

# Folland: *Real Analysis*

Danny Nygård Hansen

17th October 2022

## 0 • Introduction

- We use the letter  $d$  to denote vector spaces dimensions, freeing up  $n$  to be used as an index, e.g. in sequences. In particular we write  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathbb{C}^d$ .
- The Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is denoted  $\lambda_d$ , and  $\lambda = \lambda_1$ .
- The symbol  $\mathbb{K}$  denotes either the real or complex numbers.
- The unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  is denoted  $\mathbb{S}^n$ .
- We denote the power set of a set  $X$  by  $2^X$ .
- The restriction of a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  to a subset  $A \subseteq X$  is denoted  $f|_A$ .
- Whenever we need to make the distinction,  $\mathcal{L}^p(\mu)$  refers to the space of  $\mu$ - $p$ -integrable functions, while  $L^p(\mu)$  denotes the quotient of  $\mathcal{L}^p(\mu)$  with the subspace of functions that are zero  $\mu$ -a.e.
- The space of bounded operators between normed spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  is denoted  $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ .
- The bounded and continuous complex-valued functions on a topological space  $X$  is denoted  $C_b(X)$ .
- A vector space equipped with an inner product is called an *inner product space*.

## 1 • Measures

### 1.2. $\sigma$ -algebras

#### EXERCISE 1.1

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an infinite  $\sigma$ -algebra.

- (a)  $\mathcal{M}$  contains an infinite sequence of disjoint sets.

(b)  $|\mathcal{M}| \geq \mathfrak{c}$ .

Of course part (a) is trivial unless we require the sets to be nonempty.

**SOLUTION.** (a) We show by contraposition that there exists a nonempty set  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  such that the restriction of  $\mathcal{M}$  to  $A^c$  is infinite. That is, assuming that no such set exists, we show that  $\mathcal{M}$  is finite. Pick any nonempty  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . Then the restriction of  $\mathcal{M}$  to  $A$  and  $A^c$  respectively are both finite. For any  $B \in \mathcal{M}$  we can write

$$B = (B \cap A) \cup (B \cap A^c).$$

But each set in the union lies in one of the restrictions, so there are finitely many decompositions like the one above, so there are finitely many sets  $B \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Now construct the sequence: Pick  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  as above, restrict  $\mathcal{M}$  to  $A^c$ , and continue recursively.

(b) Let  $(A_n)$  be the sequence constructed above. There is an injection  $\varphi: 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  given by  $\varphi(I) = \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$  (injectivity follows since the sets in the sequence are disjoint). Hence  $|\mathcal{M}| \geq |2^{\mathbb{N}}| = \mathfrak{c}$ .  $\square$

### 1.3. Measures

#### EXERCISE 1.14

If  $\mu$  is a semifinite measure and  $\mu(E) = \infty$ , for any  $C > 0$  there exists  $F \subseteq E$  with  $C < \mu(F) < \infty$ .

**SOLUTION.** Consider

$$S = \sup\{\mu(F) \mid F \subseteq E, \mu(F) < \infty\}.$$

If  $S = \infty$ , then the result is obvious. So assume towards a contradiction that  $S < \infty$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  choose  $F_n \subseteq E$  with  $\mu(F_n) < \infty$  such that

$$S - \frac{1}{n} \leq \mu(F_n) \leq S.$$

Put  $G_k = \bigcup_{n=1}^k F_n$ . Then  $G_k \subseteq E$  and  $\mu(G_k) < \infty$ , so the same inequality holds with  $F_n$  replaced by  $G_k$ . Now putting  $G = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} G_k$ , continuity of  $\mu$  gives

$$S - \frac{1}{n} \leq \mu(G) \leq S$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so  $\mu(G) = S$ .

By assumption  $\mu(E \setminus G) = \infty$ , so  $E \setminus G$  contains a set  $G' \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $0 < \mu(G') < \infty$ . But then

$$\mu(G \cup G') = \mu(G) + \mu(G') > S,$$

a contradiction.  $\square$

#### EXERCISE 1.16

Let  $(X, \mathcal{M}, \mu)$  be a measure space. A set  $E \subseteq X$  is called *locally measurable* if  $E \cap A \in \mathcal{M}$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\mu(A) < \infty$ . Let  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  be the collection of all locally measurable sets. Clearly  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ ; if  $\mathcal{M} = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ , then  $\mu$  is called *saturated*.

