < s$. Then s is an upper bound of E .

By least upper bound property, $\exists y \in \mathbb{R}. y = \sup E$. Since $t \in E$, $0 < t < y$, so $y > 0$. We claim that $y^n < x$ and $y^n > x$ are both impossible (proof is exercise), so $y^n = x$.

Definition: Let $n \geq 1$; for $x \in \mathbb{R}, x > 0$, we write $x^{\frac{1}{n}} = y$ where $y^n = x$. We set $0^{\frac{1}{n}} = 0$.

1.6.1 Absolute Value

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the function $|\cdot| : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid r \geq 0\}$:

$$|x| = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ -x & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases}$$

Proposition (Properties of $|\cdot|$):

1. $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}. |x| \geq 0$ and $|x| = 0 \iff x = 0$
2. $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}. |x| < y \iff -y < x < y$
3. $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}. |xy| = |x||y|$
4. $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}. |x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$ (Triangle Inequality)
5. $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}. ||x| - |y|| \leq |x - y|$

2 Sequences

Let E be a set. Then we may define a sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq E$ as the set of values $a_n \equiv a(n)$ for some $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and some function $a : \{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \geq l\} \rightarrow E$.

2.1 Convergence and Bounds

Definition: We say a sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ converges to $a \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e. $a_n \rightarrow a$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ or $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = a$, if for every $0 < \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $N \in \{m \in \mathbb{Z} \mid m \geq l\}$ such that $n \geq N \implies |a_n - a| < \epsilon$.

Definition: We say a sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is bounded iff. $\exists M \in \mathbb{R}, M > 0. |a_n| < M (\forall n \geq l)$.

Lemma: If a sequence converges, then it is bounded.

Definition: Given $\{a_n\}, \{b_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ we define $\{a_n + b_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ to be the sequence whose elements are $a_n + b_n$. We similarly define $\{ca_n\}$ for a fixed $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{a_nb_n\}$, and $\{a_n/b_n\}$ where $b_n \neq 0, n \geq l$.

Theorem (algebra of convergence): Let $\{a_n\}, \{b_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}, c \in \mathbb{R}$, and assume that $a_n \rightarrow a, b_n \rightarrow b$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then the following hold:

1. $a_n + b_n \rightarrow a + b$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$
2. $ca_n \rightarrow ca$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$
3. $a_nb_n \rightarrow ab$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$
4. If $b_n \neq 0$ and $b \neq 0$, then $a_n/b_n \rightarrow a/b$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: (1), (2) are in next week's HW.

(3): Note that $|a_nb_n - ab| = |a_nb_n - ab_n + ab_n - ab| \leq |a_nb_n - ab_n| + |ab_n - ab| = |b_n||a_n - a| + |a||b_n - b|$. Since $b_n \rightarrow b$ we know that $\exists M > 0. |b_n| < M (\forall n \geq l)$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Since $a_n \rightarrow a$ and $b_n \rightarrow b$ we may choose N_1 such that $n \geq N_1 \implies |a_n - a| < \frac{\epsilon}{2M}$; and N_2 where $n \geq N_2 \implies |b_n - b| < \frac{\epsilon}{2(1+|a|)}$.

Then set $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$. So if $n \geq N$ we know that $|a_n b_n - ab| \leq |b_n| |a_n - a| + |a| |b_n - b| < M |a_n - a| + |a| |b_n - b| < M \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2M} + |a| \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2(1+|a|)} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$.

Since ϵ was arbitrary, we deduce that $a_n b_n \rightarrow ab$.

(4): We know $|\frac{a_n}{b_n} - \frac{a}{b}| = |\frac{a_n b - ab_n}{b_n b}| = |\frac{a_n b - ab + ab - ab_n}{b_n b}| \leq \frac{|a_n b - ab|}{|b_n| |b|} + \frac{|ab - ab_n|}{|b| |b_n|} = \frac{|a_n - a|}{|b_n|} + \frac{|a|}{|b| |b_n|} |b_n - b|$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Since $b_n \rightarrow b \neq 0$ we know that $\exists N_1$ such that $n \geq N_1 \implies |b_n - b| < \frac{|b|}{2}$. Then $n \geq N \implies 0 < |b| = |b - b_n + b_n| \leq |b - b_n| + |b_n| < \frac{|b|}{2} + |b_n| \implies 0 < \frac{|b|}{2} \leq |b_n| \implies 0 < \frac{1}{|b_n|} < \frac{2}{|b|}$.

Similarly, $a_n \rightarrow a \implies \exists N_2$. ($n \geq N_2 \implies |a_n - a| < \frac{\epsilon}{4} |b|$; and

$b_n \rightarrow b \implies \exists N_3$. ($n \geq N_3 \implies |b_n - b| < \frac{\epsilon |b|^2}{4(1+|a|)}$).

Set $N = \max(N_1, N_2, N_3)$. Then $n \geq N \implies |\frac{a_n}{b_n} - \frac{a}{b}| \leq \frac{|a_n - a|}{|b_n|} + \frac{|a|}{|b_n| |b|} |b_n - b| < \frac{2}{|b| |a_n - a|} + \frac{2|a|}{|b|^2} |b_n - b| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \frac{|a|}{1+|a|} < \epsilon$.

Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we deduce $\frac{a_n}{b_n} \rightarrow \frac{a}{b}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma: Let $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty}$ converge to $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\forall \epsilon > 0$. $\exists N$. $m, n \geq N \implies |a_n - a_m| < \epsilon$.

Definition: We say $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is *Cauchy* iff $\forall \epsilon > 0$. $\exists N$. $m, n \geq N \implies |a_n - a_m| < \epsilon$.

Lemma: If $\{a_n\}$ is Cauchy, then it's bounded.

Proof: Let $\epsilon = 1$. Then $\exists N$. $m, n \geq N \implies |a_m - a_n| < 1$. Then $n \geq N \implies |a_n - a_N| < 1 \implies |a_n| < |a_n - a_N| + |a_N| < 1 + |a_N|$. Set $M = \max(1 + |a_N|, k)$, where $k = \max\{|a_l|, \dots, |a_{N-1}|\}$. Then $|a_n| < M (\forall n \geq l)$, and $\{a_n\}$ is bounded.

Theorem: Let $\{a_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Then $\{a_n\}$ converges $\iff \{a_n\}$ is Cauchy.

Proof: \implies is covered by 2nd-previous lemma. We show the converse:

Suppose $\{a_n\}$ is Cauchy. Then $|a_n| < M (\forall n \geq l)$ by the last lemma.

Set $E = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists N. n \geq N \implies x < a_n\}$. Note that $-M < a_n (\forall n \geq l)$, and so $-M \in E$ and $E \neq \emptyset$.

Also, $x \in E \implies \exists N_x$. $n \geq N_x \implies x < a_n < M$, and so M is an upper bound of E .

By the least upper bound property of \mathbb{R} , $\exists a = \sup E \in \mathbb{R}$. We claim that $a_n \rightarrow a$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then since $\{a_n\}$ is Cauchy, $\exists N$. $m, n \geq N \implies |a_n - a_m| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. In particular, $|a_n - a_N| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ when $n \geq N$. Then $n \geq N \implies a_N - \frac{\epsilon}{2} < a_n \implies a_N - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \in E \implies a_N - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \leq a$.

If $x \in E$, then $\exists E_x$. ($n \geq N_x \implies x < a_n < a_N + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$). Hence $a_N + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ is an upper bound of $E \implies a \leq a_N + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Then $|a - a_N| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

But if $n \geq N$, then $|a_n - a| \leq |a_n - a_N| + |a_N - a| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$. Hence $a_n \rightarrow a$.

2.1.1 Squeeze Lemma

Lemma: Let $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty}, \{b_n\}, \{c_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and suppose that $a_n \rightarrow a, c_n \rightarrow a$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If $\exists k \geq l$ such that $a_n \leq b_n \leq c_n (\forall n \geq k)$, then $b_n \rightarrow a$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Examples:

1. Suppose $a_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\{b_n\}$ is bounded, i.e. $|b_n| \leq M (\forall n \geq l)$. Then $|a_n b_n| = |a_n| |b_n| \leq |a_n| M$. But $c_n \rightarrow 0 \iff |c_n| \rightarrow 0$. Then $0 \leq |a_n b_n| \leq |a_n| M$, both sides of which go to 0; and by the squeeze lemma, $|a_n b_n| \rightarrow 0 \implies a_n b_n \rightarrow 0$.
2. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq 1$. Set $a_n = \frac{1}{n^k}, n \geq 1$. Then $0 \leq \frac{1}{n^k} \leq \frac{1}{n}$, and by squeeze lemma $\frac{1}{n^k} \rightarrow 0$.
3. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq 2$. Let $a_n = \frac{1}{k^n}, n \geq 0$. We know $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}. n \leq k^n$ (proof by induction). Then $0 \leq \frac{1}{k^n} \leq \frac{1}{n}$, and by squeeze $\frac{1}{k^n} \rightarrow 0$.

2.2 Monotonicity and limsup, liminf

Definition: Let $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^\infty \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. We say $\{a_n\}$ is:

1. increasing iff. $a_n < a_{n+1} (\forall n \geq l)$,
2. non-decreasing iff. $a_n \leq a_{n+1} (\forall n \geq l)$,
3. decreasing iff. $a_{n+1} < a_n (\forall n \geq l)$,
4. non-increasing iff. $a_{n+1} \leq a_n (\forall n \geq l)$.

We say $\{a_n\}$ is *monotone* iff. it is either non-increasing or non-decreasing.

Remark: increasing \implies non-decreasing, decreasing \implies non-increasing.

Theorem: Suppose that $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^\infty \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is monotone. Then $\{a_n\}$ is bounded iff $\{a_n\}$ is convergent.

Proof: \Leftarrow is done in a previous lemma.

\implies : We'll prove when the sequence is non-decreasing (other case handled by similar argument).

Set $E = \{a_n \mid n \geq l\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Clearly $E \neq \emptyset$. Also, since $\{a_n\}$ is bounded, E is as well (in particular above). By least upper bound property of \mathbb{R} , $\exists a = \sup(E) \in \mathbb{R}$. We claim that $a = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Since $a = \sup(E)$ we know that $a - \epsilon$ is not an upper bound of E ; hence $\exists (N \geq l). a - \epsilon < a_N$. Also, since the sequence is non-decreasing, $a_n \leq a_{n+1} (\forall n \geq l)$, and so $n \geq N \implies a_N \leq a_n$. Then $n \geq N \implies a - \epsilon < a_N \leq a_n \leq a$ because a is an upper bound of E .

So $n \geq N \implies -\epsilon < a_n - a \leq 0 \implies |a_n - a| < \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we deduce that $a_n \rightarrow a$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma: Suppose that $\{a_n\}$ is bounded. Set $S_m = \sup\{a_n \mid n \geq m\}$ and $I_m = \inf\{a_n \mid n \geq m\}$. Then $S_m, I_m \in \mathbb{R}$ are well-defined $\forall m \geq l$; $\{S_m\}$ is non-increasing; and $\{I_m\}$ is non-decreasing. Both sequences are bounded.

Definition: Suppose $\{a_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is bounded. We set $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} S_m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} I_m \in \mathbb{R}$. Both limits exist by the lemma and previous theorem. We know that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ from HW.

2.3 Subsequences

Definition: Let $\phi : \{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \geq l\} \rightarrow \{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \geq l\}$ be order preserving (increasing), i.e. $m < n$ then $\phi(m) < \phi(n)$. Let $\{a_n\}_{l=k}^\infty \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence. We say $\{a_{\phi(k)}\}_{k=l}^\infty$ is a *subsequence* of $\{a_n\}$.

Remarks:

1. $\phi(k) = k$ is order preserving, so every sequence is a subsequence of itself.
2. Not every a_n has to be in the subsequence $\{a_{\phi(k)}\}$.
For example, if $l = 0$ then $\phi(k) = 2k$ is order preserving. In this case a_n, n odd does not appear in the subsequence $\{a_{\phi(k)}\}$.
3. We will often write $n_k = \phi(k)$ to simplify notation, so $\{a_{n_k}\}$ denotes a subsequence.
4. From HW1, we know $k \leq \phi(k)$ ($\forall k \geq l$).

Proposition: Suppose $\{a_n\}$ satisfies $a_n \rightarrow a \in \mathbb{R}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then any subsequence of $\{a_n\}$ also converges to a .

Proof:

Let $\{a_{\phi(k)}\}$ be a subsequence of $\{a_n\}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Since $a_n \rightarrow a$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we know $\exists N \geq l. n \geq N \implies |a_n - a| < \epsilon$. We claim $\exists K \geq l. k \geq K \implies \phi(k) \geq N$.

If not, then $\phi(k) < N (\forall k \geq l)$; but $k \leq \phi(k) < N (\forall k \geq l)$ is a contradiction. Then the claim is true, and $k \geq K \implies \phi(k) \geq N \implies |a_{\phi(k)} - a| < \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we deduce $\{a_{\phi(k)}\} \rightarrow a$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark: Converse fails. Example: $a_n = (-1)^n$; $a_{2n} = +1 \rightarrow +1$, but $a_{2n+1} = -1 \rightarrow -1$.

2.3.1 Limsup Theorem

Theorem: Let $\{a_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be bounded. The following hold:

1. Every subsequence of $\{a_n\}$ is bounded.
2. If $\{a_{n_k}\}$ is a subsequence, then $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$.
3. If $\{a_{n_k}\}$ is a subsequence, then $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k}$.
4. There exists a subsequence $\{a_{n_k}\}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$.
5. There exists a subsequence $\{a_{n_k}\}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ (\neq (4)).

Proof:

1. Trivial.
2. Since $k \leq \phi(k)$, $\{a_{\phi(n)} \mid n \geq k\} \subseteq \{a_n \mid n \geq k\}$ for every order-preserving ϕ . Hence $S_k = \sup\{a_{\phi(n)} \mid n \geq k\} \subseteq \sup\{a_n \mid n \geq k\} = T_k$. But:
 $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{\phi(n)} = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{a_{\phi(n)} \mid n \geq k\} \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{a_n \mid n \geq k\} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$.
3. Similar to (2); exercise to reader.
4. Too lazy to L^AT_EX; exercise to reader.
5. Exercise to reader.

Theorem: Suppose $\{a_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$; the following are equivalent:

1. $a_n \rightarrow a$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$
2. $\{a_n\}$ is bounded, and every convergent subsequence converges to a .
3. $\{a_n\}$ is bounded, and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$.

Proof: (1) \implies (2) proven already.

