

MATH 2080

Section 1.3 Arithmetic operations on sequences.

We now learn how to effectively take limits via arithmetic operations on sequences.

For example, suppose $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are sequences. Then what happens with $\{a_n + b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, $\{a_n b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\left\{\frac{a_n}{b_n}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ (if b_n is never zero).

Theorem: If $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to A and $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to B , then $\{a_n + b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $A + B$.

Proof: Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrary. Then there's an integer N_1 such that $n \geq N_1$ implies $|a_n - A| < \varepsilon/2$, and there's an integer N_2 such that $n \geq N_2$ implies $|b_n - B| < \varepsilon/2$. Let $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$.

Then if $n \geq N$, we have both $|a_n - A| < \varepsilon/2$ and $|b_n - B| < \varepsilon/2$, so this lets us compute:

$$\begin{aligned} |(a_n + b_n) - (A + B)| &= |a_n - A + b_n - B| \\ &\leq |a_n - A| + |b_n - B| \\ &< \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

So overall, $\{a_n + b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $A + B$.

We can do the same for $\{a_n b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. First, a lesson in epsilon-picking: Here is how to write a nice proof that involves choosing big values of N .

Suppose $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to A and $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to B . We guess that $\{a_n b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to AB . So we want

$$|a_n b_n - AB| < \epsilon$$

by choosing n to be large. Can we bound $|a_n b_n - AB|$ above by the quantities $|a_n - A|$ and $|b_n - B|$ somehow?

$$|a_n b_n - AB| = |a_n b_n - a_n B + a_n B - AB|$$

$$\leq |a_n b_n - a_n B| + |a_n B - AB|$$

$$= |a_n| |b_n - B| + |a_n B - AB|$$

here is the quantity we wanted to see.

$$= |a_n| |b_n - B| + |B| |a_n - A|$$

here is the other quantity we wanted to see.

Now by choosing n large, we can make both $|a_n - A|$ and $|b_n - B|$ small. The constant $|B|$ is negligible if we choose $|a_n - A|$ small enough, but $|a_n|$ is not negligible—it depends on n . However, convergent sequences are bounded, so there exists M such that

$|a_n| \leq M$ for all n . (So $|a_n|$ is never too large).

Now given $\varepsilon > 0$, we want to get

$$|a_n b_n - AB| \leq |a_n| |b_n - B| + |B| |a_n - A| < \varepsilon$$

This will happen as long as

$$|b_n - B| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2M} \quad \text{and} \quad |a_n - A| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2|B|}.$$

So we could choose n so large that these both hold, and get

$$\begin{aligned} |a_n b_n - AB| &\leq |a_n| |b_n - B| + |B| |a_n - A| \\ &\leq M |b_n - B| + |B| |a_n - A| \\ &< M \frac{\varepsilon}{2M} + |B| \frac{\varepsilon}{2|B|} = \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We could also choose n so large that

$$|b_n - B| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M+|B|} \quad \text{and} \quad |a_n - A| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M+|B|},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} |a_n b_n - AB| &\leq M |b_n - B| + |B| |a_n - A| \\ &< M \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{M+|B|} \right) + |B| \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{M+|B|} \right) \\ &= (M+|B|) \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{M+|B|} \right) = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The choice of how to bound it depends on personal choice. After deciding, we write a formal proof.

Theorem: If $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to A and $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to B , then $\{a_n b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to AB .

Proof: Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Since $\{a_n\}$ is bounded, there exists M such that $|a_n| \leq M$ for all n .

Choose N such that $|a_n - A| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M + |B|}$ and

$|b_n - B| < \frac{\varepsilon}{M + |B|}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |a_n b_n - AB| &= |a_n b_n - a_n B + a_n B - AB| \\ &\leq |a_n| |b_n - B| + |B| |a_n - A| \\ &< M \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{M + |B|} \right) + |B| \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{M + |B|} \right) \\ &= M + |B| \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{M + |B|} \right) = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We can do the same for division of sequences. There is a careful investigation in the book, but here we present the "cleaned up" proof. First we need a small lemma.

