# *Introduction to Analysis Classic 4th edition Wade Solutions Manual*

SKU: 9780134707624-SOLUTIONS

CHAPTER 2

**2.1 Limits of Sequences.**

**2.1.0.** a) True. If $x_n$ converges, then there is an $M > 0$ such that $|x_n| \le M$. Choose by Archimedes an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $N > M/\varepsilon$. Then $n \ge N$ implies $|x_n/n| \le M/n \le M/N < \varepsilon$.
b) False. $x_n = \sqrt{n}$ does not converge, but $x_n/n = 1/\sqrt{n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.
c) False. $x_n = 1$ converges and $y_n = (-1)^n$ is bounded, but $x_n y_n = (-1)^n$ does not converge.
d) False. $x_n = 1/n$ converges to 0 and $y_n = n^2 > 0$, but $x_n y_n = n$ does not converge.

**2.1.1.** a) By the Archimedean Principle, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $N > 1/\varepsilon$. Thus $n \ge N$ implies

$$|(2 - 1/n) - 2| \equiv |1/n| \le 1/N < \varepsilon.$$

b) By the Archimedean Principle, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $N > \pi^2/\varepsilon^2$. Thus $n \ge N$ implies

$$|1 + \pi/\sqrt{n} - 1| \equiv |\pi/\sqrt{n}| \le \pi/\sqrt{N} < \varepsilon.$$

c) By the Archimedean Principle, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $N > 3/\varepsilon$. Thus $n \ge N$ implies

$$|3(1 + 1/n) - 3| \equiv |3/n| \le 3/N < \varepsilon.$$

d) By the Archimedean Principle, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $N > 1/\sqrt{3\varepsilon}$. Thus $n \ge N$ implies

$$|(2n^2 + 1)/(3n^2) - 2/3| \equiv |1/(3n^2)| \le 1/(3N^2) < \varepsilon.$$

**2.1.2.** a) By hypothesis, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n \ge N$ implies $|x_n - 1| < \varepsilon/2$. Thus $n \ge N$ implies

$$|1 + 2x_n - 3| \equiv 2\,|x_n - 1| < \varepsilon.$$

b) By hypothesis, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n \ge N$ implies $x_n > 1/2$ and $|x_n - 1| < \varepsilon/4$. In particular, $1/x_n < 2$. Thus $n \ge N$ implies

$$|(\pi x_n - 2)/x_n - (\pi - 2)| \equiv 2\,|(x_n - 1)/x_n| < 4\,|x_n - 1| < \varepsilon.$$

c) By hypothesis, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n \ge N$ implies $x_n > 1/2$ and $|x_n - 1| < \varepsilon/(1 + 2e)$. Thus $n \ge N$ and the triangle inequality imply

$$|(x_n^2 - e)/x_n - (1 - e)| \equiv |x_n - 1| \left|1 + \frac{e}{x_n}\right| \le |x_n - 1| \left(1 + \frac{e}{|x_n|}\right) < |x_n - 1|(1 + 2e) < \varepsilon.$$

**2.1.3.** a) If $n_k = 2k$, then $3 - (-1)^{n_k} \equiv 2$ converges to 2; if $n_k = 2k + 1$, then $3 - (-1)^{n_k} \equiv 4$ converges to 4.
b) If $n_k = 2k$, then $(-1)^{3n_k} + 2 \equiv (-1)^{6k} + 2 = 1 + 2 = 3$ converges to 3; if $n_k = 2k + 1$, then $(-1)^{3n_k} + 2 \equiv (-1)^{6k+3} + 2 = -1 + 2 = 1$ converges to 1.
c) If $n_k = 2k$, then $(n_k - (-1)^{n_k} n_k - 1)/n_k \equiv -1/(2k)$ converges to 0; if $n_k = 2k+1$, then $(n_k - (-1)^{n_k} n_k - 1)/n_k \equiv (2n_k - 1)/n_k = (4k + 1)/(2k + 1)$ converges to 2.

**2.1.4.** Suppose $x_n$ is bounded. By Definition 2.7, there are numbers $M$ and $m$ such that $m \le x_n \le M$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Set $C := \max\{1, |M|, |m|\}$. Then $C > 0$, $M \le C$, and $m \ge -C$. Therefore, $-C \le x_n \le C$, i.e., $|x_n| < C$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.
Conversely, if $|x_n| < C$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then $x_n$ is bounded above by $C$ and below by $-C$.

**2.1.5.** If $C = 0$, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, given $\varepsilon > 0$ use Definition 2.1 to choose an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n \ge N$ implies $|b_n| \equiv b_n < \varepsilon/|C|$. Hence by hypothesis, $n \ge N$ implies

$$|x_n - a| \le |C| b_n < \varepsilon.$$

By definition, $x_n \to a$ as $n \to \infty$.

**2.1.6.** If $x_n = a$ for all $n$, then $|x_n - a| = 0$ is less than any positive $\varepsilon$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Thus, by definition, $x_n \to a$ as $n \to \infty$.



Copyright © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall.

Introduction to Analysis Classic 4th edition Wade Solutions Manual

**2.1.7.** a) Let $a$ be the common limit point. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n \geq N$ implies $|x_n - a|$ and $|y_n - a|$ are both $< \varepsilon/2$. By the Triangle Inequality, $n \geq N$ implies

$$|x_n - y_n| \leq |x_n - a| + |y_n - a| < \varepsilon.$$

By definition, $x_n - y_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

b) If $n$ converges to some $a$, then given $\varepsilon = 1/2$, $1 = |(n+1) - n| < |(n+1) - a| + |n - a| < 1$ for $n$ sufficiently large, a contradiction.

c) Let $x_n = n$ and $y_n = n + 1/n$. Then $|x_n - y_n| = 1/n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, but neither $x_n$ nor $y_n$ converges.

