

III. REAL NUMBERS (cf. Ch. 3)

1. ORDERED FIELDS

Def. A field is a triple $(F, +, \cdot)$ where F is a nonempty (!) set, $+$: $F \times F \rightarrow F$ and \cdot : $F \times F \rightarrow F$ are functions, called addition and multiplication, satisfying the following axioms:

(A1) $\forall x, y \in F, x + y \in F$

(A2) $\forall x, y \in F, x + y = y + x$ /commutativity/

(A3) $\forall x, y, z \in F, x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z$ /associativity/

(A4) there exists an element $0 \in F$ st. $\forall x \in F, x + 0 = x$ /additive identity/

(A5) $\forall x \in F \exists y \in F$ st. $x + y = 0$. We write $y = -x$. /additive inverse/

(M1) $\forall x, y \in F, x \cdot y \in F$

(M2) $\forall x, y \in F, x \cdot y = y \cdot x$

(M3) $\forall x, y, z \in F, x \cdot (y \cdot z) = (x \cdot y) \cdot z$

(M4) there exists an element $1 \in F \setminus \{0\}$ st. $\forall x \in F, x \cdot 1 = x$ /multiplicative identity/

(M5) $\forall x \in F \setminus \{0\} \exists y \in F$ st. $x \cdot y = 1$. We write $y = x^{-1}$ (or $\frac{1}{x}$)

(DL) $\forall x, y, z \in F, x \cdot (y + z) = x \cdot y + x \cdot z$. /distributive law/

(4.34) Thm. Let $(F, +, \cdot)$ be a field. Then,

(i) The additive and multiplicative identities are unique.

(ii) $\forall x \in F, -x$ is unique.

(iii) $\forall x \in F \setminus \{0\}, x^{-1}$ is unique.

(iv) $\forall x, y, z \in F, (x + z = y + z) \Rightarrow (x = y)$ /cancellation law/

(v) $\forall x \in F, x \cdot 0 = 0$

(vi) $\forall x \in F, (-1) \cdot x = -x$

(vii) $\forall x, y \in F, x \cdot y = 0 \Rightarrow (x = 0 \vee y = 0)$

(viii) $\forall x, y \in F \exists! z \in F$ st. $x = y + z$ /subtraction/

(ix) $\forall x \in F \forall y \in F \setminus \{0\} \exists! z \in F$ st. $x = y \cdot z$ /division/

PF. (i) Suppose $0_1, 0_2$ both satisfy (A4). Then, $0_1 \stackrel{(A4) \text{ for } 0_2}{=} 0_1 + 0_2 \stackrel{(A2)}{=} 0_2 + 0_1 \stackrel{(A4) \text{ for } 0_1}{=} 0_2$. ✓

Similarly, if $1_1, 1_2$ both satisfy (M4), then $1_1 \stackrel{(M4) \text{ for } 1_2}{=} 1_1 \cdot 1_2 \stackrel{(M2)}{=} 1_2 \cdot 1_1 \stackrel{(M4) \text{ for } 1_1}{=} 1_2$. ✓

(ii) Given $x \in F$, suppose $x+y=0 \wedge x+z=0$. Then, $y = y+0 = y+(x+z) = (x+y)+z = 0+z = z$. ✓

(iii) Given $x \in F \setminus \{0\}$, suppose $x \cdot y = 1 \wedge x \cdot z = 1$. Then, $y = y \cdot 1 = y \cdot (x \cdot z) = (y \cdot x) \cdot z = 1 \cdot z = z = 1 \cdot x = x$. ✓

(iv) Let x, y, z be sf. $x+z = y+z$. Then, $x = x+0 = x+(z+(-z)) = (x+z)+(-z) = y+(z+(-z)) = y+0 = y$. ✓

(v) Given $x \in F$, we have $x \cdot 0 = x \cdot (0+0) = x \cdot 0 + x \cdot 0$. On the other hand, $x \cdot 0 = x \cdot 0 + 0$, hence $0 + x \cdot 0 = x \cdot 0 + x \cdot 0$, and thus $0 = x \cdot 0$, by (iv). ✓

(vi) Given $x \in F$, $(-1) \cdot x + x = ((-1)+1) \cdot x = 0 \cdot x = 0$, by (v). By (i) then, $(-1) \cdot x = -x$. ✓

(vii) Suppose $x, y \in F \setminus \{0\}$ and $x \cdot y = 0$. Then, both x and y have multiplicative inverses and hence $1 = 1 \cdot 1 \stackrel{\text{by (M4), } 1 \neq 0}{=} x^{-1} \cdot x \cdot y \cdot y^{-1} = x^{-1} \cdot 0 \cdot y^{-1} = x^{-1} \cdot 0 = 0$, by (v). This contradicts (M4). ✓

(viii) Given $x, y \in F$, define $z = x + (-y)$. Then, $x = x+0 = x+(y+(-y)) = y+(x+(-y)) = y+z$.

If, for some other $w \in F$, $x = y+w$, then $y+w = y+z \stackrel{\text{(iv)}}{\implies} w = z$. ✓

(ix) Given $x \in F$ and $y \in F \setminus \{0\}$, define $z = x \cdot (y^{-1})$. Then $x = x \cdot 1 = x \cdot (y \cdot y^{-1}) = y \cdot (x \cdot y^{-1}) = y \cdot z$.

If also $x = y \cdot w$, then $w = 1 \cdot w = y^{-1} \cdot y \cdot w = y^{-1} \cdot x = y^{-1} \cdot y \cdot z = 1 \cdot z = z$. ✓

Def. The characteristic of a field F is defined as

$$\text{char}(F) = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } p = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \underbrace{1+1+\dots+1}_{k \text{ times}} = 0\} \\ 0 & \text{if there's no such } p \end{cases}$$

Examples:

1) $\mathbb{Q} = \{P/Q : p \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$ = rational numbers - the smallest field of characteristic 0.

2) \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C} - other fields of characteristic 0.

3) If $p \in \mathbb{N}$ is a prime, define $\mathbb{Z}_p := \{\bar{0}, \bar{1}, \bar{2}, \dots, \overline{p-1}\}$ with addition and multiplication induced from \mathbb{Z} modulo p (i.e. $\bar{m} + \bar{n} = \overline{m+n}$, $\bar{m} \cdot \bar{n} = \overline{m \cdot n}$). Then, \mathbb{Z}_p is a field and $\text{char}(\mathbb{Z}_p) = p$.

Def. An ordered field is a field equipped with a linear order relation compatible with the field addition and multiplication. That is, $(F, +, \cdot)$ is an ordered field, when there is a relation " $<$ " on F satisfying the following

(01) $\forall x, y \in F, x < y \vee x = y \vee y < x$ (trichotomy)

(02) $\forall x, y, z \in F, x < y \wedge y < z \implies x < z$ (transitivity)

(03) $\forall x, y, z \in F, x < y \implies x+z < y+z$.

(04) $\forall x, y, z \in F, x < y \wedge 0 < z \implies x \cdot z < y \cdot z$.

Notation:

We write $x \leq y$, when $x < y \vee x = y$.

Examples: \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R} with usual $<$. But, \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{Z}_p are not ordered fields!

Def. Let $(F, <)$ be an ordered field. We say that an element $a \in F$ is positive when $0 < a$, and negative when $a < 0$. (Also, nonnegative when $0 \leq a$.)

(cf. 3.5) Thm. Let $(F, <)$ be an ordered field, $x, y, z, w \in F$. Then,

(i) $(x < y \wedge z < w) \Rightarrow x+z < y+w$.

