

Shengtian Yang

---

# Notes

ON Walter Rudin's  
*Principles of Mathematical Analysis*

VERSION: 0.3.1

DATE: 2014-01-03

---

CODLAB.NET

Title: *Notes on Walter Rudin's Principles of Mathematical Analysis.*

Author: Shengtian Yang.

Version: 0.3.1 (no. 201401032111).<sup>1</sup>

Copyright © 2013 by Shengtian Yang.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>.

The latest version of this work is available from <http://www.codlab.net/>.

---

<sup>1</sup>This file was generated on January 3, 2014 by XeTeX 0.9999 with format LaTeX2e 2011/06/27.

---

# Contents

---

<b>Preface</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1 The Real and Complex Number Systems</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Notes on Text . . . . .	1
1.2 Solutions to Exercises . . . . .	3
<b>2 Basic Topology</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Notes on Text . . . . .	13
2.2 Solutions to Exercises . . . . .	13
<b>3 Numerical Sequences and Series</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 Notes on Text . . . . .	23
3.2 Solutions to Exercises . . . . .	23
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>39</b>



---

# Preface

---

This document includes my solutions to the exercises of the book *Principles of Mathematical Analysis* (Rudin, 1976), as well as my notes on some interesting facts in the book. Because of copyright reasons, the original text of the exercises is not included in the public release of this document.

Rudin's book is very well known. As someone said, it can rightly be called "the bible of classical analysis". The book may be difficult for a beginner, but it is very suitable for those (like me) who have already basic knowledge of calculus or analysis.

I am very glad for bug reports as well as any comments on all aspects of this document.

Shengtian Yang  
Hangzhou, China  
yangst@codlab.net  
June 12, 2013

(Last revised on June 12, 2013)



---

# The Real and Complex Number Systems

---

## 1.1 Notes on Text

**Note 1.1** (p. 2, Example 1.1) The described trick is useful for estimating  $\sqrt{2}$ . It essentially requires us to find a function  $f$  such that for any initial number  $x_0 > 0$ , the sequence

$$x_0, \quad x_1 = f(x_0), \quad x_2 = f(x_1), \quad \dots,$$

being ascending or descending, converges to  $\sqrt{2}$ . (An extra requirement is that  $f(\mathbf{Q}) \subseteq \mathbf{Q}$ .)

A heuristic approach is to find a function having the following form:

$$f(x) := x - \frac{x^2 - 2}{g(x)},$$

where  $g(x)$  is positive for  $x > 0$ . This ensures that  $f(x) > x$  for  $x < \sqrt{2}$  and  $f(x) < x$  for  $x > \sqrt{2}$ . To make the sequence converge to  $\sqrt{2}$ , we still need to choose appropriate  $g$  such that  $f(x) < \sqrt{2}$  for  $x < \sqrt{2}$  and  $f(x) > \sqrt{2}$  for  $x > \sqrt{2}$ . Since

$$(f(x))^2 - 2 = (x^2 - 2) \left[ 1 - \frac{2x}{g(x)} + \frac{x^2 - 2}{(g(x))^2} \right],$$

we have the following equivalent condition:

$$(g(x))^2 - 2xg(x) + x^2 - 2 > 0.$$

If we let  $g(x) = x + a$ , the above inequality further reduces to

$$a^2 - 2 > 0.$$

Now we choose  $a = \frac{3}{2}$ , and then


$$f(x) = \frac{3x + 4}{2x + 3}.$$

Taking  $x_0 = 0$ , we obtain the following sequence:

$$x_0 = 0, \quad x_1 = \frac{4}{3}, \quad x_2 = \frac{24}{17} \approx 1.412, \quad x_3 = \frac{140}{99} \approx 1.41414, \quad \dots$$




**Note 1.2** (p. 10, Theorem 1.21)

**Fact 1.1.** For  $b > a > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 2}$ ,  $na^{n-1}(b-a) < b^n - a^n < nb^{n-1}(b-a)$ . 

*Proof.* Use  $b^n - a^n = (b-a)(b^{n-1} + b^{n-2}a + \dots + ba^{n-2} + a^{n-1})$ . □

**Note 1.3** (p. 21, Step 9)

**Fact 1.2.** Any two ordered fields with the least-upper-bound property are isomorphic. 

*Proof.* We will show that any ordered field  $F$  with the least-upper-bound property is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{R}$ . In other words, there is a ring-isomorphism from  $\mathbf{R}$  to  $F$  that is also monotone increasing.

Suppose that  $0'$  and  $1'$  are the additive identity and the multiplicative identity of  $F$ , respectively. We first define a map from  $\mathbf{Q}$ , the subfield of  $\mathbf{R}$ , to  $F$ . For any  $x \in \mathbf{Q}$ , write  $x = m/n$  where  $m$  and  $n$  are integers and  $n \neq 0$ . We define

$$f(x) := (m1')/(n1'),$$

where  $n1'$  denotes the sum of  $n$   $1'$ 's.

Clearly,  $f$  is well defined, and is in fact a ring-monomorphism, since

$$\begin{aligned} f(a/b + c/d) &= f((ad + bc)/bd) \\ &= [(ad + bc)1']/(bd1') \\ &= (a1')/(b1') + (c1')/(d1') \\ &= f(a/b) + f(c/d), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f((a/b)(c/d)) &= f((ac)/(bd)) \\ &= (ac1')/(bd1') \\ &= [(a1')/(b1')][(c1')/(d1')] \\ &= f(a/b)f(c/d), \end{aligned}$$

$$f(1) = 1'/1' = 1'.$$

The map  $f$  is monotone increasing since for any rational  $x = m/n > 0$  where  $m, n > 0$ , we have  $f(x) = (m1')/(n1') > 0$ , where the last inequality follows from the property of an ordered field (Definition 1.17 and Proposition 1.18).

Now we extend  $f$  from  $\mathbf{Q}$  to  $\mathbf{R}$ . We define the map  $g: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow F$  by

$$g(x) := \sup_{y \in \mathbf{Q}: y < x} f(y).$$



It is well defined since  $F$  has the least-upper-bound property. It is also clear that  $g(x) = f(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbf{Q}$ . Furthermore, it is easy to show that  $g$  is a monotone increasing ring-monomorphism. Finally, let us show that it is in fact an isomorphism. For any  $x' \in F$ , it follows from Theorem 1.20 that there exists a sequence  $y'_k = (m_k 1') / (n_k 1')$  such that  $x' - 1' / (k 1') < y'_k < x'$ . Let  $x = \sup_k (m_k / n_k)$ . We have

$$g(x) > g(m_k / n_k) = y'_k > x' - 1' / (k 1'),$$

so that  $g(x) \geq x'$ . If  $g(x) > x'$ , then there would exist a rational  $y' = (m 1') / (n 1')$  such that  $x' < y' < g(x)$ . It then follows that

$$y := m/n \geq \sup_k (m_k / n_k) = x,$$

contrary to the monotone increasing property of  $g$ . Therefore  $g(x) = x'$ , so that  $g$  is surjective.  $\square$

## 1.2 Solutions to Exercises

1.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $r + x$  (resp.  $rx$ ) is rational. Since  $r$  is rational and nonzero, both  $-r$  and  $1/r$  are rational, so that  $x = -r + (r + x)$  (resp.  $x = (1/r)rx$ ) is rational, a contradiction.  $\square$

2.

*Proof.* If there were a rational  $x$  such that  $x^2 = 12$ , we could write  $x = m/n$  where  $m$  and  $n$  are not both multiples of 3. Then  $x^2 = 12$  implies that

$$m^2 = 12n^2.$$

This shows that 3 divides  $m^2$ , and hence, that 3 divides  $m$ , so that 9 divides  $m^2$ . It then follows that  $n^2$  is divisible by 3, so that  $n$  is a multiple of 3, which contradicts our assumption.  $\square$

3.

*Proof.* If  $xy = xz$  and  $x \neq 0$ , then  $y = 1y = (1/x)xy = (1/x)xz = 1z = z$ . This proves (a). Take  $z = 1$  in (a) to obtain (b). (a) with  $z = 1/x$  gives (c). (c) with identity  $(1/x)x = 1$  yields (d).  $\square$

4.

*Proof.* Choose  $x \in E$  and we have  $\alpha \leq x$  and  $x \leq \beta$ , so that  $\alpha \leq \beta$ . □

### 5.

*Proof.* Note first that there is a one-to-one correspondence between  $x \in A$  and  $-x \in -A$ . By definition,  $x \geq \inf A$  for all  $x \in A$ , so that  $-x \leq -\inf A$  for all  $-x \in -A$ , and hence  $\sup(-A) \leq -\inf A$ , or  $\inf A \leq -\sup(-A)$ . Similarly,  $y \leq \sup(-A)$  for all  $y \in -A$ , so that  $-y \geq -\sup(-A)$  for all  $-y \in A$ , and hence  $\inf A \geq -\sup(-A)$ . Therefore  $\inf A = -\sup(-A)$ . □

### 6.

*Proof.* (a) It is clear that  $(x^n)^{1/n} = x = (x^{1/n})^n$  for real  $x > 0$  and integer  $n > 0$  (Theorem 1.21). It is also clear that for positive integers  $m$  and  $n$ ,  $x^{mn} = (x^m)^n$  and  $x^{1/(mn)} = (x^{1/m})^{1/n}$ , where the second identity can be proved by the following argument:

$$[(x^{1/(mn)})^n]^m = (x^{1/(mn)})^{mn} = x,$$

which implies that  $x^{1/(mn)} = (x^{1/m})^{1/n}$ .

With the simple identities  $(1/x)^n = 1/x^n$  and  $(1/x)^{1/n} = 1/x^{1/n}$  where  $x > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ , it can be further shown that

$$\begin{aligned} (x^n)^{1/n} &= x = (x^{1/n})^n && \text{for } n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\neq 0}, \\ x^{mn} &= (x^m)^n && \text{for } m, n \in \mathbf{Z}, \\ x^{1/(mn)} &= (x^{1/m})^{1/n} && \text{for } m, n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\neq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

The convention here is  $x^{-m/n} := 1/x^{m/n}$ .