**2.1.8.** By Theorem 2.6, if $x_n \to a$ then $x_{n_k} \to a$. Conversely, if $x_{n_k} \to a$ for every subsequence, then it converges for the "subsequence" $x_n$.

**2.2 Limit Theorems.**

**2.2.0.** a) False. Let $x_n = n^2$ and $y_n = -n$ and note by Exercise 2.2.2a that $x_n + y_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

b) True. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. If $x_n \to -\infty$ as $n \to \infty$, then choose $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n \geq N$ implies $x_n < -1/\varepsilon$. Then $x_n < 0$ so $|x_n| = -x_n > 0$. Multiply $x_n < -1/\varepsilon$ by $\varepsilon/(-x_n)$ which is positive. We obtain $-\varepsilon < 1/x_n$, i.e., $|1/x_n| = -1/x_n < \varepsilon$.

c) False. Let $x_n = (-1)^n/n$. Then $1/x_n = (-1)^n n$ has no limit as $n \to \infty$.

d) True. Since $(2^x - x)' = 2^x \log 2 - 1 > 1$ for all $x \geq 2$, i.e., $2^x - x$ is increasing on $[2, \infty)$. In particular, $2^x - x \geq 2^2 - 2 > 0$, i.e., $2^x > x$ for $x \geq 2$. Thus, since $x_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, we have $2^{x_n} > x_n$ for $n$ large, hence

$$2^{-x_n} < \frac{1}{x_n} \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$.

**2.2.1.** a) $|x_n| \leq 1/n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ and we can apply the Squeeze Theorem.

b) $2n/(n^2 + \pi) = (2/n)/(1 + \pi/n^2) \to 0/(1+0) = 0$ by Theorem 2.12.

c) $(\sqrt{2n} + 1)/(n + \sqrt{2}) = ((\sqrt{2}/\sqrt{n}) + (1/n))/(1 + (\sqrt{2}/n)) \to 0/(1+0) = 0$ by Exercise 2.2.5 and Theorem 2.12.

d) An easy induction argument shows that $2n + 1 < 2^n$ for $n = 3, 4, \ldots$. We will use this to prove that $n^2 \leq 2^n$ for $n = 4, 5, \ldots$. It's surely true for $n = 4$. If it's true for some $n \geq 4$, then the inductive hypothesis and the fact that $2n + 1 < 2^n$ imply

$$(n+1)^2 = n^2 + 2n + 1 \leq 2^n + 2n + 1 < 2^n + 2^n = 2^{n+1}$$

so the second inequality has been proved.

Now the second inequality implies $n/2^n < 1/n$ for $n \geq 4$. Hence by the Squeeze Theorem, $n/2^n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

**2.2.2.** a) Let $M \in \mathbf{R}$ and choose by Archimedes an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $N > \max\{M, 2\}$. Then $n \geq N$ implies $n^2 - n = n(n-1) \geq N(N-1) > M(2-1) = M$.

b) Let $M \in \mathbf{R}$ and choose by Archimedes an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $N > -M/2$. Notice that $n \geq 1$ implies $-3n \leq -3$ so $1 - 3n \leq -2$. Thus $n \geq N$ implies $n - 3n^2 = n(1 - 3n) \leq -2n \leq -2N < M$.

c) Let $M \in \mathbf{R}$ and choose by Archimedes an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $N > M$. Then $n \geq N$ implies $(n^2 + 1)/n = n + 1/n > N + 0 > M$.

d) Let $M \in \mathbf{R}$ satisfy $M \leq 0$. Then $2 + \sin\theta \geq 2 - 1 = 1$ implies $n^2(2 + \sin(n^3 + n + 1)) \geq n^2 \cdot 1 > 0 \geq M$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. On the other hand, if $M > 0$, then choose by Archimedes an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $N > \sqrt{M}$. Then $n \geq N$ implies $n^2(2 + \sin(n^3 + n + 1)) \geq n^2 \cdot 1 \geq N^2 > M$.

**2.2.3.** a) Following Example 2.13,

$$\frac{2 + 3n - 4n^2}{1 - 2n + 3n^2} = \frac{(2/n^2) + (3/n) - 4}{(1/n^2) - (2/n) + 3} \to \frac{-4}{3}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

b) Following Example 2.13,

$$\frac{n^3 + n - 2}{2n^3 + n - 2} = \frac{1 + (1/n^2) - (2/n^3)}{2 + (1/n^2) - (2/n^3)} \to \frac{1}{2}$$

as $n \to \infty$.



Copyright © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall.

Introduction to Analysis Classic 4th edition Wade Solutions Manual

c) Rationalizing the expression, we obtain

$$\sqrt{3n+2}-\sqrt{n}=\frac{(\sqrt{3n+2}-\sqrt{n})(\sqrt{3n+2}+\sqrt{n})}{\sqrt{3n+2}+\sqrt{n}}=\frac{2n+2}{\sqrt{3n+2}+\sqrt{n}}\to\infty$$

as $n\to\infty$ by the method of Example 2.13. (Multiply top and bottom by $1/\sqrt{n}$.)

d) Multiply top and bottom by $1/\sqrt{n}$ to obtain

$$\frac{\sqrt{4n+1}-\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{9n+1}-\sqrt{n+2}}=\frac{\sqrt{4+1/n}-\sqrt{1-1/n}}{\sqrt{9+1/n}-\sqrt{1+2/n}}\to\frac{2-1}{3-1}=\frac{1}{2}.$$

**2.2.4.** a) Clearly,

$$\frac{x_n}{y_n}-\frac{x}{y}=\frac{x_ny-xy_n}{yy_n}=\frac{x_ny-xy+xy-xy_n}{yy_n}.$$

Thus

$$\left|\frac{x_n}{y_n}-\frac{x}{y}\right|\le\frac{1}{|y_n|}|x_n-x|+\frac{|x|}{|yy_n|}|y_n-y|.$$

