

Somashekhar Nainpally

Topological convergence and uniform convergence

*Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, Vol. 37 (1987), No. 4, 608–612

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/102188>

## Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1987

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

## TOPOLOGICAL CONVERGENCE AND UNIFORM CONVERGENCE

S. A. NAIMPALLY, Thunder Bay\*)

(Received November 12, 1985)

**1. Introduction.** This work was inspired by the recent papers of Beer [1, 2, 3]. Beer studied metric spaces whereas we work in uniform spaces. We make a detailed study of the relationships among uniform convergence (U.C.), uniform convergence on compacta (U.C.C.), pointwise convergence (P.C.) [Kelley [4]], Hasudorff convergence (H.C.) [Beer, [1, 2, 3], Naimpally [6]], Leader convergence (L.C.) [Leader [5], Njåstad [8]], Topological convergence (T.C.) [Beer [1, 2]] proximal convergence (R.C.) [see below]. We provide examples to clarify these relationships and also prove several results.

For General Topology see Kelley [4] and for Proximity Spaces see Naimpally-Warrack [7].

In this paper  $(X, U)$  and  $(Y, V)$  denote Hausdorff uniform spaces with associated (Efremovič) proximities  $\delta_1 = \delta(U)$ ,  $\delta_2 = \delta(V)$  respectively. For the ease in writing proofs, we'll suppose that  $U, V$  contain only symmetric members i.e.  $U, V$  are bases.  $D$  denotes a directed set and  $(f_n; n \in D)$  a net of functions on  $X$  to  $Y$  converging to a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ .  $C(X, Y)$  denotes the set of all continuous functions on  $X$  to  $Y$ .

**1.1. Definition.** (Hausdorff Convergence)  $f_n \rightarrow^{H.C.} f$  iff for each  $U \in U$ ,  $V \in V$ , there exists an  $m \in D$  such that for all  $n \geq m$ , and for each  $x \in X$ , there exist  $y, z \in X$  such that  $(x, y)$  and  $(x, z)$  are both in  $U$  and  $(f_n(x), f(y)), (f(x), f_n(z))$  are both in  $V$ . Intuitively H.C. can be looked upon as the convergence of  $f_n$  to  $f$  in the hyperspace (Hausdorff) uniformity of  $X \times Y$  when all functions are viewed as subsets of  $X \times Y$ , as for example

$$f = \{(x, f(x)): x \in X\} \subset X \times Y.$$

It is easy to show that U.C. implies H.C. and that the converse holds if  $f$  is uniformly continuous. In particular, if  $X$  is compact, then H.C. = U.C. (For the metric case see Beer [1] and Naimpally [6]).

**1.2. Definition.** (Leader Convergence)  $f_n \rightarrow^{L.C.} f$  iff for each  $A \subset X$ ,  $E \subset Y$  if  $f(A) \text{ non } \delta_2 E$ , then eventually  $f_n(A) \text{ non } \delta_2 E$ .

It is known that U.C. implies L.C. and the converse holds if  $D$  is linearly ordered

\*) This research was partially supported by an operating grant from NSERC (Canada).

or  $V$  is totally bounded. (Leader [5], Njåstad [8]). We prove that L.C. implies U.C.C.; in particular, if  $X$  is compact then L.C. = U.C.

**1.3. Definition.** (Proximal Convergence)  $f_n \rightarrow^{R.C.} f$  iff for subsets  $A, B$  of  $X$ , if  $f(A)$  non  $\delta_2 f(B)$ , then eventually  $f_n(A)$  non  $\delta_2 f_n(B)$ .

It is implicit in Leader's proof (see [7]) that L.C. implies R.C. and that R.C. preserves continuity i.e.  $f_n \in C(X, Y)$  and  $f_n \rightarrow^{R.C.} f$  implies  $f \in C(X, Y)$ . However, R.C. need not imply P.C. even when  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}$  (see (Example 2.4). Obviously, P.C. does not imply R.C.

