

LAST TIME:

- A SET  $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  IS OPEN IF FOR EVERY  $a \in \mathcal{O}$ , THERE IS AN  $\epsilon$ -NEIGHBORHOOD  $V_\epsilon(a) \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ .
- $x \in A$  IS A LIMIT POINT OF A IF EVERY  $\epsilon$ -NEIGHBORHOOD OF  $x$  IS CONTAINED IN  $A$ .
- A SET  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  IS CLOSED IF IT CONTAINS ALL OF ITS LIMIT POINTS.
- A SET  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  IS COMPACT IF EVERY SEQUENCE OF POINTS IN  $K$  HAS A CONVERGENT SUBSEQUENCE WITH A LIMIT IN  $K$ .

DEF: GIVEN ANY  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , LET  $L$  BE THE SET OF ALL LIMIT POINTS OF  $A$ .  
THEN THE CLOSURE OF A IS  $\bar{A} = A \cup L$ .

EX: LET  $A = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$ . THEN  $\bar{A} = A \cup \{0\}$ .

- $\overline{(0,1)} = [0,1]$
- $\overline{[0,1]} = [0,1]$
- $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{R}$
- $\overline{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R}$

THM: FOR ANY  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\bar{A}$  IS CLOSED AND  $\bar{A}$  IS THE SMALLEST CLOSED SET CONTAINING  $A$ .

PF  
IN HW

DEF GIVEN  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , THE COMPLEMENT OF A IS  ~~$A^c = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \notin A\}$~~

$$A^c = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \notin A\}.$$

Thm:

- A SET  $O$  IS OPEN  $\iff O^c$  IS CLOSED.
- A SET  $E$  IS CLOSED  $\iff E^c$  IS OPEN

PP  $\implies$  SPOSE  $O$  IS OPEN. TO SEE  $O^c$  IS CLOSED, WE HAVE TO SHOW IT CONTAINS ITS LIMIT POINTS. LET  $x$  BE A LIMIT POINT OF  $O^c$ , SO FOR EVERY  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $V_\epsilon(x) \cap O^c \neq \emptyset$ .

BUT THEN  $x \notin O$ , FOR IF SO, EVERY POINT OF  $V_\epsilon(x)$  IS IN  $O$ , I.E.  $V_\epsilon(x) \cap O^c = \emptyset$ .

$\impliedby$  SPOSE  $O^c$  IS CLOSED. LET  $x$  BE ANY POINT OF  $O$ . SINCE  $O^c$  IS CLOSED  $x$  IS NOT A LIMIT POINT OF  $O^c$ . BUT THEN THERE MUST BE A NEIGHBORHOOD  $V_\epsilon(x)$  THAT IS DISJOINT FROM  $O^c$ . THAT IS,  $V_\epsilon(x) \subseteq O$ .

SINCE  $(E^c)^c = E$ , THIS GIVES THE SECOND STATEMENT.

Thm: IF  $E_i$  ARE CLOSED,  $\bigcup_{i=1}^K E_i$  IS A CLOSED SET.

IF  $\{E_\alpha\}$  IS A COLLECTION OF CLOSED SETS  $\bigcap_{\alpha \in \Lambda} E_\alpha$  IS CLOSED.

THIS FOLLOWS FROM  $(\bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} E_\alpha)^c = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Lambda} E_\alpha^c$

AND  $(\bigcap_{\alpha \in \Lambda} E_\alpha)^c = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} E_\alpha^c$

Thm:  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  IS COMPACT  $\iff$   $K$  IS CLOSED AND BOUNDED

Pf/  $\Rightarrow$  SPROZE  $K$  IS COMPACT. LET'S SHOW IT IS BOUNDED.

IF IT IS NOT BOUNDED, THEN IT HAS ARBITRARILY LARGE ELEMENTS. IE, FOR EACH  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , WE CAN FIND (NOT NECESSARILY DISTINCT)  $x_n \in K$  WITH  $|x_n| > n$ .

BUT IF  $K$  IS COMPACT,  $\{x_n\}$  HAS A CONVERGENT SUBSEQUENCE  $\{x_{n_j}\}$ .  $\iff$  BECAUSE  $\{x_{n_j}\}$  IS UNBOUNDED AND CONVERGENT SEQs ARE BDD.

$K$  IS ALSO CLOSED: SUPPSE  $x_n \rightarrow x$  WITH  $x_n \in K$ .

WE MUST SHOW  $x \in K$ .

