NOTE OF ELEMENTARY ANALYSIS II

CHI-WAI LEUNG

1. Riemann Integrals

Notation 1.1. .

(i) : *All functions* $f, g, h...$ *are bounded real valued functions defined on* $[a, b]$. *And* $m \leq f \leq M$.
(ii) : $\mathcal{P} : a = x_0 < x_1 < .... < x_n = b$ *denotes a partition on* $[a, b]$; $\Delta x_i = x_i - x_{i-1}$ *and* $\|\mathcal{P}\| = \max \Delta x_i$.
(iii) : $M_i(f, \mathcal{P}) := \sup\{f(x) : x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i\}$; $m_i(f, \mathcal{P}) := \inf\{f(x) : x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i\}$. *And* $\omega_i(f, \mathcal{P}) = M_i(f, \mathcal{P}) - m_i(f, \mathcal{P})$.
(iv) : $U(f, \mathcal{P}) := \sum M_i(f, \mathcal{P})\Delta x_i$; $L(f, \mathcal{P}) := \sum m_i(f, \mathcal{P})\Delta x_i$.
(v) : $\mathcal{R}(f, \mathcal{P}, \{\xi_i\}) := \sum f(\xi_i)\Delta x_i$, *where* $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$.
(vi) : $\mathcal{R}[a, b]$ *is the class of all Riemann integral functions on* $[a, b]$.

Definition 1.2. *We say that the Riemann sum* $\mathcal{R}(f, \mathcal{P}, \{\xi_i\})$ *converges to a number* A *as* $\|\mathcal{P}\| \to 0$ *if for any* $\varepsilon > 0$, *there is* $\delta > 0$ *such that*

$$|A - \mathcal{R}(f, \mathcal{P}, \{\xi_i\})| < \varepsilon$$

for any $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ *whenever* $\|\mathcal{P}\| < \delta$.

Theorem 1.3. $f \in \mathcal{R}[a, b]$ *if and only if for any* $\varepsilon > 0$, *there is a partition* $\mathcal{P}$ *such that* $U(f, \mathcal{P}) - L(f, \mathcal{P}) < \varepsilon$.

Lemma 1.4. $f \in \mathcal{R}[a, b]$ *if and only if for any* $\varepsilon > 0$, *there is* $\delta > 0$ *such that* $U(f, \mathcal{P}) - L(f, \mathcal{P}) < \varepsilon$ *whenever* $\|\mathcal{P}\| < \delta$.

Proof. The converse follows from Theorem 1.3.
Assume that f is integrable over $[a, b]$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there is a partition $\mathcal{Q} : a = y_0 < ... < y_l = b$ on $[a, b]$ such that $U(f, Q) - L(f, Q) < \varepsilon$. Now take $0 < \delta < \varepsilon / l$. Suppose that $\mathcal{P} : a = x_0 < ... < x_n = b$ with $\|\mathcal{P}\| < \delta$. Then we have

$$U(f, \mathcal{P}) - L(f, \mathcal{P}) = I + II$$

where

$$I = \sum_{i : Q \cap (x_{i-1}, x_i) = \emptyset} \omega_i(f, \mathcal{P})\Delta x_i;$$

and

$$II = \sum_{i : Q \cap (x_{i-1}, x_i) \neq \emptyset} \omega_i(f, \mathcal{P})\Delta x_i$$

Notice that we have

$$I \leq U(f, \mathcal{Q}) - L(f, \mathcal{Q}) < \varepsilon$$

and

$$II \leq (M - m) \sum_{i : Q \cap (x_{i-1}, x_i) \neq \emptyset} \Delta x_i \leq (M - m) \cdot l \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{l} = (M - m)\varepsilon.$$

The proof is finished. □

Date: April 12, 2016.

