

4

mischevious fairy upon the cookie, to $\frac{1}{7}$ it with her $\mathcal{V}^{\star} \star \Leftrightarrow$ that turns chocolate into cookie. The next \mathbf{O} , the baker finds that her perfect cookie is now $1-1 = \square$ chocolate! She decides to outsmart the $\frac{1}{2}$ by splitting her is chocolate cookie into two pieces. The $\overset{\text{w}}{=}$ decides to send two fairies to $\overset{\text{h}}{=}$ the halves with their $\mathcal{V}^* \star \mathfrak{A}$. However, being simple creatures of $\star \star$, neither fairy knows which half the other \clubsuit and each **f** the halves randomly. The next day, the baker wakes up to find that her is cookie is now $\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = \square$ chocolate! She decides outsmart the 🖞 by splitting her 📼 chocolate cookie into three pieces...

3. A BAKER'S STORY A baker wants to bake the perfect cookie: a

cookie of 100% chocolate. She bakes it, and sets her cookie to cool. In the \mathbb{C} , the $\underline{\mathbb{W}}$ of fairies sends a



guide. I will teach you about Have no fear, and let me be your



I

4. The function of the function e^x

Yes, we defined $e^{\Delta \Delta}$ as a series, or as some limit of a sequence, but that's ok. It's still a function, with some nice properties.

(2) $e^{x+y} = e^x e^y$, $e^0 = 1$ (homomorphism!)

Theorem. $\frac{d}{dx}e^x = e^x (\Rightarrow \frac{d}{dx}e^{cx} = ce^{cx} by \diamondsuit rule).$ *Proof.* Use the first definition, and differentiate

5

function from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} .

leftward.

But most importantly:

term by term.

(1) e^x is a monotonically increasing positive

(3) If you made a slide in the shape of the

plot of $y = e^x$, you will never stop slidin'

EQUATIONS 8. e^{x} -ТКА-ОКDINARY DIFFERENTIAL

ferential equations²: Example 2. Consider the system of linear dif-

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ uf^{u'} a^{p} b^{+} \cdots + a^{p} f^{u'} a^{p} b^{+} \cdots + a^{p} f^{u'} a^{p} b^{-} a^{p} b^{p} b^{p}$$

of constants and $\vec{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ is a vector of xirtsm s si $i_i(i_i b) = A$ srene $\tilde{i}_i h = \tilde{l} \frac{b}{xb} AXA$

 $ufu'up + \dots + \mathbb{I}f\mathbb{I}'up = {}^{u}f$

Let $f(0) = v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the initial condition. Then: functions of a single variable.

$$a_{xV} \partial V = a \frac{xp}{p}_{xV} \partial + a \left(xV \partial \frac{xp}{p} \right) = a_{xV} \partial \frac{xp}{p}$$

meets the initial condition $f(0) = e^0 v = v_n$. Meaning that $f = e^{Ax}v$ solves the system, and

cists solve Schr@dinger's equation. trix with any linear operator. This is how physi-Remark. This also works when replacing a ma-

Pages ago and now we're doing differential equations? ²Whoa what's this? We only learned what e was a few

6



- add the c! >No, it's a priceless yacht, you disregarded the absolute value
- >log cabin
 >No, it's a houseboat, you forgot to
- >loglogloglog >What do you get when you integrate one over cabin with respect to cabin?

>How does a number theorist drown?

tion of e^x , has always been controversial. Some say that log makes them feel \bigcirc \fbox S "

CAPTAIN'S LOG DAY 1: e-LOG-ICAL MUSINGS

" $\log(x)$, being the inverse func-

7. e IS WI FOR MORE THAN R

Nothing¹ prevents *x* from being another kind of number. Another number? Different numbers? Other numbers? Complex numbers.

Theorem. Let $a + bi = z \in \mathbb{C}$. Then

 $e^{z} = e^{a}e^{bi} = e^{a}(\cos(b) + i\sin(b))$

Proof. To prove $e^z = e^a e^{bi}$, we have to use multinomial theorem on the first definition, like in the real case. To prove $e^{bi} = \cos(b) + i \sin(b)$, exponentiate and and use Taylor's formulas for exponentiate and so the taylor's formulas for taylor's formulas for exponentiate and so the taylor's formulas for taylor's formulas for taylor's formulas for exponentiate and taylor's formulas for taylor's for taylor's formulas for taylor's formulas for taylor's for

Example 1. We can take the exponent of a square matrix to get another matrix. It turns out that if $A \in Mat(n)$, then $e^A e^{-A} = I_n$, so e^A is always invertible.

However, some of the exponent rules don't work. If $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, then: $e^A e^B \neq e^B e^A$

¹well, some things, like being able to take powers, sums, division over \mathbb{Q} , convergence...

639193200305992182.4Properties of e334295260595630 30702154Ok, so we have this number, but what is it 84 ⁴¹¹⁸⁵ good for? Well, it's a good approximation for 2.7, which is a good approximation for 3, which 77211 is a good approximation for π for sufficiently 4549 bad approximations of good. Succinctly: ²⁷⁶³⁵¹⁴⁸²² 7933203625094431173012epprox 3 $pprox \pi$ 6140397019837679 0698 **Theorem.** *e* is irrational 598888519345807273866 *Proof.* If $e = \frac{a}{b}$, then: $x := b! \left(rac{a}{b} - \sum_{n=0}^{b} rac{1}{n!}
ight) = a(b-1)! - \sum_{n=0}^{b} rac{b!}{n!} \in \mathbb{Z}$ But then by definition of $e = \sum_{n} \frac{1}{n!}$: 47450158539047 $0419957777093503\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} - \sum_{n=0}^{b} \frac{1}{n!}\right) = \sum_{4n=b+1}^{\infty} \frac{b!}{n!} > 0$ Next, note that if n > b, then $\frac{b!}{n!} < \frac{1}{(b+1)^{n-b}}$, so: $278509 = 0 < x < \sum_{n=b+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(b+1)^{n-b}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(b+1)^k} = \frac{1}{b} \le 1$ so 0 < x < 1, a contradiction to $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. 57320568128845920541334053922000113786300945560688166 7400169842055804033637953764520304024322566135278369

1. How can our e's be real if our numbers aren't real?

If real numbers were an ocean, e would be the tropical island where there's nothing to eat but coconuts.



Definition. For any S≪ ∈ ℝ, we define:

$$c_{\infty} = \sum_{\infty}^{\infty} \frac{g_{\infty} e_{0}}{g_{\infty}}$$

This definition sucks, let's try again:

.Definition. We define:

$$\overset{\text{OF}}{=} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + 1 \right) \underset{\text{mil}}{\min} = 9$$

and its side-kick:

$$\mathcal{S} = \lim_{\mathbf{0} \to \infty} \left(\frac{\mathbf{0} \mathbf{0}}{\mathbf{0} \mathbf{0}} + \mathbf{1} \right) \lim_{\mathbf{0} \to \infty} \left(\frac{\mathbf{0} \mathbf{0}}{\mathbf{0} \mathbf{0}} + \mathbf{0} \right)$$

Shit, we accidentally defined the same thing.

Proof. Expand for finite ૐo. □