(2) \implies (3)

Limsup theorem (4,5) $\implies \exists \{a_{\phi(k)}\}, \{a_{\gamma(k)}\}$ subsequences such that $a_{\phi(k)} \rightarrow \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n, a_{\gamma(k)} \rightarrow \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By (2) the limits must agree.

(3) \implies (1)

Limsup theorem (1-3) $\implies \forall \{a_{\phi(k)}\}. \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{\phi(k)} \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{\phi(k)} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$. As the first and last are equal, by transitivity it follows all subsequences satisfy $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{\phi(k)} = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{\phi(k)}$. As a_n is a subsequence of itself, it therefore converges to some a as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem (Bolzano-Weierstrass): If $\{a_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is bounded then there exists a convergent subsequence. Proof from (4) or (5) of Limsup Theorem.

2.4 Special Sequences

Definition: Given $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ for $0 \leq k \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $\sum_{k=0}^n a_k = a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_n$.

Lemma (Binomial Theorem): Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $(x + y)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} x^k y^{n-k}$, where $\binom{n}{k} := \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!} \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem: In the following assuming that $n \geq 1$:

1. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}, x > 0$. Then $a_n = \frac{1}{n^x} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
2. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}, x > 0$. Then $a_n = x^{1/n} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
3. Let $a_n = n^{1/n}$; then $a_n \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
4. Let $a, x \in \mathbb{R}, x > 0$. Then $\frac{n^a}{(1+x)^a} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
5. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}, |x| < 1$. Then $a_n = x^n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

3 Series

Definition: Let $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$; for $p < q$ we write $\sum_{n=p}^q a_n = (a_p + \cdots + a_q)$.

1. We define, for each $n \geq l$, $S_n = \sum_{k=l}^n a_k \in \mathbb{R}$ to be the n^{th} partial sum of $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty}$.
2. If $\exists s \in \mathbb{R}. S_n \rightarrow s$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n = s$. We say the "infinite series" $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges.
3. If the series does not converge, it diverges.

Examples

1. Let $a_n = x^n$ for $n \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $S_n = \sum_{k=0}^n x^k$. Notice that $(1-x)S_n = \sum_{k=0}^n x^k - \sum_{k=0}^n x^{k+1} = \sum_{k=0}^n x^k - \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} x^k = 1 - x^{n+1}$.
So $S_n = \sum_{k=0}^n x^k = \left(\frac{1-x^{n+1}}{1-x}\right)$. If $|x| < 1$ then $S_n \rightarrow \frac{1}{1-x}$ by special seq (5).
2. Suppose $\{b_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ where $b_n \rightarrow b$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Set $a_n = b_{n+1} - b_n$ for $n \geq 0$. Then the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ converges and in fact $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n = b - b_0$.

3.1 Convergence Results

We develop tools that will let us deduce the convergence of a series without knowing its value.

Theorem: Suppose $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges. Then $a_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: Notice that $a_n = S_n - S_{n-1}$ and so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S_n - S_{n-1}) = S - S = 0$.

Corollary: $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n$ diverge, as neither sequences converge to 0.

Corollary: The series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n$ converges $\iff |x| < 1$.

Proof: $|x| \geq 1 \implies |x^n| = |x|^n \geq 1 (\forall n \in \mathbb{N})$. The converse was proved last time.

Next, we provide a characterization of convergence in terms of the size of the “tails” of the series.

Theorem: $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges $\iff \forall \epsilon > 0. \exists N \geq l. m \geq k \geq N \implies |\sum_{n=k}^m a_n| < \epsilon$.

Proof: $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges $\iff S_k = \sum_{n=l}^k a_n$ converges $\iff \{S_k\}$ is Cauchy.

This is useful in practice because we can guarantee a series converges without knowing its value.

Theorem:

1. If $\forall n \geq k. |a_n| \leq b_n$ for some $k \geq l$, and $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} b_n$ converges, then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges.
2. If $\forall n \geq k. 0 \leq a_n \leq b_n$ for some $k \geq l$, and $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ diverges, then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} b_n$ diverges.

Proof: (1) Let $\epsilon > 0$ and prove with previous theorem and induction on triangle inequality. (2) follows from contrapositive.

Examples:

1. $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{2^n}$ converges because $|\frac{(-1)^n}{2^n}| = \frac{1}{2^n}$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n}$ converges ($\frac{1}{2} < 1$).
2. Suppose $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ converges and $a_n \geq 0 \forall n \geq 0$. Let $\{b_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be bounded, i.e. $|b_n| \leq M \forall n$. Then $|a_n b_n| = |a_n| |b_n| \leq M a_n$. Then $M S_n = M \sum_{k=0}^n a_k = \sum_{k=0}^n M a_k$, so by the theorem, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n b_n$ converges.
3. $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{2^n} \cdot \frac{n!}{n^n} \cdot \frac{3n^2}{4n^2+2}$ converges because the product is bounded.

Theorem: Suppose $\forall n \geq l. a_n \geq 0$. Then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges $\iff \{S_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty}$ is bounded.

Proof: Since $a_n \geq 0$, the sequence $S_n = \sum_{k=l}^n a_k$ is non-decreasing: $S_{n+1} = a_{n+1} + S_n \geq S_n$. Since S_n is monotone and converges, it is bounded.

3.1.1 Cauchy Criterion Theorem

Theorem: Suppose that $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\forall n \geq l. a_n \geq 0$ and $\forall n \geq 1. a_{n+1} \leq a_n$. Then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ converges $\iff \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n a_{2^n}$ converges.

Proof:

Let $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k$ and $T_n = \sum_{n=0}^m 2^n a_{2^n}$. Notice that if $m \leq 2^k$ then $S_m = a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{2^k} \leq a_1 + (a_2 + a_3) + \dots + (a_{2^k} + \dots + a_{2^{k+1}-1}) \leq a_1 + 2a_2 + \dots + 2^k a_{2^k} = T_k$.

On the other hand, if $m \geq 2^k$, $S_m \geq a_1 + \cdots + a_{2^k} = a_1 + a_2 + (a_3 + a_4) + \cdots + (a_{2^{k-1}-1} + \cdots + a_{2^k}) \geq \frac{1}{2}a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + 2^{k-1}a_{2^k} = \frac{1}{2}T_k$.

Now, if $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n a_{2^n}$ converges, then $T_n \rightarrow T$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and so $S_m \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_m = T$, which means $\{S_m\}$ is bounded and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ converges.

Similarly, if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ converges, then $T_k \leq 2 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n \implies \{T_k\}$ is bounded $\implies \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n a_{2^n}$ converges.

Theorem: Let $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^p}$ converges $\iff p > 1$.

Proof:

If $p \leq 0$ the result is trivial since $\frac{1}{n^p} \geq 1$ (the sequence converges to 0). Assume that $p > 0$. Then $\frac{1}{(n+1)^p} \leq \frac{1}{n^p}$, so we can apply the Cauchy criterion:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^p} \text{ converges } \iff \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^n}{(2^n)^p} \text{ converges.}$$

But $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^n}{(2^n)^p} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2^{p-1})^n}$, and this series converges $\iff \frac{1}{2^{p-1}} < 1 \iff p > 1$.

Notice $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ is divergent, but $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1+r}}$ converges $\forall r > 0$. To try to find intermediate series, we need the logarithm.

3.1.2 Logarithm

Definition: From Supplemental Reading 3, for every $1 < b \in \mathbb{R}$, we define a function $\log_b : \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x > 0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

1. $b^{\log_b x} = x$ ($\forall x > 0$)
2. $\log_b(1) = 0$, $\log_b b = 1$
3. $0 < x < y \iff \log_b x < \log_b y$
4. $\log_b(x^z) = z \log_b(x)$ ($\forall x > 0, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}$)
5. \log_b is a bijection
6. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_b n}{n^r} = 0$ ($\forall r \in \mathbb{R}, r > 0$)

Then from (6), for large n and $p > 0$ we know:

$$n \leq n(\log_b n)^p \leq n \cdot n^p = n^{1+p} \implies \frac{1}{n^{1+p}} \leq \frac{1}{n(\log_b n)^p} \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

So $\frac{1}{n(\log_b n)^p}$ is such an “intermediate series.”

Theorem: Let $b > 1$. $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\log_b n)^p}$ converges $\iff p > 1$. ($n \geq 2 \implies \log_b n > 0$)

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\log_b n)^p} \text{ converges } &\iff \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^n}{2^n(\log_b 2^n)^p} \text{ converges by Cauchy criterion, but} \\ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(\log_b 2)^p n^p} &= \frac{1}{(\log_b 2)^p} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^p} \text{ converges } \iff p > 1. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n \log_b n}$ is divergent.

3.2 The number e

Lemma: $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!}$ converges.

Proof: If $n \geq 2$ then:

$$\begin{aligned} S_n &= \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!} = 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot 1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n(n-1) \cdots 2 \cdot 1} \\ &\leq 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \cdot 2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \\ &\leq 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} = 1 + 2 = 3 \end{aligned}$$

Since S_n is increasing and bounded, we know that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!}$ converges.

Definition: We set $e = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!}$. Note that $e > 1$.

Theorem: $e = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 + \frac{1}{n})^n$.

Proof: Let $S_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!}$, $T_n = (1 + \frac{1}{n})^n$. Then by the Binomial Theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &= (1 + \frac{1}{n})^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!} \frac{1}{n^k} \\ &= 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} \frac{n(n-1)}{n^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n!} \frac{n(n-1) \cdots 1}{n^n} \\ &= 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} (1 - \frac{1}{n}) + \frac{1}{3!} (1 - \frac{1}{n})(1 - \frac{2}{n}) + \cdots + \frac{1}{n!} (1 - \frac{1}{n}) \cdots (1 - \frac{n-1}{n}) \\ &\leq 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n!} = S_n \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = e$.

OTOH, fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for $n \geq m$:

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &\geq 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} (1 - \frac{1}{n}) + \cdots + \frac{1}{m!} (1 - \frac{1}{n}) \cdots (1 - \frac{m-1}{n}) \\ \implies \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{RHS} \geq 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \frac{1}{n}) + \cdots + \frac{1}{m!} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \frac{1}{n}) \cdots (1 - \frac{m-1}{n}) = 1 + 1 + \cdots \end{aligned}$$

Then, letting $m \rightarrow \infty$, $e = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} S_m \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n$.

Thus, $e \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n \leq e \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n = e$.

Theorem: $\forall n \geq 1$. $0 < e - S_n < \frac{1}{n \cdot n!}$. Also, $e \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ is irrational.

Proof: Since S_n is increasing, $0 < e - S_n$ is clear. The other side can be seen from algebra.

Now, suppose $e \in \mathbb{Q}$; then $e = \frac{p}{q}$ for $p, q \in \mathbb{N}, p, q \geq 1$.

Then $0 < q!(e - S_q) < \frac{1}{q}$ ($\forall q \geq 1$). Notice that $q!e = q!\frac{p}{q} = (q-1)!p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q!(1 + \frac{1}{2!} + \cdots + \frac{1}{q!}) \in \mathbb{N}$.

Hence $q!(e - S_q) \in \mathbb{Z}$; but this yields an integer between 0 and 1, a contradiction. So e is irrational.

Remark: In fact, e is transcendental.

3.3 More Convergence Results

Theorem (Root Test): Suppose $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $\{|a_n|^{1/n}\}$ is bounded. Let $0 \leq \alpha = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n|^{1/n}$. Then the following holds:

1. If $\alpha < 1$, then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges.
2. If $\alpha > 1$, then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ diverges.
3. if $\alpha = 1$, both convergence and divergence are possible.

Theorem (Ratio Test): Let $\{a_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$:

1. converges if $\{|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}|\}_{n=l}^{\infty}$ is bounded and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|a_{n+1}|}{|a_n|} < 1$.
2. diverges if $\exists k \geq l$. $|a_k| \neq 0$ and $|a_{n+1}| \geq |a_n| (\forall n \geq k)$.

Lemma (Summation of Parts): Let $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and define:

$$A_n = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^n a_k & \text{if } n \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } n = -1 \end{cases}$$

Then if $0 \leq p < q$:

$$\sum_{n=p}^q a_n b_n = \sum_{n=p}^{q-1} A_n (b_n - b_{n+1}) + A_q b_q - A_{p-1} b_p$$

Theorem (Dirichlet Test): Suppose $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}, \{b_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ satisfy:

1. The sequence $A_n = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k$ is bounded.
2. $0 \leq b_{n+1} \leq b_n (\forall n \in \mathbb{N})$
3. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 0$

Then $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n b_n$ converges.

Corollary (Alternating Series): Suppose $0 \leq a_{n+1} \leq a_n, a_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} (-1)^n a_n$ converges. Proof follows from Dirichlet Test.

Corollary (Abel's Test): Suppose $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges, $b_{n+1} \leq b_n (\forall n \geq l)$ and $b_n \rightarrow b$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n b_n$ converges.

3.4 Algebra of Series

Theorem: If $A = \sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n, B = \sum_{n=l}^{\infty} b_n$, then

$$(1) A + B = \sum_{n=l}^{\infty} (a_n + b_n) \qquad (2) cA = \sum_{n=l}^{\infty} ca_n \quad (\forall c \in \mathbb{R})$$

Theorem: Suppose $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}, \{b_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy:

$$(1) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n| \text{ converges} \qquad (2) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n = B \qquad (3) c_n = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k b_{n-k} \text{ for } n \geq 0$$

Then $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n = A \cdot B$ converges.

Definition: The series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$, where $c_n = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k b_{n-k}$, is called the *Cauchy product* of the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n$.

Remark: If $\sum a_n$, $\sum b_n$ converge, $\sum c_n$ does not necessarily converge if neither series has convergent absolute values.

3.5 Absolute Convergence and Rearrangements

Proposition: If $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} |a_n|$ converges, then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges. Proof is trivial.

Definition: Suppose $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges. If $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} |a_n|$ converges, the series converges *absolutely*. If $\sum |a_n|$ diverges, the series is *conditionally convergent*.

Example: $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n}$ is conditionally convergent, while $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n^2}$ is absolutely convergent.

Let's try to manipulate the series without being careful.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} = 1 - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4} + \cdots \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (S_k = \sum_{n=0}^k \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (S_{2k} = \sum_{n=0}^{2k} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n}) \\ \text{but: } S_{2k} &= (1 - \frac{1}{2}) + (\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4} + \cdots + (\frac{1}{2k-1} - \frac{1}{2k})) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\gamma > 0$. But the next step is questionable:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\gamma &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2)(-1)^{n+1}}{n} \stackrel{?}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{2k+1} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{2k} \\ &\stackrel{?}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{2k+1} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2k+1} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2k} = \gamma \\ &\implies 2\gamma = \gamma \wedge \gamma > 0 \quad \text{a contradiction!} \end{aligned}$$

Problem: rearrangement is a delicate issue.

