

# Math 113: Functional Analysis

Sair Shaikh

May 21, 2025

**Problem 42.** Let  $\mathfrak{c}$  be the subspace of  $l^\infty$  of sequences  $x = (x_n)$  such that  $\lim_n x_n$  exists and let  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  be the subspace of  $\mathfrak{c}$  for which the limit is 0.

- If  $y \in l^1$ , then let  $\phi_y$  be the functional on  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  given by:

$$\phi_y(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n y_n$$

Show that  $y \rightarrow \phi_y$  is an isometric isomorphism of  $l^1$  onto  $\mathfrak{c}_0^*$ .

- Describe the dual of  $\mathfrak{c}$ .
- Is either  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  or  $\mathfrak{c}$  reflexive?

*Solution.*

1. Let  $\Phi : l^1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{c}_0^*$  be the map given by  $\Phi(y) = \phi_y$ . Since the map is given to us, we assume it is well-defined (it is also immediate via Holder's inequality with  $p = 1$  and  $q = \infty$ ). We need to show that  $\Phi$  is an isometric isomorphism, thus we need to show it is linear, isometric and surjective.

First, to show that  $\Phi$  is linear, let  $y, z \in l^1$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$ . Then, we have for all  $x \in \mathfrak{c}_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi(\alpha y + z)(x) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n(\alpha y_n + z_n) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n(\alpha y_n + z_n) \\
&= \alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n y_n + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n z_n \\
&= \alpha \Phi(y)(x) + \Phi(z)(x) \\
&= (\alpha \Phi(y) + \Phi(z))(x)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\Phi$  is linear. Next, we show that  $\Phi$  is isometric. Let  $y \in l^1$  be arbitrary. Then, for any  $x \in \mathfrak{c}_0$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Phi(y)(x)| &= \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n y_n \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n| |y_n| \\
&\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x\|_{\infty} |y_n| \\
&= \|x\|_{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n| \\
&= \|y\|_1 \|x\|_{\infty}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\|\Phi(y)\| \leq \|y\|_1$ . To show the other direction, recall the definition of the operator norm:

$$\|\Phi(y)\| = \sup_{\|x\|_{\infty} \leq 1} |\Phi(y)(x)|$$

for  $x \in \mathfrak{c}_0$ . Thus, to show that  $\|\Phi(y)\| \geq \|y\|_1$ , for  $\epsilon > 0$ , we need to find an  $x \in \mathfrak{c}_0$  such that  $\|x\|_{\infty} \leq 1$  and  $|\Phi(y)(x)| \geq \|y\|_1 - \epsilon$ .

Note that we have:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n| = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| = \|y\|_1$$

Thus, there exists an  $N$  such that:

$$\|y\|_1 - \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| < \epsilon$$

Next, define  $x \in l^\infty$  as follows:

$$x_n = \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn}(y_n) & \text{if } n \leq N \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $\operatorname{sgn}$  returns the sign of a real number, and 0 for 0.

Clearly, as  $x_n \in \{0, 1, -1\}$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that  $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$ . Moreover, as  $x_n$  is zero after a finite number of terms, we have that  $\lim_n x_n = 0$ . Thus,  $x \in \mathfrak{c}_0$ . Finally, we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(y)(x)| &= \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n y_n \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \operatorname{sgn}(y_n) y_n + \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} (0) y_n \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| \right| \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| \\ &\geq \|y\|_1 - \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have that  $\|\Phi(y)\| \geq \|y\|_1$ . Thus, we conclude that  $\|\Phi(y)\| = \|y\|_1$  and  $\Phi$  is isometric.

Since  $\Phi$  is isometric map of normed vector spaces, it is also injective (i.e. the only things mapped to 0 must have norm 0, which is just 0). Thus, we only need to show that  $\Phi$  is surjective.