- (a) If  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, then  $\mu$  is saturated.
- (b)  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.
- (c) Define  $\tilde{\mu}$  on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  by  $\tilde{\mu}(E) = \mu(E)$  if  $E \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\tilde{\mu}(E) = \infty$  otherwise. Then  $\tilde{\mu}$  is a saturated measure on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ , called the *saturation* of  $\mu$ .
- (d) If  $\mu$  is complete, so is  $\tilde{\mu}$ .
- (e) Suppose that  $\mu$  is semifinite. For  $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  define

$$\underline{\mu}(E) = \sup\{\mu(A) \mid A \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } A \subseteq E\}.$$

Then  $\underline{\mu}$  is a saturated measure on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  that extends  $\mu$ .

- (f) Let  $X_1, X_2$  be disjoint uncountable sets,  $X = X_1 \cup X_2$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra of countable or co-countable sets in  $X$ . Let  $\mu_0$  be counting measure on  $2^{X_1}$ , and define  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  by  $\mu(E) = \mu_0(E \cap X_1)$ . Then  $\mu$  is a measure on  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = 2^X$ , and in the notation of parts (c) and (e),  $\tilde{\mu} \neq \underline{\mu}$ .

**SOLUTION.** (a) Assume that  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, and let  $E \subseteq X$  be locally measurable. Let  $(A_n) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  be such that  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$  and  $\mu(A_n) < \infty$ . Then  $E \cap A_n \in \mathcal{M}$ , and so  $E = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (E \cap A_n) \in \mathcal{M}$ .

(b) Clearly we have  $X \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ . Then let  $(E_n) \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ , and let  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mu(A) < \infty$ . Then

$$A \cap \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (A \cap E_n) \in \mathcal{M},$$

so  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ . Finally let  $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mu(A) < \infty$ . Then

$$E^c \cap A = A \setminus E = A \setminus (E \cap A) = (E \cap A)^c \cap A \in \mathcal{M}$$

since  $E \cap A \in \mathcal{M}$ , so  $E^c \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ .

(c) We first show that  $\tilde{\mu}$  is a measure. Clearly  $\tilde{\mu}(\emptyset) = 0$ , so let  $(E_n)$  be a sequence of disjoint sets in  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ , and let  $E = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n$ . Say that  $E_m$  does not lie in  $\mathcal{M}$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then we must have  $\tilde{\mu}(E) = \infty$ , since otherwise  $E \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mu(E) < \infty$ , and hence  $E_m = E_m \cap E \in \mathcal{M}$ . Thus we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mu}(E_n) \geq \tilde{\mu}(E_m) = \infty = \tilde{\mu}(E),$$

so  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mu}(E_n) = \tilde{\mu}(E)$ . The same is obviously true if all  $E_n$  lie in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Next we show that  $\tilde{\mu}$  is saturated, i.e. that  $\widetilde{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ , so let  $E \in \widetilde{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}$ . For all  $A \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $\tilde{\mu}(A) < \infty$  we then have  $E \cap A \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ . By definition of  $\tilde{\mu}$  we must have  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ , so we also have

$$E \cap A = (E \cap A) \cap A \in \mathcal{M}.$$

And since this is true for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mu(A) < \infty$ , it follows that  $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ .

In some sense, the fact that  $\tilde{\mu}$  is saturated is obvious: The more sets of finite measure, the harder it is to be saturated, and vice-versa. On the other hand, the sets of infinite measure are irrelevant, so since the only new sets in  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  have infinite measure, they cannot affect whether the measure is saturated or not.

(d) Assume that  $\mu$  is complete. Let  $F \subseteq X$  be such that there is a set  $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $F \subseteq E$  and  $\tilde{\mu}(E) = 0$ . Then also  $E \in \mathcal{M}$ , and since  $\mu$  is complete we have  $F \in \mathcal{M} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  as desired. Or more succinctly: Saturating a measure only introduces sets of infinite measure, so it does not introduce any null-sets.

(e) Assume that  $\mu$  is semifinite. We first show that  $\underline{\mu}$  is a measure. Clearly  $\underline{\mu}(\emptyset) = 0$ , so let  $(E_n) \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  be a sequence of disjoint sets. Clearly  $\underline{\mu}$  is increasing, so sigma-additivity is obvious if any of the sets  $E_n$  have infinite measure. Assume then that  $\mu(E_n) < \infty$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and choose  $A_n \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $A_n \subseteq E_n$  and  $\underline{\mu}(E_n) \leq \mu(A_n) + \varepsilon/2^n$ . Then

$$\underline{\mu}\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n\right) \geq \underline{\mu}\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \underline{\mu}(E_n) - \varepsilon.$$