We are now ready to prove the identity. Since  $m/n = p/q$ , we have  $mq = np$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} (b^m)^{1/n} &= \{[(b^m)q]^{1/q}\}^{1/n} \\ &= (b^{mq})^{1/nq} \\ &= (b^{np})^{1/nq} \\ &= \{[(b^p)^n]^{1/n}\}^{1/q} \\ &= (b^p)^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

(b) Suppose  $r = m/n$  and  $s = p/q$  where  $n > 0$  and  $q > 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} b^{r+s} &= b^{(mq+np)/(nq)} \\ &= (b^{mq+np})^{1/(nq)} \\ &= (b^{mq}b^{np})^{1/(nq)} \\ &= (b^{mq})^{1/(nq)}(b^{np})^{1/(nq)} && \text{(Corollary of Theorem 1.21)} \\ &= b^r b^s. \end{aligned}$$

(c) We first show that  $b^r$  is strictly increasing in  $r \in \mathbf{Q}$ . It is clear that  $b^r$  is strictly increasing in  $r \in \mathbf{Z}$  (Proposition 1.18). Now suppose that  $r = m/n < s = p/q$  where  $n > 0$  and  $q > 0$ . It then follows that

$$b^r = (b^{mq})^{1/(nq)} < (b^{np})^{1/(nq)} = b^s.$$

This implies  $b^r \geq \sup B(r)$  for  $r \in \mathbf{Q}$ , so that  $b^r = B(r)$  since  $b^r \in B(r)$ .

It can be further shown that  $b^x$  is strictly increasing in  $x \in \mathbf{R}$ . For any real  $x < y$ , choose rational  $r$  and  $s$  such that  $x < r < s < y$  (Theorem 1.20). By definition, it follows that  $b^y \geq b^s > b^r \geq b^x$ .

(d) The following inequality will be needed in the proof:

$$b^{1/n} - 1 < (b - 1)n^{-1} \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 2},$$

which is an easy consequence of Fact 1.1.

We first show that  $b^{x+y} \leq b^x b^y$ . Choose rational  $r \leq x$  and  $s \leq y$  such that  $r > x - 1/(2n)$  and  $s > y - 1/(2n)$  where  $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 2}$ . It follows that  $b^r \leq b^x$  and  $b^s \leq b^y$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} b^x b^y &\geq b^r b^s \\ &= b^{r+s} && \text{(Part (b))} \\ &= b^{x+y} - (b^{x+y} - b^{r+s}) \\ &> b^{x+y} - (b^{r+s+1/n} - b^{r+s}) && \text{(Proof of part (c))} \\ &= b^{x+y} - b^{r+s}(b^{1/n} - 1) \\ &> b^{x+y} - b^{r+s}(b - 1)n^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $b^x b^y \geq b^{x+y}$ .

On the other hand, choose rational  $r \leq x$  and  $s \leq y$  such that  $r > x - 1/n$  and  $s > y - 1/n$  where  $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 2}$ . It follows that

$$b^{x+y} \geq b^{r+s} = b^r b^s,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b^r &> b^x - (b^{r+1/n} - b^r) > b^x - b^r(b - 1)n^{-1}, \\ b^s &> b^y - (b^{s+1/n} - b^s) > b^y - b^s(b - 1)n^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$b^{x+y} > b^x b^y - 2b^r b^s (b - 1)n^{-1}$$

and therefore  $b^{x+y} \geq b^x b^y$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

*Proof.* (a)  $b^n - 1 = (b - 1)(b^{n-1} + b^{n-2} + \cdots + 1) \geq n(b - 1)$  (cf. Fact 1.1).

(b)  $b - 1 = (b^{1/n})^n - 1 \geq n(b^{1/n} - 1)$ .

(c)  $b^{1/n} = 1 + b^{1/n} - 1 \leq 1 + (b - 1)/n < t$ .

(d) Taking  $n > (b - 1)/(yb^{-w} - 1)$ , and then it follows from (c) that  $b^{w+(1/n)} = b^w b^{1/n} < y$ .

(e) Since  $b^w > y$ , or  $b^{-w} < y^{-1}$ , it follows from (d) that  $b^{-w+(1/n)} < y^{-1}$  for sufficiently large  $n$ , that is,  $b^{w-(1/n)} > y$ .

(f) From (d) it follows that  $x \notin A$ , so that  $b^x \geq y$ . On the other hand, it is impossible that  $b^x > y$ , for otherwise it follows from (e) that  $x$  is not the least upper bound of  $A$ . The proof is complete.

(g) Use the strict increasing property of  $b^x$  (see the proof of Ex. 6.(c)).  $\square$

## 8.

*Proof.* If there were an order defined in the complex field that turns it into an ordered field, we would have  $-1 = i^2 > 0$  (Proposition 1.18), a contradiction.  $\square$

## 9.

*Proof.* Enumerating all the possibilities shows that

$$a < c, a = c, \text{ or } a > c$$

and

$$b < d, b = d, \text{ or } b > d.$$

Every possibility gives  $z < w$ ,  $z = w$ , or  $z > w$ . In other words, any  $z$  and  $w$  are comparable.

To prove this is an ordered set, it remains to show that the order is transitive. Suppose  $z = a + bi$ ,  $w = c + di$ , and  $x = e + fi$ . Supposing  $z < w$  and  $w < x$ , we will show that  $z < x$ .

The relation  $z < w$  shows that  $a < c$  or  $a = c$  but  $b < d$ . Likewise,  $w < x$  gives  $c < e$  or  $c = e$  but  $d < f$ . Thus there are in total four possibilities:

1.  $a < c$  and  $c < e$ ;
2. ( $a = c$  but  $b < d$ ) and  $c < e$ ;
3.  $a < c$  and ( $c = e$  but  $d < f$ );
4. ( $a = c$  but  $b < d$ ) and ( $c = e$  but  $d < f$ ).

The first three cases yields  $a < e$  and the last case yields  $a = e$  but  $b < f$ . Therefore  $z < x$  in all cases.

Let  $A$  consist of all complex numbers whose real part is 0. If  $z = a + bi$  is an upper bound of  $A$ , then  $a$  must be positive, for otherwise we have  $z < (b+1)i \in A$ . However,  $z = a + (b-1)i$  is a smaller upper bound of  $A$ . This indicates that this ordered set does not have the least-upper-bound property.  $\square$

**10.**

*Proof.* At first, we note that

$$ab = \left( \frac{|w|^2 - u^2}{4} \right)^{1/2} = \frac{|v|}{2}.$$

Then by conditions, we have

$$z^2 = a^2 - b^2 + 2abi = u + |v|i = w \quad \text{for } v \geq 0$$

and

$$(\bar{z})^2 = \overline{z^2} = u - |v|i = w \quad \text{for } v \leq 0.$$

Given any  $w$ , the formula for  $z$  provides a way for computing one square root of  $w$ , say  $x$ . It is clear that  $-x$  is another square root whenever  $x \neq 0$ . In fact,  $w$  has only two square roots, i.e.,  $\pm x$ . If there were another number  $y$  such that  $y^2 = w$ , then  $y^2 = x^2$ , or  $(y+x)(y-x) = 0$ , so that  $y = x$  or  $y = -x$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**11.**

*Proof.* Suppose  $z = a + bi$ . Let  $r = |z|$  and  $w = z/r$ . It is easy to show that  $r \geq 0$ ,  $|w| = 1$ , and  $z = rw$ .

If  $z \neq 0$ , it uniquely determines  $r$  and  $w$ . If there were another  $r'$  and  $w'$  such that  $r' > 0$ ,  $|w'| = 1$ , and  $z = r'w'$ , then we would have  $r' = |z| = r$  and  $w' = z/r' = z/r = w$ .  $\square$

**12.**

*Proof.* Use induction on  $n$  with Theorem 1.33.  $\square$

**13.**

*Proof.* By Ex. 12, we have

$$|x| = |x - y + y| \leq |x - y| + |y|,$$

so that  $|x| - |y| \leq |x - y|$ , which also implies  $|y| - |x| \leq |y - x| = |x - y|$ . Therefore  $||x| - |y|| \leq |x - y|$ .  $\square$

14.

*Solution.*

$$|1 + z|^2 + |1 - z|^2 = 1 + 2 \operatorname{Re}(z) + |z|^2 + 1 - 2 \operatorname{Re}(z) + |z|^2 = 4. \quad \square$$

15.

*Answer.* The equality holds if and only if  $Ba_j = Cb_j$  for some  $B, C \in \mathbf{R}$  and all  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  (see the proof of Theorem 1.35).  $\square$

16.

*Proof.* Consider the equation  $|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}| = |\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}| = r$ , which is equivalent to

$$(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}) = r^2.$$

After some manipulations, we get three equivalent equations from the first equality:

$$(2\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = 0,$$

$$2(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) = d^2,$$

$$2(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = d^2.$$

Furthermore, we obtain the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} |2\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2 &= |\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}|^2 + 2(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}) + |\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}|^2 \\ &= 2r^2 + 2|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}|^2 + 2(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \\ &= 4r^2 - d^2. \end{aligned}$$

It is then clear that  $|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}| = |\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}| = r$  is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} [\mathbf{z} - (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})/2] \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = 0, \\ |\mathbf{z} - (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})/2| = \sqrt{r^2 - d^2/4}, \end{cases}$$

or more compactly,

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}' \cdot \mathbf{y}' = 0, \\ |\mathbf{x}'| = \sqrt{r^2 - d^2/4}. \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathbf{y}' := \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$ .

(a) It suffices to show that for any  $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$  and  $s > 0$ , there are infinitely many  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^k$  such that  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = 0$  and  $|\mathbf{x}| = s$ , that is,

$$\begin{cases} x_1y_1 + x_2y_2 + \cdots + x_ky_k = 0, \\ x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \cdots + x_k^2 = s^2. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , with no loss of generality, we suppose  $y_k \neq 0$ . Now let  $x_3, \dots, x_{k-1}$  be zero. We get two reduced equations:

$$\begin{cases} x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 + x_k y_k = 0, \\ x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_k^2 = s^2. \end{cases}$$

From the first equation we have  $x_k = c_1 x_1 + c_2 x_2$  where  $c_1 = -y_1/y_k$  and  $c_2 = -y_2/y_k$ . This combined with the second equation gives

$$(1 + c_1^2)x_1^2 + (2c_1 c_2 x_2)x_1 + (1 + c_2^2)x_2^2 - s^2 = 0.$$

Calculating the discriminant, we have

$$\Delta = 4[(1 + c_1^2)s^2 - (1 + c_1^2 + c_2^2)x_2^2].$$

Then for any  $x_2$  such that

$$|x_2| < \sqrt{\frac{(1 + c_1^2)s^2}{1 + c_1^2 + c_2^2}},$$

we obtain two solutions for  $x_1$ . This proves that there are infinitely many solutions because  $x_2$  can take infinitely many distinct values.

(b) It suffices to show that for any  $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , there is exactly one  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^k$  such that  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = 0$  and  $|\mathbf{x}| = 0$ , which is obvious.