(ii) $x < y \Rightarrow -y < -x$.

(iii) $(x < y \wedge z < 0) \Rightarrow xz > yz$.

(iv) $0 < 1$.

(v) $x > 0 \Rightarrow \frac{1}{x} > 0$.

(vi) $0 < x < y \Rightarrow \frac{1}{x} > \frac{1}{y}$.

Pf. (i) Suppose $x < y \wedge z < w$. Then, $x+z < y+z \stackrel{(03)}{=} z+y < w+y \stackrel{(03)}{=} y+w$. ✓

(ii) Suppose $x < y$. Then, $-y = -y+0 = -y+(x+(-x)) = x+(-y+(-x)) < (y+(-y))+(-x) = 0+(-x) = -x$. ✓

(iii) By (ii), if $z < 0$, then $-z > -0$. But $-0 = 0$, so $0 < -z$. Then, $x < y \stackrel{(04)}{\Rightarrow} x \cdot (-z) < y \cdot (-z) \Rightarrow -xz < -yz \stackrel{(ii)}{\Rightarrow} -(-yz) < -(-xz) \Rightarrow yz < xz$. ✓
by multiplicative inverse of additive inverse

(iv) By definition $0 \neq 1$. Suppose then that $1 < 0$.

Then, $1 = |1| \stackrel{(ii)}{>} |0| = 0$ which contradicts $1 < 0$. Thus, by (01), $0 < 1$. ✓

(v) Suppose $x > 0$. Then, $\neg(\frac{1}{x} = 0)$, for else $1 = x \cdot \frac{1}{x} = x \cdot 0 = 0$; a contradiction.

By (01) thus $\frac{1}{x} < 0$ or $\frac{1}{x} > 0$. Suppose $\frac{1}{x} < 0$. Then, by (iii),

$x > 0 \Rightarrow 1 = x \cdot \frac{1}{x} < 0 \cdot \frac{1}{x} = 0$, which contradicts (v). Thus, $\frac{1}{x} > 0$. ✓

(vi) Suppose $0 < x < y$. Then, $\neg(\frac{1}{x} = \frac{1}{y})$, for else $1 = x \cdot \frac{1}{x} = x \cdot \frac{1}{y} < y \cdot \frac{1}{y} = 1$; a contradiction.

Thus, by (01), $\frac{1}{x} < \frac{1}{y}$ or $\frac{1}{y} < \frac{1}{x}$. ✓

Suppose $\frac{1}{x} < \frac{1}{y}$. Then, $1 = x \cdot \frac{1}{x} < x \cdot \frac{1}{y} < y \cdot \frac{1}{y} = 1$; a contradiction. Thus, $\frac{1}{y} < \frac{1}{x}$. ✓

Thm. Let $(F, <)$ be an ordered field. Then, there is an injection $\mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow F$, such that elements of $\varphi(\mathbb{N}_+)$ are positive, and $\text{char}(F) = 0$.

Pf. Define a function $\varphi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow F$ recursively by $\varphi(0) = 0_F$, $\varphi(n+1) = \varphi(n) + 1_F$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by above thm., $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varphi(n) = 0 + \varphi(n) < 1 + \varphi(n) = \varphi(n+1) = 0 + \varphi(n+1) < 1 + \varphi(n+1) = \varphi(n+2) < \dots$. One easily proves by induction that $\varphi(n) < \varphi(n+k)$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Thus, φ is injective. In particular, there is no $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $\varphi(n) = 0$, hence $\text{char}(F) = 0$, by definition. ✓

Corollary. Every ordered field F contains the field of rational numbers \mathbb{Q} .

Pf. Let $(F, <)$ be an ordered field. Then, $\mathbb{N} \subset F$ and hence, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_+, \frac{1}{n} \in F$ (by (M1)).
Similarly, by (A5), $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, -n \in F$. Thus, by (M1), $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}_+, \frac{m}{n}, -\frac{m}{n} \in F$. \square

Corollary. Let $(F, <)$ be an ordered field, $x, y \in F$.
If $\forall \epsilon > 0, x \leq y + \epsilon$, then $x \leq y$.

Pf. Suppose $\forall \epsilon > 0, x \leq y + \epsilon$ and $y < x$. Then $x - y > 0$, and so $\epsilon := \frac{1}{2} \cdot (x - y) > 0$.
Now, $y + \epsilon = y + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (x - y) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2 \cdot y + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (x - y) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (2y + x - y) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot ((1+1)y + x - y) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (y + x + (y - y))$
 $= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (y + x) < \frac{1}{2} \cdot (x + x) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2 \cdot x = x$; a contradiction. \square

Def. Let $(F, <)$ be an ordered field. Define the absolute value function on F as

$$|x| := \begin{cases} x, & \text{when } 0 \leq x \\ -x, & \text{when } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Thm. Let $(F, <)$ be an ordered field, $x, y \in F, a \in F, a \geq 0$. Then,

- (i) $|x| \geq 0$
- (ii) $|x| \leq a \iff -a \leq x \leq a$
- (iii) $|x \cdot y| = |x| \cdot |y|$
- (iv) $|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$ (triangle inequality)

Pf. (i) By definition, and since $x > 0 \implies -x = x \cdot (-1) < 0$. \checkmark

(ii) Suppose $|x| \leq a$. If $x \geq 0$, then $x = |x| \leq a$. Also, $a \geq 0 \implies -a \leq 0$, so $-a \leq 0 \leq x$. \checkmark
If $x < 0$, then $x = -|x| = (-1) \cdot |x| \geq (-1) \cdot a = -a$. Also, $a \geq 0 \implies x < 0 \leq a$. \checkmark

Conversely, suppose $-a \leq x \leq a$. If $x \geq 0$, then $|x| = x \leq a$. \checkmark

If $x < 0$, then $|x| = -x$, and $-x = (-1) \cdot x \leq (-1) \cdot (-a) = a$. \checkmark

(iii) Exercise.

(iv) We have, by (ii), $-|x| \leq x \leq |x| \wedge -|y| \leq y \leq |y|$, hence
 $-(|x| + |y|) = -|x| + (-|y|) \leq x + y \leq |x| + |y|$, hence $|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$, by (ii) again. \square

Def (Interval) Let (X, \leq) be a nonempty set with a linear order relation \leq .
A subset $I \subset X$ is called an interval (in X), when

$$\forall x, y, z \in X, (x \in I \wedge y \in I \wedge x < z \wedge z < y) \implies z \in I.$$

2. COMPLETENESS AXIOM

Def. Let (X, \leq) be a nonempty set with linear ordering \leq , let $S \subset X$.

- 1) Element $a \in X$ is called a lower bound for S , when $a \leq s, \forall s \in S$.
- 2) If S has a lower bound, we say S is bounded below.
- 3) Element $a \in X$ is called an upper bound for S , when $s \leq a, \forall s \in S$.
- 4) If S has an upper bound, we say S is bounded above.
- 5) Element $a \in X$ is called the minimal element of S (or minimum of S), when $a \in S \wedge (\forall s \in S, a \leq s)$.
- 6) Element $a \in X$ is called the maximal element of S (or maximum of S), when $a \in S \wedge (\forall s \in S, s \leq a)$.

Examples: Closed vs open intervals, \mathbb{N} , $\{\frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$.

Def. Let (X, \leq) be a nonempty set w/ linear order \leq , let $S \subset X$, $S \neq \emptyset$ be bounded.