Definition: Let $\gamma : \{m \in \mathbb{Z} \mid m \geq l\} \rightarrow \{m \in \mathbb{Z} \mid m \geq l\}$ be a bijection. The series $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_{\gamma(n)}$ is called a rearrangement of $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$.

Theorem: If $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ is absolutely convergent, then every rearrangement converges to $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$.

Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$.

Since $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$ converges absolutely, $\exists N \geq l. k \geq m \geq N \implies \sum_{n=m}^k |a_n| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Let $k \rightarrow \infty : \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} |a_n| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon$.

Now choose $M \geq N$ such that $\{l, l+1, \dots, N\} \subseteq \{\gamma(l), \gamma(l+1), \dots, \gamma(M)\}$. Then $m \geq M \implies |\sum_{n=l}^m a_n - \sum_{n=l}^m a_{\gamma(n)}| \leq \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} |a_n| < \epsilon$.

Hence $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{n=l}^m a_n - \sum_{n=l}^m a_{\gamma(n)}) = 0$ and from this we deduce $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=l}^m a_{\gamma(n)} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=l}^m a_n = \sum_{n=l}^{\infty} a_n$.

When a series is only conditionally convergent, the situation is vastly worse.

Theorem: Suppose $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ is conditionally convergent. Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

There exists a rearrangement (bijection) $\gamma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{\gamma(n)} = c$.

Lemma: Suppose $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ is conditionally convergent and set:

$$b_n = \begin{cases} a_n & \text{if } a_n > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } a_n \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad c_n = \begin{cases} -a_n & \text{if } a_n < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } a_n \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

Then $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$ both diverge.

Proof: Suppose not; one of the series is convergent. If $\sum b_n$ converges, then $c_n = b_n - a_n \implies \sum c_n = \sum b_n - \sum a_n$; but $|a_n| = b_n + c_n$ and so $\sum |a_n| = \sum b_n + \sum c_n$ is convergent, a contradiction. A similar argument holds if $\sum c_n$ converges.

Rearrangement Theorem Proof:

Let $\{a_n^+\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ denote the subsequence of $\{b_n \mid b_n > 0 \text{ or } b_n = 0 \wedge a_n = 0\}$. Let $\{a_n^-\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ denote the subsequence of $\{c_n \mid c_n > 0\}$ (from last lemma). Note:

1. $a_n^+ \rightarrow 0, a_n^- \rightarrow 0$ since $a_n \rightarrow 0 \implies b_n \rightarrow 0, c_n \rightarrow 0$.
2. $\sum a_n^+$ and $\sum a_n^-$ both diverge because they differ by 0 from $\sum b_n, \sum c_n$ respectively.

Set $m_0 = n_0 = -1$. Since $\sum a_n^+$ diverges we may use the well-ordering principle: $\exists m_1 = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \sum_{n=0}^k a_n^+ > c\}$. Similarly, $\exists n_1 = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \sum_{n=0}^{m_1} a_n^+ - \sum_{n=0}^k a_n^- < c\}$.

Next, if m_p and n_p are known, we set:

$$m_{p+1} = \min \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \sum_{l=0}^{p-1} \sum_{j=1+m_l}^{m_l} a_j^+ - \sum_{l=0}^{p-1} \sum_{j=1+n_l}^{n_l} a_j^- + \sum_{j=1+m_p}^k a_j^+ > c \right\}$$

$$n_{p+1} = \min \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \sum_{l=0}^{p-1} \sum_{j=1+m_l}^{m_l} a_j^+ - \sum_{l=0}^{p-1} \sum_{j=1+n_l}^{n_l} a_j^- + \sum_{j=1+m_p}^{m_{p+1}} a_j^+ - \sum_{j=1+n_p}^k a_j^- < c \right\}$$

Consider the series $(a_1^+ + \cdots + a_{m_1}^+) - (a_1^- + \cdots + a_{n_1}^-) + (a_{1+m_1}^+ + \cdots + a_{m_2}^+) - (a_{1+n_1}^- + \cdots + a_{n_2}^-) + \cdots$. This is clearly a rearrangement of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$.

Write $A_p = \sum_{l=1+m_p}^{m_{p+1}} a_l^+, A_p^- = \sum_{l=1+n_p}^{n_{p+1}} a_l^-$, and let S_j denote the j^{th} partial sum of the rearrangement.

By construction, $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} S_j = \limsup_{p \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{l=0}^{p+1} A_l^+ - \sum_{l=0}^p A_l^-)$ and $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} S_j = \liminf_{p \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{l=0}^p A_l^+ + \sum_{l=0}^p A_l^-)$.

Also, $c < \sum_{l=0}^{p+1} A_l^+ - \sum_{l=0}^p A_l^- < c + a_{m_{p+1}}^+$ and $c - a_{n_{p+1}}^- < \sum_{l=0}^{p+1} A_l^+ - \sum_{l=0}^{p+1} A_l^- < c$.

Thus, by the squeeze lemma, $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{l=0}^{p+1} A_l^+ - \sum_{l=0}^p A_l^-) = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{l=0}^p A_l^+ - \sum_{l=0}^p A_l^-) = c$, and so $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} S_j = c \implies \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{\gamma(n)} = c$.

Remark: One can also rearrange such that $\sum a_{\gamma(n)} = \pm\infty$.

4 Topology of \mathbb{R}

Our goal in Section 4 is to develop some tools for understanding the “topology” of \mathbb{R} , which is a sort of generalized qualitative geometry.

4.1 Open and Closed Sets

4.1.1 Open Sets

Definition:

1. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a \leq b$, we define:

$$\begin{aligned} (a, b) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a < x < b\} & [a, b) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x < b\} \\ (a, b] &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a < x \leq b\} & [a, b] &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x \leq b\} \end{aligned}$$

2. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we set $B(x, \epsilon) = (x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon)$ and $B[x, \epsilon] = [x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon]$. We call the set $B(x, \epsilon)$ a *neighborhood* of x or a “ball of radius ϵ centered at x ”.
3. A set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is *open* if $\forall x \in E. \exists \epsilon > 0. B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq E$.
In other words, every point in E has a neighborhood contained in E .

Examples:

1. \emptyset is vacuously open.
2. \mathbb{R} is open because $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}. B(x, 1) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.
3. If $a < b$ then (a, b) is open.
Proof: Fix $x \in (a, b)$ and let $\epsilon = \min\{x - a, b - x\} > 0$. Then $a \leq x - \epsilon < x < x + \epsilon \leq b$ by construction, and $B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq (a, b)$.
4. If $a < b$ then $[a, b)$ is not open.
Proof: For $x = a$ we know that $\forall \epsilon > 0. a - \epsilon \notin [a, b)$ and hence $B(a, \epsilon) \not\subseteq [a, b)$.
5. $[a, b]$ is not open, nor is $(a, b]$ by previous argument.
6. $E = \{a\}$ is not open.
7. $E = \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1\}$ is not open: $\forall \epsilon > 0. B(1, \epsilon) \not\subseteq E$.

Lemma: If $E_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is open $\forall \alpha \in A$ (some index set), then $\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} E_\alpha$ is open.

Proof: Let $x \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} E_\alpha$. Then $x \in E_{\alpha_0}$ for some $\alpha_0 \in A$. Since E_{α_0} is open, $\exists \epsilon > 0. B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq E_{\alpha_0} \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} E_\alpha$.

Lemma: If $E_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is open for $i \in [n], n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\bigcap_{i=1}^n E_i$ is open.

Remark: Infinite intersections of open sets need not be open. Let $E_n = (\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}), n \geq 1$. Then $\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty E_n = \{0\}$ which is closed.

4.1.2 Closed Sets

Definition: We say $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is *closed* iff $E^c = \mathbb{R} \setminus E$ is open.

Lemma: E is open $\iff E^c$ is closed (by definition).

Examples:

1. \emptyset is closed because $\emptyset^c = \mathbb{R}$ is open.
2. \mathbb{R} is closed because $\mathbb{R}^c = \emptyset$ is open.
3. $[a, b]$ is closed because $[a, b]^c = (-\infty, a) \cup (b, \infty)$ is the union of open sets, and thus open.
4. $[a, b)$ and $(a, b]$ are not closed because $[a, b)^c = (-\infty, a) \cup [b, \infty)$ and $B(b, \epsilon) \not\subseteq [a, b)^c$ ($\forall \epsilon > 0$).
5. $\{a\}$ is closed since $\{a\}^c = (-\infty, a) \cup (a, \infty)$, both open sets.
6. Suppose $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is finite. Write $E = \{a_i \mid i \in [n]\}$ where $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_n$. Then $E^c = (-\infty, a_1) \cup (a_1, a_2) \cup \dots \cup (a_{n-1}, a_n) \cup (a_n, \infty)$, all of which are open.
7. $E = \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1\}$ is not closed. $E^c = (-\infty, 0] \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n}) \cup (1, \infty)$ is not open because $B(0, \epsilon) \cap E = \{\frac{1}{n} \mid \frac{1}{\epsilon} < n\} \neq \emptyset \implies B(0, \epsilon) \not\subseteq E^c$.
8. $E = \{0\} \cup \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \geq 1\}$ is closed, as $E^c = (-\infty, 0) \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n}) \cup (1, \infty)$ is open.

Lemma:

1. If $E_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is closed $\forall \alpha \in A$, then $\bigcap_{\alpha \in A} E_\alpha$ is closed.
2. If $E_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is closed $\forall i \in [n]$ then $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$ is closed.

Proof: The complement is the union of E_α^c (open by claim), which is open by previous lemma.

Remark: Example (7) shows that infinite unions of closed sets need not be closed.

4.1.3 Limit Points

Definition: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

1. A point $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is a *limit point* of E iff. $\forall \epsilon > 0$. $(B(x, \epsilon) \cap E) \setminus \{x\} \neq \emptyset$.
2. A point $x \in E$ is called *isolated* if it is not a limit point.

Example: $E = \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \geq 1\}$. 0 is a limit point, but $\frac{1}{n} \in E$ is isolated, since $B(\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n(n+1)}) \cap E = \{\frac{1}{n}\}$.

Theorem: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. E is closed \iff every limit point of E is contained in E .

Proof:

\implies :

Assume E is closed and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is a limit point of E . If $x \in E^c$ then, since E^c is open, $\exists \epsilon > 0$. $B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq E^c \implies B(x, \epsilon) \cap E = \emptyset$. But this contradicts the fact that x is a limit point of E ; thus $x \in E$.

\impliedby :

Suppose E is not closed; then E^c is not open and so $\forall \epsilon > 0$. $\exists x \in E^c$. $B(x, \epsilon) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. Since $x \in E^c$, $(B(x, \epsilon) \cap E) \setminus \{x\} = B(x, \epsilon) \cap E \neq \emptyset$ and hence x is a limit point of E . Then $x \in E \cap E^c$, a contradiction; and E is closed.

Definition: Let $\{x_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq S$ for some set S . We say $\{x_n\}$ is *eventually constant* if $\exists N \geq l$. $x_n = x_N$ ($\forall n \geq N$).

Proposition: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Then x is a limit point of $E \iff \exists \{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subseteq E$ such that the sequence is not eventually constant and $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof:

\implies :

Suppose x is a limit point of E , i.e. $\forall \epsilon > 0$. $(B(x, \epsilon) \cap E) \setminus \{x\} \neq \emptyset$. Set $r_1 = 1$ and choose $x_1 \in E$ such that $x_1 \in (B(x, r) \cap E) \setminus \{x\}$.

Set $r_n = \min(\frac{1}{n}, |x - x_{n-1}|)$ and choose $x_n \in (B(x_1, r_n) \cap E) \setminus \{x\}$.

Then $\forall n \geq 1$. $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq E$ and $|x - x_{n-1}| < |x - x_n|$ and $|x - x_n| < \frac{1}{n}$. It follows $\{x_n\}$ is not eventually constant, and $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

\impliedby :

Let $\epsilon > 0$. $\exists N \geq 1$. $n \geq N \implies |x - x_n| < \epsilon$. Then $\{x_n \mid n \geq N\} \subseteq B(x, \epsilon) \cap E$. If $\{x_n \mid n \geq N\} = \{x\}$ then $\{x_n\}$ is eventually constant, a contradiction. Hence $\emptyset \neq \{x_n \mid n \geq N\} \setminus \{x\} \subseteq (B(x, \epsilon) \cap E) \setminus \{x\} \implies (B(x, \epsilon) \cap E) \setminus \{x\} \neq \emptyset$, and hence x is a limit point.

Corollary: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. The following are equivalent (proof follows from last theorem):

1. E is closed.
2. If $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is a limit point of E , $x \in E$.
3. If $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq E$ is such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $x \in E$.

Corollary: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $E \neq \emptyset$. Suppose E is closed.

1. If E is bounded above, then $\sup E \in E$, i.e. $\sup E = \max E$.
2. If E is bounded below, then $\inf E \in E$, i.e. $\inf E = \min E$.

4.1.4 Closure, Interior, and Boundary Sets

Definition: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

1. Let $\mathcal{O}(E) = \{V \subseteq \mathbb{R} \mid V \subseteq E \text{ and } V \text{ is open}\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$
 $\mathcal{C}(E) = \{C \subseteq \mathbb{R} \mid E \subseteq C \text{ and } C \text{ is closed}\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$.
 Note that $\emptyset \in \mathcal{O}(E)$ and $\mathbb{R} \in \mathcal{C}(E)$.
2. We define $E^0 = \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{O}(E)} V$, and call this set the *interior* of E .
 We define $\bar{E} = \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}(E)} C$, and call this set the *closure* of E .
3. We define $\partial E = E \setminus E^0$ to be the *boundary* of E .

Theorem: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. The following hold:

1. $E^0 \subseteq E \subseteq \bar{E}$
2. E^0 is open and $\bar{E}, \partial E$ are closed.
3. For every $x \in E$, $x \in E^0 \oplus x \in \partial E$.
4. $\partial E = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid \forall \epsilon > 0. B(x, \epsilon) \cap E \neq \emptyset \text{ and } B(x, \epsilon) \cap E^c \neq \emptyset\}$.
5. E is open $\iff E = E^0$, E is closed $\iff E = \bar{E}$.

Proof:

1. Trivial.
2. E^0 is an arbitrary union of open sets and thus open; \bar{E} is an arbitrary intersection of closed sets, so it's closed. $\partial E = \bar{E} \setminus E^0 = \bar{E} \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E^0)$ is the intersection of two closed sets, so it's closed.

