INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BOMBAY MA205 Complex Analysis Autumn 2012

Anant R. Shastri

Department of Mathematics Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay

July 25, 2012

Sequences and Series

- Review
- Uniform Convergence

Lecture 2 25th July

Review of Sequences and Series

This is a brief summary of the theory of convergence of sequences and series. We assume that you are already familiar with the general theory of convergence of sequences and series, such as elementary properties, various convergence tests etc.. So, here we recall them very briefly to the extent that is needed for immediate purpose. There are several good books from which you can learn this topic better. One such reference is [K]. For the time being, going through the material here should be enough.

 \blacktriangleright Let $\mathbb N$ denote the set of natural numbers,

 $\mathbb{N}:=\{0,1,2,3,\ldots\}.$

• Let $\mathbb N$ denote the set of natural numbers,

 $\mathbb{N}:=\{0,1,2,3,\ldots\}.$

Definition

By a sequence in a set A, we mean a mapping $s : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow A$.

• Let $\mathbb N$ denote the set of natural numbers,

 $\mathbb{N}:=\{0,1,2,3,\ldots\}.$

Definition

By a *sequence* in a set A, we mean a mapping $s : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow A$.

▶ It is customary to denote a sequence f by $\{s(n)\}$ or $\{s_n\}, \{a_n\}, \{b_n\}$ etc. $\{s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3, \ldots,\}$ etc.

Definition

A sequence $\{z_n\}$ of numbers is said to be *convergent* to the *limit* w if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an integer n_0 such that for all $n \ge n_0$, we have,

 $|z_n-w|<\epsilon.$

Definition

A sequence $\{z_n\}$ of numbers is said to be *convergent* to the *limit* w if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an integer n_0 such that for all $n \ge n_0$, we have,

$$|z_n-w|<\epsilon.$$

It follows that the limit of a sequence if it exists, is unique.

For if w_1 and w_2 are two limits of a sequence $\{z_n\}$ then, given $\epsilon > 0$ we can choose n_0 as above, so that for $n \ge n_0$ we have, $|z_n - w_1| < \epsilon$, and $|z_n - w_2| < \epsilon$. Hence, $|w_1 - w_2| < 2\epsilon$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we must have $w_1 = w_2$.

We use the following two notations

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} z_n := w; \quad \text{OR} \quad z_n \to w,$$

to represent the limit of the sequence $\{z_n\}$.

We use the following two notations

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} z_n := w; \quad \text{OR} \quad z_n \to w,$$

to represent the limit of the sequence $\{z_n\}$.

• If a sequence is not convergent then it is said to be *divergent*.

We use the following two notations

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} z_n := w; \quad \text{OR} \quad z_n \to w,$$

to represent the limit of the sequence $\{z_n\}$.

- ▶ If a sequence is not convergent then it is said to be *divergent*.
- If $\{a_n\}, \{b_n\}$ are convergent sequences, then the sequences $\{a_n + b_n\}$ and $\{za_n\}$ are also so with limits given by

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} (a_n + b_n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} a_n + \lim_{n \to \infty} b_n; \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} za_n = z \lim_{n \to \infty} a_n.$$

We use the following two notations

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} z_n := w; \quad \text{OR} \quad z_n \to w,$$

to represent the limit of the sequence $\{z_n\}$.

- ▶ If a sequence is not convergent then it is said to be *divergent*.
- ▶ If $\{a_n\}, \{b_n\}$ are convergent sequences, then the sequences $\{a_n + b_n\}$ and $\{za_n\}$ are also so with limits given by

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} (a_n + b_n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} a_n + \lim_{n \to \infty} b_n; \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} za_n = z \lim_{n \to \infty} a_n.$$

▶ It is fairly obvious that if $z_n = a_n + ib_n$ where, $a_n, b_n \in \mathbb{R}$, then $z_n \longrightarrow w$ iff $a_n \longrightarrow \Re(w)$ and $b_n \longrightarrow \Im(w)$.

The following criterion for convergence of sequences is one of the immediate consequences of the construction of real numbers.

The following criterion for convergence of sequences is one of the immediate consequences of the construction of real numbers.

Theorem

A sequence $\{z_n\}$ of numbers is convergent iff it satifies the following **Cauchy's** Criterion:

for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists n_0 such that for all $n, m \ge n_0$, we have $|z_n - z_m| < \epsilon$.

The following criterion for convergence of sequences is one of the immediate consequences of the construction of real numbers.

Theorem

A sequence $\{z_n\}$ of numbers is convergent iff it satifies the following Cauchy's Criterion:

for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists n_0 such that for all $n, m \ge n_0$, we have $|z_n - z_m| < \epsilon$.