Since $y\neq 0$, $|y_n|\ge|y|/2$ for large $n$. Thus

$$\left|\frac{x_n}{y_n}-\frac{x}{y}\right|\le\frac{2}{|y|}|x_n-x|+\frac{2|x|}{|y|^2}|y_n-y|\to 0$$

as $n\to\infty$ by Theorem 2.12i and ii. Hence by the Squeeze Theorem, $x_n/y_n\to x/y$ as $n\to\infty$.

b) By symmetry, we may suppose that $x=y=\infty$. Since $y_n\to\infty$ implies $y_n>0$ for $n$ large, we can apply Theorem 2.15 directly to obtain the conclusions when $\alpha>0$. For the case $\alpha<0$, $x_n>M$ implies $\alpha x_n<\alpha M$. Since any $M_0\in\mathbf{R}$ can be written as $\alpha M$ for some $M\in\mathbf{R}$, we see by definition that $x_n\to-\infty$ as $n\to\infty$.

**2.2.5.** *Case 1.* $x=0$. Let $\epsilon>0$ and choose $N$ so large that $n\ge N$ implies $|x_n|<\epsilon^2$. By (8) in 1.1, $\sqrt{x_n}<\epsilon$ for $n\ge N$, i.e., $\sqrt{x_n}\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$.

*Case 2.* $x>0$. Then

$$\sqrt{x_n}-\sqrt{x}=(\sqrt{x_n}-\sqrt{x})\left(\frac{\sqrt{x_n}+\sqrt{x}}{\sqrt{x_n}+\sqrt{x}}\right)=\frac{x_n-x}{\sqrt{x_n}+\sqrt{x}}.$$

Since $\sqrt{x_n}\ge 0$, it follows that

$$|\sqrt{x_n}-\sqrt{x}|\le\frac{|x_n-x|}{\sqrt{x}}.$$

This last quotient converges to 0 by Theorem 2.12. Hence it follows from the Squeeze Theorem that $\sqrt{x_n}\to\sqrt{x}$ as $n\to\infty$.

**2.2.6.** By the Density of Rationals, there is an $r_n$ between $x+1/n$ and $x$ for each $n\in\mathbf{N}$. Since $|x-r_n|<1/n$, it follows from the Squeeze Theorem that $r_n\to x$ as $n\to\infty$.

**2.2.7.** a) By Theorem 2.9 we may suppose that $|x|=\infty$. By symmetry, we may suppose that $x=\infty$. By definition, given $M\in\mathbf{R}$, there is an $N\in\mathbf{N}$ such that $n\ge N$ implies $x_n>M$. Since $w_n\ge x_n$, it follows that $w_n>M$ for all $n\ge N$. By definition, then, $w_n\to\infty$ as $n\to\infty$.

b) If $x$ and $y$ are finite, then the result follows from Theorem 2.17. If $x=y=\pm\infty$ or $-x=y=\infty$, there is nothing to prove. It remains to consider the case $x=\infty$ and $y=-\infty$. But by Definition 2.14 (with $M=0$), $x_n>0>y_n$ for $n$ sufficiently large, which contradicts the hypothesis $x_n\le y_n$.

**2.2.8.** a) Take the limit of $x_{n+1}=1-\sqrt{1-x_n}$, as $n\to\infty$. We obtain $x=1-\sqrt{1-x}$, i.e., $x^2-x=0$. Therefore, $x=0,1$.

b) Take the limit of $x_{n+1}=2+\sqrt{x_n-2}$ as $n\to\infty$. We obtain $x=2+\sqrt{x-2}$, i.e., $x^2-5x+6=0$. Therefore, $x=2,3$. But $x_1>3$ and induction shows that $x_{n+1}=2+\sqrt{x_n-2}>2+\sqrt{3-2}=3$, so the limit must be $x=3$.

c) Take the limit of $x_{n+1}=\sqrt{2+x_n}$ as $n\to\infty$. We obtain $x=\sqrt{2+x}$, i.e., $x^2-x-2=0$. Therefore, $x=2,-1$. But $x_{n+1}=\sqrt{2+x_n}\ge 0$ by definition (all square roots are nonnegative), so the limit must be $x=2$.

This proof doesn't change if $x_1>-2$, so the limit is again $x=2$.



Copyright © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall.

Introduction to Analysis Classic 4th edition Wade Solutions Manual

**2.2.9.** a) Let $E = \{k \in \mathbf{Z} : k \geq 0 \text{ and } k \leq 10^{n+1}y\}$. Since $10^{n+1}y < 10$, $E \subseteq \{0, 1, \ldots, 9\}$. Hence $w := \sup E \in E$. It follows that $w \leq 10^{n+1}y$, i.e., $w/10^{n+1} \leq y$. On the other hand, since $w+1$ is not the supremum of $E$, $w + 1 > 10^{n+1}y$. Therefore, $y < w/10^{n+1} + 1/10^{n+1}$.

b) Apply a) for $n = 0$ to choose $x_1 = w$ such that $x_1/10 \leq x < x_1/10 + 1/10$. Suppose

$$s_n := \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{x_k}{10^k} \leq x < \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{x_k}{10^k} + \frac{1}{10^n}.$$

Then $0 < x - s_n < 1/10^n$, so by a) choose $x_{n+1}$ such that $x_{n+1}/10^{n+1} \leq x - s_n < x_{n+1}/10^{n+1} + 1/10^{n+1}$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \frac{x_k}{10^k} \leq x < \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \frac{x_k}{10^k} + \frac{1}{10^{n+1}}.$$

c) Combine b) with the Squeeze Theorem.