3. Trivial.
4. Suppose $x \in \partial E$. Show the two properties of the set are satisfied via contradiction. Next, assume x in the set, and show that $x \in \partial E$.
5. Trivial.

Corollary: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Then E is closed $\iff \partial E \subseteq E$.

Proof: E is closed $\implies E = \bar{E} \implies \partial E \subseteq \bar{E} \subseteq E$. On the other hand, if $\partial E \subseteq E$ then $E \subseteq \bar{E} = E^0 \cup \partial E \subseteq E$, so $E = \bar{E}$.

Theorem (Bolzano-Weierstass, Part 2): Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be infinite and bounded. Then E has a limit point.

Proof: Since E is infinite we may construct a non-eventually-constant sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \subseteq E$. We do so by choosing $x_0 \in E$ arbitrarily, and $x_n \in E \setminus \{x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Since E is bounded, the sequence is too, so B-W implies there exists a convergent subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}_{k=0}^\infty \subseteq E$. This subsequence is not eventually constant by construction, so its limit is a limit point.

4.2 Compact Sets

Definition:

1. Let A be some index set and assume $\forall \alpha \in A. V_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. We write $\mathcal{V} = \{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ for the collection of all of these subsets.
2. If $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $E \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} V_\alpha$, then we say \mathcal{V} is a *cover* of E .
3. If $V_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is open $\forall \alpha \in A$ and \mathcal{V} is a cover of E , we say \mathcal{V} is an *open cover*.
4. Let \mathcal{V} be a cover of E . We say $\mathcal{W} = \{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A'}$ is a *subcover* of E if $A' \subseteq A$ and \mathcal{W} is a cover of E .
5. Let \mathcal{V} be a cover of E . If A is finite, then $\mathcal{W} = \{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A'}$ is a *finite subcover* of E , if \mathcal{W} is a subcover of E .

Examples:

1. Every $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ admits a cover: $E = \bigcup_{x \in E} \{x\}$.
2. Every $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ admits an open cover: $E \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in E} B(x, \epsilon)$ for $\epsilon > 0$.
3. If E is finite and \mathcal{V} is an open cover, we claim there is a finite open subcover. Indeed, write $E = \{a_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and choose V_{α_i} such that $a_i \in V_{\alpha_i}$. Then $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_{\alpha_i}$ and $\{V_{\alpha_i}\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$. Hence every open cover of a finite set admits a finite open subcover.
4. $E = \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \geq 1\}$. $\mathcal{V} = \{B(\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n(n+1)})\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is an open cover of E . Note that $B(\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n(n+1)}) \cap E = \{\frac{1}{n}\}$, so there does not exist a finite subcover.
5. $E = \{0\} \cup \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \geq 1\}$. Suppose \mathcal{V} is an open cover of E . Since $0 \in E$, $\exists \alpha_0 \in A. 0 \in V_{\alpha_0}$. Since V_{α_0} is open, $\exists \epsilon > 0. B(0, \epsilon) \subseteq V_{\alpha_0}$. Then $B(0, \epsilon) \cap E = \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \geq N\}$ where $N = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon}\}$. Hence $E \setminus B(0, \epsilon) = \{\frac{1}{n} \mid 1 \leq n \leq N\}$. There exist V_{α_n} for $n \in [N]$ such that $\frac{1}{n} \in V_{\alpha_n}$. Then $E \subseteq \bigcup_{n=0}^N V_{\alpha_n}$ and E has a finite subcover.
6. Let $a < b$ and $E = (a, b)$. Then $\mathcal{V} = \{(a + \frac{1}{n+1}, b - \frac{1}{n+1})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an open cover of E . Since these intervals are nested, there cannot be a finite subcover.

Definition: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. We say that E is *compact* if every open cover of E admits a finite subcover.

Examples:

1. \emptyset is trivially compact.
2. \mathbb{R} is not compact because $\mathcal{V} = \{B(0, n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an open cover that clearly does not admit a finite subcover of \mathbb{R} .
3. Any finite set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is compact.
4. (a, b) for $a < b$ is not compact.
5. $\{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \geq 1\}$ is not compact.
6. $\{0\} \cup \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \geq 1\}$ is compact.

Notice in each of our examples of compact sets that the set is closed and bounded.

4.2.1 Heine-Borel Theorem

Theorem: Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Then K is compact $\iff K$ is closed and bounded.

Proof:

\implies Suppose K is compact.

Notice that $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B(0, n) = \mathbb{R}$ (since \mathbb{R} is Archimedean) and so $K \subseteq \mathbb{R} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B(0, n)$. Then $\{B(0, n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is an open cover of K . Since K is compact, \exists a finite subcover: $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^m B(0, n_i)$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Set $r = \max_{i \in [m]} n_i$. Then $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^m B(0, n_i) \subseteq B(0, r) \implies K$ is bounded.

Now we show K is closed. Let $x \in K^C$. For each $y \in K$ we set $r_y = \frac{1}{2}|x - y| > 0$. Then $B(y, r_y) \cap B(x, r_y) = \emptyset$ ($\forall y \in K$). Also, $\{B(y, r_y)\}_{y \in K}$ is an open cover.

K compact $\implies \exists$ a finite subcover: $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(y_i, r_{y_i})$. Set $r = \min_{i \in [n]} r_i > 0$ and notice that $B(y_i, r_{y_i}) \cap B(x, r) = \emptyset$. Hence $\bigcup_{i=1}^n B(y_i, r_{y_i}) \cap B(x, r) = \emptyset \implies K \cap B(x, r) = \emptyset \implies B(x, r) \subseteq K^C$. This means that K^C is open and so K is closed.

\Leftarrow (**Heine-Borel**) Suppose K is closed and bounded. If $K = \emptyset$ we're done, so suppose $K \neq \emptyset$.

Notice that K bounded $\implies \inf K, \sup K \in \mathbb{R}$, and K closed $\implies \inf K, \sup K \in K$. In particular, $\sup K = \max K, \inf K = \min K$. Let \mathcal{V} be an open cover of K .

Let $E = \{x \in K \mid \mathcal{V} \text{ admits a finite subcover of } K \cap [\inf K, x]\} \subseteq K$. Notice that $K \cap [\inf K, \inf K] = \{\inf K\}$ is a finite set and hence compact; thus \mathcal{V} admits a finite subcover of $K \cap [\inf K, \inf K]$. Hence $\inf K \in E$, and so $E \neq \emptyset$. Clearly E is bounded above by $\sup K$. By LUB property, $\exists \sup E \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sup E \leq \sup K$.

We want to show $\sup E = \sup K = \max E$. Notice that $\forall n \geq 1, \exists x_n \in E \subseteq K$ such that $\sup E - \frac{1}{n} < x_n \leq \sup E$. Then $x_n \rightarrow \sup E$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and so $\sup E \in K$ (since K is closed).

Write $\mathcal{V} = \{V_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in A}$. Since $\sup E \in K, \exists \alpha_0 \in A$ such that $\sup E \in V_{\alpha_0}$. But V_{α_0} is open so $\exists \epsilon > 0, B(\sup E, \epsilon) \subseteq V_{\alpha_0}$. By definition, $\exists x \in E, \sup E - \epsilon < x \leq \sup E$. Hence \mathcal{V} admits a finite subcover of $K \cap [\inf K, x]$, i.e. $K \cap [\inf K, x] \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_{\alpha_i}$. Then $K \cap [\inf K, \sup E] \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_{\alpha_i} \implies \sup E \in E \implies \sup E = \max E$.

Assume for sake of contradiction that $\max E < \max K$. Let $K' = K \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^n V_{\alpha_i}$. K' is closed since it's the intersection of closed sets. $K' \neq \emptyset$ since otherwise $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^n V_{\alpha_i} \implies \max E = \max K$.

Let $y = \inf K' = \min K'$ (since K' is closed) and note that $y > \max E$. Then $K \cap [\inf K, y] = K \cap [\inf K, \min K'] \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^n V_{\alpha_i} \cup \{y\}$. But since $y \in K' \subseteq K$, $\exists V_{\alpha_{n+1}} \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $y \in V_{\alpha_{n+1}}$. Hence $K \cap [\inf K, y] \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{n+1} V_{\alpha_i} \implies y \in E \implies \max E < y \leq \max E$, a contradiction. We then deduce that $\max E = \max K \implies K = K \cap [\min K, \max K]$ is covered by a finite subcover of \mathcal{V} ; thus, K is compact.

Corollary:

1. If $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is compact and $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is closed, then $E \cap K$ is compact.
2. If $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is compact and $E \subseteq K$ is closed, then E is compact.
3. If $K_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is compact for $i \in [n]$, then $\bigcup_{i=1}^n K_i$ is compact.
4. If $K_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is compact $\forall \alpha \in A$, then $\bigcap_{\alpha \in A} K_\alpha$ is compact.

4.3 Connected Sets

Definition: We say two sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ are *separated* if $A \cap \bar{B} = \bar{A} \cap B = \emptyset$.

A set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is *disconnected* if $E = A \cup B$ such that $A \neq \emptyset, B \neq \emptyset$ and A, B are separated. If a set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is not disconnected, we say it's *connected*.

Examples:

1. $(0, 1)$ and $[1, 2)$ are not separated, though they are disjoint, since $\overline{(0, 1)} \cap [1, 2) = [0, 1] \cap [1, 2) = \{1\} \neq \emptyset$.
2. (a, b) and (b, c) for $a < b < c$ are separated, since $\overline{(a, b)} \cap (b, c) = \emptyset = (a, b) \cap \overline{(b, c)}$. Then $(a, c) \setminus \{b\}$ is disconnected, since $(a, c) \setminus \{b\} = (a, b) \cup (b, c)$.
3. Similarly, $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}$. $(-\infty, a)$ and (a, ∞) are separated. Then $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{a\} = (-\infty, a) \cup (a, \infty)$ is disconnected.

Theorem: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Then E is connected $\iff (x, y \in E \text{ and } x < z < y \implies z \in E)$.

Proof:

$\neg 2 \implies \neg 1$:

If (2) is false then $\exists x, y \in E$ and $z \in (x, y)$ such that $z \notin E$. Then $E = L_z \cup R_z$ for $L_z = E \cap (-\infty, z)$ and $R_z = E \cap (z, \infty)$. Since $x \in L_z, y \in R_z$, and $L_z \subseteq (-\infty, z)$ and $R_z \subseteq (z, \infty)$, it follows that L_z and R_z are separated. Hence E is disconnected.

$\neg 1 \implies \neg 2$

Suppose E is disconnected. Write $E = A \cup B$ with $A, B \neq \emptyset$ and $\bar{A} \cap B = A \cap \bar{B} = \emptyset$. Let $x \in A$ and $y \in B$. Without loss of generality, we assume $x < y$.

Let $z = \sup(A \cap [x, y])$. Clearly $z \in \bar{A}$ and so $z \notin B \implies z \neq y \implies x \leq z \leq y$. If $z \notin A$ then $z \neq x \implies x < z < y$ and $z \notin A \cup B = E$. Otherwise, if $z \in A$, then $z \notin \bar{B}$. \bar{B} is closed, so \bar{B}^C is open; and hence we can find w such that $z < w < y$, $w \notin B$, and $w \notin A$. Then $x < w < y$ and $w \notin A \cup B = E$. In all cases, then, $\neg 2$ is true.

Corollary: $\mathbb{R}, (-\infty, a), (-\infty, a], (a, \infty), [a, \infty), (a, b), (a, b], [a, b), \text{ and } [a, b]$ are all connected.

5 Continuity

5.1 Limits of Functions

Definition: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $p \in \mathbb{R}$ be a limit point. Let $q \in \mathbb{R}$.

We say $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$ or $f(x) \rightarrow q$ as $x \rightarrow p$ iff $\forall \epsilon > 0. \exists \delta > 0. x \in E \wedge 0 < |x - p| < \delta \implies |f(x) - q| < \epsilon$.

Examples:

1. $E = [0, 1], f(x) = x$. Let $p = \frac{1}{2}$. $\lim_{x \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}} f(x) = \frac{1}{2}$.
Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$; choose $\delta = \epsilon > 0$. Then $x \in [0, 1]$ and $0 < |x - \frac{1}{2}| < \delta \implies |f(x) - \frac{1}{2}| < \epsilon$.
2. $E = [0, 1], f(x) = x$ (for $x \neq \frac{1}{2}$), $f(x) = 37$ (for $x = \frac{1}{2}$).
 By the proof of (1), the claim still holds.
3. $f(x) = x^n$ on $E = (0, 1)$ for $2 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$. 0 is a limit point of E ; we claim $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} x^n = 0$.
Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$; choose $\delta = \epsilon^{1/n} > 0$. Then $x \in (0, 1)$ and $0 < |x - 0| < \delta \implies 0 < x < \delta \implies 0 < x^n < \delta^n = \epsilon \implies |f(x) - 0| = x^n < \epsilon$.
4. $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} x = p$ whenever p is a limit point of E .
5. If $\forall x \in E. f(x) = 1$ then $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = 1$ whenever p is a limit point of E .
6. Let $E = \mathbb{R}$ and $f(x) = \cos(x)$. From HW6, $|\cos(x) - 1| \leq x^2 e^{x^2}$. We claim $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \cos(x) = 1$.
Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$. Choose $\delta = \min(1, \sqrt{\epsilon/e}) > 0$. Then for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < |x - 0| < \delta \implies |x| < \min(1, \sqrt{\epsilon/e}) \implies |\cos(x) - 1| \leq x^2 e^{x^2}$ (since $|x|^2 < \delta \leq 1 \implies e^{|x|^2} \leq e^1$) $\implies |\cos(x) - 1| < \delta^2 e \leq (\sqrt{\epsilon/e})^2 e = \epsilon$.
7. $E = \{\frac{1}{n} \mid n \geq 1\}, p = 0$. Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ for $x \in E$. We claim $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x)$ does not exist.
Proof: Suppose not. Then for $\epsilon = 1$. $\exists \delta > 0. x \in E, 0 < |x - 0| < \delta \implies |f(x) - q| < 1$. But $x \in E, |x| < \delta \implies x = \frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{\delta} < n$, and $|f(x) - q| = |\frac{1}{1/n} - q| = |n - q| < 1$, which is a contradiction.

Definition: Let $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. If $A \subseteq E$ we define $f(A) = \{f(x) \mid x \in A\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ as the *image* of A under f . If $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ we define $f^{-1}(B) = \{x \in E \mid f(x) \in B\}$ as the *pre-image* of B under f .

