



S.O.S. Mathematics CyberBoard

Your Resource for mathematics help on the web!

Logout [helmut] 0 new messages

FAQ Search Members User Control Panel

Last visit was: Mon, 13 Apr 2020 09:20

It is currently Mon, 13 Apr 2020 12:30

[View unanswered posts](#) | [View active topics](#)

[View unread posts](#) | [View new posts](#) | [View your posts](#)

All times are UTC - 6 hours

[Board index](#) » [Math 3341](#) » [Chapter 3](#)

3.8

Moderator: [helmut](#)

[\[Moderator Control Panel \]](#)

[newtopic](#) [locked](#) Page 1 of 1 [11 posts]

[Subscribe topic](#) | [Bookmark topic](#) | [Print view](#) | [E-mail friend](#)

[Previous topic](#) | [Next topic](#)

Author

Message

oula-khouzam

Post subject: 3.8

Posted: Mon, 06 Apr 2020 11:00

[offline](#)

Member

Joined: Tue, 31 Mar 2020 17:23
Posts: 12

Assume $f(x)$ has a lim at x_0 and assume the limit is L .

Now by the limit def.:

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0 \text{ such that } |f(x) - L| < \epsilon \text{ whenever } x \in D \text{ and } |x - x_0| < \delta$$

a) let us start from $x \in D$ and $|x - x_0| < \delta$:

this is the same as saying that : $x_0 - \delta < x < x_0 + \delta$ and $x \in D$
which is the same as saying that $x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta) \cap D$

b) Now back to the first part where: $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$:

it is equivalent to $|f(x) - L| + |L| < \epsilon + |L|$

from (1.7) we all know that: $|f(x) - L + L| \leq |f(x) - L| + |L| < \epsilon + |L|$

so $|f(x)| < \epsilon + |L|$

c) now assume that $M = \epsilon + |L|$ which is >0

from a, b and c

the statement :

$$|f(x)| \leq M \text{ for all } x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta) \cap D$$

is true.



[Top](#)

[profile](#) [pm](#) [email](#)

[edit](#) [quote](#)

helmut

Post subject: Re: 3.8

Posted: Tue, 07 Apr 2020 14:31

[online](#)

Site Admin



oula-khouzam wrote:

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0 \text{ such that } |f(x) - L| < \epsilon \text{ whenever } x \in D \text{ and } |x - x_0| < \delta$$

Don't you know that only when $x \neq x_0$?

Joined: Sat, 26 Apr 2003

15:14

Posts: 2237

Location: El Paso TX (USA)

The greater danger for most of us lies not in setting our aim too high and falling short; but in setting our aim too low, and achieving our mark. - Michelangelo Buonarroti



Top



oula-khouzam

Post subject: Re: 3.8

Posted: Tue, 07 Apr 2020 16:06

offline

Member

Joined: Tue, 31 Mar 2020

17:23

Posts: 12

yeah you are right Dr.
so for the case $x=x_0$
can we choose M to be the Max of $\{\epsilon+|L|, |f(x_0)|\}$?



Top



helmut

Post subject: Re: 3.8

Posted: Tue, 07 Apr 2020 16:31

online

Site Admin



Yes. Please write it up again.

The greater danger for most of us lies not in setting our aim too high and falling short; but in setting our aim too low, and achieving our mark. - Michelangelo Buonarroti



Joined: Sat, 26 Apr 2003

15:14

Posts: 2237

Location: El Paso TX (USA)

Top



oula-khouzam

Post subject: Re: 3.8

Posted: Tue, 07 Apr 2020 16:56

offline

Member

Joined: Tue, 31 Mar 2020

17:23

Posts: 12

Assume $f(x)$ has a lim at x_0 and assume the limit is L .
Now by the limit def.:
 $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0$ such that $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$ whenever $x \in D$ and $|x - x_0| < \delta$
and $x \neq x_0$

a) let us start from $x \in D$ and $|x - x_0| < \delta$:
this is the same as saying that $x_0 - \delta < x < x_0 + \delta$ and $x \in D \setminus \{x_0\}$
which is the same as saying that $x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta) \cap D \setminus \{x_0\}$

b) Now back to the first part where: $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$:
it is equivalent to $|f(x) - L| + |L| < \epsilon + |L|$
from (1.7) we all know that: $|f(x) - L + L| \leq |f(x) - L| + |L| < \epsilon + |L|$
so $|f(x)| < \epsilon + |L|$

c) now assume that $M = \text{Max}\{\epsilon + |L|, |f(x_0)|\}$ which is > 0
Not: in case $x = x_0, f(x) = f(x_0)$

from a, b and c
the statement :
 $|f(x)| \leq M$ for all $x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta) \cap D$
is true.