**1.4. Definition.** (Topological Convergence)  $f_n \rightarrow^{T.C.} f$  iff

- (a) for each  $x \in X$ , there is a net  $(x_n)$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow x$  and  $f_n(x_n) \rightarrow f(x)$ ; and
- (b) for each subnet  $(x_k, f_{n_k}(x_k)) \rightarrow (x, y)$ ,  $y = f(x)$ .

It is easy to show that H.C. implies T.C. and that T.C. and P.C. are independent. If  $X \times Y$  is compact, then T.C. = H.C. = U.C. (for this and further information see Beer [1]).

It is known that if  $\{f_n\}$  is eventually equicontinuous and  $f_n \rightarrow^{P.C.} f$ , then  $f_n \rightarrow^{U.C.C.} f$  (Kelley [4]).

**2. Examples.** In this section we present some examples to clarify the relationships among the various convergences.

**2.1. Example.** We take  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}$  and  $f(x) = x^2$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set  $f_n(x) = (x + n^{-1})^2$ . Here  $f_n$  converges to  $f$  in H.C. and U.C.C. (hence in T.C. and P.C.) and R.C. but not in L.C. or U.C. To see H.C. we observe that the Hausdorff distance between  $f$  and  $f_n$  is  $n^{-1}$  (for  $(x, f(x))$  choose  $(x - n^{-1}, f_n(x - n^{-1}))$  on  $f_n$  and for  $(x, f_n(x))$  choose  $(x + n^{-1}, f(x + n^{-1}))$  on  $f$ ). However,  $|f_n(n) - f(n)| > 2$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and so  $f_n$  does not converge to  $f$  uniformly.

**2.2. Example.** (Beer [3]). Here  $X = \{n^{-1} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}$ ,  $Y = [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_n(x) &= 1 - k^{-1} \quad \text{for } x = k^{-1}, \quad k \leq n, \\ &= 0 \quad \text{otherwise.} \\ f(k^{-1}) &= 1 - k^{-1}, \\ f(0) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $f_n \rightarrow^{H.C.} f$  but  $f$  is not continuous although each  $f_n$  is so. Hence  $f_n \not\rightarrow^{R.C.} f$ .

**2.3. Example.** Here we take  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f_n(x) = nx(1 + n^2x^2)^{-1}$ ,  $f(x) = 0$  for each  $x$ . Here  $f_n \rightarrow^{R.C.} f$  but  $f_n$  does not converge to  $f$  in H.C. or T.C. If the limit function is constant, then the convergence is R.C. Since  $(n^{-1}, 2^{-1}) \in f_n$  and  $\rightarrow (0, 2^{-1}) \notin f$ ,  $f_n$  does not converge to  $f$  topologically.

**2.4. Example.** Here we take  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f_n(x) = x + n$  and  $f(x) = x$ . Here  $f_n \rightarrow^{R.C.} f$  but  $f_n \not\rightarrow^{P.C.} f$ . Thus R.C. and P.C. are independent.

**3. Results.** As noted in Section 1, Leader showed that U.C. implies L.C. and that the converse holds if  $V$  is totally bounded or  $f_n$  is a sequence. Here we show that if  $f_n \in C(X, Y)$  and  $f_n \rightarrow^{L.C.} f$ , then  $\{f_n\}$  is eventually equicontinuous. This in turn implies that  $f_n \rightarrow^{U.C.C.} f$  and  $f_n \rightarrow^{T.C.} f$ . So if  $X$  is compact, L.C. = U.C. We also show that if  $X$  is pseudocompact then on  $C(X, \mathbb{R})$ , L.C. = U.C.

**3.1. Theorem.** *Suppose  $f_n \in C(X, Y)$  and  $f_n \rightarrow^{L.C.} f$ ; then  $\{f_n\}$  is eventually equicontinuous.*

*Proof.* By Leader's theorem,  $f$  is continuous. Let  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ ; then there is a  $W \in V$  such that  $W^4 \subset V$ . Since  $f$  is continuous at  $x \in X$ , there is a  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $f(U(x)) \subset W[f(x)]$ . Hence  $f(U(x)) \cap \delta_2(Y - W^2[f(x)]) = \emptyset$ . Since  $f_n \rightarrow^{L.C.} f$ , eventually  $f_n(U(x)) \cap \delta_2(Y - W^2[f(x)]) = \emptyset$ . So eventually,  $f_n(U(x)) \subset W^2[f(x)]$ . This in turn implies that eventually,  $f_n(U(x)) \subset W^4[f_n(x)] \subset V[f_n(x)]$ .