Lemma: If $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to B and $B \neq 0$ then there exists $M > 0$ and an integer N such that if $n \geq N$ then $|b_n| \geq M$.

Proof: Set $\varepsilon = \frac{|B|}{2}$, note $\varepsilon > 0$.

For this particular ϵ , there exists N such that $n \geq N$ implies $|b_n - B| < \epsilon$. Set $M = \frac{|B|}{2}$. Then for $n \geq N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |b_n| &= |b_n - B + B| \geq |B| - |b_n - B| \geq |B| - \frac{|B|}{2} \\ &= \frac{|B|}{2} = M. \end{aligned}$$

Now we are ready to prove:

Theorem: Suppose $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to A and $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to B . If $B \neq 0$ and $b_n \neq 0$ for all n , then $\left\{\frac{a_n}{b_n}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $\frac{A}{B}$.

Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$. By the previous Lemma, there exists $M > 0$ and an integer N_1 such that $|b_n| \geq M$ for all $n \geq N_1$. Set $\epsilon' = \frac{M\epsilon}{1 + \frac{|A|}{|B|}}$.

Now choose a positive integer N_2 such that $n \geq N_2$ implies $|a_n - A| < \epsilon'$, and a positive integer N_3 such that $n \geq N_3$ implies $|b_n - B| < \epsilon'$. Set

$N = \max\{N_1, N_2, N_3\}$, so that for $n \geq N$ we have $|a_n - A| < \epsilon'$, $|b_n - B| < \epsilon'$, and $|b_n| \geq M$.

Now compute, for $n \geq N$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{a_n}{b_n} - \frac{A}{B} \right| &= \left| \frac{a_n B - b_n A}{b_n B} \right| = \left| \frac{a_n B - AB + AB - b_n A}{b_n B} \right| \\
&\leq \left| \frac{a_n - A}{b_n} \right| + \frac{|A| |b_n - B|}{|b_n| |B|} \\
&< \frac{1}{|b_n|} \varepsilon' + \frac{|A|}{|b_n| |B|} \varepsilon' \\
&\leq \varepsilon' \left(\frac{1}{M} \left(1 + \frac{|A|}{|B|} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{M \varepsilon}{\left(1 + \frac{|A|}{|B|} \right)} \left(\frac{1}{M} \left(1 + \frac{|A|}{|B|} \right) \right) = \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Favourite quote from book:

"You have now been initiated into the exclusive club of epsilon pickers".

§ 1.3 continued.

We can now use some familiar tricks for calculating limits of sequences.

Example: What does $\left\{ \frac{n^3 - 1}{2n^3 + n^2} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converge to?

Solution: Rewrite this:

$$\frac{n^3 - 1}{2n^3 + n^2} = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{n^3}}{2 + \frac{1}{n}}. \quad \text{We saw already that}$$

$\left\{ \frac{1}{n} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to 0. The sequence $\left\{ \frac{1}{n^3} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ also converges to zero, being a product of $\left\{ \frac{1}{n} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with itself 3 times.

Thus the sequence $\left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{n^3} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to 1, and $\left\{ 2 + \frac{1}{n} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to 2. Thus $\left\{ \frac{1 - \frac{1}{n^3}}{2 + \frac{1}{n}} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $\frac{1}{2}$, being a quotient of these two. So $\left\{ \frac{n^3 - 1}{2n^3 + n^2} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $\frac{1}{2}$.

Example: Consider the sequence $\left\{ \sqrt{n+1} - \sqrt{n} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

Solution: We first multiply by the conjugate:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n+1} - \sqrt{n} & \cdot \frac{\sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n}} = \frac{n+1 - n}{\sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n}} \\ & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

But now observe that

$$0 < \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{Since we replaced} \\ \sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n} \text{ with the} \\ \text{smaller term } 2\sqrt{n} \end{array} \right)$$

and the sequence $\left\{ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to zero, so

the sequence $\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n}} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} = \left\{ \sqrt{n+1} - \sqrt{n} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges

to zero as well, "by Exercise 9". (A squeeze theorem type result).