d) Since an easy induction proves that $9^n > n$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, we have $9^{-n} < 1/n$. Hence the Squeeze Theorem implies that $9^{-n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Hence, it follows from Exercise 1.4.4c and definition that

$$.4999\cdots = \frac{4}{10} + \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=2}^{n} \frac{9}{10^k} = \frac{4}{10} + \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{10}\left(1 - \frac{1}{9^n}\right) = \frac{4}{10} + \frac{1}{10} = 0.5.$$

Similarly,

$$.999\cdots = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{9}{10^k} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{9^n}\right) = 1.$$

**2.3 The Bolzano–Weierstrass Theorem.**

**2.3.0.** a) False. $x_n = 1/4 + 1/(n+4)$ is strictly decreasing and $|x_n| \leq 1/4 + 1/5 < 1/2$, but $x_n \to 1/4$ as $n \to \infty$.

b) True. Since $(n-1)/(2n-1) \to 1/2$ as $n \to \infty$, this factor is bounded. Since $|\cos(n^2+n+1)| \leq 1$, it follows that $\{x_n\}$ is bounded. Hence it has a convergent subsequence by the Bolzano–Weierstrass Theorem.

c) False. $x_n = 1/2 - 1/n$ is strictly increasing and $|x_n| \leq 1/2 < 1 + 1/n$, but $x_n \to 1/2$ as $n \to \infty$.

d) False. $x_n = (1 + (-1)^n)n$ satisfies $x_n = 0$ for $n$ odd and $x_n = 2n$ for $n$ even. Thus $x_{2k+1} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, but $x_n$ is NOT bounded.

**2.3.1.** Suppose that $-1 < x_{n-1} < 0$ for some $n \geq 0$. Then $0 < x_{n-1} + 1 < 1$ so $0 < x_{n-1} + 1 < \sqrt{x_{n-1}+1}$ and it follows that $x_{n-1} < \sqrt{x_{n-1}+1} - 1 = x_n$. Moreover, $\sqrt{x_{n-1}+1} - 1 \leq 1 - 1 = 0$. Hence by induction, $x_n$ is increasing and bounded above by 0. It follows from the Monotone Convergence Theorem that $x_n \to a$ as $n \to \infty$. Taking the limit of $\sqrt{x_{n-1}+1} - 1 = x_n$ we see that $a^2 + a = 0$, i.e., $a = -1, 0$. Since $x_n$ increases from $x_0 > -1$, the limit is 0. If $x_0 = -1$, then $x_n = -1$ for all $n$. If $x_0 = 0$, then $x_n = 0$ for all $n$.

Finally, it is easy to verify that if $x_0 = \ell$ for $\ell = -1$ or 0, then $x_n = \ell$ for all $n$, hence $x_n \to \ell$ as $n \to \infty$.

**2.3.2.** If $x_1 = 0$ then $x_n = 0$ for all $n$, hence converges to 0. If $0 < x_1 < 1$, then by 1.4.1c, $x_n$ is decreasing and bounded below. Thus the limit, $a$, exists by the Monotone Convergence Theorem. Taking the limit of $x_{n+1} = 1 - \sqrt{1 - x_n}$, as $n \to \infty$, we have $a = 1 - \sqrt{1-a}$, i.e., $a = 0, 1$. Since $x_1 < 1$, the limit must be zero.

Finally,

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

**2.3.3.** *Case 1.* $x_0 = 2$. Then $x_n = 2$ for all $n$, so the limit is 2.

*Case 2.* $2 < x_0 < 3$. Suppose that $2 < x_{n-1} \leq 3$ for some $n \geq 1$. Then $0 < x_{n-1} - 2 \leq 1$ so $\sqrt{x_{n-1}-2} \geq x_{n-1} - 2$, i.e., $x_n = 2 + \sqrt{x_{n-1}-2} \geq x_{n-1}$. Moreover, $x_n = 2 + \sqrt{x_{n-1}-2} \leq 2 + 1 = 3$. Hence by induction, $x_n$ is increasing and bounded above by 3. It follows from the Monotone Convergence Theorem that $x_n \to a$ as $n \to \infty$. Taking the limit of $2 + \sqrt{x_{n-1}-2} = x_n$ we see that $a^2 - 5a + 6 = 0$, i.e., $a = 2, 3$. Since $x_n$ increases from $x_0 > 2$, the limit is 3.

*Case 3.* $x_0 \geq 3$. Suppose that $x_{n-1} \geq 3$ for some $n \geq 1$. Then $x_{n-1} - 2 \geq 1$ so $\sqrt{x_{n-1}-2} \leq x_{n-1} - 2$, i.e., $x_n = 2 + \sqrt{x_{n-1}-2} \leq x_{n-1}$. Moreover, $x_n = 2 + \sqrt{x_{n-1}-2} \geq 2 + 1 = 3$. Hence by induction, $x_n$ is decreasing



Copyright © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall.

Introduction to Analysis Classic 4th edition Wade Solutions Manual

and bounded above by 3. By repeating the steps in Case 2, we conclude that $x_n$ decreases from $x_0 \geq 3$ to the limit 3.

**2.3.4.** *Case 1.* $x_0 < 1$. Suppose $x_{n-1} < 1$. Then

$$x_{n-1} = \frac{2x_{n-1}}{2} < \frac{1 + x_{n-1}}{2} = x_n < \frac{2}{2} = 1.$$

Thus $\{x_n\}$ is increasing and bounded above, so $x_n \to x$. Taking the limit of $x_n = (1 + x_{n-1})/2$ as $n \to \infty$, we see that $x = (1 + x)/2$, i.e., $x = 1$.

*Case 2.* $x_0 \geq 1$. If $x_{n-1} \geq 1$ then

$$1 = \frac{2}{2} \leq \frac{1 + x_{n-1}}{2} = x_n \leq \frac{2x_{n-1}}{2} = x_{n-1}.$$

Thus $\{x_n\}$ is decreasing and bounded below. Repeating the argument in Case 1, we conclude that $x_n \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$.