- 1) Element $\alpha \in X$ is called the infimum (or greatest lower bound) of S , when $(\forall s \in S, \alpha \leq s) \wedge [\forall \beta \in X, \alpha < \beta \Rightarrow (\exists s \in S \text{ st. } s < \beta)]$.
- 2) Element $\alpha \in X$ is called the supremum (or least upper bound) of S , when $(\forall s \in S, s \leq \alpha) \wedge [\forall \beta \in X, \beta < \alpha \Rightarrow (\exists s \in S \text{ st. } \beta < s)]$.

Examples: $\{\frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$; $[0, \sqrt{2}] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ in $X = \mathbb{Q}$; $[0, \sqrt{2})$ in \mathbb{R} ; if $\max S$ exists, then $\sup S = \max S$. (!)

Def. We say that a nonempty linearly ordered set (X, \leq) satisfies Completeness Axiom, when every nonempty bounded above subset of X has a least upper bound.

- (1) Def. The field \mathbb{R} of real numbers is defined as the smallest (w/ to inclusion) ordered field satisfying the Completeness Axiom.

Archimedean Property of \mathbb{R}

Thm. The set \mathbb{N} is not bounded above in \mathbb{R} .

Pf. Suppose otherwise, and let $\alpha = \sup \mathbb{N}$. Then, $\alpha - 1$ is not an upper bound for \mathbb{N} , so $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\alpha - 1 < n$. But then $\alpha < n + 1$. \downarrow \square

Thm. FCAE:

- (i) \mathbb{N} is not bounded above.
- (ii) $\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $x < n$.
- (iii) $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}, x > 0 \Rightarrow \exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $n \cdot x > y$.
- (iv) $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x > 0 \Rightarrow \exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $0 < \frac{1}{n} < x$.

Pf. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) \checkmark

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+, y \in \mathbb{R}$ be arbitrary. By (ii), $\exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\frac{y}{x} < n_0$.
Then, as $x > 0$, $\frac{y}{x} \cdot x < n_0 \cdot x$. \checkmark

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv): Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be arbitrary. By (iii), $\exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_+$ st. $n_0 \cdot x > 1$.
Then, $n_0 > 0 \Rightarrow \frac{1}{n_0} > 0 \Rightarrow n_0 \cdot x \cdot \frac{1}{n_0} > 1 \cdot \frac{1}{n_0}$; i.e., $x > \frac{1}{n_0}$. \checkmark

(iv) \Rightarrow (i): Suppose $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is st. $\alpha \geq n, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $\alpha \geq 1 > 0$, and
for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $\frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha}$, contradicting (iv). \square

Thm. For every $s \in \mathbb{R}, s > 0 \Rightarrow \exists x \in \mathbb{R}$ st. $x^2 = s$.

Pf. Given $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, let $S := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \geq 0 \wedge x^2 \leq s\}$.

Then, $S \neq \emptyset$ as $0 \in S$, and S is bndd above (indeed,
 $s > 0 \Rightarrow s+1 > 1 \Rightarrow (s+1)^2 > s+1 \Rightarrow s+1 \notin S$).

Let $\alpha := \sup S$. We claim that $\alpha^2 = s$. Proof by contradiction:
I. Suppose $\alpha^2 < s$.

Then, $s - \alpha^2 > 0$, so $\exists n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $s - \alpha^2 > \frac{1}{n_1}$, or $\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{n_1} < s$.

Now, if we find $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $(\alpha + \frac{1}{n_2})^2 \leq \alpha^2 + \frac{1}{n_1}$, then $\alpha + \frac{1}{n_2} \in S$, contradicting
definition of α .

So, it suffices to find $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}_+$ st. $\alpha^2 + \frac{2\alpha}{n_2} + \frac{1}{n_2^2} \leq \alpha^2 + \frac{1}{n_1}$, or $\frac{2\alpha}{n_2} + \frac{1}{n_2^2} \leq \frac{1}{n_1}$.

Since $1 \leq n_2$ then $\frac{2\alpha}{n_2} + \frac{1}{n_2^2} \leq \frac{2\alpha+1}{n_2}$. Choosing $n_2 \geq n_1 \cdot (2\alpha+1)$ does the job. \checkmark

II. Suppose then that $s < \alpha^2$.

Then, $\exists n_1 \in \mathbb{N}_+$ st. $\alpha^2 - s > \frac{1}{n_1}$, or $\alpha^2 - \frac{1}{n_1} > s$.

Again, we look for $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}_2$ st. $(\alpha - \frac{1}{n_2})^2 \geq \alpha^2 - \frac{1}{n_1}$, b/c for such n_2 we get
that $\alpha - \frac{1}{n_2} \notin S$ and hence $\sup S \leq \alpha - \frac{1}{n_2}$, contradicting definition of α .

Need $\alpha^2 - \frac{2\alpha}{n_2} + \frac{1}{n_2^2} \geq \alpha^2 - \frac{1}{n_1}$, or $\frac{1}{n_1} \geq \frac{2\alpha}{n_2} - \frac{1}{n_2^2}$.

Now, if $\frac{1}{n_1} \geq \frac{2\alpha}{n_2}$, then also $\frac{1}{n_1} \geq \frac{2\alpha}{n_2} - \frac{1}{n_2^2}$, so suffices to have
 $n_2 \geq n_1 \cdot 2\alpha$. \square

Corollary. For every prime number p , there exists $x_p \in \mathbb{R}$ st. $x_p^2 = p$.
Hence, $\mathbb{Q} \neq \mathbb{R}$.

Density of \mathbb{Q} in \mathbb{R}

Thm. If $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x < y$, then there is $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ st. $x < q < y$.

Pf. By Archimedean Principle, $y > x \Rightarrow y - x > 0 \Rightarrow \exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\frac{1}{n} < \frac{y-x}{2}$.
Fix such n . Then, $\exists k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $x < \frac{k_0}{n_0} < y$. Indeed, $\exists k \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $k > n_0 \cdot x$.
Let k_0 be the minimal such k (exists, by Well-ordering Principle).
Then, $k_0 - 1 \leq n_0 \cdot x$, so $\frac{k_0}{n_0} \leq x + \frac{1}{n_0} < x + \frac{y-x}{2} = \frac{y+x}{2} < \frac{2y}{2} = y$. \square

Thm. If $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x < y$, then there is $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ st. $x < s < y$.

Pf. By above theorem, $\exists q \in \mathbb{Q}$ st. $\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}} < q < \frac{y}{\sqrt{2}}$. Then $s := q\sqrt{2}$ is good. \square

Thm. (Nested Interval Principle) Let $I_1 \supseteq I_2 \supseteq I_3 \supseteq \dots$ be a nested sequence of closed intervals in \mathbb{R} . Then, $\bigcap_{k \geq 1} I_k \neq \emptyset$.

Proof: For $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, let a_k denote the left endpoint of I_k , and b_k - the right one.
Then, the set $\{a_k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$ is bounded above (for instance, by b_1) and the set $\{b_k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$ is bounded below (by a_1).

Thus, $\alpha := \sup\{a_k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$, $\beta := \inf\{b_k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$ are well-defined.

Claim: $\alpha \leq \beta$.

For a proof by contradiction, suppose $\beta < \alpha$. Then, β is not an upper bound for $\{a_k \mid k \geq 1\}$, so we can pick a_{k_1} st. $\beta < a_{k_1} \leq \alpha$. Then, in turn, a_{k_1} is not a lower bound for $\{b_k \mid k \geq 1\}$, so we can pick b_{k_2} st.