Theorem 1.5. *$f \in \mathcal{R}[a,b]$ if and only if the Riemann sum $\mathcal{R}(f,\mathcal{P},\{\xi_i\})$ is convergent. In this case, $\mathcal{R}(f,\mathcal{P},\{\xi_i\})$ converges to $\int_a^b f(x)dx$ as $\|\mathcal{P}\| \to 0$.*

Proof. For the proof $(\Rightarrow)$: we first note that we always have

$$L(f,\mathcal{P}) \leq \mathcal{R}(f,\mathcal{P},\{\xi_i\}) \leq U(f,\mathcal{P})$$

and

$$L(f,\mathcal{P}) \leq \int_a^b f(x)dx \leq U(f,\mathcal{P})$$

for any $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ and for all partition $\mathcal{P}$.

Now let $\varepsilon > 0$. Lemma 1.4 gives $\delta > 0$ such that $U(f,\mathcal{P}) - L(f,\mathcal{P}) < \varepsilon$ as $\|\mathcal{P}\| < \delta$. Then we have

$$|\int_a^b f(x)dx - \mathcal{R}(f,\mathcal{P},\{\xi_i\})| < \varepsilon$$

as $\|\mathcal{P}\| < \delta$. The necessary part is proved and $\mathcal{R}(f,\mathcal{P},\{\xi_i\})$ converges to $\int_a^b f(x)dx$.

For $(\Leftarrow)$: there exists a number A such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$, we have

$$A - \varepsilon < \mathcal{R}(f,\mathcal{P},\{\xi_i\}) < A + \varepsilon$$

for any partition $\mathcal{P}$ with $\|\mathcal{P}\| < \delta$ and $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$.

Now fix a partition $\mathcal{P}$ with $\|\mathcal{P}\| < \delta$. Then for each $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$, choose $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ such that $M_i(f,\mathcal{P}) - \varepsilon \leq f(\xi_i)$. This implies that we have

$$U(f,\mathcal{P}) - \varepsilon(b-a) \leq \mathcal{R}(f,\mathcal{P},\{\xi_i\}) < A + \varepsilon.$$

So we have shown that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a partition $\mathcal{P}$ such that

$$\overline{\int_a^b} f(x)dx \leq U(f,\mathcal{P}) \leq A + \varepsilon(1 + b - a). \tag{1.1}$$

By considering $-f$, note that the Riemann sum of $-f$ will converge to $-A$. The inequality 1.1 will imply that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a partition $\mathcal{P}$ such that

$$A - \varepsilon(1 + b - a) \leq \underline{\int_a^b} f(x)dx \leq \overline{\int_a^b} f(x)dx \leq A + \varepsilon(1 + b - a).$$

The proof is finished. □

Theorem 1.6. *Let $f \in \mathcal{R}[c,d]$ and let $\phi : [a,b] \longrightarrow [c,d]$ be a strictly increasing C^1 function with $f(a) = c$ and $f(b) = d$.*
Then $f \circ \phi \in \mathcal{R}[a,b]$, moreover, we have

$$\int_c^d f(x)dx = \int_a^b f(\phi(t))\phi'(t)dt.$$

Proof. Let $A = \int_c^d f(x)dx$. By Theorem 1.5, we need to show that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k| < \varepsilon$$

for all $\xi_k \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$ whenever $\mathcal{Q} : a = t_0 < ... < t_m = b$ with $\|\mathcal{Q}\| < \delta$.

Now let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by Lemma 1.4 and Theorem 1.5, there is $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$|A - \sum f(\eta_k)\triangle x_k| < \varepsilon \tag{1.2}$$

