

Thm: If $f(x)$ exists at $x=a$, then $f(x)$ is continuous at $x=a$.

Proof(?)

I. We prove the theorem by contradiction.

II. Suppose $f(x)$ is not continuous at $x=a$ then there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for $\delta > 0$ $|x-a| < \delta$ implies $|f(x) - f(a)| \geq \epsilon$.

III. Now for $|x-a| < \frac{1}{N}$ we have $\frac{1}{|x-a|} > N$

and $\left| \frac{f(x) - f(a)}{x-a} \right| \geq N \epsilon$

IV. But this implies $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \left| \frac{f(x) - f(a)}{x-a} \right| = +\infty$

V. $|f'(a)| = \left| \lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{f(x) - f(a)}{x-a} \right| = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} \left| \frac{f(x) - f(a)}{x-a} \right| = +\infty$ because $|x|$ is a continuous function and IV

VI. But this is a contradiction for $f'(x)$ exists $x=a$ means $f'(a)$ is not infinite.

3. Thm A monotone increasing sequence $\{a_n\}$ either converges or has limit $= +\infty$. In either case $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \sup \{a_n\}$.

Proof(?)

I. By the fact $\sup \{a_n\}$ is an upper bound $\forall n, a_n \leq \sup \{a_n\}$.

II. Since $\sup \{a_n\}$ is a sup, for all $\epsilon > 0$ there is a_N with $a_N > \sup \{a_n\} - \epsilon$.

III. Since $\{a_n\}$ is monotone for $n > N$ $a_n \geq a_N > \sup \{a_n\} - \epsilon$

IV. Thus for $n > N$ $\sup \{a_n\} \geq a_n > \sup \{a_n\} - \epsilon$

V. Therefore $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \sup \{a_n\}$

VI. Since $\sup \{a_n\}$ always exists {if we allow $\pm\infty$ } the second sentence in the theorem, implies the first {since $\sup \{a_n\}$ can't be $= -\infty$ } sentence in the statement of the theorem.

4 Thm: If S and T are non-void sets of positive reals and if $S+T = \{s+t; s \in S, t \in T\}$, then $\sup S + \sup T = \sup(S+T)$.

Proof (?)

- I. Since $\sup S$ (respectively $\sup T$) is an upper bound for S (respectively T) we have $\forall s \in S, s \leq \sup S$ (respectively $\forall t \in T, t \leq \sup T$).
- II. Hence $s+t \leq \sup S + \sup T$ for $s \in S, t \in T$.
- III. Since $\sup S + \sup T$ is an upper bound for $S+T$ we have $\sup(S+T) \leq \sup S + \sup T$.
- IV. Now we break the prove of the reverse inequality into two cases: (A) one of $\sup S$ or $\sup T$ is $+\infty$; (B) neither $\sup S$ nor $\sup T$ is $+\infty$.
- V. To complete the proof for case A we show $\sup(S+T) = +\infty$.
- VI. Suppose $\sup S = +\infty$, thus for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an $s \in S$ with $s \geq n$.
- VII. Thus for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in T$ there is an $s \in S$ with $s+t \geq n$.
- VIII. Therefore $\sup(S+T) = +\infty$.
- IX. Case B: Let $s_0 \in S$ st. $s_0 = \sup S$ and $t_0 \in T$ with $t_0 = \sup T$.
- X. Since $s_0 + t_0 \in S+T$, $s_0 + t_0 \leq \sup(S+T)$.
- XI. Thus $\sup S + \sup T = s_0 + t_0 \leq \sup(S+T)$.
- XII. Since we have shown one inequality in III and the other in VIII & IX, we have $\sup S + \sup T = \sup(S+T)$.

5 Theorem: A monotone function is continuous except at a finite number of pts on any bounded interval.

Proof?

I We may assume $f(x)$ is an increasing function on the interval $[0, 1]$

II Hence $f(0)$ is the minimum value and $f(1)$ is the maximal value of $f(x)$ on $[0, 1]$.

III Thus for each $a \in (0, 1)$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow a^-} f(x)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} f(x)$ exists because the function

is increasing (or decreasing for $x \rightarrow a^+$) and bounded above (respectively bounded below).

IV Suppose $f(x)$ is not continuous at $x=a$, but the $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x)$ does exist (i.e. both limits in III are equal). Then $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) \neq f(a)$ [say $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) < f(a)$] then $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) < f(a)$. (the other case is similar)

V But this is impossible since it implies there are $x > a$ with $f(x) < f(a)$ which contradicts the fact f is increasing.

VI So if $f(x)$ is not continuous at $x=a$ then

$\lim_{x \rightarrow a^-} f(x) \neq \lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} f(x)$, and by the increasing nature of $f(x)$ we may conclude $\lim_{x \rightarrow a^-} f(x) < \lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} f(x)$.

Some definitions let $f(a^-) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a^-} f(x)$, $f(a^+) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} f(x)$ and let $J(a) = f(a^+) - f(a^-)$ be the jump at $x=a$.

VII To complete the proof it suffices to show that

there are only finitely many jumps.

VIII Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $0 < a_1 < a_2 \dots < a_n < 1$ be points where $J(a_i) \geq \epsilon$. Then

$$f(1) - f(0) = (f(1) - f(x_{n+1})) + (f(x_{n+1}) - f(a_n)) + \dots + (f(x_2) - f(x_1)) + (f(x_1) - f(0))$$

where $0 < x_1 < a_1 < x_2 < a_2 \dots < x_n < a_n < 1$

IX Now $f(x_{i+1}) - f(x_i) \geq f(a_i^+) - f(a_i^-) = J(a_i) \geq \epsilon$.

Hence $f(1) - f(0) \geq n\epsilon$ or $\frac{f(1) - f(0)}{\epsilon} \geq n$.

X Therefore there are only finitely many discontinuities since ϵ was arbitrary.

2. Thm Consider (1) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$, (2) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n$ and (3) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n)$. If any two of (1), (2) or (3) exist, then the other also exists and in this case (1) + (2) = (3)

[exists means converges or has a limit in \mathbb{R}]

Proof(?)

I. If (1) & (2) exist implies that (3) exists is a theorem in the book.
 II. Otherwise, by symmetry, we complete the proof by showing (1) & (3) existing implies the existence of (2). [Actually we need statement II as well.]
 III. Suppose (2) does not exist, then (b_n) is not a Cauchy sequence.
 IV. So there is an $\epsilon > 0$ and a subsequence (b_{n_k}) of (b_n) such that $|b_{n_k} - b_{n_{k+1}}| \geq \epsilon$, for $k=1, 2, 3, \dots$
 V. One of three things can happen
 A: (b_{n_k}) has a subsequence whose limit is $+\infty$

B: (b_{n_k}) has a subsequence whose limit is $-\infty$

C: (b_{n_k}) has two subsequences $(b_{n_{k_j}})$ and $(b_{n_{k_i}})$ with $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} b_{n_{k_j}} = B$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} b_{n_{k_i}} = B^*$ and $B \neq B^*$.

VI. In case A & B imply $(a_n + b_n)$ has a subsequence whose limit is one of the infinities, a contradiction.

VII. In case C, let $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = A$ then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_{k_i}} + b_{n_{k_i}} = A + B^*$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (a_{n_{k_j}} + b_{n_{k_j}}) = A + B$.

VIII. Hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n)$ does not converge a contradiction.

IX. There existence of (1) & (3) \Rightarrow (2) exists

X. Finally (1) + (2) = (3) follows from the theorem in book given in I.