$b_{k_2} < a_{k_1}$. Let $k_0 := \max\{k_1, k_2\}$. Then, $b_{k_0} \leq b_{k_2} < a_{k_1} \leq a_{k_0}$ (by nestedness of the interval sequence), which contradicts $a_{k_0} \leq b_{k_0}$. \downarrow

Now, by construction, $\frac{\beta + \alpha}{2}$ is greater than or equal to a_k , $\forall k \geq 1$, and less than or equal to b_k , $\forall k \geq 1$, hence $\frac{\beta + \alpha}{2} \in I_k$, $\forall k \geq 1$. \square

IV. INFINITE SEQUENCES & SERIES (cf. Ch. 4-7)

1. LIMITS OF SEQUENCES

Def. A sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is said to converge to $L \in \mathbb{R}$, when
 $\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N \in \mathbb{N}$ st $\forall n \geq N, |a_n - L| < \epsilon$.

If (a_n) converges to L , then L is called its limit, and we write $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = L$.
If no such L exists, (a_n) is called divergent.

Def. We say that (a_n) diverges to ∞ , when
 $\forall M \in \mathbb{R} \exists N \in \mathbb{N}$ st $\forall n \geq N, a_n > M$. (Write $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \infty$.)

We say (a_n) diverges to $-\infty$, when
 $\forall m \in \mathbb{R} \exists N \in \mathbb{N}$ st $\forall n \geq N, m < a_n$. ($\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = -\infty$)

- Thm. 1) Every convergent sequence is bounded (i.e., $\exists M > 0$ st $\forall n, |a_n| \leq M$).
2) Every sequence divergent to ∞ is bounded below.
3) Every sequence divergent to $-\infty$ is bounded above.

Pf. 1) Suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = L$. Let $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be st $\forall n \geq N_0, |a_n - L| < 1$.

Define then $M := \max\{|a_1|, \dots, |a_{N_0-1}|, |L| + 1\}$.

We have $|a_n| \leq M$ for all $n \geq 1$, b/c $\|a_n - L\| \leq |a_n - L|$, by triangle inequality.

2), 3) = Exercise. \square

Thm. If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ exists then it is unique.

Pf. Suppose $L_1, L_2 \in \mathbb{R}, L_1 \neq L_2$ both are limits of (a_n) .

Set $\epsilon := |L_1 - L_2|/2$. Then there exist $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ st

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \forall n \geq N_1, |a_n - L_1| < \epsilon \\ \forall n \geq N_2, |a_n - L_2| < \epsilon \end{array} \right\}$$

Let $N_0 := \max\{N_1, N_2\}$. Then $N_0 \geq N_1, N_0 \geq N_2$,

hence $|a_{N_0} - L_1| < \epsilon \wedge |a_{N_0} - L_2| < \epsilon$. Then,

$$|L_1 - L_2| \leq |L_1 - a_{N_0}| + |a_{N_0} - L_2| < 2\epsilon < |L_1 - L_2|. \quad \downarrow \quad \square$$

Thm. (Algebraic Limit Theorem) Let $(a_n)_n, (b_n)_n$ be sequences w/ $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = A, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = B$.

Then, (i) $(a_n + b_n)_n$ converges and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) = A + B$.

(ii) $(a_n - b_n)_n$ converges and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n - b_n) = A - B$.

(iii) $(c \cdot a_n)_n$ converges and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c a_n = c \cdot A$, for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

(iv) $(a_n \cdot b_n)_n$ converges and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n \cdot b_n) = A \cdot B$.

(v) If $B \neq 0$, then $(\frac{a_n}{b_n})_n$ converges and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\frac{a_n}{b_n}) = \frac{A}{B}$.

Pf. (i) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Choose $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $|a_n - A| < \varepsilon/2$ for all $n \geq N_1$, and $|b_n - B| < \varepsilon/2$ for all $n \geq N_2$. Set $N_0 := \max\{N_1, N_2\}$.

Then, $\forall n \geq N_0, |(a_n + b_n) - (A + B)| \leq |a_n - A| + |b_n - B| < \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon$. \checkmark

(iv) Write $|a_n b_n - AB| = |a_n b_n - a_n B + a_n B - AB| \leq |a_n| \cdot |b_n - B| + |a_n - A| \cdot |B|$.

Let $M > 0$ be st. $|a_n| \leq M$ for all n .

Now, given $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $|a_n - A| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M+|B|}$ for all $n \geq N_1$, and $|b_n - B| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M+|B|}$ for all $n \geq N_2$.

Set $N_0 := \max\{N_1, N_2\}$.

Then, $\forall n \geq N_0, |a_n b_n - AB| < M \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{M+|B|} + \frac{\varepsilon}{M+|B|} \cdot |B| \leq \varepsilon \cdot \frac{M+|B|}{M+|B|} = \varepsilon$. \checkmark

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(v)} \text{ Write } \left| \frac{a_n}{b_n} - \frac{A}{B} \right| &= \left| \frac{a_n B - b_n A}{b_n B} \right| = \left| \frac{a_n B - AB + AB - b_n A}{b_n B} \right| \leq \\ &\leq \frac{|a_n - A| \cdot |B|}{|b_n| \cdot |B|} + \frac{|A| \cdot |b_n - B|}{|b_n| \cdot |B|} \end{aligned}$$

Since $B \neq 0$, there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $|b_n - B| < \frac{|B|}{2}$ for all $n \geq N_1$, and hence $|b_n| > \frac{|B|}{2}$ for all $n \geq N_1$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary.

Choose $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $|a_n - A| < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot |B|}{4}$ for all $n \geq N_2$.

Also, choose $N_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $|b_n - B| < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot |B|^2}{4|A|}$ for all $n \geq N_3$.

Set $N_0 := \max\{N_1, N_2, N_3\}$.

Now, $\forall n \geq N_0, \left| \frac{a_n}{b_n} - \frac{A}{B} \right| \leq \frac{|a_n - A|}{|b_n|} + \frac{|A| \cdot |b_n - B|}{|b_n| \cdot |B|} < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot |B|}{4 \cdot |B|} + \frac{|A| \cdot \frac{\varepsilon \cdot |B|^2}{4|A|}}{\frac{|B|^2}{2}} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon$. \blacksquare

Thm. Let $(a_n)_n, (b_n)_n$ be sequences, $A \in \mathbb{R}, r > 0$, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 0$.

If $|a_n - A| \leq r \cdot |b_n|$ for all but fin. many $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = A$.

Pf. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be st. $|b_n| = |b_n - 0| < \frac{\varepsilon}{r}$. Then, $\forall n \geq N_0, |a_n - A| < r \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{r} = \varepsilon$. \blacksquare

Thm. Let $(a_n), (b_n)$ be sequences, with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = A, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = B$.

- (i) If $A < B$, then $a_n < b_n$ for all but fin. many $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (ii) If $a_n \geq b_n$ for all but fin. many $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $A \geq B$.

Pf. (i) Suppose $A < B$, and let $\epsilon = \frac{B-A}{2}$. Choose $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $|a_n - A| < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N_1$, and $|b_n - B| < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N_2$. Set $N_0 = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$. Then, $\forall n \geq N_0, a_n < A + \epsilon = A + \frac{B-A}{2} = B + (A-B) + \frac{B-A}{2} = B - \frac{B-A}{2} = B - \epsilon < b_n$. ✓

(ii) By contradiction - Exercise (!) ✖

Example: No " $A \leq B \Rightarrow a_n \leq b_n$ ". Set $a_n = \frac{(-1)^n}{n}, b_n = 0$.

Thm. (Squeeze Theorem) Given sequences $(a_n), (b_n), (c_n)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n$, and for all but finitely many $n, a_n \leq b_n \leq c_n$, it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$.