Let  $\phi \in \mathfrak{c}^*$  be arbitrary. Define the sequence  $y$  as:

$$y_n = \phi(e_n)$$

where  $e_n$  is the sequence is 1 at the  $n$ th index and 0 elsewhere (note  $e_n \in \mathfrak{c}_0$  as all but one entry are 0). We claim that  $y \in l^1$ . To see this, note that:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| &= \sum_{n=1}^N |\phi(e_n)| \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \phi(e_n) \operatorname{sgn}(\phi(e_n)) \\ &= \phi(x^{(N)}) \end{aligned}$$

where:

$$x^{(N)} = \begin{cases} \text{sgn}(\phi(e_n)) & \text{if } n \leq N \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that for all  $N$ ,  $x^{(N)} \in \mathfrak{c}_0$  as it is 0 after a finite number of terms. Moreover,  $\|x^{(N)}\|_\infty = 1$ . Thus, as  $\phi$  is bounded on  $\mathfrak{c}_0$ , we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| &= \phi(x^{(N)}) \\ &\leq \|\phi\| \cdot \|x^{(N)}\|_\infty \\ &= \|\phi\| \end{aligned}$$

Then taking the limit as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|y\|_1 &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| \\ &\leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\phi\| \\ &= \|\phi\| \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $y \in l^1$ . Finally, we calculate  $\Phi(y)$ . For all  $x \in \mathfrak{c}_0$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(y)(x) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n y_n \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n \phi(e_n) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(x_n e_n) \\ &= \phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n e_n\right) \\ &= \phi(x) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown that  $\Phi(y) = \phi$ . Thus,  $\Phi$  is surjective.

Thus, we have shown that  $\Phi$  is an isometric isomorphism of  $l^1$  onto  $\mathfrak{c}_0^*$ .

2. We claim that the dual of  $\mathfrak{c}$  is also  $l^1$ . Note that if  $x \in \mathfrak{c}$  and  $b = \lim_n x_n$ , if we write  $\mathbf{1}$  for the constant sequence of 1s, we have that:

$$\lim_n (x - b\mathbf{1})_n = \lim_n (x_n - b) = 0$$

Thus,  $x - b\mathbf{1} \in \mathfrak{c}_0$ . Thus, for each  $x \in \mathfrak{c}$ , there exists an  $x' \in \mathfrak{c}_0$ , such that  $x_m = (\lim_n x_n) + x'_m$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus, every bounded linear functional on  $\mathfrak{c}$  can be written, for  $x \in \mathfrak{c}$ , as:

$$\phi(x) = (\lim_n x_n)\phi(\mathbf{1}) + \phi(x')$$

by linearity. Thus, each map  $\phi$  is characterized by its values on  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  and  $\phi(\mathbf{1})$  (which may or may not be independent of each other).

Next, note that  $S(l^1) \cong l^1$ , where  $S$  is the shift by one operator defined in Problem 39. Clearly,  $S(l^1) \subset l^1$  as removing the first element keeps a finite  $l^1$  norm finite. Moreover, every sequence in  $l^1$  can be obtained by shifting a sequence in  $l^1$  (say, take the original sequence and append a 0 in the first position). Thus, we can write:

$$l^1 \cong \mathbb{F} \oplus l^1$$

by the map  $x \rightarrow (x_1, S(x))$ . If we define the norm on  $\mathbb{F} \oplus l^1$  as:

$$||(\alpha, x)|| = |\alpha| + ||x||_1$$

this mapping is clearly isometric (it agrees with the  $l^1$  norm on the domain by definition). In this formulation, we can construct an map from  $\Phi : \mathbb{F} \otimes l^1$  to  $\mathfrak{c}$ , for all  $(\alpha, y) \in \mathbb{F} \otimes l^1$  by:

$$\Phi(\alpha, y)(x) = \alpha \lim_n x_n + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n y_n$$

This is clearly surjective, by our characterization of all bounded linear functionals on  $\mathfrak{c}$  earlier. It is also easily seen to be linear. We show it is isometric as:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(\alpha, y)(x)| &= \left| \alpha \lim_n x_n + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n y_n \right| \\ &\leq |\alpha| \lim_n |x_n| + ||x||_{\infty} \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n \right| \\ &\leq (|\alpha| + ||y||_1) \cdot ||x||_{\infty} \end{aligned}$$

noting that  $|\lim_n x_n| \leq ||x||_{\infty}$ . Thus, we have:

$$||\Phi(\alpha, y)|| \leq |\alpha| + ||y||_1$$

To show that this bound is achievable, we can reuse the same proof as before.