(c) Obvious.

If  $k = 2$ , then the equations in the proof of (a) become

$$\begin{cases} x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 = 0, \\ x_1^2 + x_2^2 = s^2. \end{cases}$$

The equations have only zero, one, or two solutions, corresponding to the cases (c), (b), and (a), respectively.

If  $k = 1$ , then the equations in the proof of (a) become

$$\begin{cases} x_1 y_1 = 0, \\ x_1^2 = s^2. \end{cases}$$

The equations have only zero or one solutions. The former corresponds to (a) or (c), while the latter corresponds to (b).  $\square$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}|^2 + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2 &= 2|\mathbf{x}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{y}|^2 + \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{x} \\ &= 2|\mathbf{x}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{y}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Geometrically, this shows that the sum of the squares of the sides of a parallelogram equals the sum of the squares of its diagonals.  $\square$

**18.**

*Proof.* With no loss of generality, we suppose  $x_k \neq 0$ . Let

$$\mathbf{y} = (x_k, 0, \dots, 0, -x_1),$$

which is nonzero. It is easy to see that  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = 0$ .

It is clearly false for  $k = 1$  if  $x \neq 0$  (by the property of field).  $\square$

**19.**

*Solution.* The trick is to find an equivalent form of the equation that is like  $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}| = r$ . Taking squares in both sides of the equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 3|\mathbf{x}|^2 - 2\mathbf{x} \cdot (4\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a}) + 4|\mathbf{b}|^2 - |\mathbf{a}|^2 &= 0 \\ |\mathbf{x} - (4\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a})/3|^2 &= |2(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a})/3|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $\mathbf{c} = (4\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a})/3$  and  $r = 2|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a}|/3$ .  $\square$

**20.**

*Proof.* First, we show that the resulting set is an ordered set with the least-upper-bound property.

Given two cuts  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we say  $\alpha < \beta$  if  $\alpha$  is a proper subset of  $\beta$ . Now if  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , then without loss of generality, we assume that there is a  $p \in \beta$  but  $p \notin \alpha$ . This implies that  $p$  is an upper bound of  $\alpha$ , so that  $\alpha$  is a proper subset of  $\beta$ , and therefore  $\alpha < \beta$ . This shows that the resulting set is an ordered set since its transitive property is an easy consequence of the set-inclusion relation.

Let  $A$  be a nonempty subset of  $\mathbf{R}$ . We define  $\alpha := \bigcup_{\gamma \in A} \gamma$ . We shall prove that  $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $\alpha = \sup A$ . It is clear that  $\alpha$  is nonempty. If  $p \in \alpha$ , then  $p \in \gamma$  for some  $\gamma \in A$ , so that  $q \in \gamma \subseteq \alpha$  for all  $q \in \mathbf{Q}$  with  $q < p$ . Therefore  $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$ .

By definition,  $\alpha$  is an upper bound of  $A$ . Assume that  $\beta \in \mathbf{R}$  is an upper bound of  $A$ . Then  $\gamma \subseteq \beta$  for all  $\gamma \in A$ , so that  $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ , that is,  $\alpha \leq \beta$ , and therefore  $\alpha = \sup A$ .

Second, we show that addition satisfies axioms (A1) to (A4).



Given two cuts  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we define the addition  $\alpha + \beta$  to be the set of all sums  $r + s$  where  $r \in \alpha$  and  $s \in \beta$ . It is well defined because it is easy to show that  $\alpha + \beta$  is a cut. This also asserts that the set of cuts is closed under addition, i.e., (A1).

(A2) is obviously true, because  $\alpha + \beta = \{r + s : r \in \alpha, s \in \beta\} = \{s + r : r \in \alpha, s \in \beta\} = \beta + \alpha$ . The same trick also applies to (A3).

Let  $0^* = \{t \in \mathbf{Q} : t \leq 0\}$ . It is easy to show that  $\alpha + 0^* = \alpha$  for any cut  $\alpha$ . This proves (A4).

Finally, we show that (A5) fails. Let  $\alpha = \{r \in \mathbf{Q} : r < 0\}$ . If there were some  $\beta$  such that  $\alpha + \beta = 0^*$ , then there is an  $r \in \alpha$  and  $s \in \beta$  such that  $r + s = 0$ . Since  $r < 0$ , we can choose a  $p \in \alpha$  between  $r$  and 0 so that  $p + s > 0$  and hence, the cut  $0^*$  contains positive rationals, which is absurd.  $\square$



---

# Basic Topology


---


## 2.1 Notes on Text


**Note 2.1** (p. 38, Theorem 2.36) The crucial idea of the proof is the following equivalence:

$$A \subseteq B \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad A \cap B^c = \emptyset,$$

which establishes the relation between intersection problems and covering problems.

According to the proof, the theorem also holds for a collection of closed subsets with only one subset being compact. 

**Note 2.2** (p. 40, Theorem 2.41) Conditions (b) and (c) are equivalent in any metric space (Ex. 26). The importance of the compactness of a space is that it enables us to convert an infinite covering into a finite covering, so that many facts in a finite setting can be easily generalized to a general compact space. Analogously, the separable property (Ex. 22) enables us to reduce a problem involving uncountable set operations to a problem with only countable set operations. 

**Note 2.3** (p. 42, Definition 2.45) Let  $Y = A \cup B$ . The condition  $A \cap \overline{B} = \overline{A} \cap B = \emptyset$  implies that  $\overline{A} \cap Y = A$  and  $\overline{B} \cap Y = B$ , which further implies that both  $A$  and  $B$  are open relative to  $Y$  (Theorem 2.30). In some books (e.g., Munkres, 2000, Sec. 23), this (equivalent) condition is used to define a separation of a topological space (or subspace). 

## 2.2 Solutions to Exercises

1.

*Proof.* This is trivially true because the empty set contains no element. In other words, we can say there is no element of the empty set such that it is not an element of an arbitrary set.  $\square$

2.

*Proof.* Since every equation with integer coefficients yields only  $n$  algebraic numbers, it suffices to show that the set of such equations is countable. We note that each equation is identified with the  $n$ -tuple  $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ , so the whole set of such equations is  $\bigcup_{N=3}^{\infty} E_N$ , where

$$E_N := \left\{ (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \bigcup_{m=2}^{N-1} \mathbf{Z}^m : a_0 \neq 0, n + |a_0| + \dots + |a_n| = N \right\}.$$

Since  $E_N$  is finite for each  $N \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ , it is clear that the number of equations is countable (Theorem 2.12).  $\square$

### 3.

*Proof.* If all real numbers were algebraic, then  $\mathbf{R}$  would be countable (Ex. 2), which is in contradiction to the fact that  $\mathbf{R}$  is uncountable (Theorem 2.14 or 2.43).  $\square$

### 4.

*Proof.* No. If the set of all irrational real numbers were countable, the set of real numbers would also be countable, in contradiction to Theorem 2.14.  $\square$

### 5.

*Solution.* Define  $A(x) := \{x + 1/n : n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}\}$ . It is clear that  $A(-1) \cup A(0) \cup A(1)$  is bounded and has three limit points  $-1$ ,  $0$ , and  $1$ .  $\square$

### 6.

*Proof.* For any  $p \notin E'$ , there is a neighborhood  $N_r(p)$  that is disjoint from  $E \setminus \{p\}$ . This implies that  $N_r(p)$  contains no limit points of  $E$  (Theorem 2.20). Therefore  $p$  is an interior point of  $E'^c$ , and hence  $E'^c$  is open, so that  $E'$  is closed.

It is enough to show that a limit point of  $\overline{E}$  is also a limit point of  $E$ . Let  $p$  be a limit point of  $\overline{E}$ . If  $p$  were not a limit point of  $E$ , then  $p$  would be a limit point of  $E'$ , so that  $p \in E'$ , and therefore  $p$  is a limit point of  $E$ , a contradiction.

No, they may have different limit points. For example, let  $E = \{1/n : n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}\}$  in  $\mathbf{R}$ , so that  $E' = \{0\}$ , which has no limit points.  $\square$

### 7.

*Proof.* (a) Observe that a point  $p$  is a limit point of  $B_n$  if and only if it is a limit point of  $A_i$  for some  $i$  (since  $B_n$  is a finite union of  $A_1, \dots, A_n$ ). Then,

$$\overline{B_n} = B_n \cup B'_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n A'_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^n (A_i \cup A'_i) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \overline{A_i}.$$

(b) Use a similar argument of (a) with the fact that a limit point of  $A_i$  is a limit point of  $B$ .

For a counter example, let  $A_i = \{1/i\}$  in  $\mathbf{R}$ . We have

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \overline{A_i} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \neq \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i = \overline{B}. \quad \square$$

8.

*Solution.* It is true for open set but false for closed sets. □

9.

*Proof.* (a) If  $p \in E^\circ$ , then there is a neighborhood  $N_r(p)$  of  $p$  such that  $N_r(p) \subseteq E$ . Since  $N_r(p)$  is open, its every point is its interior point, and hence an interior point of  $E$ , so that  $p$  is an interior point of  $E^\circ$ . This shows that  $E^\circ$  is open.

(b) By (a),  $E^\circ = E$  implies that  $E$  is open. Conversely, if  $E$  is open, then every point of  $E$  is an interior point of  $E$ , so that  $E^\circ = E$ .

(c) Observe that every (interior) point of  $G$  is an interior point of  $E$ .

(d) The complement of  $E^\circ$  is a closed set containing  $E^c$  and hence its closure. It remains to show that every point of  $(E^\circ)^c$  is a point of the closure of  $E^c$ . If  $p \notin E^\circ$ , then every neighborhood of  $p$  contains points of  $E^c$ . This implies that  $p$  is a point of  $E^c$  or a limit point of  $E^c$  (or both), and therefore  $p$  is a point of  $\overline{E^c}$ .

(e) No. An interior point of  $E$  must be an interior point of  $\overline{E}$ . However an interior point of  $\overline{E}$  is not necessarily an interior point of  $E$ . For example, consider the subset  $E = (0, 1) \cup (1, 2)$  of  $\mathbf{R}$ . It is clear that the interior of the closure of  $E$  is  $(0, 2)$ , which is however not equal to  $E^\circ = E$ .

(f) No. Consider the subset  $E = \{1/n : n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}\}$  of  $\mathbf{R}$ . Then we have  $\overline{E} = E \cup \{0\}$  while  $\overline{E^\circ} = \emptyset$ . □

10.