Pf. Suppose first that $\lim_{\infty} a_n = \lim_{\infty} c_n = L \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ be st. $a_n \leq b_n \leq c_n, \forall n \geq N_1$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary, and pick $N_2, N_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $L - \epsilon < a_n < L + \epsilon, \forall n \geq N_2$, and $L - \epsilon < c_n < L + \epsilon, \forall n \geq N_3$. Set $N_0 = \max\{N_1, N_2, N_3\}$. Then, $\forall n \geq N_0, L - \epsilon < a_n \leq b_n \leq c_n < L + \epsilon$, hence $|b_n - L| < \epsilon$. ✓

Next, suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \infty$. Let $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ be as above. Let $M > 0$ be arbitrary, and pick $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $M < a_n, \forall n \geq N_2$. Set $N_0 = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$. Then, $\forall n \geq N_0, M < a_n \leq b_n$. Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = \infty$. ✓

The case $\lim_{\infty} a_n = -\infty$ is an exercise. ✖

Thm. Let $q \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^n = \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } q > 1 \\ 1, & \text{if } q = 1 \\ 0, & \text{if } |q| < 1. \end{cases}$

Lemma (Bernoulli's Inequality) If $a \geq -1$, then $(1+a)^n \geq 1+na, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Pf. (Induction on n): $n=0: (1+a)^0 = 1 \geq 1+0$. ✓

For $k \geq 0, (1+a)^{k+1} = (1+a)^k \cdot (1+a) \geq (1+ka) \cdot (1+a) = 1+a+ka+ka^2 \geq 1+(k+1)a$.
 ↑ ind. hypothesis ✖

Pf. of Thm.: If $q > 1$, then $q^n = (1 + (q-1))^n \geq 1 + n(q-1)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^n = \infty$ for any $c > 0$, hence the claim follows from Squeeze Thm. ✓

If $q = 0$ or $q = 1$, then (q^n) is a constant sequence.

Suppose then that $q \in (0, 1)$. Then, $\frac{1}{q} > 1$, by axioms of ordered field, and hence $\frac{1}{q^n} = \left(\frac{1}{q}\right)^n \geq 1 + n\left(\frac{1}{q} - 1\right) = 1 + n\left(\frac{1-q}{q}\right)$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary, and choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $1 + N\left(\frac{1-q}{q}\right) > \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ (by Arch. Principle). Then, $\forall n \geq N$, $\frac{1}{q^n} \geq 1 + n\left(\frac{1-q}{q}\right) \geq 1 + N\left(\frac{1-q}{q}\right) > \frac{1}{\epsilon}$, hence $0 < q^n < \epsilon$, and so $|q^n - 0| < \epsilon$.

Finally, suppose $q \in (-1, 0)$. Then, by above, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |q|^n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |q^n| = 0$, and hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^n = 0$, by the lemma below. ■

Lemma. For any sequence (a_n) , $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0 \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n| = 0$.

Pf. Suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary, and choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\forall n \geq N$, $|a_n - 0| < \epsilon$. Then, $\forall n \geq N$, $||a_n| - 0| = |a_n| = |a_n - 0| < \epsilon$.

Conversely, suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n| = 0$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary, and choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\forall n \geq N$, $||a_n| - 0| < \epsilon$. Then, $\forall n \geq N$, $|a_n - 0| = |a_n| = ||a_n|| = ||a_n| - 0| < \epsilon$. ■

Thm. (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{n} = 1$.
 (ii) $\forall c > 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{c} = 1$.

Pf. (i) Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ be arbitrary. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be st. $N > \frac{16}{\epsilon^2}$. Then, $\forall n \geq N$, $n > \frac{16}{\epsilon^2}$, and if n is even, then $(1+\epsilon)^{n/2} > n \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ (by Bernoulli), hence $(1+\epsilon)^n > n^2 \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)^2 > n$ (by above); if n is odd, then $(1+\epsilon)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} > (n-1) \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ (---), hence $(1+\epsilon)^n > (1+\epsilon)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} > \left(\frac{n-1}{2} \cdot \epsilon\right)^2 > \left(\frac{n}{2} \cdot \epsilon\right)^2 > n$. In any case, $\sqrt[n]{n} < 1 + \epsilon$.

On the other hand, $n > 1 \implies 1 - \epsilon < \sqrt[n]{n}$, and thus $|\sqrt[n]{n} - 1| < \epsilon$, $\forall n \geq N$. ✓

(ii) Given $c > 0$, we have $c \leq n$ for all but finitely many n , and hence $\sqrt[n]{c} \leq \sqrt[n]{n}$ for all but finitely many n . The claim thus follows by Squeeze Thm. ■

Thm. Given a sequence (a_n) with non-zero terms, suppose $\left|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}\right| \leq q$ for some $q < 1$ for all but finitely many n . Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$.

Pf. Let $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be st. $|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}| \leq q, \forall n \geq N_0$, where $q \in [0, 1)$ is a constant

Then, $|a_{N_0+1}| \leq |a_{N_0}| \cdot q,$

$|a_{N_0+2}| \leq |a_{N_0+1}| \cdot q \leq |a_{N_0}| \cdot q^2,$

... $|a_{N_0+k}| \leq |a_{N_0}| \cdot q^k, \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}_+.$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^n = 0$, we can choose $N_1 \geq N_0$ st. $q^{n-N_0} < \frac{\epsilon}{|a_{N_0}|}$ for all $n \geq N_1$. Then, $\forall n \geq N_1, |a_n| = |a_{N_0+(n-N_0)}| \leq |a_{N_0}| \cdot q^{n-N_0} < |a_{N_0}| \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{|a_{N_0}|} = \epsilon$, which proves that $a_n \rightarrow 0$.

Corollary. Given $(a_n)_n$, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} = c$ and $|c| < 1$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$.

Pf. Suppose $\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} \rightarrow c$, where $|c| < 1$, and $q \in \mathbb{R}$ be st. $|c| < q < 1$. Set $\epsilon = q - |c|$, and choose $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\forall n \geq N_0, |\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} - c| < \epsilon$. Then, $\forall n \geq N_0, |\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}| - |c| \leq |\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} - c| < \epsilon$, hence $|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}| < \epsilon + |c| = q$, and the result follows from the above thm.

Def. (Subsequence) An (infinite) subsequence of a sequence $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a composition of functions $(a_n) \circ \varphi$, where $\varphi: \mathbb{N}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_+$ is strictly increasing. Notation: $(a_{n_k})_{k=1}^{\infty}$.

Thm. Let $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence.

- (i) If $(a_n)_n$ is convergent, then so is every its subseq. $(a_{n_k})_k$, and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$.
- (ii) If $(a_n)_n$ is unbounded above, then there exists a subsequence $(a_{n_k})_k$ of $(a_n)_n$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} = \infty$.
- (iii) If $(a_n)_n$ is unbounded below, then $\exists (a_{n_k})_k$ st. $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} = -\infty$.

Pf. (i) Suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = L$, and let $(a_{n_k})_k$ be an arbitrary subseq. of $(a_n)_n$. Given arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, choose $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\forall n \geq N_0, |a_n - L| < \epsilon$, and choose $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $n_{k_0} \geq N_0$. Then, $\forall k \geq K_0, n_k \geq n_{k_0} \geq N_0$, and so $|a_{n_k} - L| < \epsilon$.

(ii) Suppose $(a_n)_n$ is unbounded above.