and

$$\sum \omega_k(f,\mathcal{P})\triangle x_k < \varepsilon \tag{1.3}$$

for all $\eta_k \in [x_{k-1}, x_k]$ whenever $\mathcal{P} : c = x_0 < ... < x_m = d$ with $\|\mathcal{P}\| < \delta_1$.
Now put $x = \phi(t)$ for $t \in [a, b]$.
Now since ϕ and ϕ' are continuous on $[a, b]$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that $|\phi(t) - \phi(t')| < \delta_1$ and $|\phi'(t) - \phi'(t')| < \varepsilon$ for all t, t' $in[a, b]$ with $|t - t'| < \delta$.
Now let $\mathcal{Q} : a = t_0 < ... < t_m = b$ with $\|\mathcal{Q}\| < \delta$. If we put $x_k = \phi(t_k)$, then $\mathcal{P} : c = x_0 < .... < x_m = d$ is a partition on $[c, d]$ with $\|\mathcal{P}\| < \delta_1$ because ϕ is strictly increasing.
Note that the Mean Value Theorem implies that for each $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$, there is $\xi_k^* \in (t_{k-1}, t_k)$ such that

$$\triangle x_k = \phi(t_k) - \phi(t_{k-1}) = \phi'(\xi_k^*)\triangle t_k.$$

This yields that

$$|\triangle x_k - \phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k| < \varepsilon\triangle t_k \tag{1.4}$$

for any $\xi_k \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$ for all $k = 1, ..., m$ because of the choice of δ.
Now for any $\xi_k \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k| \leq\; & |A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\triangle t_k| \\ & + |\sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\triangle t_k - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k| \\ & + |\sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k| \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

Notice that inequality 1.2 implies that

$$|A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\triangle t_k| = |A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\triangle x_k| < \varepsilon.$$

Also, since we have $|\phi'(\xi_k^*) - \phi'(\xi_k)| < \varepsilon$ for all $k = 1, .., m$, we have

$$|\sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\triangle t_k - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k| \leq M(b - a)\varepsilon$$

where $|f(x)| \leq M$ for all $x \in [c, d]$.
On the other hand, by using inequality 1.4 we have

$$|\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k| \leq \triangle x_k + \varepsilon\triangle t_k$$

for all k. This, together with inequality 1.3 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k| \\ & \leq \sum \omega_k(f, \mathcal{P})|\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k| \; (\because \phi(\xi_k^*), \phi(\xi_k) \in [x_{k-1}, x_k]) \\ & \leq \sum \omega_k(f, \mathcal{P})(\triangle x_k + \varepsilon\triangle t_k) \\ & \leq \varepsilon + 2M(b - a)\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Finally by inequality 1.5, we have

$$|A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k)\triangle t_k| \leq \varepsilon + M(b - a)\varepsilon + \varepsilon + 2M(b - a)\varepsilon.$$

The proof is finished. □

Example 1.7. *Define (*formally*) an improper integral* $\Gamma(s)$ *(called the* Γ*-function) as follows:*

$$\Gamma(s) := \int_0^\infty x^{s-1}e^{-x}dx$$

for $s \in \mathbb{R}$*. Then* $\Gamma(s)$ *is convergent if and only if* $s > 0$*.*

Proof. Put $I(s) := \int_0^1 x^{s-1}e^{-x}dx$ and $II(s) := \int_1^\infty x^{s-1}e^{-x}dx$. We first claim that the integral $II(s)$ is convergent for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.
In fact, if we fix $s \in \mathbb{R}$, then we have

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{x^{s-1}}{e^{x/2}} = 0.$$

So there is $M > 1$ such that $\frac{x^{s-1}}{e^{x/2}} \le 1$ for all $x \ge M$. Thus we have

$$0 \le \int_M^\infty x^{s-1}e^{-x}dx \le \int_M^\infty e^{-x/2}dx < \infty.$$

Therefore we need to show that the integral $I(s)$ is convergent if and only if $s > 0$.
Note that for $0 < \eta < 1$, we have

$$0 \le \int_\eta^1 x^{s-1}e^{-x}dx \le \int_\eta^1 x^{s-1}dx = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{s}(1-\eta^s) & \text{if } s-1 \neq -1; \\ -\ln\eta & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

Thus the integral $I(s) = \lim_{\eta\to 0+} \int_\eta^1 x^{s-1}e^{-x}dx$ is convergent if $s > 0$.
Conversely, we also have

$$\int_\eta^1 x^{s-1}e^{-x}dx \ge e^{-1}\int_\eta^1 x^{s-1}dx = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{-1}}{s}(1-\eta^s) & \text{if } s-1 \neq -1; \\ -e^{-1}\ln\eta & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