*Proof.* First, we show that this is a metric. It suffices to show that it satisfies the triangular inequality. For  $p, q, r \in X$ , if  $p \neq q$ , then

$$d(p, q) = 1 \leq d(p, r) + d(r, q),$$

since  $r$  may equal  $p$  or  $q$  but not both; otherwise, we have  $p = q$ , so that

$$d(p, q) = 0 \leq d(p, r) + d(r, q).$$

Since every point is open with respect to this metric, all subsets of  $X$  are open, and hence also closed. The compact subsets of  $X$  are its finite subsets. For if a subset  $S$  is infinite, then we may consider the open cover  $(N_{1/2}(p))_{p \in S}$ , of which any proper subset cannot cover  $S$ .  $\square$

### 11.

*Proof.* The function  $d_1(x, y)$  is not a metric, because  $d_1(1, 3) = 4 > 2 = d_1(1, 2) + d_1(2, 3)$ .

The function  $d_2(x, y)$  is nonnegative and is zero only if  $x = y$ . It is also symmetric. Moreover, it satisfies the triangular inequality because

$$\sqrt{|x - y|} \leq \sqrt{|x - z| + |z - y|} \leq \sqrt{|x - z|} + \sqrt{|z - y|}.$$

Therefore it is a metric.

The function  $d_3(x, y)$  is not a metric because  $d_2(1, -1) = 0$ .

The function  $d_4(x, y)$  is not a metric because  $d_2(2, 1) = 0$ .

It is easy to verify that  $d_5(x, y)$  satisfies the first and second condition of a metric. We now show that it satisfies the triangular inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|x - y|}{1 + |x - y|} &= 1 - \frac{1}{1 + |x - y|} \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{1}{1 + |x - z| + |z - y|} \\ &\leq \frac{|x - z|}{1 + |x - z|} + \frac{|z - y|}{1 + |z - y|}. \end{aligned}$$

So  $d_5(x, y)$  is a metric.  $\square$

### 12.

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mathcal{G}$  is an open cover of  $K$ . Then there is an open set  $A_0 \in \mathcal{G}$  covering 0, and hence covering the numbers  $1/n$  for  $n \geq N$  where  $N$  is fixed integer. Now for each  $n < N$ , choosing an open set  $A_n \in \mathcal{G}$  that covers  $1/n$ , we thus obtain a finite open cover  $(A_n)_{n=0}^N$  of  $K$ , and therefore  $K$  is compact.  $\square$

### 13.

*Solution.* Let  $A_n := \{1/2^n\} \cup \{1/2^n + 1/k : k \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}\}$ . Let us consider the limit points of the set  $A := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ . It is clear that 0 and  $1/2^n$  ( $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ ) are its limit points. We shall show there are no other limit points.

At first, it is clear that any negative number is not a limit point of  $A$ . Next, for any positive  $x$  such that  $1/2^{m+1} < x < 1/2^m$  where  $m \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ , let

$$r = \frac{1}{2} \min\{x - 1/2^{m+1}, 1/2^m - x\}.$$

Then the neighborhood  $N_r(x)$  contains at most finite points of  $A_n$  for  $n > m$  and contains no points of  $A_n$  for  $n \leq m$ . So it is not a limit point of  $A$ . Finally, it is also clear that all points greater than  $1/2$  are not limit points of  $A$ .

Therefore  $\bar{A}$  is closed and hence compact (because it is bounded), and moreover, its limit points form a countable set (see also Ex. 6).  $\square$

14.

*Solution.* Let  $A_n = (2/4^{n+1}, 3/4^n)$  for  $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . It is clear that the segment  $(0, 1)$  is covered by the collection  $(A_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  which however contains no finite subcover.  $\square$

15.

*Proof.* Let  $A_n = [n, +\infty)$  where  $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ . It is clear that  $A_n$  is closed and that the intersection of every finite subcollection of  $(A_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is nonempty. However  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = \emptyset$ .

Let  $A_n = (0, 1/n)$  where  $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ . It is clear that  $A_n$  is bounded and that the intersection of every finite subcollection of  $(A_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is nonempty. However  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

16.

*Proof.* Note that  $\mathbf{Q}$  is a subset of  $\mathbf{R}$  with the same distance  $d(p, q)$ . Since

$$E = \mathbf{Q} \cap ((-\sqrt{3}, -\sqrt{2}) \cup (\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}))$$

and

$$\mathbf{Q} \setminus E = \mathbf{Q} \cap ((-\infty, -\sqrt{3}) \cup (-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}) \cup (\sqrt{3}, +\infty)),$$

$E$  is both open and closed in  $\mathbf{Q}$  (Theorem 2.30), and it is bounded. However it is not compact, since we may easily construct an infinite sequence of points in  $E$  that converges to  $\sqrt{2}$ , which is not in  $E$ , so that the sequence has no limit points in  $E$ .  $\square$

17.

*Solution.*  $E$  is countable. Since we may establish a one-to-one correspondence between the points of  $E$  and binary sequences by mapping 4 to 0 and 7 to 1, respectively.

$E$  is not dense since, for example, the decimal expansion of any point in the segment  $(0.1, 0.2)$  contains 1.

For every point  $p \in [0, 1] \setminus E$ , its decimal expansion contains at least a digit not equal to 4 or 7. We suppose the first such digit is at the  $i$ th position and that the decimal expansion of that point is in the form  $0.d_1d_2 \cdots d_i$ . With no loss of generality, we assume that  $i \geq 2$  (since the case of  $i = 1$  is trivial). If  $d_i \neq 0$  or 9, then any numbers in the segment

$$(0.d_1d_2 \cdots d_{i-1}(d_i - 1)9, 0.d_1d_2 \cdots d_{i-1}(d_i + 1)1)$$

are not in  $E$ ; if  $d_i = 0$ , then any numbers in the segment

$$(0.d_1d_2 \cdots (d_{i-1} - 1)99, 0.d_1d_2 \cdots d_{i-1}11)$$

are not in  $E$ ; if  $d_i = 9$ , then any numbers in the segment

$$(0.d_1d_2 \cdots d_{i-1}89, 0.d_1d_2 \cdots (d_{i-1} + 1)01)$$

are not in  $E$ . All the above facts show that  $E^c$  is open and hence  $E$  is closed. Because  $E$  is bounded, it is compact (Theorem 2.41).

For any point  $p$  of  $E$ , we may replace the  $n$ th digit of its decimal expansion by 4 or 7. In this way, we can construct an infinite sequence of points (distinct from  $p$ ) in  $E$  such that it converges to  $p$ . Therefore  $E$  is perfect.  $\square$

### 18.

*Solution.* Yes, there is. Let  $(r_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be an enumeration of rational numbers. Let  $S_n$  be the segment  $(r_n - 2^{-n-1}, r_n + 2^{-n-1})$  and consider the set  $A = [0, 2] \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} S_n$ . It is clear that  $A$  is a closed and uncountable set containing no rational numbers. By Ex. 27, the set of condensation points of  $A$  is a perfect set containing no rational numbers.  $\square$

### 19.

*Proof.* (a) It is clear that  $A \cap \overline{B} = A \cap B = \overline{A} \cap B = \emptyset$ , so  $A$  and  $B$  are separated.

(b) Suppose that  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint open sets. This shows that  $A$  is a subset of the closed set  $B^c$ , so that  $\overline{A} \cap B \subseteq B^c \cap B = \emptyset$ . Likewise, we have  $A \cap \overline{B} = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $A$  and  $B$  are separated.

(c) It is clear that  $A$  is open (Theorem 2.19). A similar argument to Theorem 2.19 also shows that  $B$  is open. Since  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint, they are separated (part (b)).



(d) Suppose that  $p$  and  $q$  are two distinct points of the connected metric space. Let  $r = d(p, q)$ . Then for every  $\delta \in (0, r)$ , there is at least one point  $u_\delta$  such that  $d(p, u_\delta) = \delta$ , for otherwise the metric space would consist of two separated sets by (c). Since the segment  $(0, r)$  is uncountable and  $u_\delta$  is a one-to-one mapping of  $(0, r)$  into the metric space, the metric space is uncountable.  $\square$

**20.**

*Solution.* The closure of a connected set is also connected. Suppose that  $A$  is a connected set. If  $\overline{A}$  were a union of two nonempty separated sets, say  $B$  and  $C$ , then  $A$  would be a union of two nonempty separated sets  $A \cap B$  and  $A \cap C$ , in contradiction to our hypothesis.

To see that  $A \cap B$  and  $A \cap C$  is separated, let us show that  $\overline{A \cap B} \cap (A \cap C) = (A \cap B) \cap \overline{A \cap C} = \emptyset$ . It is clear that  $\overline{A \cap B}$  is a subset of  $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B}$ . Since  $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B} \cap (A \cap C) = A \cap (\overline{B} \cap C) = \emptyset$ , we have  $\overline{A \cap B} \cap (A \cap C) = \emptyset$ . Likewise,  $(A \cap B) \cap \overline{A \cap C} = \emptyset$ .

However, the interior of a connected set is not necessarily connected. For example, let

$$A = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^2 : |\mathbf{x}| \leq 1\} \cup \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^2 : |\mathbf{x} - (2, 0)| \leq 1\}.$$

It is clear that  $A^\circ$  is not connected.  $\square$

**21.**

*Proof.* (a) Since  $\mathbf{p}(t) - \mathbf{p}(t') = (t - t')(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a})$ , it is easy to show that for any  $A \subseteq \mathbf{R}^1$ , if  $s$  is a limit point of  $A$ , then  $\mathbf{p}(s)$  is a limit point of  $\mathbf{p}(A)$ . This shows that  $\mathbf{p}(\overline{A}) \subseteq \overline{\mathbf{p}(A)}$  for any  $A \subseteq \mathbf{R}^1$ , and hence we have

$$\mathbf{p}(\overline{A_0}) \subseteq \overline{\mathbf{p}(A_0)} \subseteq \overline{A}$$

and similarly  $\mathbf{p}(\overline{B_0}) \subseteq \overline{B}$ . Therefore  $A_0$  and  $B_0$  must be separated.

(b) Let  $A_1 = A_0 \cap [0, 1]$  and  $B_1 = B_0 \cap [0, 1]$ . It is clear that  $0 \in A_1$  and  $1 \in B_1$ . If there were no  $t_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\mathbf{p}(t_0) \notin A \cup B$ , the interval  $[0, 1]$  would be the union of two separated nonempty sets  $A_1$  and  $B_1$ , which is absurd because  $[0, 1]$  is connected.