Choose $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $a_{n_1} > 1$, and for any $k \geq 1$, choose $n_{k+1} > \max\{n_k, k+1\}$ st. $a_{n_{k+1}} > \max\{|a_{n_k}|, k+1\}$. (Exists, for else $|a_n| \leq \max\{|a_{n_k}|, k+1\}$, $\forall n \geq 1$.)

Claim: $(a_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty$ diverges to ∞ .

Indeed, for any $M > 0$ can choose $k \geq 1$ st. $M < k+1$, and hence $\forall k \geq k_0$, $a_{n_k} > k+1 \geq k_0+1 > M$. \checkmark

(iii) Exercise. \blacksquare

Corollary. Suppose $(a_n)_n$ has two convergent subsequences $(a_{n_k})_k, (a_{m_l})_l$ st. $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} \neq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} a_{m_l}$. Then, $(a_n)_n$ is divergent.

Monotone Sequences

Def. A sequence $(a_n)_n$ is said to be:

- increasing, when $a_n \leq a_{n+1}$, $\forall n$
- decreasing, when $a_{n+1} \leq a_n$, $\forall n$
- monotone, when it is increasing or decreasing.

Thm. (Monotone Convergence) If a sequence $(a_n)_n$ is increasing and bounded above, or decreasing and bounded below, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ exists.

Pf. W.l.o.g., assume $a_n \leq a_{n+1}$, $\forall n$, and $a_n \leq M$, for some $M > 0$.

Then $\alpha := \sup\{a_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$ exists. Claim: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \alpha$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Then, $\alpha - \varepsilon$ is not an upper bound for $\{a_n \mid n \geq 1\}$, and hence can choose $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $a_{N_0} > \alpha - \varepsilon$. Since $a_{n+1} \geq a_n$, $\forall n$, then $\forall n \geq N_0$, $\alpha - \varepsilon < a_{N_0} \leq a_n$. Also, by def'n of α , $\alpha + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ is an upper bound for $\{a_n \mid n \geq 1\}$, and so $a_n \leq \alpha + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \alpha + \varepsilon$, $\forall n$. \blacksquare

Thm. (Bolzano-Weierstrass) Every bounded sequence contains a convergent subsequence.

Pf. Given a bounded sequence $(s_n)_n$, let $a_1, b_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ be st. $s_n \in [a_1, b_1]$, $\forall n$.

If the interval $[a_1, \frac{a_1+b_1}{2}]$ contains inf. many terms of $(s_n)_n$, then set $a_2 = a_1, b_2 = \frac{a_1+b_1}{2}$.

Otherwise, set $a_2 = \frac{a_1+b_1}{2}, b_2 = b_1$. Recursively, having constructed intervals $I_1 \supset I_2 \supset \dots \supset I_k = [a_k, b_k]$, if $[a_k, \frac{a_k+b_k}{2}]$ contains inf. many terms of $(s_n)_n$, set $a_{k+1} = a_k, b_{k+1} = \frac{a_k+b_k}{2}$; otherwise, set $a_{k+1} = \frac{a_k+b_k}{2}, b_{k+1} = b_k$. Write $I_{k+1} = [a_{k+1}, b_{k+1}]$.

Then, $(I_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ is a nested sequence of closed intervals. By the Nested Interval Property, $\exists p \in \mathbb{R}$ st. $p \in \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty I_k$.

Claim: \exists subsequence $(s_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty$ of $(s_n)_n$ st. $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s_{n_k} = p$.

Indeed, set $s_{n_1} = s_1$, and for any $k \geq 1$, choose $n_{k+1} > n_k$ st. $s_{n_{k+1}} \in I_{k+1}$ (exists by infiniteness of $\{s_n | n \geq 1\} \cap I_{k+1}$).

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary.

Choose $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\frac{b_1 - a_1}{2^{K_0}} < \epsilon$. Then, for any $k \geq K_0$,

$$|s_{n_k} - p| \leq \text{diam}(I_k) = \frac{b_1 - a_1}{2^k} \leq \frac{b_1 - a_1}{2^{K_0}} < \epsilon. \quad \blacksquare$$

Def. A sequence $(a_n)_n$ is called Cauchy, when $\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \forall m, n \geq N, |a_m - a_n| < \epsilon$.

Thm. Let $(a_n)_n$ be a sequence. Then, $(a_n)_n$ is Cauchy iff $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \in \mathbb{R}$.

Pf. Suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = L \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary, and choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $|a_n - L| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \forall n \geq N$. Then, $\forall m, n \geq N$, $|a_m - a_n| \leq |a_m - L| + |a_n - L| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon. \quad \checkmark$

Suppose next that $(a_n)_n$ is a Cauchy sequence.

Claim 1: $(a_n)_n$ is bounded.

Indeed, if $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ is st. $\forall m, n \geq N_0, |a_m - a_n| < 1$, then, for all $n \geq N_0$, $|a_n - a_{N_0}| < 1$, and hence $||a_n| - |a_{N_0}|| < 1$, whence $|a_n| - 1 < |a_n| - |a_{N_0}| < |a_n - a_{N_0}| < 1$, $\forall n \geq N_0$.

By B.-L., can choose a subsequence $(a_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty$ st. $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} =: L \in \mathbb{R}$.

Claim 2: $L = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$.

Indeed, for an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, choose $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\forall k \geq K_0, |a_{n_k} - L| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, and choose $N_0 \geq n_{K_0}$ st. $\forall m, n \geq N_0, |a_m - a_n| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Then, $\forall n \geq N_0, |a_n - L| \leq |a_n - a_{n_{K_0}}| + |a_{n_{K_0}} - L| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon. \quad \blacksquare$

2. SERIES

Def. A series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ is a pair of sequences $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}, (s_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$, where (a_n) is the sequence of terms of the series, and the (s_n) is its sequence of partial sums, satisfying the relation $s_k = \sum_{n=0}^k a_n$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We say that the series $\sum_n a_n$ is convergent, when $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n$ exists. In that case, if $L = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n$, we write $\sum_n a_n = L$ and say that L is the sum of the series. Otherwise, we say that the series diverges.

If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \infty$, we write $\sum_n a_n = \infty$ and say that the series diverges to ∞ .

Thm. (Divergence Test) If $\sum_n a_n$ converges, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$.

Pf. $a_n = s_n - s_{n-1} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} L - L = 0$. \square

Example: The series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n \cdot \frac{n}{2n+1}$ is divergent
Indeed, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{2n+1} = \frac{1}{2}$ and hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^n \cdot \frac{n}{2n+1} \neq 0$. \checkmark

Warning: The converse of Div. Test doesn't hold!

Ex. Harmonic Series: $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ div. to ∞ , even though $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0$.

Pf.: Note that the sequence $(s_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of partial sums is increasing, since all the terms of the series are positive. Thus, to show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \infty$, it suffices to find a subsequence $(s_{n_k})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ w/ $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s_{n_k} = \infty$. (Exercise!)

Consider the subsequence $(s_{2^k})_{k=0}^{\infty}$.

We have $s_{2^0} = s_1 = 1$

$$s_{2^1} = 1 + \frac{1}{2}$$

$$s_{2^2} = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4}\right) > 1 + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}$$

$$s_{2^3} = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{5} + \dots + \frac{1}{8}\right) > 1 + 3 \cdot \frac{1}{2}$$

...

$$s_{2^k} > 1 + k \cdot \frac{1}{2}. \quad \text{Since } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + \frac{k}{2}\right) = \infty, \text{ then } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s_{2^k} = \infty. \quad \square$$

Thm. (Cauchy Criterion for Convergence) A series $\sum_n a_n$ is convergent iff $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \forall n > m \geq N, \left| \sum_{k=m+1}^n a_k \right| < \varepsilon$.