Let  $(\alpha, y) \in \mathbb{F} \oplus l^1$  be arbitrary. Note that we have:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n| = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| = ||y||_1$$

Thus, there exists an  $N$  such that:

$$\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} |y_n| = \|y\|_1 - \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| < \epsilon$$

Next, define  $x \in l^\infty$  as follows:

$$x_n = \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn}(y_n) & \text{if } n \leq N \\ \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $\operatorname{sgn}$  returns the sign of a real number, and 0 for 0.

Clearly, as  $x_n \in \{0, 1, -1\}$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that  $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$ . Moreover, as  $x_n$  is constant after a finite number of terms, we have that  $\lim_n x_n = \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha)$ . Thus,  $x \in \mathfrak{c}$ . Finally, we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(\alpha, y)(x)| &= \left| \alpha \lim_n x_n + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n y_n \right| \\ &= \left| \alpha \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) + \sum_{n=1}^N \operatorname{sgn}(y_n) y_n + \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} y_n \right| \end{aligned}$$

Next, note that:

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} y_n \leq \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} |y_n| < \epsilon$$

Thus, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(\alpha, y)(x)| &\geq \left| \alpha \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) + \sum_{n=1}^N \operatorname{sgn}(y_n) y_n \right| - \epsilon \\ &= |\alpha| + \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| - \epsilon \\ &= \|(\alpha, y)\| - \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have that  $\Phi$  is isometric. Thus, we have shown isometric isomorphisms:

$$l^1 \cong \mathbb{F} \oplus l^1 \cong \mathfrak{c}^*$$

Since the composition of isometric isomorphisms is an isometric isomorphism, we have that  $\mathfrak{c}^* \cong l^1$ .

3. We claim that neither  $\mathfrak{c}$  nor  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  are reflexive. Note that we showed that the dual of both of these spaces is isometrically isomorphic to  $l^1$ . However, we know that the dual of  $l^1$  is isometrically isomorphic to  $l^\infty$ . Thus, we have that the double dual of these spaces is isometrically isomorphic to  $l^\infty$ . However, these subspaces of  $l^\infty$  are not isometrically isomorphic to  $l^\infty$  as  $l^\infty$  is not separable, but these subspaces are separable as their dual,  $l^1$  is separable (Problem 41).

**Problem 43.** Show that  $X$  is reflexive if and only if  $X^*$  is.

*Solution.* Assume  $X$  is reflexive. Then  $X$  is isometrically isomorphic to  $X^{**}$  via the map:

$$\begin{aligned}\iota : X &\rightarrow X^{**} \\ \iota(x)(f) &= f(x)\end{aligned}$$

for  $x \in X$  and  $f \in X^*$ . To show that  $X^*$  is reflexive, we need to show that the map given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda : X^* &\rightarrow X^{***} \\ \lambda(f)(y) &= y(f)\end{aligned}$$

for  $f \in X^*$  and  $y \in X^{**}$  is onto.

Thus, let  $F \in X^{***}$ . Since  $X$  is reflexive, every element of  $X^{**}$  can be written as  $\iota(x)$  for a unique  $x$  in  $X$ . Then, we can define a well-defined functional  $f \in X^*$  by:

$$f(x) = F(\iota(x))$$

i.e.  $f = F \circ \iota$ . This is linear and bounded as its a composition of linear bounded functionals. Then, note that for any  $\iota(x) \in X^{**}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(f)(\iota(x)) &= \iota(x)(f) \\ &= f(x) \\ &= F(\iota(x))\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $F = \lambda(l)$ . Since  $F$  was arbitrary, we have shown that  $\lambda$  is onto and thus  $X^*$  is reflexive.

Now, assume that  $X^*$  is reflexive. Then, by the previous argument, we have that  $X^{**}$  is reflexive. Let  $\iota$  and  $\lambda$  be as before. Assume for the sake of contradiction that  $\iota$  is not onto.