Lemma: Suppose $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then $A \subseteq B \subseteq E \implies f(A) \subseteq f(B)$, and $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{R} \implies f^{-1}(A) \subseteq f^{-1}(B) \subseteq E$.

5.1.1 Divergence Criteria

Theorem (Divergence Criteria): Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, p be a limit point of E , $q \in \mathbb{R}$. The following are equivalent:

1. $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$
2. For every open set $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that $q \in V$, \exists an open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $p \in U$ such that $f(U \cap E \setminus \{p\}) \subseteq V$. (*Topological characterization*)

3. If $\{x_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq E$ satisfies $x_n \neq p$ ($\forall n \geq l$) and $x_n \rightarrow p$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the sequence $\{f(x_n)\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ converges and $f(x_n) \rightarrow q$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. (*Sequential characterization*)

Proof:

(1) \implies (2) :

Assume (1) and let $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be open with $q \in V$. Since V is open, $\exists \epsilon > 0$. $B(q, \epsilon) \subseteq V$. Since $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$, $\exists \delta > 0$. $x \in E \wedge 0 < |x - p| < \delta \implies |f(x) - q| < \delta$. Let $U = B(p, \delta)$ (an open set). Then $x \in U \cap E \setminus \{p\} \implies x \in E \wedge |x - p| < \delta \implies |f(x) - q| < \epsilon \implies f(x) \in B(q, \epsilon) \subseteq V$. So $f(U \cap E \setminus \{p\}) \subseteq V$ as desired.

(2) \implies (3):

Assume (2) and let $\{x_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq E$ satisfy $x_n \neq p, x_n \rightarrow p$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and set $V = B(q, \epsilon)$ (open). From (2), \exists open U such that $f(U \cap E \setminus \{p\}) \subseteq V$ and $p \in U$. Since U is open, $\exists \delta > 0$. $B(p, \delta) \subseteq U$. Since $x_n \rightarrow p$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\exists N \geq l$. $n \geq N \implies |x_n - p| < \delta \implies x_n \in U \cap E \setminus \{p\} \implies f(x_n) \in V = B(q, \epsilon)$. Hence $n \geq N \implies |f(x_n) - q| < \epsilon$, and $f(x) \rightarrow q$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

$\neg(1) \implies \neg(3)$:

Suppose (1) is false; then $\exists \epsilon > 0$. $\forall \delta > 0$. $\exists x \in E$ with $0 < |x - p| < \delta$ such that $|f(x) - q| \geq \epsilon$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1$, set $\delta = \frac{1}{n}$ to find $x_n \in E$ such that $0 < |x_n - p| < \frac{1}{n}$ and $|f(x_n) - q| \geq \epsilon$. Clearly, $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subseteq E$ satisfies $x_n \neq p, x_n \rightarrow p$. But $f(x_n)$ does not converge to q . Hence (3) fails.

Corollary: If $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}, f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, p$ is a limit point of E , and $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$, then q is unique.

Proof: Limits of sequences are unique, so this follows from (3) in Divergent Criteria theorem.

Corollary (Algebra of limits): Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}, f, g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, p$ be a limit point of E . Assume $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q_1, \lim_{x \rightarrow p} g(x) = q_2$. The following hold:

1. If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ then $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} (\alpha f(x) + \beta g(x)) = \alpha q_1 + \beta q_2$
2. $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x)g(x) = q_1 q_2$
3. If $q_2 = \lim_{x \rightarrow p} g(x) \neq 0$, then $\frac{f}{g} : E \setminus g^{-1}(\{0\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is well-defined, p is a limit point of $E \setminus g^{-1}(\{0\})$, and $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = \frac{q_1}{q_2}$

Proof: All follow from the algebra of sequential limits and (3) in the Theorem.

As an application of this, we get a large class of limit examples.

Corollary: Let $P : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial, i.e. $P(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}, a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in [n]$. If p is a limit point of E , then $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} P(x) = P(p)$.

Proof: We know $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} 1 = 1, \lim_{x \rightarrow p} x = p$. Algebra of limits (2) and simple induction show $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} x^k = p^k$ ($\forall k \in \mathbb{N}^+$). Then algebra of limits (1) and another induction argument prove $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} P(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p} (a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p} (a_0 + a_1p + \cdots + a_np^n) = P(p)$.

5.2 Continuous Functions

Definition: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}, f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, p \in E$. We say f is *continuous* at p iff:

$$\forall \epsilon > 0. \exists \delta > 0. x \in E \wedge |x - p| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(p)| < \epsilon$$

If $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous at each $p \in E$ we say f is continuous on E .

Remarks:

1. In order to be continuous at $p \in E$, f must be defined at p . Contrast this to $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x)$, in which case p need only be a limit point of E .
2. Informally one can think of continuous functions as those approximated well “near p ” by $f(p)$, i.e. $f(x) \approx f(p)$ when $x \approx p$.
3. In the definition, the value of δ may depend on the point p . If a function is continuous on E then for a given $\epsilon > 0$ the $\delta = \delta(p)$ may vary greatly as p varies.
4. If $p \in E$ is isolated (not a limit point of E), then f is vacuously continuous at p : $x \in E, |x - p| < \delta$ for δ small enough $\implies x = p$.

Example:

We saw last time that $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} P(x) = P(p)$ for all polynomials $P : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Hence $\forall \epsilon > 0. \exists \delta > 0. x \in \mathbb{R}, 0 < |x - p| < \delta \implies |P(x) - P(p)| < \epsilon$. Hence P is continuous at p .

Theorem: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}, f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, p \in E$ be a limit point of E . Then:

$$f \text{ is continuous at } p \iff \lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = f(p)$$

Corollary (Algebra of Continuity): Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}, f, g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $p \in E$. Assume that f, g are continuous at p . Then the following hold:

1. If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ then $\alpha f + \beta g$ is continuous at p .
2. fg is continuous at p .
3. If $g(p) \neq 0$ then $\frac{f}{g} : E \setminus g^{-1}(\{0\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is well-defined and continuous at p .

Proof: If p is isolated, the claim is vacuously true. Assume p is not isolated, i.e. p is a limit point of E . Then the last theorem and algebra of limits gives the result.

Corollary: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}, f, g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If f, g are continuous on E , then:

1. If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ then $\alpha f + \beta g$ is continuous on E .
2. fg is continuous on E .
3. If $g(x) \neq 0$ ($\forall x \in E$), then $\frac{f}{g}$ is continuous on E .

Theorem: Let $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{R}, f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, g : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assume $f(E) \subseteq F$, f is continuous at $p \in E$, and g is continuous at $f(p) \in F$. Then $g \circ f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (where $(g \circ f)(x) = g(f(x))$) is continuous at p . Moreover, if f is continuous on E and g is continuous on F , then $g \circ f$ is continuous on E .

Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$.

Since g is continuous at $f(p)$, $\exists \eta > 0. y \in F$ and $|y - f(p)| < \eta \implies |g(y) - g(f(p))| < \epsilon$.

Since f is continuous at p , $\exists \delta > 0. x \in E, |x - p| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(p)| < \eta$.

Since $f(E) \subseteq F$ we know that $x \in E, |x - p| < \delta \implies f(x) \in F, |f(x) - f(p)| < \eta \implies |g(f(x)) - g(f(p))| < \epsilon$. Hence, $g \circ f$ is continuous by definition.

Examples:

1. $\exp, \cos, \sin : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous on \mathbb{R} (proof in HW). Also, $\log : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous on $(0, \infty)$.
2. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and set $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $f(x) = x^\alpha$. Notice that $f(x) = \exp(\alpha \log x)$. Since \log and \exp are continuous, $f(x) = x^\alpha$ is continuous.

Definition: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $A \subseteq E$. We say A is *relatively open* in E iff $A = U \cap E$ for some open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, we say A is *relatively closed* in E iff $A = C \cap E$ for some closed $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

Proposition: Let $A \subseteq E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. The following hold:

1. A is relatively open in $E \iff \forall x \in A. \exists \epsilon > 0. B(x, \epsilon) \cap A \subseteq E$.
2. A is relatively closed in $E \iff A = B^C \cap E$ for some relatively open $B \subseteq E$.

Theorem (Continuity Criteria): Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}, f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The following are equivalent:

1. f is continuous on E .
2. If $p \in E$ is a limit point of E , then $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = f(p)$.
3. If $p \in E$ is a limit point of E and $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq E$ satisfies $x_n \rightarrow p$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(p)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
4. If $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is open, then $f^{-1}(V) \subseteq E$ is relatively open in E .
5. If $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is closed, then $f^{-1}(C) \subseteq E$ is relatively closed in E .

Proof:

- (1) \iff (2) \iff (3) follows from the sequential criterion of limits, previous theorem.
 (4) \iff (5) follows since $f^{-1}(V^C) = (f^{-1}(V))^C \cap E$.

(1) \implies (4):

Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be open and choose $p \in f^{-1}(V)$. Since V is open, $\exists \epsilon > 0. B(f(p), \epsilon) \subseteq V$. It suffices to show, via previous proposition, that $\exists \delta > 0. B(p, \delta) \cap E \subseteq f^{-1}(V)$. Since f is continuous on E , $\exists \delta > 0. x \in E, |x - p| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(p)| < \epsilon$. That is, $x \in B(p, \delta) \cap E \implies |f(x) - f(p)| < \epsilon \implies f(x) \in B(f(p), \epsilon) \subseteq V$. Hence $B(p, \delta) \cap E \subseteq f^{-1}(V)$.

(4) \implies (1):

Let $p \in E, \epsilon > 0$, and $V = B(f(p), \epsilon)$. Then $f^{-1}(B(f(p), \epsilon)) \subseteq E$ is relatively open in $E \implies$ (by previous proposition) $\exists \delta > 0. B(p, \delta) \cap E \subseteq f^{-1}(B(f(p), \epsilon))$. Then $x \in E$ and $|x - p| < \delta \implies f(x) \in B(f(p), \epsilon) \implies |f(x) - f(p)| < \epsilon$. Since ϵ, p were arbitrary, we deduce f is continuous on E .

5.3 Compactness and Continuity

Theorem: Suppose $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is compact and $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous on K . Then $f(K)$ is compact.

Proof:

Note that for $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $f(f^{-1}(E)) \subseteq E$ and $E \subseteq f^{-1}(f(E))$. Let $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ be an open cover of $f(K)$. Since f is continuous and V_α is open, $f^{-1}(V_\alpha)$ is relatively open in $K \implies f^{-1}(V_\alpha) = U_\alpha \cap K$ for some open $U_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

Since $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ cover $f(K)$, we see that $\{f^{-1}(V_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in A}$ is a cover of K . Then $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ is an open cover of K . Since K is compact, there exists a finite subcover: $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_{\alpha_i}$. Then $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_{\alpha_i} \cap K = \bigcup_{i=1}^n f^{-1}(V_{\alpha_i}) \implies f(K) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n f(f^{-1}(V_{\alpha_i})) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_{\alpha_i}$. As we have extracted a finite open subcover of $f(K)$, $f(K)$ is compact.

Extreme Value Theorem: Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be compact and $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Then $\exists x_0, x_1 \in K$ such that $f(x_0) \leq f(x) \leq f(x_1)$ ($\forall x \in K$). That is, $f(x_0) = \min_{x \in K} f(x) = \min f(K)$ and $f(x_1) = \max_{x \in K} f(x) = \max f(K)$.

Proof: From last theorem, we know $f(K)$ is compact, so it's closed and bounded. From a previous theorem, closed and bounded sets contain their infimum and supremum (and thus min, max).

Definition: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We say f is *uniformly continuous* on E iff:

$$\forall \epsilon > 0. \exists \delta > 0. x, y \in E \wedge |x - y| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon$$

Remarks:

1. f is uniformly continuous on $E \implies f$ is continuous on E .
2. The key difference is that for uniform continuity, $\delta > 0$ works for all points in E .

Examples:

1. Let $E = (0, 1)$ and $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. It's trivial that f is continuous on E , but it is not uniformly continuous.

Proof: Suppose it is; then for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, $\exists \delta > 0$. $x, y \in (0, 1) \wedge |x - y| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(y)| < \frac{1}{2}$. Choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} < N$. Then $x = \frac{1}{n}$, $y = \frac{1}{n+1}$ satisfy $|x - y| = \frac{1}{n(n+1)} \leq \frac{1}{n^2} < \delta$ if $n \geq N$. Then $\frac{1}{2} > |f(x) - f(y)| = |n - (n+1)| = 1$, a contradiction.

Definition: A function $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *Lipschitz* if $\forall x, y \in E. \exists k > 0. |f(x) - f(y)| \leq k|x - y|$.

Claim: If f is Lipschitz, it is uniformly continuous. *Proof:* let $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{k}$.

Theorem: Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be compact and $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Then f is uniformly continuous on K .

5.4 Continuity and Connectedness

Theorem: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be connected and $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous on E . If $X \subseteq E$ is connected, then $f(X)$ is connected.

Intermediate Value Theorem: Let $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. If $f(a) < c < f(b)$ or $f(b) > c > f(a)$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\exists x \in (a, b). f(x) = c$.

5.5 Discontinuities

Lemma: If p is a limit point of $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ then p is a limit point of $E_p^+ = E \cap (p, \infty)$ or $E_p^- = E \cap (-\infty, p)$.

Definition: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, p be a limit point of E , $q \in \mathbb{R}$.

1. If p is a limit point of E_p^- , we say $\lim_{x \rightarrow p^-} f(x) = q \iff \forall \epsilon > 0. \exists \delta > 0. x \in E_p^-, 0 < p - \delta \implies |f(x) - q| < \epsilon$.
2. If p is a limit point of E_p^+ , then $\lim_{x \rightarrow p^+} f(x) = q \iff \forall \epsilon > 0. \exists \delta > 0. x \in E_p^+, 0 < x - p < \delta \implies |f(x) - q| < \epsilon$.

Proposition: If p is not a limit point of E_p^+ then $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p^-} f(x)$. If p is not a limit point of E_p^- then $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p^+} f(x)$.

Proposition: If p is both a limit point of either E_p^+ or E_p^- , then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q \iff \lim_{x \rightarrow p^-} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p^+} f(x) = q$$

Definition: Suppose $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $p \in E$ is a limit point of E . Suppose further that p is not a point of continuity of f .

1. We say f has a *simple discontinuity* of p if
 - p is not a limit point of E_p^+ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow p^-} f(x)$ exists,
 - p is not a limit point of E_p^- and $\lim_{x \rightarrow p^+} f(x)$ exists, or
 - p is a limit point of E_p^+ and E_p^- and $\lim_{x \rightarrow p^+} f(x)$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow p^-} f(x)$ both exist.
2. Otherwise, we say f has an *essential discontinuity* of p .