**2.3.5.** The result is obvious when $x = 0$. If $x > 0$ then by Example 2.2 and Theorem 2.6,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x^{1/(2n-1)} = \lim_{m\to\infty} x^{1/m} = 1.$$

If $x < 0$ then since $2n - 1$ is odd, we have by the previous case that $x^{1/(2n-1)} = -(-x)^{1/(2n-1)} \to -1$ as $n \to \infty$.

**2.3.6.** a) Suppose that $\{x_n\}$ is increasing. If $\{x_n\}$ is bounded above, then there is an $x \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $x_n \to x$ (by the Monotone Convergence Theorem). Otherwise, given any $M > 0$ there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $x_N > M$. Since $\{x_n\}$ is increasing, $n \geq N$ implies $x_n \geq x_N > M$. Hence $x_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

b) If $\{x_n\}$ is decreasing, then $-x_n$ is increasing, so part a) applies.

**2.3.7.** Choose by the Approximation Property an $x_1 \in E$ such that $\sup E - 1 < x_1 \leq \sup E$. Since $\sup E \notin E$, we also have $x_1 < \sup E$. Suppose $x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_n$ in $E$ have been chosen so that $\sup E - 1/n < x_n < \sup E$. Choose by the Approximation Property an $x_{n+1} \in E$ such that $\max\{x_n, \sup E - 1/(n+1)\} < x_{n+1} \leq \sup E$. Then $\sup E - 1/(n+1) < x_{n+1} < \sup E$ and $x_n < x_{n+1}$. Thus by induction, $x_1 < x_2 < \ldots$ and by the Squeeze Theorem, $x_n \to \sup E$ as $n \to \infty$.

**2.3.8.** a) This follows immediately from Exercise 1.2.6.

b) By a), $x_{n+1} = (x_n + y_n)/2 < 2x_n/2 = x_n$. Thus $y_{n+1} < x_{n+1} < \cdots < x_1$. Similarly, $y_n = \sqrt{y_n^2} < \sqrt{x_n y_n} = y_{n+1}$ implies $x_{n+1} > y_{n+1} > y_n \cdots > y_1$. Thus $\{x_n\}$ is decreasing and bounded below by $y_1$ and $\{y_n\}$ is increasing and bounded above by $x_1$.

c) By b),

$$x_{n+1} - y_{n+1} = \frac{x_n + y_n}{2} - \sqrt{x_n y_n} < \frac{x_n + y_n}{2} - y_n = \frac{x_n - y_n}{2}.$$

Hence by induction and a), $0 < x_{n+1} - y_{n+1} < (x_1 - y_1)/2^n$.

d) By b), there exist $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $x_n \downarrow x$ and $y_n \uparrow y$ as $n \to \infty$. By c), $|x - y| \leq (x_1 - y_1) \cdot 0 = 0$. Hence $x = y$.

**2.3.9.** Since $x_0 = 1$ and $y_0 = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n+1}^2 - 2y_{n+1}^2 &= (x_n + 2y_n)^2 - 2(x_n + y_n)^2 \\ &= -x_n^2 + 2y_n^2 = \cdots = (-1)^n(x_0 - 2y_0) = (-1)^n. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $x_1 = 1 = y_1$. If $y_{n-1} \geq n - 1$ and $x_{n-1} \geq 1$ then $y_n = x_{n-1} + y_{n-1} \geq 1 + (n - 1) = n$ and $x_n = x_{n-1} + 2y_{n-1} \geq 1$. Thus $1/y_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ and $x_n \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Since

$$\left|\frac{x_n^2}{y_n^2} - 2\right| = \left|\frac{x_n^2 - 2y_n^2}{y_n^2}\right| = \frac{1}{y_n^2} \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$, it follows that $x_n/y_n \to \pm\sqrt{2}$ as $n \to \infty$. Since $x_n, y_n > 0$, the limit must be $\sqrt{2}$.



Copyright © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall.

Introduction to Analysis Classic 4th edition Wade Solutions Manual

**2.3.10.** a) Notice $x_0 > y_0 > 1$. If $x_{n-1} > y_{n-1} > 1$ then $y_{n-1}^2 - x_{n-1}y_{n-1} = y_{n-1}(y_{n-1} - x_{n-1}) > 0$ so $y_{n-1}(y_{n-1} + x_{n-1}) < 2x_{n-1}y_{n-1}$. In particular,

$$x_n = \frac{2x_{n-1}y_{n-1}}{x_{n-1} + y_{n-1}} > y_{n-1}.$$

It follows that $\sqrt{x_n} > \sqrt{y_{n-1}} > 1$, so $x_n > \sqrt{x_n y_{n-1}} = y_n > 1 \cdot 1 = 1$. Hence by induction, $x_n > y_n > 1$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

Now $y_n < x_n$ implies $2y_n < x_n + y_n$. Thus

$$x_{n+1} = \frac{2x_n y_n}{x_n + y_n} < x_n.$$

Hence, $\{x_n\}$ is decreasing and bounded below (by 1). Thus by the Monotone Convergence Theorem, $x_n \to x$ for some $x \in \mathbf{R}$.

On the other hand, $y_{n+1}$ is the geometric mean of $x_{n+1}$ and $y_n$, so by Exercise 1.2.6, $y_{n+1} \geq y_n$. Since $y_n$ is bounded above (by $x_0$), we conclude that $y_n \to y$ as $n \to \infty$ for some $y \in \mathbf{R}$.

b) Let $n \to \infty$ in the identity $y_{n+1} = \sqrt{x_{n+1}y_n}$. We obtain, from part a), $y = \sqrt{xy}$, i.e., $x = y$. A direct calculation yields $y_6 > 3.141557494$ and $x_7 < 3.14161012$.