Since  $X$  is Banach and  $\iota$  is an isometric injection, we have that  $\iota(X) \subset X^{**}$  is a closed proper subspace. Then by the 2nd corollary to the Hahn-Banach theorem, we have a non-zero functional  $F \in X^{***}$  such that  $F(\iota(x)) = 0$  for all  $x \in X$ . Since  $\lambda$  is onto, there exists a  $f \in X^*$  such that  $\lambda(f) = F$ . Then, following the unpacking of the definitions, we get, for all  $x \in X$ :

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= F(\iota(x)) \\ &= \lambda(f)(\iota(x)) \\ &= \iota(x)(f) \\ &= f(x)\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $f \equiv 0$ , which is a contradiction. Thus,  $X$  is reflexive.

**Problem 44.** Let  $\beta \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$  be a cover of  $X$ . Show that  $\beta$  is a basis for  $\tau(\beta)$  if and only if given  $U$  and  $V$  in  $\beta$  and  $x \in U \cap V$  there is a  $W \in \beta$  such that  $x \in W \subset U \cap V$ .

*Solution.* Assume  $\beta$  is a basis for  $\tau(\beta)$ . Then, if  $U$  and  $V$  are in  $\beta$ , they are in  $\tau(\beta)$ . Since  $\tau(\beta)$  is a topology,  $U \cap V$  is in  $\tau(\beta)$ . As  $\beta$  is a basis for  $\tau(\beta)$ , for any  $x \in U \cap V$ , there exists a  $W \in \beta$  such that  $x \in W \subset U \cap V$ . Thus, the condition holds.

Now, assume that the condition holds. Define  $\tau'$  to be the collection of arbitrary unions of elements of  $\beta$ . We claim that  $\tau' = \tau(\beta)$  and  $\beta$  is a basis for  $\tau'$ . Clearly, as  $\beta \subset \tau(\beta)$ ,  $\tau(\beta)$  must contain arbitrary unions of elements of  $\beta$  as it is a topology. Thus, we have that  $\tau' \subset \tau(\beta)$ .

To show the other direction, we need to show that  $\tau'$  is a topology that contains  $\beta$ , since then  $\tau(\beta) \subset \tau'$  by definition. Thus, we check the axioms:

1. Since  $\beta$  is a cover,  $X = \bigcup_{U \in \beta} U$ . Thus,  $X$  is in  $\tau'$ .  $\emptyset$  is the empty union of elements of  $\beta$ , so it is in  $\tau'$  as well.
2.  $\tau'$  is closed under arbitrary unions by definition, as arbitrary unions of arbitrary unions of elements of  $\beta$  are still arbitrary unions of elements of  $\beta$ .
3. Let  $U$  and  $V$  be in  $\tau'$ . Then, by definition,  $U = \bigcup_{i \in I} U_i$  and  $V = \bigcup_{j \in J} V_j$  for some index sets  $I, J$  and with  $U_i, V_j \in \beta$ . Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} U \cap V &= \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} U_i \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{j \in J} V_j \right) \\ &= \bigcup_{i \in I} \bigcup_{j \in J} (U_i \cap V_j) \end{aligned}$$

i.e. something is in  $U \cap V$  iff it is in some  $U_i$  and some  $V_j$ , if and only if it is in some  $U_i \cap V_j$ . However, by the given condition, for any  $x \in U_i \cap V_j$ , there exists a  $W_{x,i,j} \in \beta$  such that  $x \in W_{x,i,j} \subset U_i \cap V_j$ . Then, clearly,

$$U_i \cap V_j = \bigcup_{x \in U_i \cap V_j} W_{x,i,j}$$

as each  $W_{x,i,j}$  is contained in  $U_i \cap V_j$  and conversely each  $x$  is contained in some  $W_{x,i,j}$ . Thus, we finally write:

$$\begin{aligned} U \cap V &= \bigcup_{i \in I} \bigcup_{j \in J} (U_i \cap V_j) \\ &= \bigcup_{i \in I} \bigcup_{j \in J} \left( \bigcup_{x \in U_i \cap V_j} W_{x,i,j} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\tau'$  is closed under finite intersections.



Thus,  $\tau'$  is a topology and  $\tau' = \tau(\beta)$ .