**3.2. Corollary.** (Kelley [4]). *If  $f_n \in C(X, Y)$  and  $f_n \rightarrow^{L.C.} f$ , then  $f_n \rightarrow^{U.C.C.} f$ .*

**3.3. Remark.** Theorem 3.1 shows that if  $f_n \rightarrow^{L.C.} f$  then  $f_n$  converges to  $f$  locally uniformly (or simply uniformly as it is called). Weierstrass proved that if  $X$  is compact and  $f_n$  converges to  $f$  locally uniformly, then  $f_n \rightarrow^{U.C.} f$ .

**3.4. Corollary.** *If  $X$  is compact, then on  $C(X, Y)$ , U.C. = L.C. = H.C.*

**3.5. Theorem.** *If  $X$  is pseudocompact, then on  $C(X, \mathbb{R})$  U.C. = L.C.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $f_n \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ , and  $f_n \rightarrow^{L.C.} f$ . Then  $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$  and  $f(X) \subset [-p, p]$  for some  $p \in \mathbb{R}$ . So for  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a finite set  $\{r_i: 1 \leq i \leq q\} \subset \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$f(X) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^q S(r_i, \varepsilon/2).$$

Then  $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^q A_i$  where  $A_i = f^{-1}(S(r_i, \varepsilon/2))$ .

Since  $f(A_i) \subset S(r_i, \varepsilon/2)$ , eventually  $f_n(A_i) \subset S(r_i, \varepsilon)$  as in the proof of 3.1.

So eventually, for each  $x \in X$ ,

$$f_n(x) \in S(f(x), 2\varepsilon).$$

**3.6. Remark.** If  $V$  is totally bounded, then the above proof can be modified to show that L.C. = U.C. This proof is different from the ones given by Leader [5] or Njåstad [8].

**3.7. Theorem.** *If  $f_n \rightarrow^{P.C.} f$  and  $\{f_n\}$  is eventually equicontinuous, then  $f_n \rightarrow^{T.C.} f$ .*

*Proof.* P. C. implies 1.4(a). To prove 1.4(b), suppose a subnet  $(x_k, f_{n_k}(x_k)) \rightarrow (x, y)$ . Suppose  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ ; then there is a  $W$  such that  $W^3 \subset V$ . Since  $\{f_n\}$  is eventually equicontinuous, there is an  $m \in D$  and  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  such that for all  $n \geq m$ ,  $f_n(U(x)) \subset W[f_n(x)]$  and  $f(U(x)) \subset W[f(x)]$ .

Since  $f_n \rightarrow^{P.C.} f$ , we may suppose that for  $n \geq m$ ,  $f_n(x) \in W[f(x)]$ . So eventually,  $x_k \in U(x)$  and  $f_{n_k}(x_k) \in W[y]$ ,  $f_{n_k}(x_k) \in W^2[f(x)]$ . So  $y \in W^2[f(x)] \subset V[f(x)]$ . Since  $V$  is arbitrary,  $y = f(x)$ .

**3.8. Corollary.** *On  $C(X, Y)$ , L.C. implies T.C.*

**3.9. Corollary.** *If  $X$  is locally compact,  $f_n \in C(X, Y)$  and  $f_n \rightarrow^{u.c.c.} f$ , then  $f_n \rightarrow^{T.C.} f$ .*

*Proof.* Follows from the known fact that eventually  $\{f_n\}$  is equicontinuous.