**2.4 Cauchy sequences.**

**2.4.0.** a) False. $a_n = 1$ is Cauchy and $b_n = (-1)^n$ is bounded, but $a_n b_n = (-1)^n$ does not converge, hence cannot be Cauchy by Theorem 2.29.

b) False. $a_n = 1$ and $b_n = 1/n$ are Cauchy, but $a_n/b_n = n$ does not converge, hence cannot be Cauchy by Theorem 2.29.

c) True. If $(a_n + b_n)^{-1}$ converged to 0, then given any $M \in \mathbf{R}$, $M \neq 0$, there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n \geq N$ implies $|a_n + b_n|^{-1} < 1/|M|$. It follows that $n \geq N$ implies $|a_n + b_n| > |M| > 0 > M$. In particular, $|a_n + b_n|$ diverges to $\infty$. But if $a_n$ and $b_n$ are Cauchy, then by Theorem 2.29, $a_n + b_n \to x$ where $x \in \mathbf{R}$. Thus $|a_n + b_n| \to |x|$, NOT $\infty$.

d) False. If $x_{2^k} = \log k$ and $x_n = 0$ for $n \neq 2^k$, then $x_{2^k} - x_{2^{k-1}} = \log(k/(k-1)) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, but $x_k$ does not converge, hence cannot be Cauchy by Theorem 2.29.

**2.4.1.** Since $(2n^2 + 3)/(n^3 + 5n^2 + 3n + 1) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, it follows from the Squeeze Theorem that $x_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Hence by Theorem 2.29, $x_n$ is Cauchy.

**2.4.2.** If $x_n$ is Cauchy, then there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n \geq N$ implies $|x_n - x_N| < 1$. Since $x_n - x_N \in \mathbf{Z}$, it follows that $x_n = x_N$ for all $n \geq N$. Thus set $a := x_N$.

**2.4.3.** Suppose $x_n$ and $y_n$ are Cauchy and let $\varepsilon > 0$.

a) If $\alpha = 0$, then $\alpha x_n = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, hence is Cauchy. If $\alpha \neq 0$, then there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n, m \geq N$ implies $|x_n - x_m| < \varepsilon/|\alpha|$. Hence

$$|\alpha x_n - \alpha x_m| \leq |\alpha|\,|x_n - x_m| < \varepsilon$$

for $n, m \geq N$.

b) There is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n, m \geq N$ implies $|x_n - x_m|$ and $|y_n - y_m|$ are $< \varepsilon/2$. Hence

$$|x_n + y_n - (x_m + y_m)| \leq |x_n - x_m| + |y_n - y_m| < \varepsilon$$

for $n, m \geq N$.

c) By repeating the proof of Theorem 2.8, we can show that every Cauchy sequence is bounded. Thus choose $M > 0$ such that $|x_n|$ and $|y_n|$ are both $\leq M$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. There is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n, m \geq N$ implies $|x_n - x_m|$ and $|y_n - y_m|$ are both $< \varepsilon/(2M)$. Hence

$$|x_n y_n - (x_m y_m)| \leq |x_n - x_m|\,|y_m| + |x_n|\,|y_n - y_m| < \varepsilon$$

for $n, m \geq N$.

**2.4.4.** Let $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} x_k$ for $n = 2, 3, \ldots$. If $m > n$ then $s_{m+1} - s_n = \sum_{k=n}^{m} x_k$. Therefore, $s_n$ is Cauchy by hypothesis. Hence $s_n$ converges by Theorem 2.29.



Copyright © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall.

Introduction to Analysis Classic 4th edition Wade Solutions Manual

**2.4.5.** Let $x_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} (-1)^k/k$ for $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Suppose $n$ and $m$ are even and $m > n$. Then

$$S := \sum_{k=n}^{m} \frac{(-1)^k}{k} \equiv \frac{1}{n} - \left(\frac{1}{n+1} - \frac{1}{n+2}\right) - \cdots - \left(\frac{1}{m-1} - \frac{1}{m}\right).$$

Each term in parentheses is positive, so the absolute value of $S$ is dominated by $1/n$. Similar arguments prevail for all integers $n$ and $m$. Since $1/n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, it follows that $x_n$ satisfies the hypotheses of Exercise 2.4.4. Hence $x_n$ must converge to a finite real number.

**2.4.6.** By Exercise 1.4.4c, if $m \geq n$ then

$$|x_{m+1} - x_n| = |\sum_{k=n}^{m} (x_{k+1} - x_k)| \leq \sum_{k=n}^{m} \frac{1}{a^k} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{a^m} - (1 - \frac{1}{a^n})\right) \frac{1}{a-1}.$$

Thus $|x_{m+1} - x_n| \leq (1/a^n - 1/a^m)/(a-1) \to 0$ as $n, m \to \infty$ since $a > 1$. Hence $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy and must converge by Theorem 2.29.

**2.4.7.** a) Suppose $a$ is a cluster point for some set $E$ and let $r > 0$. Since $E \cap (a-r, a+r)$ contains infinitely many points, so does $E \cap (a-r, a+r) \setminus \{a\}$. Hence this set is nonempty. Conversely, if $E \cap (a-s, a+s) \setminus \{a\}$ is always nonempty for all $s > 0$ and $r > 0$ is given, choose $x_1 \in E \cap (a-r, a+r)$. If distinct points $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ have been chosen so that $x_k \in E \cap (a-r, a+r)$ and $s := \min\{|x_1 - a|, \ldots, |x_k - a|\}$, then by hypothesis there is an $x_{k+1} \in E \cap (a-s, a+s)$. By construction, $x_{k+1}$ does not equal any $x_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$. Hence $x_1, \ldots, x_{k+1}$ are distinct points in $E \cap (a-r, a+r)$. By induction, there are infinitely many points in $E \cap (a-r, a+r)$.

b) If $E$ is a bounded infinite set, then it contains distinct points $x_1, x_2, \ldots$. Since $\{x_n\} \subseteq E$, it is bounded. It follows from the Bolzano–Weierstrass Theorem that $x_n$ contains a convergent subsequence, i.e., there is an $a \in \mathbf{R}$ such that given $r > 0$ there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $k \geq N$ implies $|x_{n_k} - a| < r$. Since there are infinitely many $x_{n_k}$'s and they all belong to $E$, $a$ is by definition a cluster point of $E$.