Since this holds for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we obtain the first inequality. For the other inequality, let  $E = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n$ , and first assume that  $\underline{\mu}(E) = \infty$ . Pick  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $A \subseteq E$ . Since  $\mu$  is semifinite, we can choose  $A$  such that  $C < \mu(A) < \infty$  for any given  $C > 0$ . Letting  $A_n = A \cap E_n \in \mathcal{M}$  we get

$$C < \mu(A) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \underline{\mu}(E_n),$$

and since  $C$  is arbitrary, we get  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \underline{\mu}(E_n) = \infty$ . If instead  $\underline{\mu}(E) < \infty$ , pick  $A \subseteq E$  with  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\underline{\mu}(E) \leq \underline{\mu}(A) + \varepsilon$ . Again letting  $A_n = A \cap \bar{E}_n$  we get

$$\underline{\mu}(E) - \varepsilon \leq \underline{\mu}(A) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \underline{\mu}(A_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \underline{\mu}(E_n).$$

And since  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrary, we obtain the other inequality.

Next we show that  $\underline{\mu}$  is saturated. Letting  $E$  be locally  $\underline{\mu}$ -measurable, we must show that  $E$  is also locally  $\underline{\mu}$ -measurable. So let  $A \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $\underline{\mu}(A) < \infty$ . Then  $\underline{\mu}(A) < \infty$ , and so  $E \cap A \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}$ . But then

$$E \cap A = (E \cap A) \cap A \in \mathcal{M},$$

as desired.

(f) It is pretty obvious that  $\mu$  is a measure on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then let  $E \subseteq X$  and  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mu(A) < \infty$ . Then  $A \cap X_1$  must be finite, and so  $A$  is not co-countable. But then it is countable, and so is  $E \cap A$ , hence  $E \cap A \in \mathcal{M}$ . Thus every subset of  $X$  is locally measurable.

Notice that  $\mu$  is semifinite. We have  $\tilde{\mu}(X_2) = \infty$  since  $X_2 \notin \mathcal{M}$ , but  $\underline{\mu}(X_2) = 0$  since every subset of  $X_2$  is disjoint from  $X_1$ , and so it has measure zero.  $\square$

#### 1.4. Outer Measures

##### EXERCISE 1.18

Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^X$  be an algebra,  $\mathcal{A}_\sigma$  the collection of countable unions of sets in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  $\mathcal{A}_{\sigma\delta}$  the collection of countable intersections of sets in  $\mathcal{A}_\sigma$ . Let  $\mu_0$  be a premeasure on  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mu^*$  the induced outer measure.

- (a) For any  $E \subseteq X$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $A \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma$  with  $E \subseteq A$  with  $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(E) + \varepsilon$ .
- (b) If  $\mu^*(E) < \infty$ , then  $E$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable iff there exists  $B \in \mathcal{A}_{\sigma\delta}$  with  $E \subseteq B$  and  $\mu^*(B \setminus E) = 0$ .
- (c) If  $\mu_0$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, the restriction  $\mu^*(E) < \infty$  in (b) is superfluous.

**SOLUTION.** (a) Let  $E \subseteq X$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . The definition of  $\mu^*$  yields a sequence  $(A_n) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  such that  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$  and  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(A_n) \leq \mu^*(E) + \varepsilon$ . It follows that

$$\mu^*(E) + \varepsilon \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(A_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_n) \geq \mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n\right).$$

(b) Let  $E \subseteq X$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a set  $B_n \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma$  such that  $E \subseteq B_n$  and  $\mu^*(B_n) \leq \mu^*(E) + 1/n$ . Letting  $B = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n \in \mathcal{A}_{\sigma\delta}$  we get  $\mu^*(B) \leq \mu^*(E)$ , and since  $E \subseteq B$  we also have the opposite inequality, so  $\mu^*(B) = \mu^*(E)$ .

Now assume that  $\mu^*(E) < \infty$  and that  $E$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable. Then

$$\mu^*(B) = \mu^*(B \cap E) + \mu^*(B \cap E^c) = \mu^*(E) + \mu^*(B \setminus E),$$

from which it follows that  $\mu^*(B \setminus E) = 0$ .

Conversely, assume that there is a  $B \in \mathcal{A}_{\sigma\delta}$  with  $E \subseteq B$  and  $\mu^*(B \setminus E) = 0$ . Then  $B$  lies in the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{A}$ , so it is  $\mu^*$ -measurable. Let  $A \subseteq X$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(A \cap E^c) &\leq \mu^*(A \cap E^c \cap B) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c \cap B^c) \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap (B \cup E)^c) \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap B^c), \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) \leq \mu^*(A \cap B) + \mu^*(A \cap B^c) = \mu^*(A),$$

showing that  $E$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable. (Notice that we haven't used that  $\mu^*(E) < \infty$  for the second implication.)