Pf. By Cauchy's Condition for sequences, $\sum a_n$ converges iff (s_n) is Cauchy. The latter means $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \forall m, n \geq N, |s_m - s_n| < \varepsilon$. \square

Def. We say that a series $\sum a_n$ is absolutely convergent, when $\sum |a_n|$ converges.
 If $\sum a_n$ converges and $\sum |a_n|$ diverges, we say that $\sum a_n$ is conditionally convergent.

Thm If $\sum |a_n|$ converges, then so does $\sum a_n$.

Pf. Given $\sum a_n$, suppose that $\sum |a_n|$ is convergent.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary.

By assumption, we can choose $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ st. $\forall n > m \geq N_0, |\sum_{k=m+1}^n |a_k|| < \epsilon$.

Then, $\forall n > m \geq N_0, |\sum_{k=m+1}^n a_k| \leq \sum_{k=m+1}^n |a_k| = |\sum_{k=m+1}^n |a_k|| < \epsilon$, as required. \square

Thm. (Geometric Series) Let $q \in \mathbb{R}$. If $|q| < 1$, then $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^n$ is absolutely convergent, and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^n = \frac{1}{1-q}$. If $|q| \geq 1$, then $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^n$ is divergent.

Pf. Suppose first that $|q| \geq 1$. Then, $\forall n \geq 1, |q^{n+1}| = |q^n| \cdot |q| \geq |q^n|$, hence the sequence $(|q^n|)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is bounded below by 1 and increasing. It follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |q^n| \neq 0$, and hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^n \neq 0$. Thus divergence of $\sum q^n$, by Divergence Test.

Suppose next that $|q| < 1$. The following formula can be easily proved by induction on n : For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x^{n+1} - y^{n+1} = (x-y)(x^n + x^{n-1}y + \dots + y^n)$. Applying the formula with $x=1, y=q$, we get $1 - q^{n+1} = (1-q)(1 + q + q^2 + \dots + q^n)$ and hence $\sum_{k=0}^n q^k = 1 + q + \dots + q^n = \frac{1 - q^{n+1}}{1 - q}$, since $1 - q \neq 0$ by assumption.

Thus, the n^{th} partial sum of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^n$, $S_n = \frac{1 - q^{n+1}}{1 - q}$ tends to $\frac{1 - 0}{1 - q}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Hence, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^n = \frac{1}{1 - q}$. (by a thm. on p. 31 of the notes)

As for the convergence of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |q^n|$, note that $\sum_{k=0}^n |q|^k = \frac{1 - |q|^{n+1}}{1 - |q|} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1 - |q|}$. \square

Thm. (Comparison Test) Given two series $\sum a_n, \sum b_n$ satisfying $0 \leq a_n \leq b_n$ for all but fin. many n .

- (i) If $\sum b_n$ converges, then so does $\sum a_n$.
- (ii) If $\sum a_n$ diverges, then so does $\sum b_n$.

Pf. (i) Let $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ be st. $0 \leq a_n \leq b_n$ for all $n \geq N_1$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Choose $N_0 \geq N_1$ st. $\forall n > m \geq N_0, \left| \sum_{k=m+1}^n b_k \right| < \epsilon$.

Then, $\forall n > m \geq N_0, \left| \sum_{k=m+1}^n a_k \right| \leq \sum_{k=m+1}^n |a_k| = \sum_{k=m+1}^n b_k \leq \sum_{k=m+1}^n b_k = \left| \sum_{k=m+1}^n b_k \right| < \epsilon$. \checkmark

(ii) Let (s_n) (resp. (t_n)) denote the sequence of partial sums of $\sum_n a_n$ (resp. $\sum_n b_n$).

Let $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ be st. $0 \leq a_n \leq b_n$ for all $n \geq N_1$.

It follows that the sequence $(s_n)_{n=N_1}^\infty$ is increasing. Since, by assumption (s_n) has no limit, then it follows from the Monotone Conv. Thm., that (s_n) is unbounded above. Hence, by monotonicity, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \infty$.

Hence, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = \infty$, as required. \square

Thm. (Algebraic Conv. Thm.) Given series $\sum_n a_n, \sum_n b_n$, and a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose $\sum_n a_n$ and $\sum_n b_n$ converge. Then:

(i) $\sum_n (a_n + b_n)$ converges, and $\sum_n (a_n + b_n) = \sum_n a_n + \sum_n b_n$.

(ii) $\sum_n (c \cdot a_n)$ converges, and $\sum_n (c \cdot a_n) = c \cdot \sum_n a_n$.

Pf. Immediate from Alg. Limit Thm. applied to sequences of partial sums. \square

Example: Determine convergence of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{n \cdot 2^n}{\sqrt{6^n + n^2}}$ by Bernoulli, $(1+1)^n \geq 1+n$

Set $a_n = \frac{n \cdot 2^n}{\sqrt{6^n + n^2}}$. Then, $|a_n| \leq \frac{n \cdot 2^n}{\sqrt{6^n}} \leq \frac{2 \cdot 2^n}{(\sqrt{6})^n} = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}\right)^n$.

Now, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}\right)^n$ converges as $\left|\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}\right| < 1$, hence $\sum 2 \cdot \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}\right)^n$ conv. by above th., hence $\sum a_n$ converges absolutely by Comp. Test. \square

Thm. (Alternating Series) Suppose the sequence $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ satisfies the following conditions: $b_n \geq 0$ for all but fin. many n , $b_n \geq b_{n+1}$ for all but fin. many n , and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 0$. Then, the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n b_n$ converges.

Pf. Let $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ denote the sequence of partial sums of $\sum (-1)^n b_n$, and let $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be st. $0 \leq b_{n+1} \leq b_n$ for all $n \geq N_0$.

Consider the subsequences $(s_{2m})_{m=0}^\infty$ and $(s_{2m+1})_{m=0}^\infty$ of (s_n) . We have,

$$\forall m \geq N_0/2, \quad s_{2(m+1)} = s_{2m} + (-1)^{2m+1} b_{2m+1} + (-1)^{2m+2} b_{2m+2} = s_{2m} - \underbrace{b_{2m+1}}_{\leq 0} + b_{2m+2} \leq s_{2m},$$

$$\text{and } s_{2(m+1)+1} = s_{2m+1} + (-1)^{2m+2} b_{2m+2} + (-1)^{2m+3} b_{2m+3} = s_{2m+1} + \underbrace{b_{2m+2}}_{\leq 0} - b_{2m+3} \geq s_{2m+1};$$

i.e., (s_{2m}) is decreasing and (s_{2m+1}) is increasing (eventually). \square

Moreover, for any $n > m \geq N_0/2$, $s_{2n+1} = s_{2n} - b_{2n+1} = \dots = s_{2m} - (b_{2m+1} - b_{2m+2}) - \dots - (b_{2n-1} - b_{2n}) - b_{2n+1} \leq s_{2m}$

and $s_{2n} = s_{2n-1} + b_{2n} = s_{2n-3} + (b_{2n-2} - b_{2n-1}) + b_{2n} = \dots = s_{2m+1} + (b_{2m+2} - b_{2m+3}) + \dots + (b_{2n-2} - b_{2n-1}) + b_{2n} \geq s_{2m+1}$

which proves that the increasing sequence (s_{2m+1}) is bounded above and the decreasing sequence (s_{2m}) is bounded below. Thus, by M.C.Thm, there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ st. $\alpha = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} s_{2m}$, $\beta = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} s_{2m+1}$.