**2.4.8.** a) To show $E := [a, b]$ is sequentially compact, let $x_n \in E$. By the Bolzano–Weierstrass Theorem, $x_n$ has a convergent subsequence, i.e., there is an $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ and integers $n_k$ such that $x_{n_k} \to x_0$ as $k \to \infty$. Moreover, by the Comparison Theorem, $x_n \in E$ implies $x_0 \in E$. Thus $E$ is sequentially compact by definition.

b) $(0, 1)$ is bounded and $1/n \in (0, 1)$ has no convergent subsequence with limit in $(0, 1)$.

c) $[0, \infty)$ is closed and $n \in [0, \infty)$ is a sequence which has no convergent subsequence.

### 2.5 Limits supremum and infimum.

**2.5.1.** a) Since $3 - (-1)^n = 2$ when $n$ is even and 4 when $n$ is odd, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n = 4$ and $\liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n = 2$.

b) Since $\cos(n\pi/2) = 0$ if $n$ is odd, 1 if $n = 4m$ and $-1$ if $n = 4m + 2$, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n = 1$ and $\liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n = -1$.

c) Since $(-1)^{n+1} + (-1)^n/n = -1 + 1/n$ when $n$ is even and $1 - 1/n$ when $n$ is odd, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n = 1$ and $\liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n = -1$.

d) Since $x_n \to 1/2$ as $n \to \infty$, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n = \liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n = 1/2$ by Theorem 2.36.

e) Since $|y_n| \leq M$, $|y_n/n| \leq M/n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Therefore, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n = \liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n = 0$ by Theorem 2.36.

f) Since $n(1 + (-1)^n) + n^{-1}((-1)^n - 1) = 2n$ when $n$ is even and $-2/n$ when $n$ is odd, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n = \infty$ and $\liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n = 0$.

g) Clearly $x_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Therefore, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n = \liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n = \infty$ by Theorem 2.36.

**2.5.2.** By Theorem 1.20,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}(-x_n) := \lim_{n\to\infty} (\inf_{k\geq n} (-x_k)) = -\lim_{n\to\infty} (\sup_{k\geq n} x_k) = -\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n.$$

A similar argument establishes the second identity.

**2.5.3.** a) Since $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\sup_{k\geq n} x_k) < r$, there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\sup_{k\geq N} x_k < r$, i.e., $x_k < r$ for all $k \geq N$.

b) Since $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\sup_{k\geq n} x_k) > r$, there is an $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\sup_{k\geq N} x_k > r$, i.e., there is a $k_1 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $x_{k_1} > r$. Suppose $k_\nu \in \mathbf{N}$ have been chosen so that $k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_j$ and $x_{k_\nu} > r$ for $\nu = 1, 2, \ldots, j$. Choose $N > k_j$ such that $\sup_{k\geq N} x_k > r$. Then there is a $k_{j+1} > N > k_j$ such that $x_{k_{j+1}} > r$. Hence by induction, there are distinct natural numbers $k_1, k_2, \ldots$ such that $x_{k_j} > r$ for all $j \in \mathbf{N}$.



Copyright © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall.

Introduction to Analysis Classic 4th edition Wade Solutions Manual

**2.5.4.** a) Since $\inf_{k\geq n} x_k + \inf_{k\geq n} y_k$ is a lower bound of $x_j + y_j$ for any $j \geq n$, we have $\inf_{k\geq n} x_k + \inf_{k\geq n} y_k \leq \inf_{j\geq n}(x_j + y_j)$. Taking the limit of this inequality as $n \to \infty$, we obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n + \liminf_{n\to\infty} y_n \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty}(x_n + y_n).$$

Note, we used Corollary 1.16 and the fact that the sum on the left is not of the form $\infty - \infty$. Similarly, for each $j \geq n$,

$$\inf_{k\geq n}(x_k + y_k) \leq x_j + y_j \leq \sup_{k\geq n} x_k + y_j.$$

Taking the infimum of this inequality over all $j \geq n$, we obtain $\inf_{k\geq n}(x_k + y_k) \leq \sup_{k\geq n} x_k + \inf_{j\geq n} y_j$. Therefore,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}(x_n + y_n) \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n + \liminf_{n\to\infty} y_n.$$

The remaining two inequalities follow from Exercise 2.5.2. For example,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n + \liminf_{n\to\infty} y_n &= -\liminf_{n\to\infty}(-x_n) - \limsup_{n\to\infty}(-y_n) \\ &\leq -\liminf_{n\to\infty}(-x_n - y_n) = \limsup_{n\to\infty}(x_n + y_n).\end{aligned}$$

b) It suffices to prove the first identity. By Theorem 2.36 and a),

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n + \liminf_{n\to\infty} y_n \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty}(x_n + y_n).$$

To obtain the reverse inequality, notice by the Approximation Property that for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$ there is a $j_n > n$ such that $\inf_{k\geq n}(x_k + y_k) > x_{j_n} - 1/n + y_{j_n}$. Hence

$$\inf_{k\geq n}(x_k + y_k) > x_{j_n} - \frac{1}{n} + \inf_{k\geq n} y_k$$

for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Taking the limit of this inequality as $n \to \infty$, we obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}(x_n + y_n) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} x_n + \liminf_{n\to\infty} y_n.$$

c) Let $x_n = (-1)^n$ and $y_n = (-1)^{n+1}$. Then the limits infimum are both $-1$, the limits supremum are both 1, but $x_n + y_n = 0 \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. If $x_n = (-1)^n$ and $y_n = 0$ then