(c) We only need to prove the first implication above. By  $\sigma$ -finiteness of  $\mu_0$ , let  $(E_n)$  be a sequence of subsets of  $X$  such that  $\mu^*(E_n) < \infty$  and  $E = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there are sets  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma$  such that  $\mu^*(A_n) \leq \mu^*(E_n) + \varepsilon/2^n$ . Letting  $B_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma$  we get

$$\mu^*(B_\varepsilon \setminus E) = \mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (A_n \cap E^c)\right) \leq \mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (A_n \cap E_n^c)\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_n \setminus E_n) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Finally we let  $B = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} B_{1/k} \in \mathcal{A}_{\sigma\delta}$ , and we get  $\mu^*(B \setminus E) = 0$  as desired.  $\square$

**REMARK 1.1.** Notice that (b) and (c) in particular show that any Lebesgue measurable set  $E$ , and therefore any Borel set, is the intersection of a  $G_\delta$  set  $B$  and a Lebesgue null set  $B \setminus E$ .  $\lrcorner$

#### EXERCISE 1.20

Let  $\mu^*$  be an outer measure on  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{M}^*$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mu^*$ -measurable sets,  $\bar{\mu} = \mu^*|_{\mathcal{M}^*}$ , and  $\mu^+$  the outer measure induced by  $\bar{\mu}$  as in (1.12) (with  $\bar{\mu}$  and  $\mathcal{M}^*$  replacing  $\mu_0$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ ).

- (a) If  $E \subseteq X$ , we have  $\mu^*(E) \leq \mu^+(E)$ , with equality iff there exists  $A \in \mathcal{M}^*$  with  $A \supseteq E$  and  $\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(E)$ .
- (b) If  $\mu^*$  is induced from a premeasure, then  $\mu^* = \mu^+$ .

(c) If  $X = \{0, 1\}$ , there exists an outer measure  $\mu^*$  on  $X$  such that  $\mu^* \neq \mu^+$ .

**SOLUTION.** (a) Recall that the definition of  $\mu^+$  means that

$$\mu^+(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bar{\mu}(A_n) \mid A_n \in \mathcal{M}^*, E \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \right\},$$

and that we by definition of  $\bar{\mu}$  can replace  $\bar{\mu}$  with  $\mu^*$ . For any such sequence  $(A_n)$  we have

$$\mu^*(E) \leq \mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bar{\mu}(A_n).$$

And since  $\mu^+(E)$  is the infimum of all such sums, we have  $\mu^*(E) \leq \mu^+(E)$ .

Next assume that there is an  $A \in \mathcal{M}^*$  with  $E \subseteq A$  such that  $\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(E)$ . Using the sequence  $A_1 = A$  and  $A_n = \emptyset$  for  $n > 1$  in the definition of  $\mu^+$  yields

$$\mu^+(E) \leq \bar{\mu}(A) = \mu^*(A) = \mu^*(E).$$

Hence  $\mu^+(E) = \mu^*(E)$  as desired.

Conversely, assuming that  $\mu^*(E) = \mu^+(E)$  we have

$$\mu^*(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_n) \mid A_n \in \mathcal{M}^*, E \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \right\}.$$

Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , choose a sequence  $(A_n)$  such that

$$\mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_n) \leq \mu^*(E) + \varepsilon,$$

and let  $B_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$ . Letting  $A = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} B_{1/k} \in \mathcal{M}^*$  we thus have  $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(E)$ .

(b) Assume that  $\mu^*$  is induced from a premeasure on an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ , and let  $E \subseteq X$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{A}$  consists of  $\mu^*$ -measurable sets, so  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}^*$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  choose, in accordance with Exercise 1.18(a), a set  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma$  with  $E \subseteq A_n$  such that  $\mu^*(A_n) \leq \mu^*(E) + 1/n$ . Letting  $A = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$  we have  $E \subseteq A$  and  $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(E)$ . The other inequality is obvious, so  $\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(E)$ , and part (a) implies that  $\mu^*(E) = \mu^+(E)$  as desired.  $\square$

#### EXERCISE 1.21

Let  $\mu^*$  be an outer measure induced from a premeasure and  $\bar{\mu}$  the restriction of  $\mu^*$  to the  $\mu^*$ -measurable sets. Then  $\bar{\mu}$  is saturated.