The previous example uses a fact we would like to investigate in more detail: If $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to A and B respectively, and if $a_n \leq b_n$ for all n , do we get $A \leq B$? Yes!

Theorem: With $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converging to A and $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converging to B , if $a_n \leq b_n$ for all n then $A \leq B$.

Proof: Suppose $B < A$, then set $\varepsilon = \frac{A-B}{2} > 0$.

Then there's an integer N_1 such that $n \geq N_1$ implies $A - \varepsilon < a_n < A + \varepsilon$, and there's an

integer N_2 such that $n \geq N_2$ implies

$B - \varepsilon < b_n < B + \varepsilon$. Choose N to be $\max\{N_1, N_2\}$, then for $n \geq N$ we have

$$b_N < B + \varepsilon = A - \varepsilon < a_N \leq b_N$$

because $\varepsilon = \frac{A - B}{2}$

But this inequality is impossible, a contradiction. Thus we cannot have $B < A$, so $A \leq B$.

Example: If $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{c_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ both converge to some number A , and if $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to some number B , then

$$a_n \leq b_n \leq c_n \text{ for all } n$$

implies $A \leq B \leq A$, i.e. $A = B$. This gives a sort of "squeeze theorem for sequences".

There is one weakness in the above squeeze theorem, however — with what we have done so far, we need to know that the middle sequence $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges. This information may not be available in practice, and we'd like to be able to do a squeeze theorem in the absence of knowing a priori that $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges.

Theorem: If $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to 0 and $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded, then $\{a_n b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to 0.

Proof: Suppose M satisfies $|b_n| \leq M$ for all n .

Now let $\varepsilon > 0$, and set $\varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{M} > 0$. Then there exists N such that $n \geq N$ implies

$$|a_n| = |a_n - 0| < \varepsilon \quad (\text{since } \{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{ converges to } 0).$$

Then we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} |a_n b_n - 0| &= |a_n b_n| = |a_n| |b_n| \leq |a_n| M \\ &< \varepsilon' M \\ &= \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

So $\{a_n b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to 0.

Example: Consider $\left\{ \frac{1 + (-1)^n}{2n} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. This is

a product of the sequences $\left\{ \frac{1 + (-1)^n}{2} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$

$= \{0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, \dots\}$ and $\left\{ \frac{1}{n} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. The

sequence $\left\{ \frac{1 + (-1)^n}{2} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded by 1, and

$\left\{ \frac{1}{n} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to 0. By the previous theorem, $\left\{ \frac{1 + (-1)^n}{2n} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to 0 as well.

§ 1.4 Subsequences and monotone sequences

Definition: Let $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence and $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ any sequence of positive integers with $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < \dots$. The sequence $\{a_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is called a subsequence of $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

I.e.: A subsequence is an infinite subset of a sequence, listed in their original order. ~~(but with new sub~~

E.g.: The sequence $\left\{ \frac{1+(-1)^n}{2} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is $\{0, 1, 0, 1, \dots\}$.

The sequence $\{0, 0, 0, \dots\}$ is a subsequence of the original, as is $\{1, 1, 1, \dots\}$. The original sequence does not converge, but each of the subsequences do. Thus a divergent sequence can have convergent subsequences.

Question: Can a convergent sequence have divergent subsequences? If no, what do the subsequences converge to?

Example: Consider the sequence $\left\{ \frac{1}{n} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. The sequences $\left\{ \frac{1}{k^2} \right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\left\{ \frac{1}{2^k} \right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ and $\left\{ \frac{1}{2k} \right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ are all subsequences of this. According to our previous work, these sequences all converge to 0. So we guess:

Theorem: A sequence converges if and only if all of its subsequences converge, in which case they all converge to the same limit.