Dodson & Poston Exercise VII.1.1

Peter Mao, Barney Tam, ...

May 15, 2022

Abstract

In-progress solution. Feel free to add/comment/disparage.

(a) [Given] Hausdorff topological spaces X, Y and any map (not necessarily continuous of everywhere defined) $f: X \to Y$, define

 $\lim_{x\to p}(f(x))=q$ if and only if for any neighborhood N(q) we can find a neighborhood N(p) such that, if $x\in N(p)$ and f(x) is defined, then $f(x)\in N(q)$.

Comment What is there to prove or show here? Are there any counterexamples that show how this can go wrong?

(b) If X is the set of natural numbers $1, 2, 3, \ldots$ together with one extra element which we label ∞ , find a topology on X which makes Definition VI.2.01 (pg 125-126, sequence of points and the limit of a sequence) a special case of the one above (a).

Solution Without loss of generality, we shall assume a metric topology for X. In VI.2.01, a sequence is defined as a mapping $S: X \to Y$, so we want to find a metric (distance function) as defined in VI.1.02 (pg 116) that makes the sequence definition a special case of (a).

Define the metric

$$d: X \times X \to \mathbb{R} \tag{1}$$

$$(m,n) \mapsto \left| \frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{n} \right|$$
 (2)

with $\frac{1}{\infty} = 0$. This satisfies the conditions for a metric:

- i) d(m, n) = d(n, m)
- ii) $d(m,n) = 0 \iff m = n$
- iii) $d(m, n) \le d(m, r) + d(r, n)$

The third condition requires a quick check. If m < r < n, we have equality because the sign of the r term will differ in the two terms on the right side when the absolute-value is "removed." If m < n < r (the case r < m < n proceeds similarly), then we use the fact that d(m,r) = d(m,n) + d(n,r), so that the triangle inequality now reads

$$d(m,n) \le d(m,r) + d(r,n) = d(m,n) + d(n,r) + d(r,n) \tag{3}$$

which holds since d(n, r) > 0.

Since d maps into \mathbb{R} , we can use the usual topology on \mathbb{R} . Relating this back to part (a), $p = \infty$, f = S, and q is the limit of S.