Analysis I (Math 3205) Fall 2020

Book I

Intermediate Value Theorem

If f. [a, 6] - R is continuous with f(a) < 0 < f(b), then there exists $e \in (a,b)$ such that f(c) = 0. How does anyone prove this ? what is your experience with reading / writing proofs ? $(b,f(b)) \quad The \quad theorem \quad boes not hold \quad over \quad Q \\ (a,f(a)) \quad (a,f(a)) \quad eg \quad f(x) = x^2 - 2 \\ o \quad and \quad z \ge \longrightarrow Q \quad is \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad is \quad no \\ continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(z) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(o) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(o) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(o) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) < o < f(o) \quad but \quad there \quad continuous, \quad f(o) \quad but$ Solution of front = 0 in Q. R is not complete: IR is complete. The complete statement of the Interarediate Value Theorem. For all f [a,b] -> IR. if f is continuous and f(a) < 0 < f(b), then there exists < E (a,b) such that

"for al", for every, "for each": Universal quantifiers "there is", "there exists" existential quantifiers For all & there exists y such that x < y. (True in R) There exists y such that for all x, x < g (False in R) Definition of a Limit Lie Junit We say lim FIR = L if the following Note: It doesn't metter condition holds: have shat f(a) is or even shather or not it's defined For all 2 > 0, there exists S>O such that If(x)-LICE whenever O< |x-a|<S. f(x) is within & of L x is within S 18. for all 270, there boists 820 such that for ell x, if 0< (x-a)<5, then |f(x) - L| < 2.

Let's prove that $\lim_{x \to 2} (5x+1) = 11$.

If we need fir) to be within 2 of 11, how close does x have to be Rough version: f(x) = 5x+1. fo 2 ? |f(x) - 11| < 2 \iff $||+\epsilon < f(x) < 1|+\epsilon$ II- 2 < 5x+1 < 11+2</p> ← 10-2 <5x < 10+2 ← 2 - ²/₅ < x < 2+ ²/₅ (=) |x-2| < 2 5 (Adually): let 2>0. Then whenever 0< |x-2| < 2 we have 2-2 < x < 2+2 so ||-z < 5x+1 < ||+z i.e. |f(x)-|| < z. Another proof Suppose line f(x) = 4 and $\lim_{X \to 7} g(x) = 5$. Prove that $(\lim_{X \to 7} (f(x) + g(x))) = 9$. Rough version: Given z > 0 we must find s > 0 such that $|f(x) + g(x) - q| < \varepsilon$ whenever 0 < |x - 7| < 5. Since $\lim_{X \to 7} f(x) = 9$, we can find s > 0 such that $|f(x) - 4| < \varepsilon$ whenever D < |x-7| -8. Also since lim g(x) = 5, we can find 8' such that |q(x)-7 < 2 usheneren 0 < |x-7 | < S. 4-E < f(x) < 4+E whenever 7-8 < r < 7+8

7-8 < x < 7+8 i.e. |x-7| < 82-8 < x < 7+8 i.e. |x-7| < 8 $4-\varepsilon < f(x) < 4+\varepsilon$ whenever $5-\varepsilon < g(x) < 5+\varepsilon$ whenever 9-22 < f1x)+g(x) < 9+22 whenever 0< |x-7 | < min 18, 8'3 H(x)+g(x)-9/<22 whenever 0< |x-7| < min 18,5'3. Actual (final) proof: Let z > 0. There exists S such that $|f(x)-q| < \frac{z}{2}$ whenever 0 < |x-7| < S. Also there exists S'>0 such that $|g(x)-5| < \frac{z}{2}$ whenever 0 < |x-7| < S'. Then $|f(x) + g(x) - 9| \leq |f(x) - 4| + |g(x) - 5| < \frac{2}{2} + \frac{2}{2} = \varepsilon$ vohenever 0 < |x-7| < nin \$5.5'} Note: The triangle inequality says (a+b| ≤ |a| + |b| for all a,b. $|f_{(x)}+g_{(x)}-q| = |f_{(x)}-q+g_{(x)}-s|$ 1-f(x)+g(x)-9 < 2 $|f(x)-4+g(x)-5| \leq |f(x)-4| + (g(x)-5)|$ $|f(x) + g(x) - q| < \frac{2}{2} + \frac{2}{2}$