Finally, we need to show that  $\beta$  is a basis for  $\tau'$ . Let  $U \in \tau'$  and  $x \in U$ . Then, by the given property, there exists a  $V \in \beta$  such that  $x \in V \subset U \cap U = U$ . Thus,  $\beta$  is a basis for  $\tau' = \tau(\beta)$ .

**Problem 45.** If  $X$  is a finite dimensional normed space, show that the weak topology is the same as the norm topology. (Hint. Use the dual basis.)

*Solution.* Let  $\tau_W$  be the weak topology and  $\tau_N$  be the norm topology. We already know that  $\tau_W \subseteq \tau_N$  as every weakly open set is norm open. Thus, we need to show that if  $X$  is finite dimensional, then  $\tau_N \subseteq \tau_W$ .

Since  $X$  is finite dimensional, all norms on  $X$  are equivalent, thus generate the same topology. Let  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  be a basis for  $X$ . Let  $\|x\|_\infty = \max_i |x_i|$  be the  $l^\infty$  norm on  $X$ , where  $x = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i e_i$ . We will show that open balls in this topology are weakly open.

For all  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $x_0 \in X$ , let:

$$B_\epsilon(x_0) = \{x \in X : \|x - x_0\|_\infty < \epsilon\}$$

be an open ball. Let  $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\} \subset X^*$  be the dual basis. These are bounded functionals as all functionals in a finite dimensional space are bounded (Problem 33). Then, we have the following subbasis elements for the weak topology, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} U(f_i, x_0, \epsilon) &= \{x \in X : |f_i(x_0) - f_i(x)| < \epsilon\} \\ &= \{x \in X : |(x_0)_i - x_i| < \epsilon\} \end{aligned}$$

Then, the intersection of these for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{i=1}^n U(f_i, x_0, \epsilon) &= \bigcap_{i=1}^n \{x \in X : |(x_0)_i - x_i| < \epsilon\} \\ &= \{x \in X : |(x_0)_i - x_i| < \epsilon, i = 1, \dots, n\} \\ &= \{x \in X : \|x - x_0\|_\infty < \epsilon\} \\ &= B_\epsilon(x_0) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown that  $B_\epsilon(x_0)$  is weakly open for all  $x_0 \in X$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since these open balls form a basis for the norm topology, every norm open set is weakly open. Thus, we have shown that  $\tau_N \subseteq \tau_W$ .

Thus, we have shown that  $\tau_W = \tau_N$  when  $X$  is finite dimensional.

**Problem 46.** Show that if  $X$  is an infinite dimensional normed space, then every nonempty weakly open set is unbounded. (Hint provided.)

*Solution.* Let  $X$  be an infinite dimensional normed space. Let  $U$  be a non-empty weakly open set. We will show that  $U$  is unbounded.

Since  $U$  is non-empty, there exists a point  $x_0 \in U$ . Since  $U$  is a neighborhood of  $x_0$ , there exists an element of the neighborhood basis of the weak topology contained in  $U$ . Thus, there exists  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n \in X^*$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that:

$$B := U(\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n\}, x, \epsilon) = \{x \in X : |\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(x_0)| < \epsilon, 1 \leq i \leq n\} \subset U$$

Define  $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^n$  by  $\phi(x) = (\phi_1(x), \dots, \phi_n(x))$ . Consider  $\ker(\phi)$ . We note that:

$$x \in \ker(\phi) \iff x \in \ker(\phi_i), \forall 1 \leq i \leq n$$

Thus,

$$\ker(\phi) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \ker(\phi_i)$$

By Problem 33, since each  $\phi_i$  is bounded, it has a closed kernel. An intersection of closed sets is closed, thus  $\phi$  has a closed kernel. Then, finally, by Problem 33,  $\phi$  is bounded.

Moreover, note that by rank-nullity, as  $X$  is infinite dimensional and  $\dim(\text{img}(\phi)) \leq n$ , we have that  $\ker(\phi)$  is infinite dimensional, hence a non-empty linear subspace.