So if $s \le 0$, then $\int_\eta^1 x^{s-1}e^{-x}dx$ is divergent as $\eta \to 0+$. The result follows. □

2. Uniform Convergence of a Sequence of Differentiable Functions

Proposition 2.1. *Let $f_n : (a,b) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of functions. Assume that it satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) : $f_n(x)$ point-wise converges to a function $f(x)$ on (a,b);
(ii) : each f_n is a C^1 function on (a,b);
(iii) : $f'_n \to g$ uniformly on (a,b).

Then f is a C^1-function on (a,b) with $f' = g$.

Proof. Fix $c \in (a,b)$. Then for each x with $c < x < b$ (similarly, we can prove it in the same way as $a < x < c$), the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus implies that

$$f_n(x) = \int_c^x f'(t)dt.$$

Since $f'_n \to g$ uniformly on (a,b), we see that

$$\int_c^x f'_n(t)dt \longrightarrow \int_c^x g(t)dt.$$

This gives

$$f(x) = \int_c^x g(t)dt. \tag{2.1}$$

for all $x \in (c,b)$. On the other hand, g is continuous on (a,b) since each f'_n is continuous and $f'_n \to g$ uniformly on (a,b). Equation 2.1 will tell us that f' exists and $f' = g$ on (c,b). The proof is finished. □

Proposition 2.2. *Let (f_n) be a sequence of differentiable functions defined on (a,b). Assume that*

(i): there is a point $c \in (a,b)$ such that $\lim f_n(c)$ exists;
(ii): f'_n converges uniformly to a function g on (a,b).

Then

(a): f_n converges uniformly to a function f on (a,b);
(b): f is differentiable on (a,b) and $f'=g$.

Proof. For Part (a), we will make use the Cauchy theorem.
Let $\varepsilon>0$. Then by the assumptions (i) and (ii), there is a positive integer N such that

$$|f_m(c)-f_n(c)|<\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |f'_m(x)-f'_n(x)|<\varepsilon$$

for all $m,n\geq N$ and for all $x\in(a,b)$. Now fix $c<x<b$ and $m,n\geq N$. To apply the Mean Value Theorem for f_m-f_n on (c,x), then there is a point ξ between c and x such that

$$f_m(x)-f_n(x)=f_m(c)-f_n(c)+(f'_m(\xi)-f'_n(\xi))(x-c). \tag{2.2}$$

This implies that

$$|f_m(x)-f_n(x)|\leq|f_m(c)-f_n(c)|+|f'_m(\xi)-f'_n(\xi)||x-c|<\varepsilon+(b-a)\varepsilon$$

for all $m,n\geq N$ and for all $x\in(c,b)$. Similarly, when $x\in(a,c)$, we also have

$$|f_m(x)-f_n(x)|<\varepsilon+(b-a)\varepsilon.$$

So Part (a) follows.
Let f be the uniform limit of (f_n) on (a,b)
For Part (b), we fix $u\in(a,b)$. We are going to show

$$\lim_{x\to u}\frac{f(x)-f(u)}{x-u}=g(u).$$

Let $\varepsilon>0$. Since $f_n\to f$ and $f'\to g$ both are uniformly convergent on (a,b). Then there is $N\in\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|f_m(x)-f_n(x)|<\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |f'_m(x)-f'_n(x)|<\varepsilon \tag{2.3}$$

for all $m,n\geq N$ and for all $x\in(a,b)$
Note that for all $m\geq N$ and $x\in(a,b)\setminus\{u\}$, applying the Mean value Theorem for f_m-f_N as before, we have