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}(x_n + y_n) = -1 < 1 = \limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n + \liminf_{n\to\infty} y_n.$$

**2.5.5.** a) For any $j \geq n$, $x_j \leq \sup_{k\geq n} x_k$ and $y_j \leq \sup_{k\geq n} y_k$. Multiplying these inequalities, we have $x_j y_j \leq (\sup_{k\geq n} x_k)(\sup_{k\geq n} y_k)$, i.e.,

$$\sup_{j\geq n} x_j y_j \leq (\sup_{k\geq n} x_k)(\sup_{k\geq n} y_k).$$

Taking the limit of this inequality as $n \to \infty$ establishes a). The inequality can be strict because if

$$x_n = 1 - y_n = \begin{cases} 0 & n \text{ even} \\ 1 & n \text{ odd} \end{cases}$$

then $\limsup_{n\to\infty}(x_n y_n) = 0 < 1 = (\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n)(\limsup_{n\to\infty} y_n)$.

b) By a),

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}(x_n y_n) = -\limsup_{n\to\infty}(-x_n y_n) \geq -\limsup_{n\to\infty}(-x_n)\limsup_{n\to\infty} y_n = \liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n \limsup_{n\to\infty} y_n.$$

**2.5.6.** *Case 1.* $x = \infty$. By hypothesis, $C := \limsup_{n\to\infty} y_n > 0$. Let $M > 0$ and choose $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n \geq N$ implies $x_n \geq 2M/C$ and $\sup_{n\geq N} y_n > C/2$. Then $\sup_{k\geq N}(x_k y_k) \geq x_n y_n \geq (2M/C)y_n$ for any $n \geq N$ and $\sup_{k\geq N}(x_k y_k) \geq (2M/C)\sup_{n\geq N} y_n > M$. Therefore, $\limsup_{n\to\infty}(x_n y_n) = \infty$.



Copyright © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall.

Introduction to Analysis Classic 4th edition Wade Solutions Manual

*Case 2.* $0 \le x < \infty$. By Exercise 2.5.6a and Theorem 2.36,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}(x_n y_n) \le (\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n)(\limsup_{n\to\infty} y_n) = x \limsup_{n\to\infty} y_n.$$

On the other hand, given $\epsilon > 0$ choose $n \in \mathbf{N}$ so that $x_k > x - \epsilon$ for $k \ge n$. Then $x_k y_k \ge (x-\epsilon)y_k$ for each $k \ge n$, i.e., $\sup_{k\ge n}(x_k y_k) \ge (x-\epsilon)\sup_{k\ge n} y_k$. Taking the limit of this inequality as $n \to \infty$ and as $\epsilon \to 0$, we obtain

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}(x_n y_n) \ge x \limsup_{n\to\infty} y_n.$$

**2.5.7.** It suffices to prove the first identity. Let $s = \inf_{n\in\mathbf{N}}(\sup_{k\ge n} x_k)$.
*Case 1.* $s = \infty$. Then $\sup_{k\ge n} x_k = \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ so by definition,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty}(\sup_{k\ge n} x_k) = \infty = s.$$

*Case 2.* $s = -\infty$. Let $M > 0$ and choose $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\sup_{k\ge N} x_k \le -M$. Then $\sup_{k\ge n} x_k \le \sup_{k\ge N} x_k \le -M$ for all $n \ge N$, i.e., $\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n = -\infty$.
*Case 3.* $-\infty < s < -\infty$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and use the Approximation Property to choose $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\sup_{k\ge N} x_k < s + \epsilon$. Since $\sup_{k\ge n} x_k \le \sup_{k\ge N} x_k < s + \epsilon$ for all $n \ge N$, it follows that

$$s - \epsilon < s \le \sup_{k\ge n} x_k < s + \epsilon$$

for $n \ge N$, i.e., $\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n = s$.

**2.5.8.** It suffices to establish the first identity. Let $s = \liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n$.
*Case 1.* $s = 0$. Then by Theorem 2.35 there is a subsequence $k_j$ such that $x_{k_j} \to 0$, i.e., $1/x_{k_j} \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$. In particular, $\sup_{k\ge n}(1/x_k) = \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, i.e., $\limsup_{n\to\infty}(1/x_n) = \infty = 1/s$.
*Case 2.* $s = \infty$. Then $x_k \to \infty$, i.e., $1/x_k \to 0$, as $k \to \infty$. Thus by Theorem 2.36, $\limsup_{n\to\infty}(1/x_n) = 0 = 1/s$.
*Case 3.* $0 < s < \infty$. Fix $j \ge n$. Since $1/\inf_{k\ge n} x_k \ge 1/x_j$ implies $1/\inf_{k\ge n} x_k \ge \sup_{j\ge n}(1/x_j)$, it is clear that $1/s \ge \limsup_{n\to\infty}(1/x_n)$. On the other hand, given $\epsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}$, choose $j > N$ such that $\inf_{k\ge n} x_k + \epsilon > x_j$, i.e., $1/(\inf_{k\ge n} x_k + \epsilon) < 1/x_j \le \sup_{k\ge n}(1/x_k)$. Taking the limit of this inequality as $n \to \infty$ and as $\epsilon \to 0$, we conclude that $1/s \le \limsup_{n\to\infty}(1/x_n)$.

**2.5.9.** If $x_n \to 0$, then $|x_n| \to 0$. Thus by Theorem 2.36, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} |x_n| = 0$. Conversely, if $\limsup_{n\to\infty} |x_n| \le 0$, then

$$0 \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} |x_n| \le \limsup_{n\to\infty} |x_n| \le 0,$$

implies that the limits supremum and infimum of $|x_n|$ are equal (to zero). Hence by Theorem 2.36, the limit exists and equals zero.



Copyright © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall.

Introduction to Analysis Classic 4th edition Wade Solutions Manual