(c) Let  $S$  be a convex subset of  $\mathbf{R}^k$ . If it were a union of two separated nonempty subsets  $A$  and  $B$ , then by (b), there would exist a point  $\mathbf{p}(t_0) \notin A \cup B$ , which is however a point of  $S$  according to the definition of a convex set, a contradiction.  $\square$

**22.**

*Proof.* It is clear that the set  $\mathbf{Q}^k$  of points having only rational coordinates is countable (Theorem 2.12). Furthermore, for every point of  $\mathbf{R}^k$ , we can easily find a point with rational coordinates that is arbitrarily close to that point. For example, given  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{R}^k$ , we may define the point

$$\mathbf{q}_n = \left( \frac{[np_1]}{n}, \frac{[np_2]}{n}, \dots, \frac{[np_k]}{n} \right).$$

As  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $\mathbf{q}_n$  can be arbitrarily close to  $\mathbf{p}$ , so that every point of  $\mathbf{R}^k$  is a limit point of  $\mathbf{Q}^k$ . Therefore  $\mathbf{R}^k$  is separable.  $\square$

### 23.

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a separable metric space and  $S$  its countable dense subset. For any open set  $G$  and any point  $x \in G$ , there is a neighborhood, say  $N_r(x)$ , such that  $N_r(x) \subseteq G$ . Let  $r' = \lceil kr \rceil / 3k$  and  $x' \in S$  such that  $d(x, x') < r/3$ . Then for sufficiently large  $k$  we have  $x \in N_{r'}(x') \subseteq N_r(x) \subseteq G$ . This shows that  $X$  has a countable base.  $\square$

### 24.

*Proof.* According to the hint, this process must stop after finite steps, otherwise we would obtain an infinite sequence of points that has no limit point, which contradicts to the condition that every infinite subset has a limit point. This also implies that  $X$  is covered by finitely many neighborhoods of radius  $\delta$ . Repeating this process with  $\delta = 1/n$  thus yields a countable (or precisely, at most countable) dense subset of  $X$ .  $\square$

### 25.

*Proof.* For every  $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ , consider the open cover  $(N_{1/n}(x))_{x \in K}$  of  $K$ . Since  $K$  is compact, it contains a finite subcover. Considering all the centers of such neighborhoods for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . The set of all these centers is (at most) countable and is dense in  $K$ .

An alternative proof is using Theorem 2.37 and Ex. 24.  $\square$

### 26.

*Proof.* By Exs. 23 and 24,  $X$  has a countable base. Let  $(B_n)_{n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}}$  be a countable base of  $X$ . Suppose that  $X$  has an open cover  $(G_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$ . Let

$$K := \{k \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0} : B_k \subseteq G_\alpha \text{ for some } \alpha\},$$

and we define a map  $f$  from  $K$  to  $I$  given by  $k \mapsto \alpha$  such that  $G_\alpha \supseteq B_k$ . Such a map exists but may not be unique.

Now we show that the countable subcollection  $(G_{f(k)})_{k \in K}$  covers  $X$ . For every point  $p \in X$ , there is some  $\alpha$  such that  $p \in G_\alpha$ , so that  $p \subseteq B_k \subseteq G_\alpha$  for some  $k \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ . It is clear that  $k \in K$  and therefore  $p \in B_k \subseteq G_{f(k)}$ .

Suppose that  $X$  is covered by a countable collection  $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}}$  of open sets. If no finite subcollection of  $(G_n)$  covers  $X$ , then the complement  $F_n$  of  $G_1 \cup \cdots \cup G_n$  is nonempty for each  $n$ , but  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$  is empty. If  $E$  is a set which contains a point from each  $F_n$ , then  $E$  is infinite. Consider a limit point of  $E$ , say  $p$ , and  $p \in G_k$  for some  $k$ . It follows that  $G_k$  contains infinitely many points of  $E$ , which is absurd, because it contains at most  $k - 1$  points of  $E$  according to our hypothesis.  $\square$

**27.**

*Proof.* Let  $(V_n)$  be a countable base of  $\mathbf{R}^k$ , and  $W$  the union of those  $V_n$  for which  $E \cap V_n$  is at most countable. It is clear that  $P \subseteq W^c$ . Moreover, if  $p \in W^c \setminus P$ , then  $p$  is not a condensation point and hence there exists some  $k$  such that  $p \in V_k$  and  $V_k$  contains at most countably many points of  $E$ , so that  $p \in V_k \subseteq W$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $P = W^c$  and it is closed (since every limit point of  $P$  is also a condensation point of  $E$ ). Furthermore, since  $P^c \cap E = W \cap E$  is at most countable, every condensation point of  $E$  must contain uncountable points of  $P \cap E$ . In other words, every point of  $P$  is a condensation point of  $P$ , so that  $P$  is perfect.

Below is an alternative proof of a general result. Let  $X$  be a separable metric space and  $E$  a uncountable subset of  $X$ . We will show that *for any subset  $G$  of  $X$ , if it contains no condensation points of  $E$ , it contains at most countably many points of  $E$* . For each point  $p$  of  $G$ , because it is not a condensation point, there is a neighborhood  $V_p$  of  $p$  which contains at most countably many points of  $E$ . Then  $G$  is covered by  $(V_p)$  and hence is covered by a countable subcollection  $(V'_q)$  (see the proof of Ex. 26), so that  $G$  contains at most countably many points of  $E$ . This result thus shows that  $P^c \cap E$  is at most countable and that any neighborhood of a condensation point of  $E$  contains uncountably many points of  $P \cap E$ .  $\square$

**28.**

*Proof.* Let  $E$  be a closed set in a separable metric space. If it is at most countable, then we are done. Otherwise, let  $P$  be the set of condensation points of  $E$ . Since  $E$  is closed,  $P$  is a subset of  $E$  which is perfect and  $E \setminus P$  is at most countable (see the second proof of Ex. 27).

As a corollary, every countable closed set must have isolated points, for otherwise it would be a perfect set which is uncountable (Theorem 2.43).  $\square$

**29.**

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be an open set in  $\mathbf{R}^1$ . Define the map  $f : G \rightarrow 2^{\mathbf{R}^1}$  given by  $p \mapsto (p_a, p_b)$  where

$$p_a := \sup\{x \notin G : x < p\}, \quad p_b := \inf\{x \notin G : x > p\}.$$

It is clear that  $(p_a, p_b) \subseteq G$  and  $p_a, p_b \notin G$  (because  $G$  is open). It is also clear that for every  $q \in f(p)$ ,  $f(q) = f(p)$ , and hence for  $p, q \in G$ , if  $f(p) \neq f(q)$ , then they are disjoint, for otherwise, we may choose  $r \in f(p) \cap f(q)$  and we would have  $f(p) = f(r) = f(q)$ . Therefore  $G$  is a union of disjoint segments. To prove that this collection of segments is at most countable, we may restrict the domain of  $f$  to the subset  $\mathbf{Q}^1$  of rational numbers. Since  $\mathbf{Q}^1$  is dense in  $\mathbf{R}^1$ , the inverse image of each segment  $S \in f(G)$ , i.e.,  $S$ , contains a rational number, so that  $|f(G)| = |f(G \cap \mathbf{Q}^1)| \leq |\mathbf{Q}|$ .  $\square$

### 30.

*Proof.* We first show that the two statements are equivalent. Let  $F_n = G_n^c$ , if  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n$  were empty, then  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n = (\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n)^c = \mathbf{R}^k$ , so that at least one  $F_n$  has a nonempty interior, which implies that  $G_n$  is not dense, a contradiction. Similarly, let  $G_n = F_n^c$ , we can also prove that the second statement implies the first.

Now let us prove the second statement. For every point  $p \in \mathbf{R}^k$  and any neighborhood  $N$  of  $p$ , since  $G_1$  is open, we may choose a neighborhood  $V_1$  such that  $\overline{V_1} \subseteq G_1 \cap N$ . Suppose  $V_n$  has been constructed, so that  $\overline{V_n} \subseteq G_n$ . Since  $G_{n+1}$  is open and dense, there is a neighborhood  $V_{n+1}$  such that  $\overline{V_{n+1}} \subseteq V_n$  and  $\overline{V_{n+1}} \subseteq G_{n+1}$ . Proceed this construction and consider  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{V_n}$ , which is nonempty and must be contained in  $N$  and all  $G_n$ . Therefore  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n$  is dense in  $\mathbf{R}^k$ .  $\square$

---

# Numerical Sequences and Series

---


## 3.1 Notes on Text

**Note 3.1** (p. 63, before Definition 3.30) It says that Exs. 11.(b) and 12.(b) may serve as illustrations for the notion that the “boundary” conjecture is false, so it is interesting to carefully study these exercises.

Ex. 11.(b) provides an approach to construct a new divergent series from a divergent series. For example, given the obvious divergent series  $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n 1$ , it follows from Ex. 11.(b) that the series  $s'_n = \sum(1/n)$  is divergent. Furthermore, it is easy to see that the resulting series is always less than the base series, in the sense that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (s_n - s'_n) = +\infty.$$

Similarly, Ex. 12.(b) gives an approach to construct from a convergent series a new convergent series with larger limit.

Therefore we cannot expect a clear boundary between convergent and divergent series, since the series at the boundary, if any, would be neither convergent nor divergent. 

## 3.2 Solutions to Exercises

1.

*Proof.* If  $(s_n)$  converges, say to  $s$ , then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists an integer  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  implies that  $|s_n - s| < \epsilon$ , so that

$$||s_n| - |s|| \leq |s_n - s| < \epsilon$$

for all  $n \geq N$ , and therefore  $(|s_n|)$  converges to  $|s|$ .

The converse is false. For example, put  $s_n = (-1)^n(1 + 1/n)$ . It is clear that  $(|s_n|)$  converges to 1 but  $(s_n)$  diverges.  $\square$

2.

*Solution.*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n^2 + n} - n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\sqrt{n^2 + n} + n} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + 1/n} + 1} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we utilize the continuity of  $\sqrt{x}$ , which is still unknown in this chapter. However, we may prove this result by the following way:

$$\frac{1}{2} - (\sqrt{n^2 + n} - n) = \frac{1/4}{n + 1/2 + \sqrt{n^2 + n}},$$

which converges to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . □

### 3.

*Proof.* At first, we show that  $s_n < 2$  for all  $n$ . It is clear that  $s_1 < 2$ . Now suppose that  $s_n < 2$ , and then we have

$$s_{n+1} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_n}} < \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}} < \sqrt{4} = 2,$$

so that  $(s_n)$  is bounded above by 2.