$$\frac{f_m(x)-f_N(x)}{x-u}=\frac{f_m(u)-f_N(u)}{x-u}+(f'_m(\xi)-f'_N(\xi))$$

for some ξ between u and x.
So Eq.2.3 implies that

$$\left|\frac{f_m(x)-f_m(u)}{x-u}-\frac{f_N(x)-f_N(u)}{x-u}\right|\leq\varepsilon \tag{2.4}$$

for all $m\geq N$ and for all $x\in(a,b)$ with $x\neq u$.
Taking $m\to\infty$ in Eq.2.4, we have

$$\left|\frac{f(x)-f(u)}{x-u}-\frac{f_N(x)-f_N(u)}{x-u}\right|\leq\varepsilon.$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{f(x)-f(u)}{x-u}-f'_N(u)\right| &\leq\left|\frac{f(x)-f(u)}{x-c}-\frac{f_N(x)-f_N(u)}{x-u}\right|+\left|\frac{f_N(x)-f_N(u)}{x-u}-f'_N(u)\right|\\ &\leq\varepsilon+\left|\frac{f_N(x)-f_N(u)}{x-u}-f'_N(u)\right|.\end{aligned}$$

So if we can take $0<\delta$ such that $|\frac{f_N(x)-f_N(u)}{x-u}-f'_N(u)|<\varepsilon$ for $0<|x-u|<\delta$, then we have

$$\left|\frac{f(x)-f(u)}{x-u}-f'_N(u)\right|\leq 2\varepsilon \tag{2.5}$$

for $0 < |x-u| < \delta$. On the other hand, by the choice of N, we have $|f'_m(y) - f'_N(y)| < \varepsilon$ for all $y \in (a,b)$ and $m \geq N$. So we have $|g(u) - f'_N(u)| \leq \varepsilon$. This together with Eq.2.5 give

$$|\frac{f(x)-f(u)}{x-u} - g(u)| \leq 3\varepsilon$$

as $0 < |x-u| < \delta$, that is we have

$$\lim_{x\to u} \frac{f(x)-f(u)}{x-u} = g(u).$$

The proof is finished. □

Remark 2.3. *The uniform convergence assumption of (f'_n) in Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 is essential.*

Example 2.4. *Let $f_n(x) := \tan^{-1} nx$ for $x \in (-1,1)$. Then we have*

$$f(x) := \lim_n \tan^{-1} nx = \begin{cases} \pi/2 & \text{if } x > 0; \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0; \\ -\pi/2 & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Also $g(x) := \lim_n f'_n(x) = \lim_n 1/(1+n^2x^2) = 0$ for all $x \in (-1,1)$. So Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 does not hold. Note that (f'_n) does not converge uniformly to g on $(-1,1)$.

3. Absolutely convergent series

Throughout this section, let (a_n) be a sequence of complex numbers.

Definition 3.1. *We say that a series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ is absolutely convergent if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n| < \infty$.*

Also a convergent series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ is said to be conditionally convergent if it is not absolute convergent.

Example 3.2. Important Example : *The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n^\alpha}$ is conditionally convergent when $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.*
This example shows us that a convergent improper integral may fail to the absolute convergence or square integrable property.
For instance, if we consider the function $f : [1,\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f(x) = \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n^\alpha} \quad \text{if} \quad n \leq x < n+1.$$

If $\alpha = 1/2$, then $\int_1^\infty f(x)dx$ is convergent but it is neither absolutely convergent nor square integrable.

Notation 3.3. *Let $\sigma : \{1,2...\} \longrightarrow \{1,2....\}$ be a bijection. A formal series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{\sigma(n)}$ is called an rearrangement of $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$.*

Example 3.4. *In this example, we are going to show that there is an rearrangement of the series* $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{i+1}}{i}$ *is divergent although the original series is convergent. In fact, it is conditionally convergent.*
We first notice that the series $\sum_i \frac{1}{2i-1}$ *diverges to infinity. Thus for each* $M>0$*, there is a positive integer* N *such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{2i-1}\geq M \qquad \cdots\cdots\cdots(*)$$

for all $n\geq N$*. Then there is* $N_1\in\mathbb{N}$ *such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_1}\frac{1}{2i-1}-\frac{1}{2}>1.$$

