

(Q7)

(a) True.

Proof. Formally speaking, what we are trying to prove is that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \delta_1 > 0 \text{ s.t. } \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ & 0 < |x - a| < \delta_1 \implies |f(x)| < \varepsilon \quad (1) \\ & \text{if and only if} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \delta_2 > 0 \text{ s.t. } \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ & 0 < |x - a| < \delta_2 \implies ||f(x)|| < \varepsilon \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

In order to prove that $(1) \iff (2)$, we have to prove that $(1) \implies (2)$ and $(2) \implies (1)$. Assuming (1), let ε be arbitrary and fix $\delta_2 = \delta_1$. We observe that $||f(x)|| = |f(x)|$. Thus,

$$0 < |x - a| < \delta_1 \implies |f(x)| = ||f(x)||$$

Which proves $(1) \implies (2)$.

Assuming (2), let ε be arbitrary and fix $\delta_1 = \delta_2$. Using the same observation,

$$0 < |x - a| < \delta_2 \implies ||f(x)|| = |f(x)|$$

Which proves $(2) \implies (1)$.

Since we have proven that $(1) \implies (2)$ and $(2) \implies (1)$, we can conclude that $(1) \iff (2)$, as required. ■

(b) False.

As a counterexample, consider the function:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x < a \\ -1 & \text{if } x > a \end{cases}$$

$f(x)$ has no limit at a , while $|f(x)|$ does. In other words,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} |f(x)| = 1 \not\Rightarrow \lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) = 1$$