5.6 Monotone Functions

Definition: Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We say:

f is *non-decreasing* (increasing) if $x, y \in E$ and $x < y \implies f(x) \leq f(y)$ ($f(x) < f(y)$), and f is *non-increasing* (decreasing) if $x, y \in E$ and $x < y \implies f(y) \leq f(x)$ ($f(y) < f(x)$).

If f is non-increasing or non-decreasing, f is *monotone*.

Theorem: Suppose $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is monotone, and let $p \in (a, b)$. Then $\lim_{x \rightarrow p^-} f(x)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow p^+} f(x)$ both exist. Moreover, if f is non-decreasing, then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow p^-} f(x) = \sup f((a, p)) \leq f(p) \leq \inf f((p, b)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p^+} f(x)$$

Corollary: If $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is monotone, then f has no essential discontinuities.

Example: $f(x) = \lfloor x \rfloor$ is non-decreasing and f has countably many simple discontinuities.

Theorem: If $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is monotone, then f has at most countably many simple discontinuities.

6 Differentiation

6.1 The Derivative

Definition: Assume $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$. For all $x \in [a, b]$, the function $\phi : (a, b) \setminus \{x\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $\phi(t) = \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x}$ is well-defined, and x is a limit point of $(a, b) \setminus \{x\}$. If $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} \phi(t)$ exists we write $f'(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \phi(t)$ and say that f is *differentiable* at x .

We define $f' : \{x \in [a, b] \mid x \text{ is differentiable at } x\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be the *derivative* of f . If f is differentiable $\forall x \in E \subseteq [a, b]$, we say f is differentiable on E .

Definition (General): Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $x \in E$ be a limit point of E . Define $\phi : E \setminus \{x\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\phi(t) = \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x}$. If $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} \phi(t)$ exists we say f is differentiable at x , and write $f'(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \phi(t)$.

Proposition (locality of derivative): Suppose $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $x \in E \cap F$ is a limit point of $E \cap F$, and that f and g are differentiable at x . If $f = g$ on $E \cap F$ then $f'(x) = g'(x)$. This shows that $f'(x)$ only depends on the value of f “near x ”.

Proposition (Newtonian approximation): Let $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $x \in E$ be a limit point of E , and $L \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. f is differentiable at x and $f'(x) = L$
2. $\forall \epsilon > 0. \exists \delta > 0. t \in E \wedge |x - t| < \delta \implies |f(t) - (f(x) + L(t - x))| < \epsilon|t - x|$

Proof follows from definition of $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} \phi(t)$. Newton's approximation says differentiable functions are those that can be "well-approximated" by affine functions $\alpha + \beta x$. Continuous functions are those well-approximated by constants, while differentiable functions are well-approximated by the "next" simplest function.

Theorem: Suppose $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $x \in E$ is a limit point of E , and f is differentiable at x . Then f is continuous at x .

Proof: By definition, if $t \in E \setminus \{x\}$ then $f(t) - f(x) = \phi(t)(t - x)$. Then $f(t) = f(x) + \phi(t)(t - x)$ and hence $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} f(t) = f(x) + \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \phi(t)(t - x) = f(x) + f'(x)0 = f(x)$. By the limit characterization of continuity, we deduce that f is continuous at x .

Remark: The converse fails. Let $f(x) = |x|$ on \mathbb{R} . Since $||x| - |y|| \leq |x - y|$, f is Lipschitz and hence uniformly continuous. However, for $x = 0$, $t > 0 \implies \phi(t) = \frac{|t| - 0}{t - 0} = 1$ and $t < 0 \implies \phi(t) = \frac{-t - 0}{t - 0} = -1$. Then $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \phi(t) = -1 \neq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(t) = 1$, so $f'(0)$ does not exist.

Theorem (Algebra of Derivatives): Let $f, g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable at $x \in E$. Then:

1. $f + g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at x and $(f + g)'(x) = f'(x) + g'(x)$
2. $fg : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at x and $(fg)'(x) = f(x)g'(x) + f'(x)g(x)$
3. If $g(x) \neq 0$ then $\frac{f}{g} : E \setminus g^{-1}(\{0\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at x and $(\frac{f}{g})'(x) = \frac{g(x)f'(x) - f(x)g'(x)}{g(x)^2}$

Examples:

1. $f(x) = \alpha + \beta x$ on $\mathbb{R} \implies f'(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} = \beta \ (\forall x \in \mathbb{R})$.
2. $f(x) = x^n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N} \implies f'(x) = nx^{n-1}$. Proof by induction.
3. Every polynomial $P(x) = \sum_{n=0}^N a_n x^n$ is differentiable, and $P'(x) = \sum_{n=0}^N n a_n x^{n-1}$.
4. $R(x) = \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)}$ is differentiable when P, Q are polynomials at points $p \in \mathbb{R}$ where $Q(p) \neq 0$.

Theorem (Chain Rule): Suppose $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at $x \in E$, $f(E) \subseteq F$, and $g : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at $f(x) \in F$. Then $g \circ f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at x and $(g \circ f)'(x) = g'(f(x))f'(x)$.

6.2 Mean Value Theorems

Definition: Let $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We say that f has a *local maximum* at $x \in E$ if $\exists \delta > 0. t \in E$ and $|x - t| < \delta \implies f(t) \leq f(x)$. We say f has a *local minimum* at $x \in E$ if $-f$ has a local maximum.

If f has either a local max or min at $x \in E$, we say f has a *local extremum* at x .

Theorem: Suppose $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at $x \in E$ and x is a limit point of both E_x^+ and E_x^- . If f has a local extremum at x , then $f'(x) = 0$.

Proof: It suffices to assume that f has a local max at x . Let $\delta > 0$ such that $t \in E$ and $|x - t| < \delta \implies f(t) \leq f(x)$. Then $t \in E, 0 < x - t < \delta \implies \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} \geq 0$ and $0 < t - x < \delta \implies \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} \leq 0$. So $\lim_{t \rightarrow x^-} \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} = f'(x) \geq 0$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow x^+} \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} = f'(x) \leq 0$, and thus $f'(x) = 0$.

Remark: The result is false if x is not a limit point of either E_x^+ or E_x^- . Consider $f(x) = x$ on $E = [0, 1]$; f has a local min at $x = 0$, local max at $x = 1$, but $f'(x) = 1 \forall x \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem (Monotonicity part 1): Let $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable at $x \in E$.

1. If f is non-decreasing on E , then $f'(x) \geq 0$.
2. If f is non-increasing on E , then $f'(x) \leq 0$.

Cauchy's Mean Value Theorem: Suppose that $f, g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous on $[a, b]$, differentiable on (a, b) . Then $\exists x \in (a, b)$. $(g(b) - g(a))f'(x) = (f(b) - f(a))g'(x)$.

Proof:

Consider $h : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $h(x) = (g(b) - g(a))f(x) - (f(b) - f(a))g(x)$. To prove the result, it suffices to find $x \in (a, b)$ such that $h'(x) = 0$ (since h is cont, diff on $[a, b]$ and (a, b)).

Notice that $h(a) = g(b)f(a) - g(a)f(b) = h(b)$.

If h is constant, then $h'(x) = 0$ trivially and we're done. Assume h is not constant; then $\exists t \in (a, b)$. $h(t) > h(a)$ or $h(t) < h(a)$.

If $h(t) > h(a)$, then Extreme Value Theorem guarantees that $\exists x \in (a, b)$. $h(x) = \max h([a, b])$ and Local Extremum Theorem $\implies h'(x) = 0$.

If $h(t) < h(a)$ then EVT guarantees $\exists x \in (a, b)$. $h(x) = \min h([a, b])$ and LET $\implies h'(x) = 0$.

Corollary (Mean Value Theorem): If $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is cont and diff on $[a, b], (a, b)$ then $\exists x \in (a, b)$. $f(b) - f(a) = f'(x)(b - a)$. *Proof:* Set $g(x) = x$.

Corollary (Monotonicity part 2): Suppose $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable on (a, b) . The following hold:

1. $\forall x \in (a, b)$. $f'(x) > 0 \implies f$ is increasing.
2. $\forall x \in (a, b)$. $f'(x) \geq 0 \implies f$ is non-decreasing.
3. $\forall x \in (a, b)$. $f'(x) = 0 \implies f$ is constant.
4. $\forall x \in (a, b)$. $f'(x) \leq 0 \implies f$ is non-increasing.
5. $\forall x \in (a, b)$. $f'(x) < 0 \implies f$ is decreasing.

Proof: by MVT, if $a < x_1 < x_2 < b$, then $f(x_2) - f(x_1) = f'(x)(x_2 - x_1)$.

6.3 Darboux's Theorem

Definition: We say a function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is periodic with period $p > 0$ if $g(x + p) = g(x)$ ($\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$).

Theorem (Darboux): Suppose $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable on $[a, b]$ and $f'(a) < \gamma < f'(b)$. Then $\exists x \in (a, b)$. $f'(x) = \gamma$.

Corollary: If $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable on $[a, b]$, then f' has no simple discontinuities.

6.4 L'Hôpital's Rule

Theorem: Suppose $f, g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous on $[a, b]$, differentiable on (a, b) , and $g'(x) \neq 0$ ($\forall x \in (a, b)$). Assume that $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{f'(x)}{g'(x)} = L$. If $f(a) = g(a) = 0$, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = L$.

Proof:

We claim first that $g(x) \neq 0$ for $x \in (a, b]$. Otherwise, $g(x) = 0$ for some $x \in (a, b] \implies 0 = \frac{g(x) - g(a)}{x - a} = g'(z)$ for some $z \in (a, x)$, a contradiction. So $\frac{f}{g} : (a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is well-defined.

Let $\{x_n\}_{n=l}^{\infty} \subseteq (a, b]$ satisfy $x_n \rightarrow a$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We claim that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x_n)}{g(x_n)} = L$. Once this is established, the sequential characterization of limits yields the desired result.

To prove the claim, we apply Cauchy's Mean Value Theorem on $[a, x_n]$: $\exists y_n \in (a, x_n)$ such that $f'(y_n)g(x_n) = f'(y_n)(g(x_n) - g(a)) = g'(x_n)(f(x_n) - f(a)) = g'(x_n)f(x_n)$. Then $\forall n \geq l$, $\frac{f(x_n)}{g(x_n)} = \frac{f'(x_n)}{g'(x_n)}$. Since $a < y_n < x_n$, the squeeze lemma implies $y_n \rightarrow a$.

Hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x_n)}{g(x_n)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f'(x_n)}{g'(x_n)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{f'(x)}{g'(x)} = L$.

Remarks:

1. The theorem is also true if we take limits at t .
2. If $f, g : (a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} g(x) = 0$, then the theorem still works.

6.5 Higher Derivatives and Taylor's Theorem

Definition: Suppose $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at $x \in E$, and x is a limit point of $\{y \in E \mid f'(y) \text{ exists}\}$. We say f is twice differentiable at x if $f' : \{y \in E \mid f'(y) \text{ exists}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at x ; and $f''(x) = f^{(2)}(x) = (f')'(x)$. Similarly, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > 2$, we say f is n -times differentiable at x if x is a limit point of $\{y \in E \mid f^{(n-1)}(y) \text{ exists}\}$ and $f^{(n-1)}$ is differentiable at x , in which case $f^{(n)}(x) = (f^{(n-1)})'(x)$.

If $f^{(n)}$ exists $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$ we say f is infinitely differentiable at x .

Theorem (Taylor): Suppose $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assume $f^{(n-1)}$ is continuous on $[a, b]$ and $f^{(n)}$ exists on (a, b) . Let $x, y \in [a, b]$ with $x \neq y$. Then $\exists z \in (\min\{x, y\}, \max\{x, y\})$ such that

$$f(y) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{f^{(k)}(x)}{k!} (y-x)^k + \frac{f^{(n)}(z)}{n!} (y-x)^n$$

(called the Taylor polynomial or Taylor approximation).

Proof:

Suppose $x < y$ ($y < x$ is handled without loss of generality). Let $P(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{f^{(k)}(x)}{k!} (t-x)^k$, and set $M = \frac{f(y) - P(y)}{(y-x)^n}$. It suffices to prove that $M = \frac{f^{(n)}(z)}{n!}$ for some $z \in (x, y)$.

Define $g(t) = f(t) - P(t) - M(t-x)^n$, and notice that $g^{(n)}(t) = f^{(n)}(t) - n!M$. As such, it suffices to show that $g^{(n)}(z) = 0$ for some $z \in (x, y)$.

By construction, $g^{(k)}(x) = 0$ ($\forall k = 0, \dots, n-1$), and $g(y) = 0$ (by choice of M).

By Mean Value Theorem, $\exists x_1 \in (x, y)$. $g'(x_1) = \frac{g(y) - g(x)}{y-x} = 0$. Similarly, $\exists x_2 \in$

(x, x_1) . $g''(x_2) = \frac{g'(x_1) - g'(x)}{x_1 - x} = 0$. Iterating, we eventually find $x_{n-1} \in (x, y)$. $g^{(n-1)}(x_{n-1}) =$

0. Then $0 = g^{(n)}(z) = \frac{g^{(n-1)}(x_{n-1}) - g^{(n-1)}(x)}{x_{n-1} - x} = 0$ for some $z \in (x, x_{n-1})$.

7 Riemann-Stieltjes Integration

7.1 The R-S Integral

Definition: Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a \leq b$. A partition of $[a, b]$ is a finite ordered set $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ such that $a = x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n = b$. Write $\Pi[a, b] = \{P \mid P \text{ is a partition of } [a, b]\}$. For brevity we'll write $\Pi = \Pi[a, b]$.

Universal Assumptions: Throughout §7 we will always assume that:

1. $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded: $\forall x \in [a, b]. m \leq f(x) \leq M$, where $m = \inf f([a, b])$, $M = \sup f([a, b])$
2. $\alpha : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (the integrator or weight function) is non-decreasing (in particular, α is also bounded)

Definition: For each $P \in \Pi[a, b]$ we associate to f the following quantities ($P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$):

1. $m_i = \inf\{f(x) \mid x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]\}$ for $i \in [n]$
2. $M_i = \sup\{f(x) \mid x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]\}$ for $i \in [n]$
3. $\Delta\alpha_i = \alpha(x_i) - \alpha(x_{i-1}) \geq 0$ for $i \in [n]$

We write $U(P, f, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n M_i \Delta\alpha_i$, $L(P, f, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \Delta\alpha_i$.