► A sequence satisfying Cauchy's criterion is called a *Cauchy sequence*. The theorem can then be stated as: a sequence of real or complex numbers is Cauchy iff it is convergent.

As an important application of sequences, we have:

Theorem

Let $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be any function defined on a subset of \mathbb{C} . For any $z \in X$, f is continuous at z iff for every sequence $z_n \longrightarrow z$, we have, $f(z_n) \longrightarrow f(z)$.

Example

Recall that we define the principal value ARG of a complex number to be the value of θ where $z = \cos \theta + i \sin \theta$, $-\pi < \theta \le pi$.

As an important application of sequences, we have:

Theorem

Let $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be any function defined on a subset of \mathbb{C} . For any $z \in X$, f is continuous at z iff for every sequence $z_n \longrightarrow z$, we have, $f(z_n) \longrightarrow f(z)$.

Example

Recall that we define the principal value ARG of a complex number to be the value of θ where $z = \cos \theta + i \sin \theta$, $-\pi < \theta \le pi$. Put $\theta_n = -\pi + 1/n$, and $z_n = \cos \theta_n + i \sin \theta_n$. Let f(z) = Arg z. Then at z = -1 you will see that f is not continuous. Because $f(z_n) \longrightarrow -\pi$ whereas $z_n \longrightarrow -1$ and $f(-1) = \pi$.

Definition

By a series of real or complex numbers we mean an expression of the form

$$\sum_n z_n := z_0 + z_1 + \dots + z_n + \dots$$

Definition

By a series of real or complex numbers we mean an expression of the form

$$\sum_n z_n := z_0 + z_1 + \dots + z_n + \dots$$

Of course, it is possible that there are only finitely many non zero terms here. Note that this is not an equation as such. Expressions on either side do not necessarily represent any real or complex numbers.

Definition

By a series of real or complex numbers we mean an expression of the form

$$\sum_{n} z_n := z_0 + z_1 + \dots + z_n + \dots$$

Of course, it is possible that there are only finitely many non zero terms here. Note that this is not an equation as such. Expressions on either side do not necessarily represent any real or complex numbers.

Definition

The sequence of partial sums associated to the above series is defined to be $s_n := \sum_{k=1}^n z_k$. We say the series is *convergent* if the associated sequence $\{s_n\}$ of partial sums is convergent. In that case, if *s* is the limit of this sequence, then we say *s* is the *sum* of the series and write

$$\sum_n z_n := s.$$

ARS (IITB)

Basic Properties: If $\sum_{n} z_n$ and $\sum_{n} w_n$ are convergent series then:

• for any complex number λ , we have, $\sum_n \lambda z_n$ is convergent and

$$\sum_{n} \lambda z_{n} = \lambda \sum_{n} z_{n};$$

Basic Properties: If $\sum_{n} z_n$ and $\sum_{n} w_n$ are convergent series then:

• for any complex number λ , we have, $\sum_n \lambda z_n$ is convergent and

$$\sum_{n} \lambda z_{n} = \lambda \sum_{n} z_{n};$$

• $\sum_{n}(z_n + w_n)$ is convergent and

$$\sum_n (z_n + w_n) = \sum_n z_n + \sum_n w_n.$$

Cauchy's convergence criterion can be applied to series also. This yields:

Theorem

A series $\sum_{n} z_n$ of real or complex numbers is convergent iff for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists n_0 such that for all $n \ge n_0$ and for all $p \ge 0$, we have,

 $|z_n+z_{n+1}+\cdots+z_{n+p}|<\epsilon.$

Cauchy's convergence criterion can be applied to series also. This yields:

Theorem

A series $\sum_{n} z_n$ of real or complex numbers is convergent iff for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists n_0 such that for all $n \ge n_0$ and for all $p \ge 0$, we have,

 $|z_n+z_{n+1}+\cdots+z_{n+p}|<\epsilon.$

It follows that if a series is convergent, then its n^{th} term z_n tends to 0. However, this is not a sufficient condition for convergence of the series, as illustrated by the series $\sum_{n} \frac{1}{n}$.

More generally, all notions and results that we have for sequences have corresponding notions and results for series also, via the sequence of partial sums of the series. Thus, once a result is established for a sequence, the corresponding result is available for series as well and vice versa, without specifically mentioning it.

Definition

A series $\sum_{n} z_n$ is said to be absolutely convergent if the series $\sum_{n} |z_n|$ is convergent.

Definition

A series $\sum_{n} z_n$ is said to be absolutely convergent if the series $\sum_{n} |z_n|$ is convergent.

- ▶ An absolutely convergent series is convergent.
- Converse is not true: $\sum_{n} (-1)^n \frac{1}{n}$.

Definition

A series $\sum_{n} z_n$ is said to be absolutely convergent if the series $\sum_{n} |z_n|$ is convergent.