BUT SINCE  $K$  IS COMPACT, THERE IS A CONVERGENT SUBSEQ OF  $\{x_n\}$  WHOSE LIMIT IS IN  $K$ .

BUT EVERY SUBSEQUENCE OF A CONVERGENT SEQUENCE HAS THE SAME LIMIT. THUS  $x \in K$ .

←/ HOMEWORK.

THERE ARE MANY PARALLELS BETWEEN CLOSED INTERVALS AND COMPACT SETS.

FOR EXAMPLE:

NESTED COMPACT SET PROP.

SUPPSE  $K_n$  IS COMPACT <sup>AND NONEMPTY</sup> FOR EACH  $n$ , WITH

$$K_1 \supseteq K_2 \supseteq K_3 \supseteq \dots$$

THEN  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n \neq \emptyset$ .

Pf/ FOR EACH  $n$ , LET  $x_n \in K_n$ .

SINCE THE SETS ARE NESTED,  $x_n \in K_j$  FOR ALL  $j \leq n$ .

THIS MEANS  $\{x_n\} \subseteq K_1$

NOW SINCE  $K_1$  IS COMPACT,  $\{x_n\}$  HAS A CONVERGENT SUBSEQUENCE WITH A LIMIT IN  $K_1$ , I.E.  $x_{n_j} \rightarrow x \in K_1$

BUT ALSO,  $x \in K_n$  FOR EVERY  $n$ .

~~RECALL~~ GIVEN ANY  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , WE HAVE  $X_{n_0} \in K_{n_0}$  AND

ALSO  $X_n \in K_{n_0}$  FOR ALL  $n > n_0$ . BUT THIS MEANS

THAT  $X \in K_{n_0}$  SINCE THE LIMIT OF THE SUBSEQ  $\{X_{n_j}\}_{n_j > n_0}$  IS ALSO  $X$ .

SOMETIMES COMPACT SET IN  $\mathbb{R}$  IS DEFINED AS

CLOSED AND BOUNDED; THESE DEFINITIONS ARE EQUIVALENT (ALTHOUGH THE DEF WE TOOK IS MORE GENERAL.)

THERE IS ANOTHER ~~DEFINITION~~ <sup>EQUIVALENT</sup> OF COMPACT IN TERMS OF OPEN SETS, BUT WE NEED ANOTHER IDEA FIRST.

DEF: LET  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . AN OPEN COVER OF A IS A COLLECTION OF OPEN SETS  $\{\mathcal{O}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Lambda\}$  [COULD BE INFINITE, EVEN UNCOUNTABLE]

SO THAT

$$A \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathcal{O}_\alpha.$$

A FINITE SUBCOVER IS A FINITE COLLECTION OF

THESE  $\mathcal{O}_{\alpha_j}$  SO THAT  $A \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^n \mathcal{O}_{\alpha_j}$

EXAMPLE: CONSIDER  $(0,1)$ .

~~FOR~~ FOR EACH  $x \in (0,1)$ , LET  $\mathcal{O}_x = \text{~~the~~ } (x/2, 1)$ .

NOTE THAT THIS IS AN OPEN COVER, SINCE

$$x \in (x/2, 1) \text{ FOR EVERY } x \in (0,1).$$

BUT THERE IS NO FINITE SUBCOVER. IF THERE

WERE, IT WOULD LOOK LIKE  $\{\mathcal{O}_{x_1}, \mathcal{O}_{x_2}, \dots, \mathcal{O}_{x_n}\}$ .

LET  $x_0 = \min(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  AND LET  $0 < y \leq x_0/2$ .

THEN  $y \notin \mathcal{O}_{x_i}$  FOR  $i=1 \dots n$ .

==

NOW LETS TRY THE SAME FOR  $[0,1]$ .

NEITHER 0 NOR 1 ARE IN ANY OF THE SETS  $\mathcal{O}_x$ ,

SO WE MUST COVER THEM SOMEHOW.

ANY OPEN SET CONTAINING 0 MUST HAVE A SUBSET ~~of~~  $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$  FOR SOME  $\epsilon > 0$ ; SIMILARLY,  $(1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon)$  IS IN ANY OPEN AROUND 1.

$$\text{LET } \mathcal{O}_0 = (-\epsilon, \epsilon), \quad \mathcal{O}_1 = (1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon).$$

THEN  $\{\mathcal{O}_0, \mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_x \mid x \in (0,1)\}$  COVERS  $(0,1)$ .