U is the upper Riemann-Stieltjes sum, and L is the lower R-S sum.

Remark: Clearly $m(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)) = \sum_{i=1}^n m(\alpha(x_i) - \alpha(x_{i-1})) = \sum_{i=1}^n m \Delta\alpha_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n M_i \Delta\alpha_i \leq M \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta\alpha_i = M(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a))$. Hence $\forall P \in \Pi[a, b]. m(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)) \leq L(P, f, \alpha) \leq U(P, f, \alpha) \leq M(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a))$.

Definition of Integral: We define

$$\int_a^b f d\alpha = \sup\{L(P, f, \alpha) \mid P \in \Pi[a, b]\}, \text{ and } \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha} = \inf\{U(P, f, \alpha) \mid P \in \Pi[a, b]\}.$$

Both are well-defined by the remark.

If $\int_a^b f d\alpha = \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha}$ then we say f is R-S integrable with respect to α , and write

$$\int_a^b f d\alpha = \underline{\int_a^b f d\alpha} = \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha}.$$

We write $\mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha) = \{f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f \text{ is bounded, } f \text{ is R-S integrable with respect to } \alpha\}$.

When $\alpha(x) = x$, $\int_a^b f dx$ is the Riemann integral and we write $\mathcal{R}([a, b])$.

Heuristics: The function α assigns different weights to different points in $[a, b]$. The intuition is that $\int_a^b f d\alpha$ is a “weighted Riemann integral”. If α is continuous then we have a geometric interpretation of $\int_a^b f d\alpha$: consider the curve in \mathbb{R}^2 parameterized by $(x(t), y(t)) = (\alpha(t), f(t))$; $\int_a^b f d\alpha = \text{area under this curve}$.

Lemma: Let $f(x) = C$ ($\forall x \in [a, b]$). Then $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and $\int_a^b f d\alpha = C(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a))$.

Proof: For any $P \in \Pi[a, b]$ we have $m_i = M_i = C$. Hence $U(P, f, \alpha) = L(P, f, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n C \Delta\alpha_i = C(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a))$. So $\underline{\int_a^b f d\alpha} = \sup\{L(P, f, \alpha)\} = C(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)) = \inf\{U(P, f, \alpha)\} = \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha}$.

Definition: If $P, P' \in \Pi[a, b]$ and every point in P is in P' , we say P' is a *refinement* of P .

If $P_1, P_2 \in \Pi[a, b]$ we define the *common refinement* $P_1 \# P_2 \in \Pi[a, b]$ by $P_1 \# P_2 = P_1 \cup P_2$, ordered appropriately.

Proposition: If $P, P' \in \Pi[a, b]$ and P' is a refinement of P , then $L(P, f, \alpha) \leq L(P', f, \alpha) \leq U(P', f, \alpha) \leq U(P, f, \alpha)$.

Theorem: $\int_a^b f d\alpha \subseteq \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha}$.

Proof: Let $P_1, P_2 \in \Pi[a, b]$. Then $L(P_1, f, \alpha) \leq L(P_1 \# P_2, f, \alpha) \leq U(P_1 \# P_2, f, \alpha) \leq U(P_2, f, \alpha)$ by last proposition. Hence $\int_a^b f d\alpha = \sup\{L(P_1, f, \alpha) \mid P_1 \in \Pi[a, b]\} \leq U(P_2, f, \alpha)$. Then $\int_a^b f d\alpha \leq \inf\{U(P_2, f, \alpha) \mid P_2 \in \Pi[a, b]\} = \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha}$.

7.2 Integrability Criteria

Theorem (Riemann)*: $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha) \iff \forall \epsilon > 0. \exists P \in \Pi[a, b]. U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$.

Proof:

(1) \implies (2):

Let $\epsilon > 0$. By definition, $\exists P_1, P_2 \in \Pi[a, b]. \int_a^b f d\alpha - \frac{\epsilon}{2} < L(P_1, f, \alpha)$, and $U(P_2, f, \alpha) \leq \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Let $P = P_1 \# P_2$. Then $U(P_1, f, \alpha) \leq U(P_2, f, \alpha) < \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Hence $U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$.

(2) \implies (1):

For any partition $P \in \Pi[a, b]$ we know $\overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha} \leq U(P_1, f, \alpha)$ and $L(P, f, \alpha) \leq \int_a^b f d\alpha$. We also know $\int_a^b f d\alpha \leq \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha}$. Then (2) implies that for $\epsilon > 0$ we have $P \in \Pi[a, b]. U(P_1, f, \alpha) - L(P_1, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$. But then $0 \leq \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha} - \int_a^b f d\alpha < \epsilon$ ($\forall \epsilon > 0$) and so $\int_a^b f d\alpha = \overline{\int_a^b f d\alpha} \implies f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$.

Lemma: Let $P \in \Pi[a, b]$. The following are true:

1. If P' is a refinement of P , then $U(P', f, \alpha) - L(P', f, \alpha) \leq U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha)$.
2. If $s_i, t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ ($\forall i \in [n]$), then $0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |f(s_i) - f(t_i)| \Delta \alpha_i \leq U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha)$.
3. If $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$, then $t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i] \implies |\sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta \alpha_i - \int_a^b f d\alpha| \leq U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha)$.

Theorem: If f is continuous on $[a, b]$, then $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$.

Proof:

Note that EVT implies f is bounded. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and choose $k > 0$ so $k(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)) < \epsilon$. Since f is cont on compact $[a, b]$, f is uniformly continuous. Then $\exists \delta > 0. x, y \in [a, b]$ and $|x - y| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(y)| < k$.

Choose a partition $P \in \Pi[a, b]$ such that $x_i - x_{i-1} < \delta$ ($\forall i \in [n]$). Then by EVT, $\exists s_i, t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ such that $m_i = f(s_i), M_i = f(t_i)$. Then $U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) \Delta \alpha_i = \sum_{i=1}^n (f(t_i) - f(s_i)) \Delta \alpha_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n k \Delta \alpha_i = k \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta \alpha_i = k(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)) < \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we deduce via Riemann's Theorem that $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$.

Theorem: Suppose that f is monotone and α is continuous on $[a, b]$; then $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$.

Proof:

Since α is continuous, $\alpha([a, b])$ is connected. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 1$, we know $\alpha(a) + \frac{i}{n}(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)) \in \alpha([a, b])$ for $i \in [n]$. In particular, $\exists x_i \in [a, b]$ such that $\alpha(x_i) = \alpha(a) + \frac{i}{n}(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a))$. Since α is non-decreasing, we may choose these x_i such that $a = x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n = b$. Then $P_n = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a partition of $[a, b]$.

Assume f is non-decreasing (the case of f non-increasing is similar). Let $\epsilon > 0$.

Since f is non-decreasing, $f(x_i) = M_i$, $f(x_{i-1}) = m_i$ for $i \in [n]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} U(P_n, f, \alpha) - L(P_n, f, \alpha) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) \Delta \alpha_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})) \Delta \alpha_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})) \frac{(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a))}{n} \\ &= \frac{\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)}{n} (f(b) - f(a)) \end{aligned}$$

Choose n such that $n > \frac{(\alpha(b) - \alpha(a))(f(b) - f(a))}{\epsilon}$. Then $U(P_n, f, \alpha) - L(P_n, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$.

Remarks:

1. If $\alpha = x$, then all monotone functions f are in $\mathcal{R}([a, b])$, i.e. all monotone functions are Riemann integrable.
2. Monotone functions don't have to be continuous, so $\exists f$ with simple discontinuities in $\mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ when α is continuous.
3. Monotone functions can have countably infinite sets of discontinuity; R-S integrals can handle infinite discontinuities.

Next, we show that R-S integration can handle more general discontinuities.

Theorem: Suppose that f is continuous on $[a, b] \setminus E$, where $E \subseteq [a, b]$ is finite. Assume that α is continuous on E ; then $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$.

Remark: There is a much more powerful version known as Lebesgue's Theorem, which says that:

$$f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha) \iff (E = \{x \in [a, b] \mid f \text{ is not continuous at } x\} \implies E \text{ is } \alpha\text{-null})$$

Here, a set E is α -null if $\forall \epsilon > 0$. \exists intervals $(u_j, v_j) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ for $j \geq 1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $E \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} (u_j, v_j)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha(v_j) - \alpha(u_j) < \epsilon$.

In particular, if $\alpha(x) = x$, then all countable sets are α -null, and hence if f has discontinuities only on a countable set, then $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b])$.

Theorem: Let $I \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and $\int_a^b f d\alpha = I$
2. $\forall \epsilon > 0$. $\exists P \in \Pi[a, b]$. $(\forall i \in [n]. t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i] \implies |\sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta \alpha_i - I| < \epsilon)$.

7.3 Properties of $\mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$

Theorem: If $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, then $c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2 \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and $\int_a^b (c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2) d\alpha = c_1 \int_a^b f_1 d\alpha + c_2 \int_a^b f_2 d\alpha$.

Remark: This theorem gives us two important consequences:

1. $\mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ is a linear space;
2. The integral is a linear function, i.e. $\int_a^b d\alpha : \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $f \mapsto \int_a^b f d\alpha$ is a linear map.

Theorem: Suppose $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$. Then $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; c_1 \alpha_1 + c_2 \alpha_2)$ and $\int_a^b f d(c_1 \alpha_1 + c_2 \alpha_2) = c_1 \int_a^b f d\alpha_1 + c_2 \int_a^b f d\alpha_2$.

Theorem: Suppose $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$. Let $c \in (a, b)$; then $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, c]; \alpha)$ and $f \in \mathcal{R}([c, b]; \alpha)$; i.e. $\int_a^b f d\alpha = \int_a^c f d\alpha + \int_c^b f d\alpha$.

Theorem: Suppose $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and $g : [m = \inf f, M = \sup f] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous on $[m, M]$. Then $g \circ f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$.

Theorem: Suppose $f, g \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$. Then $fg \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$.

Proof: The function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $\psi(x) = x^2$ is cont. on \mathbb{R} . By the last theorem, if $h \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ then $h^2 \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$. Note that $fg = \frac{1}{4}(f+g)^2 - \frac{1}{4}(f-g)^2 \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ since $f \pm g \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$.

This result shows that $\mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ has even more structure than a linear space; it is an algebra, i.e. a vector space closed under product.

7.4 Integration and Order

Theorem: Suppose $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and $\forall x \in [a, b]. f_1(x) \leq f_2(x)$. Then $\int_a^b f_1 d\alpha \leq \int_a^b f_2 d\alpha$.

Theorem: Let $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$. Then $|f| \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and $|\int_a^b f d\alpha| \leq \int_a^b |f| d\alpha$.

Proof: $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $\psi(x) = |x|$ is continuous on \mathbb{R} , so the composition theorem guarantess that $|f| \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$. Let $c = 1$ if $\int_a^b f d\alpha \geq 0$ and -1 otherwise. Then $|\int_a^b f d\alpha| = c \int_a^b f d\alpha = \int_a^b cf d\alpha$, but $cf \leq |cf| = |c||f| = |f|$ so the last theorem gives the desired result.

Definition: Given a function $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ we define the *positive part* of f as $f^+ : E \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by $f^+(x) = \max\{f(x), 0\}$. Similarly, $f^- : E \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ via $f^-(x) = \max\{-f(x), 0\} = (-f)^+(x)$.

Lemma: $f = f^+ - f^-$ and $|f| = f^+ + f^-$. Proof is trivial.

Theorem: Let $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$. Then $f^+, f^- \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$.

Proof: $f^+ = \frac{f+|f|}{2}, f^- = \frac{f-|f|}{2}$.

This leads to a theorem $f, g \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha) \implies f \wedge g, f \vee g \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$, where $(f \wedge g)(x) = \min\{f(x), g(x)\}$ and $(f \vee g)(x) = \max\{f(x), g(x)\}$. (Proof on HW.)

7.5 Fundamental Theorem of Calculus

Lemma: Suppose $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$. Define $F : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $F(x) = \int_a^x f d\alpha$. Let $M = \sup\{|f(x)| \mid x \in [a, b]\}$. Then $|F(x) - F(y)| \leq M|\alpha(x) - \alpha(y)|$ ($\forall x, y \in [a, b]$).

Theorem: Suppose $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and define $F(x) = \int_a^x f d\alpha$. The following hold:

1. If α is continuous at a point $x \in [a, b]$, then F is continuous at x .
2. If α is continuous on $[a, b]$, then F is uniformly continuous at $[a, b]$.
3. If α is Lipschitz on $[a, b]$ ($|\alpha(x) - \alpha(y)| \leq K|x - y|$, $\forall x, y \in [a, b]$), then F is Lipschitz.

Theorem (FTC1): Assume that f is continuous at $x \in [a, b]$ and that α is differentiable at x . Let $F(s) = \int_a^s f d\alpha$. Then F is differentiable at x and $F'(x) = f(x)\alpha'(x)$.

Proof:

For $t \in [a, b] \setminus \{x\}$ set $u = \min\{t, x\}$, $v = \max\{t, x\}$. Then:

$$\frac{F(t) - F(x)}{t - x} - f(x) \left(\frac{\alpha(t) - \alpha(x)}{t - x} \right) = \frac{1}{v - u} \int_u^v (f - f(x)) d\alpha$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{F(t) - F(x)}{t - x} - f(x)\alpha'(x) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{v - u} \left| \int_u^v (f - f(x)) d\alpha \right| + \left| f(x) \left(\frac{\alpha(t) - \alpha(x)}{t - x} \right) - f(x)\alpha'(x) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{v - u} \int_u^v |f - f(x)| d\alpha + |f(x)| \left| \frac{\alpha(t) - \alpha(x)}{t - x} - \alpha'(x) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Since f is cont. at x and α is diff. at x , we can find $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|x - y| < \delta \implies |f(y) - f(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2(1 + |\alpha'(x)|)} \wedge \left| \frac{\alpha(y) - \alpha(x)}{y - x} - \alpha'(x) \right| < \min\left\{1, \frac{\epsilon}{2(1 + |f(x)|)}\right\}$$

Then, if $|x - t| < \delta$ we can deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{F(t) - F(x)}{t - x} - f(x)\alpha'(x) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{v - u} \int_u^v \frac{\epsilon}{2(1 + |\alpha'(x)|)} d\alpha + |f(x)| \frac{\epsilon}{2(1 + |f(x)|)} \\ &= \frac{\epsilon}{2(1 + |\alpha'(x)|)} \left| \frac{\alpha(t) - \alpha(x)}{t - x} \right| + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2(1 + |\alpha'(x)|)} (1 + |\alpha'(x)|) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Hence, F is differentiable at x and $F'(x) = f(x)\alpha'(x)$.