- ▶ An absolutely convergent series is convergent.
- Converse is not true: $\sum_{n} (-1)^n \frac{1}{n}$.
- ▶ The notion of absolute convergence plays a very important role throughout the study of convergence of series. As an illustration we shall obtain the following useful result about the convergence of the product series.

Sequences and Series

Definition

Given two series $\sum_{n} a_n$, $\sum_{n} b_n$ the *Cauchy product* of these two series is defined to be $\sum_{n} c_n$ where $c_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k b_{n-k}$.

Sequences and Series

Definition

Given two series $\sum_{n} a_n$, $\sum_{n} b_n$ the *Cauchy product* of these two series is defined to be $\sum_{n} c_n$ where $c_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k b_{n-k}$.

Theorem

If $\sum_{n} a_n$, $\sum_{n} b_n$ are two absolutely convergent series then their product series is absolutely convergent and its sum is equal to the product of the sums of the two series:

$$\sum_{n} c_{n} = \left(\sum_{n} a_{n}\right) \left(\sum_{n} b_{n}\right).$$
(1)

Proof: (Under the extra assumption that both the series consist of non negative real numbers only, the conclusion of the theorem is obvious. Though we need not use this result, it gives us a useful hint how to go about with the proof in the general case.)

Sequences and Series

Put

$$R_n = \sum_{k \ge n} |a_k|; \quad T_n = \sum_{k \ge n} |b_k|.$$

Clearly,

$$\sum_{0}^{n} |c_n| \leq \sum_{0}^{n} \sum_{0}^{n} |a_k| |b_l| \leq \left(\sum_{0}^{n} |a_k|\right) \left(\sum_{0}^{n} |b_l|\right) \leq R_0 T_0, \quad \text{for all } n.$$

This means that $t_n = \sum_{0}^{n} |c_n|$ is a monotonically increasing sequence of real numbers which is bounded above and hence is convergent. Therefore the series $\sum_{n} c_n$ is absolutely convergent. Further,

$$\left|\sum_{k\leq 2n}c_k-\left(\sum_{k\leq n}a_k\right)\left(\sum_{k\leq n}b_k\right)\right|\leq R_0T_{n+1}+T_0R_{n+1},$$

since the terms that remain on the LHS after cancellation are of the form $a_k b_l$ where either $k \ge n+1$ or $l \ge n+1$. Upon taking the limit as $n \longrightarrow \infty$, we obtain (1).

An important property of an absolutely convergent series is the following:

Theorem

Let $\sum_{n} z_{n}$ be an absolutely convergent series. Then every rearrangement $\sum_{n} z_{\sigma_{n}}$ of the series is also absolutely convergent. Moreover, we have $\sum_{n} z_{n} = \sum_{n} z_{\sigma_{n}}$.

An important property of an absolutely convergent series is the following:

Theorem

Let $\sum_{n} z_{n}$ be an absolutely convergent series. Then every rearrangement $\sum_{n} z_{\sigma_{n}}$ of the series is also absolutely convergent. Moreover, we have $\sum_{n} z_{n} = \sum_{n} z_{\sigma_{n}}$.

Recall that a rearrangement $\sum_{n} z_{\sigma_n}$ of $\sum_{n} z_n$ is obtained by taking a bijection $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$.

By taking real and imaginary parts seperately, it is enough to prove the statment for the real case.

- By taking real and imaginary parts seperately, it is enough to prove the statment for the real case.
- Let $\sum_n a_n$ be an absolutely cgt series of real numbers. Put $a_n^+ := \frac{|a_n + a_n|}{2}$, $a_n^- := |a_n| a_n^- 2$.

- By taking real and imaginary parts seperately, it is enough to prove the statment for the real case.
- Let $\sum_{n} a_n$ be an absolutely cgt series of real numbers. Put $a_n^+ := \frac{|a_n + a_n|}{2}$, $a_n^- := |a_n| a_n^- 2$.
- Then $a_n^{\pm} \geq 0$, and $a_n = a_n^+ a_n^{-1}$

- By taking real and imaginary parts seperately, it is enough to prove the statment for the real case.
- Let $\sum_{n} a_n$ be an absolutely cgt series of real numbers. Put $a_n^+ := \frac{|a_n + a_n|}{2}$, $a_n^- := |a_n| a_n^- 2$.
- Then $a_n^{\pm} \geq 0$, and $a_n = a_n^+ a_n^{-1}$
- ▶ And $|a_n^{\pm}| \leq |a_n|$. Therefore both the series $\sum_n a_n^+$, $\sum_n a_n^-$ are convergent. By addition theorem so is the series

$$\sum_{n} a_{n} = \sum_{n} (a_{n}^{+} - a_{n}^{-}) = \sum_{m} a_{n}^{+} - \sum_{n} a_{n}^{-}.$$

► This is then true for any re-arrangement series $\sum_{n} a_{\sigma_n}$ as well. Therefore, $\sum_{n} a_{\sigma_n} = \sum_{n} a_{\sigma_n}^+ - \sum_{n} a_{\sigma_n}^-$

• Therefore
$$\sum_{n} a_{\sigma_n} = \sum_{n} a_n^+ - \sum_{n} a_n^- = \sum_{n} a_n$$
.