Next, consider  $\phi^{-1}(\phi(x_0))$ . From undergraduate linear algebra, we know that this is a coset of  $\ker(\phi)$ , i.e.:

$$\phi^{-1}(\phi(x_0)) = x_0 + \ker(\phi)$$

Moreover, we claim that  $\phi^{-1}(\phi(x_0)) \subset B$ . To see this, let  $z \in \ker(\phi)$  be arbitrary. Then,  $z \in \ker(\phi_i)$  for all  $i$ . Thus, we have:

$$|\phi_i(x_0 + z) - \phi_i(x_0)| = |\phi_i(x_0 - x_0) + \phi_i(z)| = 0 < \epsilon$$

for all  $i$ . Thus,  $x_0 + z \in B$ . Thus,  $x_0 + \ker(\phi) \subset B$ .

Now, since  $\ker(\phi)$  is a non-empty linear subspace, it contains  $\lambda z$  for some  $z \in \ker(\phi)$  and all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ . Then, we calculate the metric distance between  $x_0$  and  $x_0 + \lambda z \in x_0 + \ker(\phi)$ :

$$\|x_0 - (x_0 + \lambda z)\| = \|\lambda z\| = |\lambda| \cdot \|z\|$$

Since  $\|z\|$  is a constant, we can choose  $|\lambda| > N$  for any  $N \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus,  $x_0 + \ker(\phi)$  is unbounded. Thus,  $B$  is unbounded. Thus,  $U$  is unbounded.

**Problem 48.** Let  $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$  be a function between topological spaces. Show that  $f$  is continuous if and only if  $f$  takes convergent nets to convergent nets. That is,  $f$  is continuous if and only if given  $x_\lambda \rightarrow x$  in  $X$ , we have  $f(x_\lambda) \rightarrow f(x)$  in  $Y$ .

*Solution.* Assume that  $f$  is continuous. Let  $x_\lambda \rightarrow x$  be a convergent net in  $X$ . Then,  $f(x_\lambda)$  is a net in  $Y$ . We need to show that  $f(x_\lambda) \rightarrow f(x)$ . Thus, we need to show that  $f(x_\lambda)$  is eventually in every neighborhood of  $f(x)$ .

Let  $V \in \mathcal{N}(f(x))$  be a neighborhood of  $f(x)$ . Then, there exists an open  $U \in \sigma$  such that  $f(x) \in U \subset V$ . Since  $f$  is continuous,  $f^{-1}(U)$  is open in  $\tau$ . Moreover, as  $x \in f^{-1}(U)$  as  $f(x) \in U$ . Thus,  $f^{-1}(U)$  is a neighborhood of  $x$ . Since  $x_\lambda \rightarrow x$ , there exists an index  $\lambda_0$  such that for all  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ ,  $x_\lambda \in f^{-1}(U)$ . Thus, for all  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ , we have that  $f(x_\lambda) \in U$ . Since  $U \subset V$ , we have that  $f(x_\lambda) \in V$ . Thus,  $f(x_\lambda)$  is eventually in  $V$ . Since  $V$  was arbitrary,  $f(x_\lambda) \rightarrow f(x)$ .

For the other direction, we prove the contrapositive. Assume that  $f$  is not continuous. Then, there exists an open set  $V \in \sigma$  such that  $f^{-1}(V)$  is not open in  $\tau$ . Then, there exists a point  $x \in f^{-1}(V)$  such that there are no open neighborhoods containing  $x$  that are contained in  $f^{-1}(V)$  (using a definition of open from point set).

Let  $\Lambda = \mathcal{N}(x)$  be the neighborhoods of  $x$  ordered by reverse inclusion. We construct a net  $(x_\lambda)$  in  $X$  by picking a point in each neighborhood of  $x$  that is not in  $f^{-1}(V)$ . We claim that this net converges to  $x$ . To see this, let  $U \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  be a neighborhood of  $x$ . Then for any  $V \geq U \in \Lambda$ , since we have  $V \subseteq U$ , we have that  $x_V \in U$ . Thus,  $x_\lambda$  is eventually in  $U$ . Since  $U$  was an arbitrary neighborhood of  $x$ , we have that  $x_\lambda \rightarrow x$ .