**3.10. Theorem.** *If  $X$  is discrete, then P.C.  $\Rightarrow$  T.C. Conversely, if on  $C(X, [0, 1])$  (or  $C(X, Y)$ , where  $Y$  contains an arc) P.C.  $\Rightarrow$  T.C., then  $X$  is discrete.*

*Proof.* If  $X$  is discrete and  $f_n \rightarrow^{P.C.} f$ , then  $\{f_n\}$  is eventually equicontinuous. So by Theorem 3.4,  $f_n \rightarrow^{T.C.} f$ . If  $X$  is not discrete, there is a net  $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ ,  $x_n \neq x_0$ . For  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  if  $x_n \in V^2(x_0) - V(x_0)$ , then there are functions  $h_{n,V}, g_{n,V} \in C(X, Y)$  ( $Y = [0, 1]$ ) such that

$$h_{n,V}(x_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f_{n,V}(X - V(x_0)) = 1, \\ g_{n,V}(V(x_0) \cup \{x_n\}) = 0, \quad g_{n,V}(X - V^2(x_0)) = 1.$$

$f_{n,V} = h_{n,V} - g_{n,V} \rightarrow^{P.C.} f$  where  $f(x) = 0$  for each  $x$ . But  $f_{n,V}(x_n) = 1$ ,  $x_n \rightarrow x_0$  and  $f(x_0) = 0$ . So  $f_{n,V} \not\rightarrow^{T.C.} f$ .

We conclude with a generalization of Beer's result [2].

**3.11. Theorem.** *If  $X$  is locally connected,  $Y$  rim compact and  $f_n \rightarrow^{T.C.} f$  in  $C(X, Y)$ , then  $f_n \rightarrow^{P.C.} f$  and  $\{f_n\}$  is eventually equicontinuous.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $f_n(x) \not\rightarrow^{P.C.} f$ ; then there exists a  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  such that  $f_{n_k}(x) \notin V[f(x)]$  where  $f_{n_k}$  is a subnet of  $f_n$ . Since  $\text{Li } f = f$ , there is a net  $(w_k, f_{n_k}(w_k)) \rightarrow (x, f(x))$ . Eventually  $w_k \in U_k(x)$  which, we may take to be connected and  $\{x\} = \bigcap U_k(x)$ . Choose  $W \in \mathcal{V}$  such that  $W \subset V$  and  $E = \partial W[f(x)]$  is compact. Eventually,  $f_{n_k}(w_k) \in W[f(x)]$ ; so  $f_{n_k}(U_k(x))$  intersects  $W[f(x)]$  and  $Y - \overline{W(f(x))}$ . Since  $f_{n_k}(U_k(x))$  is connected, eventually  $\text{Ls } (f_{n_k}(U_k(x)) \cap E) \neq \emptyset$ . Choose  $y_0$  from the set. Then  $(x, y_0) \in \text{Ls } f_n - f$ , a contradiction.

The above proof is patterned after Beer's; the second part is proved similarly.

**3.12. Corollary.** *If  $X$  is locally connected,  $Y$  is rim compact and  $f_n \rightarrow^{T.C.} f$  in  $C(X, Y)$ , then  $f_n \rightarrow^{u.c.c.} f$ .*

**3.13. Corollary.** *If  $X$  is a locally connected compact space and  $Y$  rim compact, then on  $C(X, Y)$  T.C. = U.C.*

#### References

- [1] Beer, G.: On uniform convergence of continuous functions and topological convergence of sets, *Canad. Math. Bull.* 26 (4) (1983), 418–424.
- [2] Beer, G.: More on convergence of continuous functions and topological convergence of sets, *Canad. Math. Bull.* 28 (1), (1985), 52–59.
- [3] Beer, G.: Hausdorff distance and a compactness criterion for continuous functions, (To appear).

- [4] *Kelley, J. L.*, General Topology, Van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J. (1961).
- [5] *Leader, S.*: On completion of proximity spaces by local clusters, *Fund. Math.* *48* (1960), 201–216.
- [6] *Naimpally, S.*: Graph topology for function spaces, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* *123* (1966), 267–272.
- [7] *Naimpally, S.* and *Warrack, B.*: Proximity Spaces, Cambridge University Press (1970).
- [8] *Njåstad, O.*: Some properties of proximity and generalized uniformity, *Math. Scand.* *12* (1963), 47–56.

*Author's address:* Department of Mathematical Sciences, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Ontario, P7B 5E1 Canada.