- ► This is then true for any re-arrangement series $\sum_{n} a_{\sigma_n}$ as well. Therefore, $\sum_{n} a_{\sigma_n} = \sum_{n} a_{\sigma_n}^+ - \sum_{n} a_{\sigma_n}^-$
- But each of the series ∑_n a[±]_{σ_n} be a convegent series of non negative terms, is equal to ∑_n a[±]_n respectively.
- Therefore $\sum_{n} a_{\sigma_n} = \sum_{n} a_n^+ \sum_{n} a_n^- = \sum_{n} a_n$.

We shall now consider the study of a family of sequences, viz., let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of functions defined on some set A, and taking real or complex values.

We shall now consider the study of a family of sequences, viz., let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of functions defined on some set A, and taking real or complex values. Then to each $x \in A$, we get a sequence $\{f_n(x)\}$.

We shall now consider the study of a family of sequences, viz., let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of functions defined on some set A, and taking real or complex values. Then to each $x \in A$, we get a sequence $\{f_n(x)\}$. If each of these sequences is convergent, then we get a function $f(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} f_n(x)$.

We shall now consider the study of a family of sequences, viz., let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of functions defined on some set A, and taking real or complex values. Then to each $x \in A$, we get a sequence $\{f_n(x)\}$. If each of these sequences is convergent, then we get a function $f(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x)$. In the definition of the convergence, it is obvious that the largeness of n_0 depends

on the smallness of ϵ . Naturally, it would also vary from sequence to sequence.

We shall now consider the study of a family of sequences, viz., let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of functions defined on some set A, and taking real or complex values. Then to each $x \in A$, we get a sequence $\{f_n(x)\}$. If each of these sequences is convergent, then we get a function $f(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} f_n(x)$.

In the definition of the convergence, it is obvious that the largeness of n_0 depends on the smallness of ϵ . Naturally, it would also vary from sequence to sequence. If we want the function f to behave well, it is clearly necessary that there must be some control on the variation of n_0 from sequence to sequence.

We shall now consider the study of a family of sequences, viz., let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of functions defined on some set A, and taking real or complex values. Then to each $x \in A$, we get a sequence $\{f_n(x)\}$. If each of these sequences is convergent, then we get a function

 $f(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x).$

In the definition of the convergence, it is obvious that the largeness of n_0 depends on the smallness of ϵ . Naturally, it would also vary from sequence to sequence.

If we want the function f to behave well, it is clearly necessary that there must be some control on the variation of n_0 from sequence to sequence.

One way to do this leads us to the notion of uniform convergence.

Definition

Let $\{f_n\}$ be sequence of complex valued functions on a set A. We say that it is *uniformly convergent* on A to a function f(x) if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists n_0 , *independent of* $x \in A$ such that for all $n \ge n_0$, we have, $|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$, for all $x \in A$.

Remark

Observe that if $\{f_n\}$ is uniformly convergent, then for each $x \in A$, we have, $f_n(x) \longrightarrow f(x)$. This is called *point-wise convergence* of the sequence of functions. It is fairly easy to see that if A is a finite set then pointwise convergence at all the points of A implies uniform convergence. Thus the interesting case of uniform convergence occurs only when A itself is an infinite set. Then pointwise convergence does not imply uniform convergence as seen in the following example.

Pointwise does not imply uniform

Example

A simple example of a sequence which is point-wise convergent but not uniformly convergent is $f_n : \mathbb{R}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $f_n(x) = 1/nx$. It is uniformly convergent in $[\alpha, \infty)$ for all $\alpha > 0$ but not so in $(0, \alpha)$.

Theorem

A sequence of complex valued functions $\{f_n\}$ is uniformly convergent iff it is uniformly Cauchy i.e., given $\epsilon > 0$ there exists n_0 , such that for all $n \ge n_0$ and for all $x \in A$, we have,

$$|f_{n+p}(x)-f_n(x)|<\epsilon.$$

Remark

Likewise, there are other theorems, such as sum of uniform convergent sequence is uniformly convergent etc.

Whatever we have done so far for sequences applies to series of functions as well by merely making the corresponding statements about the sequence of partial sums. For examples a series $\sum_n f_n$ of functions is uniformly Cauchy iff the sequence $\{s_n(x)\}$ of partial sums is uniformly Cauchy etc.