However,  $x_\lambda \notin f^{-1}(V)$  for all  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . Thus,  $f(x_\lambda) \notin V$  for all  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . Thus,  $f(x_\lambda)$  is not eventually in  $V$ , a neighborhood of  $f(x)$ . Thus,  $f(x_\lambda)$  does not converge to  $f(x)$ .

By the contrapositive, we have shown that if  $f$  takes convergent nets to convergent nets, then  $f$  is continuous and we are done.

**Problem 49.** Let  $X$  be a normed vector space. Show that a net  $(x_\lambda)$  converges to  $x$  weakly if and only if  $\phi(x_\lambda) \rightarrow \phi(x)$  for all  $\phi \in X^*$ . Does a weakly convergent net  $(x_\lambda)$  have to be bounded?

*Solution.* Let  $x_\lambda \subset X$  be a net.

First assume that  $x_\lambda \rightarrow x$  in the weak topology. By definition, we have that each  $\phi \in X^*$  is continuous with respect to the weak topology. Thus, by the previous problem,  $\forall \phi \in X^*$ , we have:

$$x_\lambda \rightarrow x \implies \phi(x_\lambda) \rightarrow \phi(x)$$

Next, assume  $\phi(x_\lambda) \rightarrow \phi(x)$  for all  $\phi \in X^*$ . We need to show that  $x_\lambda \rightarrow x$  in the weak topology. Thus, let  $V \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  be a neighborhood of  $x$ . We need to show that  $x_\lambda$  is eventually in  $V$ .

Let  $\beta$  be the neighborhood basis of  $x$  with respect to the weak topology that we defined in class. Since  $V$  is a neighborhood of  $x$ , we know there exists a  $U \in \beta$  such that  $U \subset V$ . Then,  $U$  is of the form:

$$U = U(\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n\}, x_0, \epsilon) = \{x' \in X : |\phi_i(x') - \phi_i(x)| < \epsilon, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$

for some  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n \in X^*$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . We will show that  $x_\lambda$  is eventually in  $U \subset V$ .

Note that  $\phi_i(x_\lambda) \rightarrow \phi_i(x)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Take  $B_\epsilon(\phi_i(x))$  to be the open ball of radius  $\epsilon$  around  $\phi_i(x)$ . Then, there exists an index  $\lambda_i$  such that for all  $\lambda \geq \lambda_i$ , we have:

$$\phi_i(x_\lambda) \in B_\epsilon(\phi_i(x)) \iff |\phi_i(x_\lambda) - \phi_i(x)| < \epsilon$$

Since the  $\lambda_i$  are a part of a directed set, any two of them have an element dominating them. By (very simple) induction, any finite collection of them has an element dominating them. Thus, let  $\lambda_0$  be the element such that:

$$\lambda_0 \geq \lambda_i \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n$$

Then, for all  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ , we have that for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ :

$$|\phi_i(x_\lambda) - \phi_i(x)| < \epsilon$$

Thus, for all  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ , we have that:

$$x_\lambda \in U$$

Thus,  $x_\lambda$  is eventually in  $U$ , thus eventually in  $V$ . Since  $V$  was an arbitrary neighborhood of  $x$ , we have that  $x_\lambda \rightarrow x$  in the weak topology.

TODO

**Problem 51.** Let  $(x_\lambda)$  be a net in the compact space  $X$ . Show that  $(x_\lambda)$  has an accumulation point. (Hint provided.)

*Solution.* Let  $(x_\lambda)$  be a net in compact space  $X$ . We need to show that there exists a point  $x \in X$  such that for any neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  and index  $\lambda_0$ , we have that there exists  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$  such that  $x_\lambda \in U$ .

