

Section 4.3 Exercises #3, 4, 2

#3b: Given f continuous (cts.) at c & g cts. @ $f(c)$, we claim $g \circ f$ is cts. @ c .

Proof using sequences:

If $(x_n) \rightarrow c$ and $g(f(x_n))$ is defined for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then we need to show $(g(f(x_n))) \rightarrow g(f(c))$.
 By continuity of f , $(f(x_n)) \rightarrow f(c)$.
 By continuity of g , $(g(f(x_n))) \rightarrow g(f(c))$. \blacksquare

Note how much easier that was than the ϵ - δ proof (3a) asked for:

3a: Given $\epsilon_1 > 0$, we must find $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad (|x - c| < \delta_1 \text{ \& } g(f(x)) \text{ defined}) \Rightarrow$$

$$(1.2) \quad |g(f(x)) - g(f(c))| < \epsilon_1.$$

Let $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_1$. By continuity of g , there is $\delta_2 > 0$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad (|y - f(c)| < \delta_2 \text{ \& } g(y) \text{ defined}) \Rightarrow$$

$$(2.2) \quad |g(y) - g(f(c))| < \epsilon_2 = \epsilon_1.$$

By continuity of f , there is,
given $\varepsilon_3 = \delta_2$, some $\delta_3 > 0$ with

$$(3.1) \quad (|x - c| < \delta_3 \text{ \& } f(x) \text{ defined}) \Rightarrow$$

$$(3.2) \quad |f(x) - f(c)| < \varepsilon_3 = \delta_2.$$

Let $\delta_1 = \delta_3$. Then, given x as
in (1.1), we see that x satisfies

(3.1); hence, x satisfies (3.2).

Letting $y = f(x)$, we then use (1.1)

& (3.2) to see that y satisfies (2.1);

hence, y satisfies (2.2);

hence, x satisfies (1.2).

Thus, (1.1) \Rightarrow (1.2) as needed. \blacksquare

Example:

#4a: Let $p=q=r=0$ & $f(x)=0$,
and $g(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ 1 & \text{else} \end{cases}$.

Then $g(f(x)) = 1$ (for all x).

Therefore, $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} 0 = 0 = q$ and

$\lim_{x \rightarrow q} g(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} x = 0 = r$ but

$\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(g(x)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} 1 = 1 \neq 0 = r$.

4b: If f & g are cts. & $\text{dom}(f) = \text{dom}(g) = \mathbb{R}$,
then $g \circ f$ is cts. by Thm. 4.3.9,
and $\text{dom}(g \circ f) = \mathbb{R}$. Given these three
continuities, if $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$ & $\lim_{x \rightarrow q} g(x) = r$,
then $q = f(p)$ & $r = g(q)$ and, hence,

$$r = g(f(p)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p} g(f(x)).$$

4a still

4c: Our example works if we require that
 f is continuous, but do not require
 g continuous. Our example fails if
we require g to be continuous. Moreover,
no other example for 4a can have

g continuous because if we assume

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q, \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow q} g(x) = r, \quad \text{and } g \text{ cts. @ } q,$$

then, given $p \neq x_n \in \text{dom}(g \circ f)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ & $(x_n) \rightarrow p$, we deduce

① $f(x_n) \rightarrow q$, because $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$,

and then ② $g(f(x_n)) \rightarrow g(q)$,

because of ① & continuity of g ,

and finally ③ $g(q) = r$, because of

continuity of g & $\lim_{x \rightarrow q} g(x) = r$.

Thus, our assumptions imply ~~the~~

~~the~~ $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} g(f(x)) = r$ using

② & ③ & the sequential character

-ization of continuity.

#2a: $f(x) = -37.2$ (or any other constant) defines a "one-tinuous" function on \mathbb{R} .

2b: $f(x) = x$ defines an "equaltinuous" function on all of \mathbb{R} . Moreover, f is nowhere "one-tinuous" because, given $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon = 1/2$, $|x - c| < \delta = 1$ does not imply $|f(x) - f(c)| = |x - c| < \epsilon = 1/2$. ($x = c + 3/4$ is a counterexample.) (The "because..." is not required.)

2c: $f(x) = 2x$ is "lesstinuous" on \mathbb{R} . (Use $\delta = \epsilon/2 < \epsilon$.) But f is nowhere "equaltinuous" because, given $c \in \mathbb{R}$ & $\epsilon = 1$, $|x - c| < \delta = \epsilon = 1$ does not imply $|f(x) - f(c)| = 2|x - c| < \epsilon = 1$. ($x = c + 3/4$ is a counterexample.)

2d: Every "lesstinuous" function f is continuous because, given $c \in \text{dom}(f)$ & $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$ as in the "lesstinuous" def., δ is also as required by the def. of continuity, simply because if $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon$ then $0 < \delta$. Conversely, given merely $0 < \delta$, & the implication $(|x - c| < \delta, \& f(x) \text{ defined}) \Rightarrow |f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon$,

We can let $\delta_2 = \min\{\delta_1, \epsilon/2\}$
to obtain $0 < \delta_2 < \delta_1$ and

$$|x-c| < \delta_2 \Rightarrow |x-c| < \delta_1 \Rightarrow |f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon$$

for all x where $f(x)$ is defined.

This; every continuous function

is "less continuous."