

2.7 # 2(e) Does

$$1 - \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4^2} + \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1}{6^2} + \dots$$

converge? No:

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

$$= \left(1 + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{5} + \dots + \frac{1}{2n-1} \right)$$

$$- \left(\frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{4^2} + \dots + \frac{1}{(2n)^2} \right)$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{6} + \dots + \frac{1}{2n} \right)$$

$$- \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \dots + \frac{1}{n^2} \right)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots + \frac{1}{n} \right) - \frac{1}{4} \cdot 2$$

because $\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \dots + \frac{1}{n^2} \leq 2$.

Because $\left(\frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{n} \right)$ is not bounded above, neither is s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots

2.7 # 4 (a) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ & $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$

diverge but $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ converges.

(b) Let $x_n = (-1)^{n+1}/n$ and

$y_n = 1$ if n odd else 0 .

Then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n = 1 - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4} + \dots$

converges (by the alternating series test) and $(y_n) = 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, \dots$ is bounded but

$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n y_n = 1 + 0 + \frac{1}{3} + 0 + \frac{1}{5} + 0 + \frac{1}{7} + \dots$

diverges.

(c) Impossible. If $\sum x_n$ & $\sum(x_n + y_n)$

converge, say, to A & B , respectively,

then $\sum y_n = \sum((x_n + y_n) - x_n)$ converges

to $B - A$.

2.7#4(d) Let $(x_n) = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{4}, 0, \frac{1}{8}, \dots$

Then $x_n = 0$ or $\frac{1}{n}$ for all n ;
so, $0 \leq x_n \leq \frac{1}{n}$ for all n .

Yet, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n x_n = 0 + \frac{1}{2} + 0 + \frac{1}{4} + 0 + \frac{1}{6} + 0 + \frac{1}{8} + \dots$ diverges.

2.7#7(a) Assume $na_n \rightarrow l \neq 0$ & $0 < a_n$.

Then $l \geq 0$ because $na_n \geq 0$. Hence, $l > 0$; hence, $n \cdot a_n > \frac{l}{2}$ eventually, say, for all $n \geq N$.

Hence, for all $n \geq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 + \dots + a_n &\geq a_1 + \dots + a_{N-1} + \frac{l}{2N} + \dots + \frac{l}{2n} \\ &= \frac{l}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{n} \right) + c \end{aligned}$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ that depends on N and a_1, \dots, a_{N-1} but not on n .

(Precisely, $c = a_1 + \dots + a_{N-1} - \frac{l}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1} + \dots + \frac{1}{N-1} \right)$.)

Since $\frac{1}{1}, \frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}, \dots$ is

not bounded above, $a_1, a_1 + a_2, a_1 + a_2 + a_3, \dots$ is not a bounded sequence.

Hence, $(a_1 + \dots + a_n)$ diverges. ■

2.7#7(b) Assume $a_n > 0$ & $n^2 a_n \rightarrow L$.

Then ~~$n^2 a_n < L + 1$ eventually.~~

~~Also~~ $n^2 a_n < L + 1$ eventually.

Therefore, $0 \leq a_n \leq (L+1)/n^2$

eventually. Since $\sum (L+1)/n^2$ converges,

so does $\sum a_n$ (by the comparison test). ■

and better

Shorter solution to 7(a):

Given $a_n > 0$ & $na_n \rightarrow l \neq 0$, we have

$l \geq 0$, and, hence, $l > 0$. Therefore,

$l > l/2 > 0$; hence, $na_n > l/2$

eventually; hence $0 \leq l/(2n) \leq a_n$

eventually. By the comparison test,

since $\sum l/(2n)$ diverges, so does $\sum a_n$.

(We know that $\sum l/(2n)$ diverges

because if it converged to A , then

$\sum 1/n$, which we know diverges,

would converge \checkmark $(2/l)A$.) ■

to