By using $(*)$ *again, there is a positive integer* N_2 *with* $N_1<N_2$ *such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_1}\frac{1}{2i-1}-\frac{1}{2}+\sum_{N_1<i\leq N_2}\frac{1}{2i-1}-\frac{1}{4}>2.$$

To repeat the same procedure, we can find a positive integers subsequence (N_k) *such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_1}\frac{1}{2i-1}-\frac{1}{2}+\sum_{N_1+1<i\leq N_2}\frac{1}{2i-1}-\frac{1}{4}+\cdots\cdots\cdots-\sum_{N_{k-1}+1<i\leq N_k}\frac{1}{2i-1}-\frac{1}{2k}>k$$

for all positive integers k*. So if we let* $a_n=\frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n}$ *and put*

$$\sigma(i)=\begin{cases}2i-1 & \text{if } 1\leq i\leq N_1 \text{ or } N_{k-1}+1<i\leq N_k \text{ for } k>1;\\ 2k & \text{if } i=N_k+1 \text{ for } k\geq 1.\end{cases}$$

then the series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}a_{\sigma(i)}$ *diverges to infinity and is an rearrangement of the series* $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{i+1}}{i}$*. The proof is finished.*

Theorem 3.5. *Let* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}a_n$ *be an absolutely convergent series. Then for any rearrangement* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}a_{\sigma(n)}$ *is also absolutely convergent. Moreover, we have* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}a_n=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}a_{\sigma(n)}$*.*

Proof. Let $\sigma:\{1,2...\}\longrightarrow\{1,2...\}$ be a bijection as before.
We first claim that $\sum_n a_{\sigma(n)}$ is also absolutely convergent.
Let $\varepsilon>0$. Since $\sum_n|a_n|<\infty$, there is a positive integer N such that

$$|a_{N+1}|+\cdots\cdots\cdots+|a_{N+p}|<\varepsilon \qquad \cdots\cdots\cdots(*)$$

for all $p=1,2....$ Notice that since σ is a bijection, we can find a positive integer M such that $M>\max\{j:1\leq\sigma(j)\leq N\}$. Then $\sigma(i)\geq N$ if $i\geq M$. This together with $(*)$ imply that if $i\geq M$ and $p\in\mathbb{N}$, we have

$$|a_{\sigma(i+1)}|+\cdots\cdots\cdots|a_{\sigma(i+p)}|<\varepsilon.$$

Thus the series $\sum_n a_{\sigma(n)}$ is absolutely convergent by the Cauchy criteria.
Finally we claim that $\sum_n a_n=\sum_n a_{\sigma(n)}$. Put $l=\sum_n a_n$ and $l'=\sum_n a_{\sigma(n)}$. Now let $\varepsilon>0$. Then

there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|l - \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n| < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |a_{N+1}| + \cdots\cdots + |a_{N+p}| < \varepsilon \cdots\cdots\cdots (**)$$

for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Now choose a positive integer M large enough so that $\{1, ..., N\} \subseteq \{\sigma(1), ..., \sigma(M)\}$ and $|l' - \sum_{i=1}^{M} a_{\sigma(i)}| < \varepsilon$. Notice that since we have $\{1, ..., N\} \subseteq \{\sigma(1), ..., \sigma(M)\}$, the condition $(**)$ gives

$$|\sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n - \sum_{i=1}^{M} a_{\sigma(i)}| \leq \sum_{N<i<\infty} |a_i| \leq \varepsilon.$$

We can now conclude that

$$|l - l'| \leq |l - \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n| + |\sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n - \sum_{i=1}^{M} a_{\sigma(i)}| + |\sum_{i=1}^{M} a_{\sigma(i)} - l'| \leq 3\varepsilon.$$

The proof is complete. □

References

(Chi-Wai Leung) Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong

E-mail address: cwleung@math.cuhk.edu.hk