Top



violeta guzman

Post subject: Re: 3.8

Posted: Thu, 09 Apr 2020 17:31

offline

Math Cadet

Joined: Tue, 31 Mar 2020
15:36

Posts: 8

Hi Oula!

I just had a quick question. in part a, how did you go from

"this is the same as saying that : $x_0 - \delta < x < x_0 + \delta$ and $x \in D$ "

to

"which is the same as saying that $x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta) \cap D$ "

Top



Abigail Chaidez

Post subject: Re: 3.8

Posted: Thu, 09 Apr 2020 18:10

offline

S.O.S. Newbie

Joined: Tue, 31 Mar 2020
14:55

Posts: 4

a) let us start from $x \in D$ and $|x - x_0| < \delta$:this is the same as saying that : $x_0 - \delta < x < x_0 + \delta$ and $x \in D \setminus \{x_0\}$

Hi Oula,

I want to know why you are able to isolate for x without changing the original statement?



Top



oula-khouzam

Post subject: Re: 3.8

Posted: Fri, 10 Apr 2020 22:08

offline

Member

Joined: Tue, 31 Mar 2020
17:23

Posts: 12

Hi Abigail,

 $|x - x_0| < \delta \iff -\delta < x - x_0 < +\delta$ add x_0 to all sides $\Rightarrow x_0 - \delta < x - x_0 + x_0 < x_0 + \delta$ $\iff x_0 - \delta < x < x_0 + \delta$ that makes $x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$ 

Top



oula-khouzam

Post subject: Re: 3.8

Posted: Fri, 10 Apr 2020 22:24

offline

Member

Joined: Tue, 31 Mar 2020
17:23

Posts: 12

Hi Violeta,

starting by $x \in D$ and $|x - x_0| < \delta$ and $x \neq x_0$ lead us to say the x should be $\in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$ and x should be $\in D$ and $x \neq x_0$ that means that x is in the intersection of these three sets $\Rightarrow x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta) \cap D$
and $x \neq x_0$ 

Top

 [profile](#)
 [pm](#)
 [email](#)

 [edit](#)
 [quote](#)

oula-khouzam

Post subject: Re: 3.8

Posted: Fri, 10 Apr 2020 22:25

offline

Hope that I answered your equations Violeta and Abigail. if not please let me know 😊

Member






Joined: Tue, 31 Mar 2020
 17:23
Posts: 12

Top

 [profile](#)
 [pm](#)
 [email](#)

 [edit](#)
 [quote](#)

helmut

Post subject: Re: 3.8

Posted: Mon, 13 Apr 2020 12:30

online

Done. Credit to Oula. 😊

Site Admin



The greater danger for most of us lies not in setting our aim too high and falling short; but in setting our aim too low, and achieving our mark. - Michelangelo Buonarroti





Joined: Sat, 26 Apr 2003
 15:14
Posts: 2237
Location: El Paso TX (USA)

Top

 [profile](#)
 [pm](#)
 [email](#)

 [edit](#)
 [quote](#)

Display posts from previous: Sort by

 [new topic](#)

 [locked](#)

Page 1 of 1 [11 posts]

[Board index](#) » [Math 3341](#) » [Chapter 3](#)

All times are UTC - 6 hours

Who is online

Users browsing this forum: **helmut**

Quick-mod tools:

You **can** post new topics in this forum
 You **can** reply to topics in this forum
 You **can** edit your posts in this forum
 You **can** delete your posts in this forum

Search for:

Jump to:

[[Administration Control Panel](#)]

[Contact Us](#) | [S.O.S. Mathematics Homepage](#)
[Privacy Statement](#) | [Search the "old" CyberBoard](#)
 734 users online during the last hour
 Powered by [phpBB](#) © 2001, 2005-2017 phpBB Group.
 Copyright © 1999-2017 MathMedics, LLC. All rights reserved.
 Math Medics, LLC. - P.O. Box 12395 - El Paso TX 79913 - USA