Theorem (FTC2): If $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b])$ and $\exists F : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is continuous on $[a, b]$ and differentiable on (a, b) and $\forall x \in (a, b)$. $F'(x) = f(x)$, then $\int_a^b f dx = F(b) - F(a)$.

Proof:

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then $\exists P \in \Pi[a, b]$ such that $|\sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i)\Delta x_i - \int_a^b f dx| < \epsilon$ for any $t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ for $i \in [n]$.

The Mean Value Theorem guarantees that $\exists t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ such that $F(x_i) - F(x_{i-1}) = (x_i - x_{i-1})F'(t_i) = f(t_i)\Delta x_i$. Hence:

$$\left| F(b) - F(a) - \int_a^b f dx \right| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^n F(x_i) - F(x_{i-1}) - \int_a^b f dx \right| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i)\Delta x_i - \int_a^b f dx \right| < \epsilon$$

Since this is true $\forall \epsilon > 0$, we deduce $\int_a^b f dx = F(b) - F(a)$.

Theorem (Integration by Parts): Suppose $f, g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are differentiable on $[a, b]$, and $f', g' \in \mathcal{R}([a, b])$. Then $\int_a^b f'g dx = f(b)g(b) - f(a)g(a) - \int_a^b fg' dx$.

Proof: Let $h(x) = f(x)g(x)$. Then $h'(x) = f(x)g'(x) + f'(x)g(x)$, and $h' \in \mathcal{R}([a, b])$ (since f, g diff. $\implies f, g$ cont). Applying FTC2 to h yields the desired result.

7.6 Advanced Results in R-S Integration

Theorem: Suppose α is diff. on $[a, b]$ and $\alpha' \in \mathcal{R}([a, b])$. Then:

$$f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha) \iff fa' \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]) \text{ and } \int_a^b f dx = \int_a^b f \alpha' dx$$

Proof: Write $K = \sup |f|$. For any $P \in \Pi[a, b]$ we know for $t_i, s_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ for $i \in [n]$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha'(s_i) - \alpha'(t_i)| \Delta x_i \leq U(P, \alpha', x) - L(P, \alpha', x)$$

(since $\alpha' \in \mathcal{R}([a, b])$). The Mean Value Theorem allows us to find $s_i \in (x_{i-1}, x_i)$ such that $\Delta \alpha_i = \alpha(x_i) - \alpha(x_{i-1}) = \alpha'(s_i)(x_i - x_{i-1}) = \alpha'(s_i) \Delta x_i$. Then for any choice of $t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta \alpha_i - \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \alpha'(t_i) \Delta x_i \right| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \alpha'(s_i) \Delta x_i - \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \alpha'(t_i) \Delta x_i \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) (\alpha'(s_i) - \alpha'(t_i)) \Delta x_i \right| \\ &\leq K \sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha'(s_i) - \alpha'(t_i)| \Delta x_i \\ &\leq K (U(P, \alpha', x) - L(P, \alpha', x)) \end{aligned}$$

Now, (1) \implies (2):

Note $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and $\alpha' \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]) \implies \exists P_1, P_2. U(P_1, f, \alpha) - L(P_1, f, \alpha) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $U(P_2, \alpha', x) - L(P_2, \alpha', x) < \frac{\epsilon}{2(1+K)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \alpha'(t_i) \Delta x_i - \int_a^b f d\alpha \right| &\leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \alpha'(t_i) \Delta x_i - \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta \alpha_i \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta \alpha_i - \int_a^b f d\alpha \right| \\ &\leq K (U(P, \alpha', x) - L(P, \alpha', x)) + U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) \\ &< K \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2(K+1)} \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and the last theorem in §7.2 guarantees that $f\alpha' \in \mathcal{R}([a, b])$ and $\int_a^b f\alpha' dx = \int_a^b f d\alpha$.

The proof that (2) \implies (1) is similar (exercise to reader).

Theorem (Change of Variables): Let $A < B$. Suppose $\phi : [A, B] \rightarrow [a, b]$ is an increasing bijection. Let $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and define $g : [A, B] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $g = f \circ \phi$ and $\beta : [A, B] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $\beta = \alpha \circ \phi$. Then $g \in \mathcal{R}([A, B]; \beta)$ and $\int_A^B g d\beta = \int_a^b f d\alpha$.

Proof:

Note that ϕ induces a bijection from $\Pi[A, B]$ to $\Pi[a, b]$: if $P = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\} \in \Pi[A, B]$ then $\phi(P) := \{\phi(x_0), \phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_n)\} \in \Pi[a, b]$.

Also, $\sup\{g(x) \mid x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]\} = \sup\{(f \circ \phi)(x) \mid x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]\} = \sup\{f(y) \mid y \in [\phi(x_{i-1}), \phi(x_i)]\}$. Similarly, $\inf\{g(x) \mid x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]\} = \inf\{f(y) \mid y \in [\phi(x_{i-1}), \phi(x_i)]\}$. Hence, since $\beta = \alpha \circ \phi$, $U(P, g, \beta) = U(\phi(P), f, \alpha)$ and $L(P, g, \beta) = L(\phi(P), f, \alpha)$ $\forall P \in \Pi[A, B]$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Since $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$, $\exists Q \in \Pi[a, b]$. $U(Q, f, \alpha) - L(Q, f, \alpha) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Writing $P = \phi^{-1}(Q)$ satisfies $U(P, g, \beta) - L(P, g, \beta) = U(Q, f, \alpha) - L(Q, f, \alpha) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. By Riemann's Theorem, we deduce that $g \in \mathcal{R}([A, B]; \beta)$.

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_A^B g d\beta - \int_a^b f d\alpha \right| &\leq \left| \int_A^B g d\beta - \sum_{i=1}^n g(x_i) \Delta\beta_i \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^n g(x_i) \Delta\beta_i - \int_a^b f d\alpha \right| \\ &= \left| \int_A^B g d\beta - \sum_{i=1}^n g(x_i) \Delta\beta_i \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(\phi(x_i)) (\alpha(\phi(x_i)) - \alpha(\phi(x_{i-1}))) - \int_a^b f d\alpha \right| \\ &\leq U(P, g, \beta) - L(P, g, \beta) + U(\phi(P), f, \alpha) - L(\phi(P), f, \alpha) \\ &= 2(U(Q, f, \alpha) - L(Q, f, \alpha)) \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we deduce that $\int_A^B g d\beta = \int_a^b f d\alpha$.

We can combine this with the last theorem to deduce the “usual” Riemmanian change of variables:

Corollary: Assume $\alpha(x) = x$ and $\phi : [A, B] \rightarrow [a, b]$ is increasing, differentiable on $[A, B]$, and $\phi' \in \mathcal{R}([A, B])$. If $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b])$ then $f \circ \phi \in \mathcal{R}([A, B])$ and $\int_a^b f(x) dx = \int_A^B f(\phi(x)) \phi'(x) dx$.

Proof: $\int_A^B g d\beta = \int_A^B g \phi' dx \forall g \in \mathcal{R}([A, B]; \beta)$ with $\beta = \alpha \circ \phi = \phi$.

8 Sequences and Series of Functions

8.1 Convergence

Definition: Let $\emptyset \neq E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Suppose $\forall n \geq l \in \mathbb{Z}$. $f_n : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then $\{f_n\}_{n=l}^\infty$ is a *sequence of functions* on E .

1. If $\exists f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\forall x \in E$. $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then f_n converges to f *pointwise* and write $f_n \rightarrow f$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
2. If $\exists f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\forall n \geq l$. $\{|f_n(x) - f(x)| \mid x \in E\}$ is bounded, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup\{|f_n(x) - f(x)|\} = 0$, then f_n converges to f *uniformly* on E , and we write $f_n \rightrightarrows f$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma:

1. Let $f_n, f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then $f_n \rightrightarrows f \iff \forall \epsilon > 0. \exists N \geq l. n \geq N \implies |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$ for every $x \in E$.
2. If $f_n \rightrightarrows f$ then $f_n \rightarrow f$. The converse fails.

Examples:

1. $E = (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $f_n(x) = x^n$.
 $f_n \rightarrow 0$ pointwise is trivial, and $|f_n(x)| = |x^n| = |x|^n \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$. So $\sup\{|f_n(x)|\} \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$ and so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup\{|f_n - 0|\} = 0$. Thus, $f_n \rightrightarrows 0$.
2. $E = \mathbb{R}$, $f_n(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} & \text{if } x \in [n, n+1] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
 $\sup\{|f_n(x)|\} = \frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0$, so $f_n \rightrightarrows 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
3. $E = \mathbb{R}$, $f_n(x) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } x \in [n, n+1] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
 Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$. For sufficiently large N , $x < N$, so $x \notin [n, n+1]$ for $n \geq N$. Hence $f_n(x) = 0$ for $n \geq N$ and $f_n \rightarrow 0$ pointwise on \mathbb{R} . However, $\sup\{|f_n(x)|\} = n \not\rightarrow 0$ and so it does not converge uniformly.

8.1.1 Big Questions

1. If $\forall n$. $f_n : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous on E , and f_n converges to $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is it true that f is continuous?
2. Same question for differentiability? If so, is $f'(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f'_n(x)$?
3. If $\forall n$. $\{f_n\}_{n=l}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$ and f_n converges to f , is $f \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$? If so, is $\int_a^b f d\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n d\alpha$?

The answer depends on the type of convergence. Pointwise convergence is not enough.

Examples

1. $f_n : (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $f_n(x) = (1 - x^2)^n$.
 We can see $f_n \rightarrow f$, where $f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
 This also shows that the convergence is not uniform. Note that f_n is differentiable and continuous on $(-1, 1)$ but f is neither. So Q1, Q2 fail when convergence is pointwise.
2. $f_n : (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $f_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sin(n^2 x)$. Note $|f_n(x)| \leq \frac{1}{n}$, so $f_n \rightrightarrows 0$, which is differentiable and convergent. On the other hand, $f'_n(x) = \frac{n^2 \cos(n^2 x)}{n} = n \cos(n^2 x)$, and this does not converge even pointwise. Then Q2.2 may be false without further assumptions.
3. HW 11 shows that if $f_n \rightarrow f$ via $f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in [a, b] \cap \mathbb{Q} \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in [a, b] \setminus \mathbb{Q} \end{cases}$, then $f \notin \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$, even when $f_n \in \mathcal{R}([a, b]; \alpha)$. So Q3 fails for pointwise convergence.
4. Consider $f_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $f_n(x) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } x \in (0, \frac{1}{n}) \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \{0\} \cup [\frac{1}{n}, 1] \end{cases}$.
 f_n is continuous except at 2 points, and hence $f_n \in \mathcal{R}([0, 1])$.
 It's easy to see $f_n \rightarrow 0 \in \mathcal{R}([0, 1])$ but the convergence is not uniform. However, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 f_n dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{1/n} n dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{n} = 1 \neq \int_0^1 0 dx$. So Q3.2 is false for pointwise convergence.

Theorem: Suppose $\forall n \geq l$, $f_n : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous on E . Assume $f_n \Rightarrow f$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then f is continuous on E .

Proof:

Let $\epsilon > 0$, $y \in E$. Since $f_n \Rightarrow f$, $\exists N$. $n \geq N \implies |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. Since f_N is continuous, $\exists \delta > 0$. $x \in E, |x - y| < \delta \implies |f_N(x) - f_N(y)| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$.

Then $x \in E$ and $|x - y| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(y)| \leq |f(x) - f_N(x)| + |f_N(x) - f_N(y)| + |f_N(y) - f(y)| < 3\frac{\epsilon}{3} = \epsilon$. Hence f is continuous at each $y \in E$.

Theorem: Suppose $f_n : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $n \geq l$, and that f_n is differentiable on $[a, b]$ and f'_n is continuous on $[a, b]$. Assume $\exists x_0 \in [a, b]$. $f_n(x_0) \rightarrow \gamma$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and that $f'_n \Rightarrow g$ for some $g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then $\exists f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is differentiable on $[a, b]$, $f_n \Rightarrow f$, and $f'(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f'_n(x) \forall x \in [a, b]$.

Proof:

Notice by FTC₂ that $\forall z \in [a, b]$. $f_n(z) = f_n(x_0) - \int_a^{x_0} f'_n dx + \int_a^z f'_n dx$, which is well-defined since g is continuous by previous theorem. By FTC, f is differentiable on $[a, b]$ and $f' = g$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then $\exists N \geq l$. $n \geq N \implies |f_n(x_0) - \gamma| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $\sup_{[a, b]} |f'_n - g| < \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)}$.

Then for all $n \geq N$ and all $z \in [a, b]$:

$$|f_n(z) - f(z)| \leq |f_n(x_0) - \gamma| + \int_a^b |f'_n - g| dx < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \int_a^b \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)} dx = \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$$

Hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup\{|f_n(z) - f(z)| \mid z \in [a, b]\} = 0$, i.e. $f_n \Rightarrow f$.

8.2 The Cauchy Condition and the Weierstrass M-Test

Theorem (Cauchy Condition for Uniform Convergence): Let $f_n : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $n \geq l$. The following are equivalent:

1. $f_n \Rightarrow f$ for some $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
2. $\forall \epsilon > 0$. $\exists N \geq l$. $m, n \geq N \implies |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| < \epsilon \forall x \in E$

Definition: Let $f_n : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $n \geq l$. We say the series $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} f_n(x)$

1. converges pointwise if the sequence $S_N(x) = \sum_{n=l}^N f_n(x)$ converges pointwise to $S(x)$;
2. converges absolutely if the sequence $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} |f_n(x)|$ converges pointwise; and
3. converges uniformly if $S_N \Rightarrow S$.

If (1) or (2) hold, we write $S = \sum_{n=l}^{\infty} f_n$.

Theorem (Weierstrass M-test): Suppose $f_n : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $n \geq l$ and $\sup_E |f_n| = M_n$. If $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} M_n$ converges, then $\sum_{n=l}^{\infty} f_n$ converges uniformly on E .

Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then $\exists N$. $n \geq m \geq N \implies \sum_{k=m}^n M_k < \epsilon$. Then

$$n \geq m \geq N \implies |S_n(x) - S_m(x)| = \left| \sum_{k=m}^n f_k(x) \right| \leq \sum_{k=m}^n |f_k(x)| \leq \sum_{k=m}^n M_k < \epsilon$$

So the Cauchy condition on uniform convergence implies $S_n \Rightarrow S$ for some $S : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.