BUT IF WE TAKE  $x^*$  SO THAT  $x^*/2 < \epsilon$ , THE COLLECTION

$$\{\mathcal{O}_0, \mathcal{O}_{x^*}, \mathcal{O}_1\} \text{ COVERS } [0,1] \text{ AND IS A FINITE SUBCOVER.}$$

# THE HEINE-BOREL THEOREM

LET  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . THE FOLLOWING ARE EQUIVALENT:

- (i)  $K$  IS COMPACT
- (ii)  $K$  IS CLOSED AND BOUNDED
- (iii) EVERY OPEN COVER OF  $K$  ADMITS A FINITE SUBCOVER.

PF/ WE'VE SEEN (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (ii).

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) / TO SEE THAT  $K$  IS BOUNDED,

LET  $\mathcal{O}_x = V_1(x) = (x-1, x+1)$ .

CERTAINLY  $\{\mathcal{O}_x \mid x \in K\}$  IS AN OPEN COVER.

BUT IF (iii) HOLDS, THERE IS A SUBCOVER

$\{\mathcal{O}_{x_1}, \mathcal{O}_{x_2}, \dots, \mathcal{O}_{x_n}\}$  WHICH COVERS.

SINCE EACH  $\mathcal{O}_{x_i}$  IS BOUNDED, SO IS THE UNION. THUS  $K$  IS BOUNDED.

NOW TO SEE  $K$  CLOSED, SUPPSE NOT. LET  $y_n \in K$  WITH  $\{y_n\}$  CAUCHY ~~BUT~~ <sup>(SO</sup>  $y_n \rightarrow y$ ) AND  $y \notin K$ .

SINCE  $y \notin K$ ,  $|x-y| > 0$  FOR EVERY  $x \in K$ .

NOW LET  $\mathcal{O}_x = (x - \frac{|x-y|}{2}, x + \frac{|x-y|}{2})$  FOR EACH  $x \in K$ .

(iii)  $\Rightarrow \{\mathcal{O}_x\}$  HAS A FINITE SUBCOVER,  $\{\mathcal{O}_{x_1}, \mathcal{O}_{x_2}, \dots, \mathcal{O}_{x_n}\}$ .  $\{\mathcal{O}_x\}$  IS AN OPEN COVER OF  $K$ .

LET  $\epsilon_0 = \min \{\frac{|x_i - y|}{2} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ . SINCE  $y_n \rightarrow y$ , THERE

IS  $y_N \in K$  WITH  $|y_N - y| < \epsilon_0$ . BUT THEN  $y_N \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}_{x_i}$   ~~$\Rightarrow$~~

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  iii

SUPPOSE  $K$  IS CLOSED AND BOUNDED (AND HENCE COMPACT)

AND LET  $\{O_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  BE AN OPEN COVER OF  $K$ .  
LETS ASSUME NO FINITE SUBCOVER EXISTS.

SINCE  $K$  IS BOUNDED, THERE IS A CLOSED INTERVAL

$[-M, M] = I_0 \supseteq K$ .

NOW LET  $I_1^- = [-M, 0]$ ,  $I_1^+ = [0, M]$ , AT LEAST ONE OF THESE IS NONEMPTY AND DOES NOT ADMIT INTERSECTION WITH  $K$  A FINITE SUBCOVER; CALL THIS  $I_1$ .

NOW SUBDIVIDE  $I_1$  TO GET  $I_2$  WITH  $|I_2| = \frac{1}{2}|I_1|$ ,  $I_2 \cap K \neq \emptyset$

AND  $I_2$  NOT ADMITTING A FINITE SUBCOVER.

NOW WE HAVE  $I_0 \supset I_1 \supset I_2 \supset \dots$

WITH  $I_n \cap K$  NOT ADMITTING A FINITE SUBCOVER FOR EVERY  $n$

BUT SINCE  $|I_n| \leq \frac{|I_0|}{2^n}$  AND  $I_n \cap K \neq \emptyset$ ,

THERE MUST BE  ~~$x \in I_n \cap K$  FOR ALL  $n$~~

$x \in K$  WITH  $x \in I_n$  FOR ALL  $n$  (RECALL  $K$  IS CLOSED)

SINCE  $\{O_\lambda\}$  WAS A COVER OF  $K$ ,

THERE IS AN ELEMENT  $O_{\lambda_0}$  WITH  $x \in O_{\lambda_0}$

AND HENCE (SINCE IT IS OPEN)  $O_{\lambda_0} \supset I_m$  FOR  $m$  SUFF. LARGE.

BUT  $I_m$  IS SUPPOSED TO NOT ADMIT A FINITE SUBCOVER AND IT IS COVERED BY ONE ELT.