Next, we show that  $(s_n)$  is monotonically increasing. It is clear that  $s_1 < s_2$ . Suppose  $s_n < s_{n+1}$ , it is easy to see that

$$s_{n+2} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_{n+1}}} > \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_n}} = s_{n+1}.$$

Thus  $(s_n)$  is bounded and monotonic, and therefore converges (Theorem 3.14). □

### 4.

*Solution.* Let  $p_n = s_{2n-1}$  and  $q_n = s_{2n}$ . It is clear that

$$p_{n+1} = \frac{1}{2}(p_n + 1), \quad q_{n+1} = \frac{1}{2}\left(q_n + \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

Simple algebraic manipulations further show that

$$p_{n+1} - 1 = \frac{1}{2}(p_n - 1) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n (p_1 - 1) = -\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n$$

and

$$q_{n+1} - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \left( q_n - \frac{1}{2} \right) = \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^n \left( q_1 - \frac{1}{2} \right) = - \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{n+1}.$$

Thus  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n = 1$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q_n = \frac{1}{2}$ . In other words, the upper and lower limits of  $(s_n)$  are 1 and  $\frac{1}{2}$ , respectively.  $\square$

5.

*Proof.* We first show that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + c) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + c$$

for  $c \in \mathbf{R}$ . The case of  $\limsup a_n = \pm\infty$  is trivially true, so we assume that  $\limsup a_n = a \in \mathbf{R}$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists an integer  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  implies that  $a_n < a + \epsilon$  (Theorem 3.17). It follows that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + c) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a + \epsilon + c) = a + c + \epsilon. \quad (\text{Theorem 3.19})$$

Since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + c) \leq a + c = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + c.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + c - c) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + c) - c.$$

Therefore,  $\limsup (a_n + c) = \limsup a_n + c$ .

Now, with no loss of generality, we assume that  $\limsup a_n \geq \limsup b_n$ .

If  $\limsup b_n = +\infty$ , the statement is clearly true.

If  $\limsup b_n = b$ , then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an integer  $N$  such that  $b_n < b + \epsilon$  for all  $n \geq N$ . It follows that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b + \epsilon) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + b + \epsilon. \quad (\text{Theorem 3.19})$$

Since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + b = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n.$$

Finally, if  $\limsup b_n = -\infty$  and  $\limsup a_n < +\infty$ , then there exist a real number  $M$  and an integer  $N$  such that  $a_n < M$  for all  $n \geq N$ , so that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (M + b_n) = -\infty. \quad \square$$

6.

*Solution.* (a) Calculate the partial sum

$$s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k = \sqrt{n+1} - 1,$$

which clearly diverges.

(b) The term  $a_n$  can be rewritten as

$$a_n = \frac{1}{n(\sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n})} < \frac{1}{n^{3/2}},$$

which implies that  $\sum a_n$  converges (Theorems 3.25 and 3.28).

(c) Resorting to the root test (Theorem 3.33), we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|a_n|} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{n} - 1 = 0, \quad (\text{Theorem 3.20})$$

so  $\sum a_n$  converges.

(d) If  $|z| \leq 1$ , then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|1+z^n|} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1+|z|^n} > 0,$$

which implies that  $\sum a_n$  diverges (Theorem 3.23).

As  $|z| > 1$ , we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|a_{n+1}|}{|a_n|} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|1+z^n|}{|1+z^{n+1}|} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|z|^n + 1}{|z|^{n+1} - 1} = \frac{1}{|z|}.$$

Therefore  $\sum a_n$  converges (Theorem 3.34).

In summary,  $\sum a_n$  converges for  $|z| > 1$  and diverges otherwise.  $\square$

7.

*Proof.*

$$\sum_{n=1}^m \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n} \leq \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{na_n + n^{-1}}{2n} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^m a_n + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2}.$$

Since  $\sum a_n$  and  $\sum (1/n^2)$  converge (Theorem 3.28),  $\sum (\sqrt{a_n}/n)$  is bounded and hence converges (Theorem 3.24).  $\square$

8.



*Proof.* Since  $(b_n)$  is monotonic and bounded, it converges, say to  $b$ . Without loss of generality we assume that  $b_n \leq b$ . Then

$$\sum_{n=1}^m a_n b_n = \sum_{n=1}^m a_n [b - (b - b_n)] = b \sum_{n=1}^m a_n - \sum_{n=1}^m a_n (b - b_n).$$

Since  $\sum [a_n(b - b_n)]$  is convergent (Theorem 3.42),  $\sum (a_n b_n)$  converges.  $\square$

### 9.

*Proof.* (a) Since  $\alpha = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{n^3} = 1$ , the radius of convergence is  $1/\alpha = 1$  (Theorem 3.39).

(b) Because

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|(2z)^{n+1}/(n+1)!|}{|(2z)^n/n!|} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2|z|}{n+1} = 0,$$

the radius of convergence is  $+\infty$  (Theorem 3.34).

(c) Since  $\alpha = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{2^n/n^2} = 2$ , the radius of convergence is  $1/\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$  (Theorem 3.39).

(d) Since  $\alpha = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{n^3/3^n} = \frac{1}{3}$ , the radius of convergence is  $1/\alpha = 3$  (Theorem 3.39).  $\square$

### 10.

*Proof.* Because infinitely many of  $(a_n)$  are nonzero integers, we have

$$\alpha = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|a_n|} \geq 1$$

and hence the radius of convergence is at most 1 (Theorem 3.39).  $\square$

### 11.

*Proof.* (a) If  $(a_n)$  is unbounded, then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{1 + a_n} = 1,$$

and therefore  $\sum [a_n/(1 + a_n)]$  diverges (Theorem 3.23). Otherwise, there exists a positive real number  $M$  such that  $a_n < M$  for all  $n$ , so that

$$\frac{a_n}{1 + a_n} > \frac{a_n}{1 + M},$$

and hence  $\sum [a_n/(1 + a_n)]$  diverges (Theorem 3.25).

(b)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a_{N+1}}{s_{N+1}} + \cdots + \frac{a_{N+k}}{s_{N+k}} &\geq \frac{a_{N+1}}{s_{N+k}} + \cdots + \frac{a_{N+k}}{s_{N+k}} \\ &= 1 - \frac{s_N}{s_{N+k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Because  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = +\infty$ , for any  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $N \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$  there exists an integer  $k$  such that  $1 - s_N/s_{N+k} > \epsilon$ . This implies that  $\sum (a_n/s_n)$  diverges (Theorem 3.22).

(c) For  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$\frac{a_n}{s_n^2} \leq \frac{a_n}{s_{n-1}s_n} = \frac{1}{s_{n-1}} - \frac{1}{s_n},$$

so that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{a_k}{s_k^2} \leq \frac{1}{s_1} + \sum_{k=2}^n \left( \frac{1}{s_{k-1}} - \frac{1}{s_k} \right) = \frac{2}{s_1} - \frac{1}{s_n} < \frac{2}{s_1},$$

and hence  $\sum [a_n/s_n^2]$  converges (Theorem 3.24).

(d) First, if  $\liminf(na_n) > 0$ , then there exist a positive real number  $\alpha$  and an integer  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  implies that  $na_n > \alpha$ , so that

$$\frac{a_n}{1 + na_n} > \frac{a_n}{(1 + 1/\alpha)na_n} = \frac{1}{n(1 + 1/\alpha)}$$

for  $n \geq N$ . Hence  $\sum [a_n/(1 + na_n)]$  diverges (Theorems 3.25 and 3.28).

Second, if  $\limsup(na_n) < +\infty$ , then there exist a positive real number  $M$  such that  $na_n < M$  for all  $n$ , so that

$$\frac{a_n}{1 + na_n} > \frac{a_n}{1 + M}.$$

Hence  $\sum [a_n/(1 + na_n)]$  diverges (Theorems 3.25).In general, however,  $\sum [a_n/(1 + na_n)]$  may converge or not. Let

$$a_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 2^k \text{ with } k \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}, \\ \frac{1}{n^2} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that  $\sum a_n$  diverges (Theorem 3.23), but

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{a_k}{1 + ka_k} &< \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor} \frac{1}{1 + 2^j} + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1/k^2}{1 + 1/k} \\ &< \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor} \frac{1}{2^j} + \sum_{k=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{k+1} \right), \\ &< 3, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $\sum [a_n/(1 + na_n)]$  converges (Theorem 3.24).

In contrast, the series  $\sum [a_n/(1 + n^2a_n)]$  surely converges because

$$\frac{a_n}{1 + n^2a_n} < \frac{a_n}{n^2a_n} = \frac{1}{n^2}. \quad (\text{Theorem 3.25}) \quad \square$$

## 12.

*Proof.* (a)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a_m}{r_m} + \cdots + \frac{a_n}{r_n} &> \frac{a_m}{r_m} + \cdots + \frac{a_n}{r_m} \\ &= \frac{r_m - r_{n+1}}{r_m} \\ &> 1 - \frac{r_n}{r_m}. \end{aligned}$$

Because  $\sum a_n$  converges,  $r_n$  can be arbitrarily small, so that for any  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $N \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$  there exists an integer  $n \geq N$  such that  $|1 - r_n/r_N| > \epsilon$ . This implies that  $\sum (a_n/r_n)$  diverges (Theorem 3.22).

(b)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a_n}{\sqrt{r_n}} &< \frac{2a_n}{\sqrt{r_n} + \sqrt{r_{n+1}}} \\ &< \frac{2a_n(\sqrt{r_n} - \sqrt{r_{n+1}})}{r_n - r_{n+1}} \\ &= 2(\sqrt{r_n} - \sqrt{r_{n+1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{a_k}{\sqrt{r_k}} < 2(\sqrt{r_1} - \sqrt{r_{n+1}}) < 2\sqrt{r_1}$$

and hence  $\sum (a_n/\sqrt{r_n})$  converges (Theorem 3.24). □

## 13.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\sum a_n$  and  $\sum b_n$  converge absolutely, so that

$$\sum_{n=0}^m \sum_{k=0}^n |a_k||b_{n-k}|$$

converges (Theorem 3.50). On the other hand,

$$\sum_{n=0}^m \left| \sum_{k=0}^n a_k b_{n-k} \right| \leq \sum_{n=0}^m \sum_{k=0}^n |a_k||b_{n-k}|,$$

so the Cauchy product of the series  $\sum a_n$  and  $\sum b_n$  converges absolutely (Theorem 3.24).  $\square$

14.