Let  $F_{\lambda'} = \overline{\{x_\lambda : \lambda \geq \lambda'\}}$ . Then, the family  $\{F_\lambda\}_\lambda$  is a family of closed sets. Moreover, let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  be a finite collection of indices. Since the indices are from a directed set, there exists an index dominating any pair of them. Thus, by (very simple) induction, we can find an index  $\lambda''$  dominating all of them (for any finite collection), i.e.  $\lambda \geq \lambda''$  implies  $\lambda \geq \lambda_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Thus, by definition, we have that:

$$x_{\lambda''} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n F_{\lambda_i}$$

Thus, the family  $\{F_\lambda\}_\lambda$  is a family of closed sets with the finite intersection property. As  $X$  is compact, we have (Problem 13) that:

$$\bigcap_{\lambda} F_\lambda \neq \emptyset$$

Thus, there exists a point  $x \in \bigcap_{\lambda} F_\lambda$ . We claim that  $x$  is an accumulation point of  $x_\lambda$ .

Let  $U$  be a neighborhood of  $x$  and  $\lambda_0$  be an index. Then,

$$x \in F_{\lambda_0} = \overline{\{x_\lambda : \lambda \geq \lambda_0\}}$$

Thus, by the definition of closure, we have that every open neighborhood of  $x$  intersects  $\{x_\lambda : \lambda \geq \lambda_0\}$ . Thus, there exists a point in  $\{x_\lambda : \lambda \geq \lambda_0\} \cap U$ . Thus, there exists a  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$  such that  $x_\lambda \in U$ .

As  $U$  and  $\lambda_0$  were arbitrary,  $x$  is an accumulation point of  $(x_\lambda)$ .

Not every weakly convergent net is bounded. Let  $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$  be the negative real numbers with their usual order. Then we have  $x_\lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  a net, defined by:

$$x_\lambda = -\lambda$$

Then,  $x_\lambda \rightarrow 0$  in the norm topology, thus  $x_\lambda$  is weakly convergent to 0 (every weakly open set is norm open). However, for any  $N \in \mathbb{R}$ , if we pick  $\lambda < N$ , we have that  $x_\lambda = -\lambda > N$ . Thus,  $x_\lambda$  is unbounded.

**Problem 52.** Let  $(x_n)$  be a sequence in a metric space  $X$ . Show that  $x$  is an accumulation point of  $(x_n)$  if and only if  $(x_n)$  has a subsequence converging to  $x$ .

*Solution.* Assume  $x$  is an accumulation point of  $(x_n)$ . Let  $B_{1/n}(x)$  be the open ball of radius  $1/n$  around  $x$ . Since  $x$  is an accumulation point and  $B_1(x)$  is a neighborhood of  $x$ , we have that there exists  $n_1 > 1$  such that  $x_{n_1} \in B_1(x)$ . Then, since  $B_{1/2}(x)$  is a neighborhood of  $x$ , there exists  $n_2 > n_1$  such that  $x_{n_2} \in B_{1/2}(x) \subset B_1(x)$ . Continuing in this manner, we can find a sequence of indices  $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_k < \cdots$  such that  $x_{n_k} \in B_{1/k}(x)$ . We claim that this subsequence converges to  $x$ .

For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can find  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $1/N < \epsilon$ . Then, for all  $k \geq N$ , we have that  $x_{n_k} \in B_{1/k}$ . However, as  $1/k < 1/N < \epsilon$ , we have that  $x_{n_k} \in B_{1/N}(x) \subseteq B_\epsilon(x)$ . Thus,  $x_{n_k} \rightarrow x$ .

Next, assume that  $(x_n)$  has a subsequence  $(x_{n_k})$  converging to  $x$ . We need to show that  $x$  is an accumulation point of  $(x_n)$ .

Let  $U$  be a neighborhood of  $x$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  be some index. We need to show that there exists an  $m > N$  such that  $x_m \in U$ .

Since every neighborhood of  $x$  contains an open neighborhood, we assume, without loss of generality, that  $U$  is open. Since  $x_{n_k}$  is a subsequence of  $x$ , we have that  $n_k \geq k$ . Moreover, since  $x_{n_k}$  converges to  $x$ , there exists an index  $N_1$  such that for all  $k \geq N_1$ , we have that  $x_{n_k} \in U$ .

Let  $N_0 > \max(N, N_1)$  be an index. Then,  $n_{N_0} \geq N_0 > N$  and as  $N_0 > N_1$ , we have that  $x_{n_{N_0}} \in U$ . Thus,  $x$  is an accumulation point of  $(x_n)$ .