Claim: $\alpha = \beta$.

Indeed, by above, we have $\alpha \geq \beta$, so it suffices to disprove $\alpha > \beta$.

Suppose then that $\alpha > \beta$, and let $\epsilon := \frac{\alpha - \beta}{3}$.

By assumption, we can choose $N_1 \geq N_0$ st. $|b_n| < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N_1$,
(even)

$|s_{2m} - \alpha| < \epsilon$ for all $m \geq N_1/2$ and $|s_{2m+1} - \beta| < \epsilon$ for all $m \geq N_1/2$.

Then, $|\alpha - \beta| = |\alpha - s_{N_1} + s_{N_1} - s_{N_1+1} + s_{N_1+1} - \beta| \leq |\alpha - s_{N_1}| + \underbrace{|s_{N_1} - s_{N_1+1}|}_{= |b_{N_1+1}|} + |s_{N_1+1} - \beta| < 3 \cdot \epsilon = |\alpha - \beta|$ \downarrow

Thus, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} s_{2m} = \alpha = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} s_{2m+1}$, and so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \alpha$. (Exercise!)

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

Def. Let $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ be a series. A rearrangement of $\sum a_n$ is a series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{\delta(n)}$ where $\delta: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a bijection.

Thm. (Riemann) Suppose $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ is conditionally convergent. Then, for any real number α , there exists a bijection $\delta: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ st. the rearrangement $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{\delta(n)}$ converges to α .

(Sketch) Ppf. Note first that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n| = \infty$, since $(\sum_{n=0}^N |a_n|)_{N=0}^{\infty}$ is increasing and has no limit.

For any n , define $a_n^+ := \max\{0, a_n\}$, $a_n^- := \max\{0, -a_n\}$. Then, $\forall n, a_n^+, a_n^- \geq 0$, and $a_n = a_n^+ - a_n^-$, $|a_n| = a_n^+ + a_n^-$. It follows that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n^+ = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n^- = \infty$.

Indeed, for if $\sum a_n^+ < \infty$, then $\sum a_n^- = \sum (a_n^+ - a_n) = \sum a_n^+ - \sum a_n$ converges, by Alg. Conv. I, and hence $\sum |a_n| = \sum a_n^+ + \sum a_n^- < \infty$. \downarrow

Similarly, if $\sum a_n^- < \infty$, then $\sum a_n^+ = \sum (a_n^+ + a_n^-) = \sum a_n^+ + \sum a_n^-$ converges, and hence so does $\sum |a_n|$. \downarrow

Define $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be the subsequence of $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ consisting of those a_n for which $a_n = a_n^+$, and let $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the subsequence of the remaining a_n 's (i.e., those for which $a_n = a_n^- \wedge a_n < 0$).

Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Set $s_0 = n_0$, so $a_{s_0} = b_0$. If $s_0 = a_{s_0} \leq \alpha$, then keep adding terms of (b_n) until $s_N > \alpha$. This will happen after fin. many steps, as $\sum_k b_k = \sum_n a_n^+ = \infty (> \alpha)$. Then, start adding terms of (c_n) until $s_{N_2} < \alpha$. Again, will happen eventually, as $\sum_k c_k = \sum_n a_n^- = -\infty (< \alpha)$. Then, switch back to the consecutive terms of (b_n) until $s_{N_3} > \alpha$. And so on. It follows that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} s_N = \alpha$, since, $\forall k$, $|s_{N_k} - \alpha| \leq |a_{s(N_k)}|$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{s(N_k)} = 0$. \square

Thm. If $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ is absolutely convergent, then \forall bijection $\sigma: \mathbb{N} \leftrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ the rearrangement $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{\sigma(n)}$ is absolutely convergent and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{\sigma(n)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$.

Pf. Assume $\sum a_n$ is absolutely convergent, and let $\sigma: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a bijection.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Choose $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $\forall n > m \geq N_0$, $|a_{n+1}| + \dots + |a_n| < \varepsilon/2$ and $\forall n \geq N_0$, $|\sum_{k=0}^n a_k - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k| < \varepsilon/2$.

Set $K_0 := \max\{\sigma^{-1}(0), \dots, \sigma^{-1}(N_0-1)\}$. Then, $\forall k \geq K_0$, $\sigma(k) \notin \{0, \dots, N_0-1\}$; i.e., $\forall k \geq K_0$, $\sigma(k) \geq N_0$.

Then, $\forall k > l \geq K_0 + 1$, $\sum_{j=l+1}^k |a_{\sigma(j)}| \leq t_p - t_q < \varepsilon/2$, where $t_s = \sum_{j=0}^s |a_j|$ and $p = \max\{\sigma(j) : l+1 \leq j \leq k\}$, $q = \min\{\sigma(j) : l+1 \leq j \leq k\}$. Thus, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_{\sigma(n)}|$ is convergent.

Finally, $\forall K \geq K_0 + 1$, $|\sum_{k=0}^K a_{\sigma(k)} - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n| \leq |\sum_{n=0}^{N_0-1} a_n - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n| + (|a_{N_0}| + \dots + |a_{\sigma(K)}|) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon$, where $J \in \mathbb{N}$ is s.t. $\sigma(J) = \max\{\sigma(k) : 0 \leq k \leq K\}$. \square

Def. A decimal expansion of $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is a sequence $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$, where $a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a_n \in \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, such that $a_0 \leq x \leq a_0 + 1$, and $a_0 + \frac{a_1}{10} + \dots + \frac{a_k}{10^k} \leq x \leq a_0 + \frac{a_1}{10} + \dots + \frac{a_k+1}{10}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

Prop. 1) Every decimal expansion represents a real number; i.e., $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{10^n} \in \mathbb{R}$.
2) Every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ admits a decimal expansion.

Pf. 1) By Comparison Test, since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{10^n} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{9}{10^n}$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{9}{10^n} = \frac{9}{10} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{10}} = 1$. \checkmark

2) Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $x > 0$ be arbitrary.

By Archimedean Principle, $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $x < n$. Let $a_0 + 1$ denote the least such n (exists by Well-ordering of \mathbb{N}). Then, $a_0 \leq x \leq a_0 + 1$.

Next, consider $x - a_0 \in [0, 1]$. Since $x - a_0 \geq \frac{0}{10}$ and $x - a_0 \leq \frac{9+1}{10}$, there exists a unique $a_1 \in \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$ s.t. $a_0 + \frac{a_1}{10} \leq x \leq a_0 + \frac{a_1+1}{10}$.

Inductively, assume that $a_0 + \frac{a_1}{10} + \dots + \frac{a_{k-1}}{10^{k-1}} \leq x \leq a_0 + \frac{a_1}{10} + \dots + \frac{a_{k-1}+1}{10}$, and let $\alpha = 10^{k-1} \cdot (x - \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \frac{a_n}{10^n})$. Since $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, then $\alpha \geq \frac{0}{10}$ and $\alpha \leq \frac{9+1}{10}$, and so $\exists!$ $a_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$ s.t. $\frac{a_k}{10} \leq \alpha \leq \frac{a_k+1}{10}$. Hence, after dividing by 10^{k-1} ,

$$a_0 + \frac{a_1}{10} + \dots + \frac{a_k}{10^k} \leq x \leq a_0 + \frac{a_1}{10} + \dots + \frac{a_k+1}{10^k}, \text{ as required. } \square$$

Warning: Decimal expansion representations are not unique, in general.

E.g., $1 = 0.999\dots$, since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{9}{10^n} = \frac{9}{10} \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{10^n} = \frac{9}{10} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{10}} = 1$, by

Geom. Series Thm.