*Proof.* (a) Since  $\lim s_n = s$ , for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists an integer  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  implies that  $|s_n - s| < \epsilon$ . So for  $n \geq N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_n - s| &= \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (s_i - s) + \sum_{i=N}^n (s_i - s)}{n+1} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |s_i - s| + \sum_{i=N}^n |s_i - s|}{n+1} \\ &\leq \frac{(N-1)|s| + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |s_i| + \epsilon(n-N+1)}{n+1} \\ &= \epsilon + \frac{(N-1)|s| + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |s_i| - \epsilon N}{n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by  $2\epsilon$  for sufficiently large  $n$ . Therefore  $\lim \sigma_n = s$ .

(b) Let  $s_n = k+1$  for  $n = 2^k$ , otherwise put  $s_n = 1/n^2$ . It is clear that  $s_n$  does not converge but  $\lim \sigma_n = 0$ .

(c) See the solution of (b).

(d)

$$\begin{aligned} s_n - \sigma_n &= \frac{ns_n - (s_0 + s_1 + \cdots + s_{n-1})}{n+1} \\ &= \frac{(s_1 - s_0) + 2(s_2 - s_1) + \cdots + n(s_n - s_{n-1})}{n+1} \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=1}^n ka_k. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\lim(na_n) = 0$ , it follows from (a) that  $\lim(s_n - \sigma_n) = 0$ , so that  $\lim s_n = \lim \sigma_n$ .

(e) We follow the outline provided by the exercise. If  $m < n$  then

$$\begin{aligned} s_n - \sigma_n &= \frac{m+1}{n-m}(\sigma_n - \sigma_m) + s_n - \frac{n+1}{n-m}\sigma_n + \frac{m+1}{n-m}\sigma_m \\ &= \frac{m+1}{n-m}(\sigma_n - \sigma_m) + \frac{1}{n-m} \left[ (n-m)s_n - \sum_{i=0}^n s_i + \sum_{j=0}^m s_j \right] \\ &= \frac{m+1}{n-m}(\sigma_n - \sigma_m) + \frac{1}{n-m} \sum_{i=m+1}^n (s_n - s_i). \end{aligned}$$

For  $i = m + 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |s_n - s_i| &\leq \sum_{j=i+1}^n |s_j - s_{j-1}| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{M}{j} \\ &\leq \frac{(n-i)M}{i+1} \\ &\leq \frac{(n-m-1)M}{m+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $\epsilon > 0$  and associate with each  $n$  the integer  $m$  that satisfies

$$m \leq \frac{n - \epsilon}{1 + \epsilon} < m + 1.$$

Then  $(m+1)/(n-m) \leq 1/\epsilon$  and  $|s_n - s_i| < M\epsilon$ . Hence

$$|s_n - \sigma_n| \leq \frac{|\sigma_n - \sigma_m|}{\epsilon} + M\epsilon,$$

so that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |s_n - \sigma| \leq M\epsilon$ . Since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary,  $\lim s_n = \sigma$ . □

### 15.

**Fact 3.1** (Theorem 3.22).  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  converges if and only if for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an integer  $N$  such that

$$\left| \sum_{k=n}^m \mathbf{a}_k \right| \leq \epsilon$$

if  $m \geq n \geq N$ .

*Proof.* By Cauchy criterion,  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  converges if and only if for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an integer  $N$  such that

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{a}_k - \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{a}_k \right| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{for all } m \geq n \geq N,$$

which is clearly equivalent to the condition of the theorem. □

**Fact 3.2** (Theorem 3.23). If  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  converges, then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{a}_n = \mathbf{0}$ .

*Proof.* Taking  $m = n$  in Fact 3.1, we have

$$|\mathbf{a}_n| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{for sufficiently large } n.$$

In other words, each component of  $\mathbf{a}_n$  converges to zero. □

**Fact 3.3** (Theorem 3.25(a)). *If  $|\mathbf{a}_n| \leq c_n$  for  $n \geq N_0$ , where  $N_0$  is some fixed integer, and if  $\sum c_n$  converges, then  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  converges.*

*Proof.* Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N \geq N_0$  such that  $m \geq n \geq N$  implies

$$\sum_{k=n}^m c_k \leq \epsilon. \quad (\text{Theorem 3.22})$$

Hence

$$\left| \sum_{k=n}^m \mathbf{a}_k \right| \leq \sum_{k=n}^m |\mathbf{a}_k| \leq \sum_{k=n}^m c_k \leq \epsilon,$$

which concludes the theorem. □

**Fact 3.4** (Theorem 3.33). *Given  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$ , put*

$$\alpha = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|\mathbf{a}_n|}.$$

*Then*

- (a) *if  $\alpha < 1$ ,  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  converges;*
- (b) *if  $\alpha > 1$ ,  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  diverges;*
- (c) *if  $\alpha = 1$ , the test gives no information.*

*Proof.* (a) Use Fact 3.3 with  $c_k = \beta^k$  where  $\beta \in (\alpha, 1)$ .

(b) Use Fact 3.2.

(c) Use Theorem 3.33(c). □

**Fact 3.5** (Theorem 3.34). *The series  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$*

(a) *converges if  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathbf{a}_{n+1}|}{|\mathbf{a}_n|} < 1$ ,*

(b) *diverges if  $\frac{|\mathbf{a}_{n+1}|}{|\mathbf{a}_n|} \geq 1$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ , where  $n_0$  is some fixed integer.*

*Proof.* If condition (a) holds, we can find  $\beta < 1$  and an integer  $N$  such that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{a}_{n+1}|}{|\mathbf{a}_n|} < \beta \quad \text{for } n \geq N.$$

Then we have

$$|\mathbf{a}_n| \leq |\mathbf{a}_N| \beta^{n-N} \quad \text{for } n \geq N,$$

so that (a) follows from Fact 3.3.

(b) Use Fact 3.2. □

**Fact 3.6** (Theorem 3.42). *Suppose*

(a) *the partial sums  $\mathbf{A}_n$  of  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  form a bounded sequence;*

(b)  $b_0 \geq b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots$ ;

(c)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 0$ .

*Then  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n b_n$  converges.*

*Proof.* Use Theorem 3.42 for each component of  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n b_n$ . □

**Fact 3.7** (Theorem 3.45). *If  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  converges absolutely, then  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  converges.*

*Proof.* Use the inequality  $|\sum_{k=n}^m \mathbf{a}_k| \leq \sum_{k=n}^m |\mathbf{a}_k|$ . □

**Fact 3.8** (Theorem 3.47). *If  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n = \mathbf{A}$ , and  $\sum \mathbf{b}_n = \mathbf{B}$ , then  $\sum (\mathbf{a}_n + \mathbf{b}_n) = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}$ , and  $\sum c\mathbf{a}_n = c\mathbf{A}$ , for any fixed  $c$ .*

*Proof.* Use Theorems 3.4 and 3.47 for each component of  $\mathbf{a}_n$  and  $\mathbf{b}_n$ . □

**Fact 3.9** (Theorem 3.55). *If  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  is a series of vectors of  $\mathbf{R}^k$  which converges absolutely, then every rearrangement of  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$  converges, and they all converge to the same sum.*

*Proof.* Use Theorems 3.25 and 3.55 for each component of  $\sum \mathbf{a}_n$ , and then apply Theorem 3.4. □

**16.**

*Proof.* (a) Observe that

$$x_{n+1} - \sqrt{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2x_n} (x_n - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 < \frac{1}{2} (x_n - \sqrt{\alpha}),$$

where the first equality ensures that  $x_n > \sqrt{\alpha}$  for all  $n \geq 1$ , so that  $x_n$  decreases monotonically and  $\lim x_n = \sqrt{\alpha}$ .

(b) The first identity has been shown in the proof of (a), and we immediately have  $\epsilon_{n+1} < \epsilon_n^2 / 2\sqrt{\alpha}$  since  $x_n > \sqrt{\alpha}$ . This inequality can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\epsilon_{n+1}}{\beta} < \left( \frac{\epsilon_n}{\beta} \right)^2$$

so that  $\epsilon_{n+1} < \beta(\epsilon_1/\beta)^{2^n}$ .

(c) It suffices to show that  $\epsilon_1/\beta < 1/10$  and  $\beta < 4$ .

$$\frac{\epsilon_1}{\beta} = \frac{2 - \sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{3}} = \frac{2\sqrt{3} - 3}{6} < \frac{2 \times 1.8 - 3}{6} = \frac{0.6}{6} = \frac{1}{10}.$$

$$\beta = 2\sqrt{3} < 2\sqrt{4} = 4.$$

□

17.

*Proof.* At first, note that

$$x_{n+1} - \sqrt{\alpha} = \frac{\alpha + x_n}{1 + x_n} - \sqrt{\alpha} = \frac{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)(\sqrt{\alpha} - x_n)}{1 + x_n}.$$

Furthremore,

$$x_{n+2} - \sqrt{\alpha} = \frac{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2(x_n - \sqrt{\alpha})}{(1 + x_n)(1 + x_{n+1})} = \frac{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2(x_n - \sqrt{\alpha})}{1 + \alpha + 2x_n},$$

so that

$$x_{n+2} - \sqrt{\alpha} < \frac{(\alpha - 2\sqrt{\alpha} + 1)(x_n - \sqrt{\alpha})}{1 + \alpha} < x_n - \sqrt{\alpha}.$$

Parts (a), (b), and (c) are easy consequences of this fact. It is also clear that the formula described in Ex. 16 converges more rapidly. □

18.

*Proof.* At first,

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n+1} - \alpha^{1/p} &= \frac{(p-1)x_n^p - px_n^{1/p}x_n^{p-1} + \alpha}{px_n^{p-1}} \\ &= \frac{(p-1)x_n^{p-1}(x_n - \alpha^{1/p}) - \alpha^{1/p}(x_n^{p-1} - \alpha^{(p-1)/p})}{px_n^{p-1}} \\ &= \frac{(x_n - \alpha^{1/p})[(p-1)x_n^{p-1} - \alpha^{1/p} \sum_{k=0}^{p-2} \alpha^{(p-2-k)/p} x_n^k]}{px_n^{p-1}} \\ &= \frac{(x_n - \alpha^{1/p}) \sum_{k=0}^{p-2} (x_n^{p-1} - \alpha^{(p-1-k)/p} x_n^k)}{px_n^{p-1}} \\ &= \frac{(x_n - \alpha^{1/p})^2 \sum_{k=0}^{p-2} x_n^k \sum_{m=0}^{p-2-k} \alpha^{(p-2-k-m)/p} x_n^m}{px_n^{p-1}} \\ &= \frac{(x_n - \alpha^{1/p})^2 \sum_{l=0}^{p-2} \sum_{k+m=l} \alpha^{(p-2-k-m)/p} x_n^{k+m}}{px_n^{p-1}} \\ &= \frac{(x_n - \alpha^{1/p})^2 \sum_{l=0}^{p-2} (l+1) \alpha^{(p-2-l)/p} x_n^l}{px_n^{p-1}}. \end{aligned}$$



This implies that  $x_n > \alpha^{1/p}$  for every integer  $n \geq 2$ , so that

$$\frac{\sum_{k=0}^{p-2} (x_n^{p-1} - \alpha^{(p-1-k)/p} x_n^k)}{p x_n^{p-1}} < \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{p-2} (x_n^{p-1} - \alpha^{(p-1)/p})}{p x_n^{p-1}} < \frac{p-1}{p},$$

and therefore

$$x_{n+1} - \alpha^{1/p} < \frac{(p-1)(x_n - \alpha^{1/p})}{p}$$

so that  $(x_n)$  decreases monotonically (for  $n \geq 2$ ) and converges to  $\alpha^{1/p}$ . Moreover, this process has the same speed of convergence as the one in Ex. 16.  $\square$

### 19.

*Proof.* At first, it is clear that  $x(a)$  is well defined (Theorem 3.33).

Next, we need a formal definition of the Cantor set. Define the piecewise function

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} 3x & x \in [0, \frac{2}{3}), \\ 3x - 2 & x \in [\frac{2}{3}, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Let  $E_n := f^{-n}([0, 1])$  (where  $f^{-(n+1)} := f^{-1} \circ f^{-n}$ ). Then  $P := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$  is just the Cantor set.

Now we show that every point  $x$  of  $P$  can be expressed as the form  $\sum(\alpha_n/3^n)$ . Define the step function

$$g(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & x \in [0, \frac{2}{3}), \\ 2 & x \in [\frac{2}{3}, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Let  $b_1 = x$ ,  $\alpha_n = g(b_n)$ , and  $b_{n+1} = 3b_n - \alpha_n = f(b_n)$ . By the definition of  $P$ , it is easy to see that  $b_n \in [0, 1]$  for all  $n$ . By induction on  $n$ , it is also easy to show that

$$b_{n+1} = 3^n \left( x - \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\alpha_k}{3^k} \right) \quad \text{for } n \geq 1.$$

This thus implies that  $x = \sum(\alpha_n/3^n)$ .

Finally, we show that every  $x(a)$  is a point of  $P$ , which is equivalent to show that  $x(a) \in E_n$  for all  $n$ . In other words, we have to show that  $f^n(x(a)) \in [0, 1]$  for all  $n$  (where  $f^{n+1} := f \circ f^n$ ). Since

$$0 \leq \sum_{k \geq n+1} \frac{\alpha_k}{3^k} \leq \frac{1}{3^n},$$

it is easy to show that

$$f^n(x(a)) = \sum_{k \geq n+1} \frac{\alpha_k}{3^{k-n}} \in [0, 1] \quad \text{for all } n. \quad \square$$

**20.**

*Proof.* Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . By the definition of Cauchy sequence, there is an integer  $N_1$  such that  $d(p_m, p_n) < \epsilon$  for all  $m, n \geq N_1$ . On the other hand, since  $(p_{n_i})$  converges to  $p$ , there is an integer  $I_2$  such that  $i \geq I_2$  implies that  $d(p_{n_i}, p) < \epsilon$ . Let  $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$  where  $N_2 = n_{I_2}$ . Then for all  $n \geq N$  and some  $i$  such that  $n_i \geq N$ , we have

$$d(p_n, p) \leq d(p_n, p_{n_i}) + d(p_{n_i}, p) < 2\epsilon,$$

so that  $(p_n)$  converges to  $p$ .  $\square$

**21.**

*Proof.* For every  $n$ , choose one point  $x_n$  in  $E_n$ . It is easy to see that  $(x_n)$  is a Cauchy sequence. Since  $X$  is complete,  $(x_n)$  converges to a point  $x \in X$ . Thus  $x$  is a limit point of the range of  $(x_k)_{k \geq n}$ . Note that the range of  $(x_k)_{k \geq n}$  is a subset of  $E_n$  and  $E_n$  is closed, so that  $x \in E_n$  for all  $n$  and hence  $x \in E = \bigcap_1^\infty E_n$ . If  $E$  contains another point  $y$ , then  $\text{diam } E > 0$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $\text{diam } E_n \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

**22.**

*Proof.* Since  $G_1$  is open, there is a neighborhood  $E_1$  such that  $\text{diam } E_1 < 1$  and  $\overline{E_1} \subseteq G_1$ . Suppose that  $E_n$  has been constructed, so that  $\text{diam } E_n < 1/n$ ,  $E_n \subseteq \bigcap_1^{n-1} E_k$ , and  $\overline{E_n} \subseteq \bigcap_1^n G_k$ . Since  $G_{n+1}$  is dense,  $E_n \cap G_{n+1}$  is not empty. Since  $E_n$  and  $G_{n+1}$  are both open, there is a neighborhood  $E_{n+1}$  such that  $\text{diam } \overline{E_{n+1}} < 1/(n+1)$  and  $\overline{E_{n+1}} \subseteq E_n \cap G_{n+1}$ , so that  $E_{n+1} \subseteq E_n = \bigcap_1^n E_n$  and  $\overline{E_{n+1}} \subseteq \bigcap_1^{n+1} G_k$ .

Let  $E = \bigcap_1^\infty E_n$ . It is clear that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam } E_n = 0$ , and hence it follows from Ex. 21 that there is a point  $x \in \bigcap_1^\infty E_n \subseteq \bigcap_1^\infty G_n$ . This proves that  $\bigcap_1^\infty G_n$  is not empty. In fact, it is dense in  $X$ , which can be proved by a similar argument starting from a neighborhood near any point  $y \in X$ .  $\square$

**23.**

*Proof.* For any  $m$  and  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |d(p_m, q_m) - d(p_n, q_n)| &\leq |d(p_m, p_n) + d(p_n, q_n) + d(q_n, q_m) - d(p_n, q_n)| \\ &= d(p_m, p_n) + d(q_m, q_n), \end{aligned}$$

which can be arbitrarily small as long as  $m$  and  $n$  are large enough. This thus shows that  $(d(p_n, q_n))$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbf{R}$  and hence converges.  $\square$

**24.**

*Proof.* (a) It is easy to prove that the relation is reflexive and symmetric. We only prove that the relation is transitive. We denote the relation by  $\sim$ .

Suppose that the Cauchy sequences  $(p_n)$ ,  $(q_n)$ , and  $(r_n)$  satisfy  $(p_n) \sim (q_n)$  and  $(q_n) \sim (r_n)$ . Then  $\lim d(p_n, q_n) = 0$  and  $\lim d(q_n, r_n) = 0$ . Since  $d(p_n, r_n) \leq d(p_n, q_n) + d(q_n, r_n)$ , we have  $\lim d(p_n, r_n) = 0$ , so that  $(p_n) \sim (r_n)$ .

(b) First, we show that  $\Delta$  is well defined, that is, it is independent of the choice of representatives of the equivalence classes. Let  $(r_n) \in P$  and  $(s_n) \in Q$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(r_n, s_n) &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (d(r_n, p_n) + d(p_n, q_n) + d(q_n, s_n)) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (a). Then by symmetry, we must have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(r_n, s_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n).$$

Second, we show that  $\Delta$  is a metric in  $X^*$ . By definition  $\Delta$  is nonnegative. (a) shows that  $\Delta(P, P) = 0$  and that  $\Delta(P, Q) > 0$  if  $P \neq Q$ . The symmetry and triangular inequality follow easily from the symmetry and triangular inequality of  $d$ .

(c) Let  $(P_n)$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $X^*$ . For every  $n$ , choose a sequence  $(p_{n,k}) \in P_n$ . Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . For every  $n$ , there is an integer  $K_n$  such that  $d(p_{n,k}, p_{n,l}) < \epsilon$  for all  $k, l \geq K_n$ . Define  $q_k := p_{k, K_k}$ . Let us show that  $P_n$  converges to the equivalence class of  $(q_k)$ .

Since  $P_n$  is a Cauchy sequence, there is an integer  $N$  such that  $\Delta(P_m, P_n) < \epsilon$  for all  $m, n \geq N$ . Then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(p_{m,k}, q_{n,k}) < \epsilon \quad \text{for } m, n \geq N,$$

so that there is an integer  $K'_{m,n}$  such that  $k \geq K'_{m,n}$  implies that  $d(p_{m,k}, q_{n,k}) < 2\epsilon$  when  $m, n \geq N$ .

For  $k, l \geq N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d(q_k, q_l) &\leq d(q_k, p_{k, K''}) + d(p_{k, K''}, p_{l, K''}) + d(p_{l, K''}, q_l) \\ &< d(p_{k, K_k}, p_{k, K''}) + 2\epsilon + d(p_{l, K''}, p_{l, K_l}) \\ &< 4\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where  $K'' := \max\{K_k, K_l, K'_{k,l}\}$ . This proves that  $(q_k)$  is a Cauchy sequence.

Let  $Q$  be the equivalence class of  $(q_k)$ . For  $n \geq N$  and  $k \geq K'''$  with  $K''' := \max\{K_n, K_k, K'_{n,k}\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_{n,k}, q_k) &\leq d(p_{n,k}, p_{n, K''''}) + d(p_{n, K''''}, p_{k, K''''}) + d(p_{k, K''''}, q_k) \\ &< 3\epsilon + d(p_{k, K''''}, p_{k, K_k}) \\ &< 4\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $\Delta(P_n, Q) < 4\epsilon$  for all  $n \geq N$ , so that  $(P_n)$  converges to  $Q$ .

(d) By definition.

(e) For every  $P \in X^*$ , choose  $(p_n) \in P$ , so that  $(\varphi(p_n))$  converges to  $P$ , and therefore  $\varphi(X)$  is dense in  $X^*$ . Furthermore, if  $X$  is complete, then  $(p_n)$  converges to  $p \in X$ , so that  $P = \varphi(p) \in \varphi(X)$ . In other words,  $X^* = \varphi(X)$ .  $\square$

**25.**

*Solution.* The completion of  $X$ , according to Ex. 24, is  $X^*$ , of which each element is identified with a real number  $x$ , or a sequence  $(x_n)$  of rational numbers, where  $x_n$  is obtained by truncating  $x$  to  $n$  decimal digits (right of the decimal point). In other words, the completion of  $X$  is  $\mathbf{R}$ .  $\square$

---

## Bibliography

---

J. R. Munkres. *Topology*. Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, second edition, 2000. 13

W. Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, third edition, 1976. v