**SOLUTION.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the algebra on which the premeasure in question is defined, and denote by  $\mathcal{M}^*$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mu^*$ -measurable sets. Recall that  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}^*$ .

Let  $E \subseteq X$  be locally measurable. It suffices to show that

$$\mu^*(F) \geq \mu^*(F \cap E) + \mu^*(F \cap E^c)$$

for all  $F \subseteq X$  with  $\mu^*(F) < \infty$ . Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , Exercise 1.18(a) yields a set  $A \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma$  such that  $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(F) + \varepsilon$ . Then  $\mu^*(A) < \infty$ , and so  $E \cap A \in \mathcal{M}^*$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(F) + \varepsilon &\geq \mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap (E \cap A)) + \mu^*(A \cap (E \cap A)^c) \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) \\ &\geq \mu^*(F \cap E) + \mu^*(F \cap E^c), \end{aligned}$$

and hence  $E \in \mathcal{M}^*$ . Thus  $\bar{\mu}$  is saturated.  $\square$

#### EXERCISE 1.22

Let  $(X, \mathcal{M}, \mu)$  be a measure space,  $\mu^*$  the outer measure induced by  $\mu$  according to (1.12),  $\mathcal{M}^*$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mu^*$ -measurable sets, and  $\bar{\mu} = \mu^*|_{\mathcal{M}^*}$ .

- (a) If  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, then  $\bar{\mu}$  is the completion of  $\mu$ .
- (b) In general,  $\bar{\mu}$  is the saturation of the completion of  $\mu$ .

**SOLUTION.** (a) Let  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$  be the  $\sigma$ -algebra from Theorem 1.9 (namely, the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the sets in  $\mathcal{M}$  along with all  $\mu$ -null sets). This is clearly the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra on which there can exist a complete extension of  $\mu$ , so since  $\bar{\mu}$  is also a complete extension of  $\mu$ , we must have  $\bar{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}^*$ . Theorem 1.9 yields the uniqueness of a complete extension of  $\mu$  on  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ , so it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{M}^* \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{M}}$ .

Now assume that  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, and let  $E \in \mathcal{M}^*$ . Then also  $E^c \in \mathcal{M}^*$ , and Exercise 1.18(c) ensures the existence of sets  $B, D \in \mathcal{M}_{\sigma\delta} = \mathcal{M}$  with  $E \subseteq B$  and  $E^c \subseteq D$  such that

$$\mu^*(B \setminus E) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^*(E \setminus D^c) = \mu^*(D \setminus E^c) = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\mu(B \setminus D^c) \leq \mu^*(B \setminus E) + \mu^*(E \setminus D^c) = 0,$$

so  $E \setminus D^c$  is a  $\mu$ -null set. Thus  $E = D^c \cup (E \setminus D^c)$  is a union of a set in  $\mathcal{M}$  and a  $\mu$ -null set, and hence  $E \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}$ .



(b) Let  $\hat{\mu}$  denote the completion of  $\mu$  on  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ , and let  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  denote the  $\sigma$ -algebra of locally  $\hat{\mu}$ -measurable sets. First we show that  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}^*$ , so let  $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ . To show that  $E$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable it suffices to show that

$$\mu^*(F) \geq \mu^*(F \cap E) + \mu^*(F \cap E^c)$$

for all  $F \subseteq X$  with  $\mu^*(F) < \infty$ . Calculations identical to the ones in the solution to Exercise 1.21 show this.

Conversely, let  $E \in \mathcal{M}^*$  and consider  $A \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $\hat{\mu}(A) < \infty$ . Then also  $A \in \mathcal{M}^*$ , so  $E \cap A \in \mathcal{M}^*$ . The argument at the beginning of part (a) showed that  $\bar{\mu}$  is an extension of  $\hat{\mu}$ , so  $\mu^*(E \cap A) = \hat{\mu}(E \cap A) < \infty$ . The same argument as in part (a), only now using Exercise 1.18(b) instead of (c), shows that  $E \cap A \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ , and so  $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ .

Finally, let  $\tilde{\mu}$  denote the saturation of  $\hat{\mu}$ . We show that  $\bar{\mu} = \tilde{\mu}$ . Since the completion of  $\mu$  on  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$  is unique, the two measures must agree here. Instead let  $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ . By definition of  $\tilde{\mu}$  we must then have  $\tilde{\mu}(E) = \infty$ . On the other hand, we just showed (for  $E \cap A$  instead of  $E$ ) that  $\mu^*(E) < \infty$  implies  $E \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ . Since we have assumed that this is not the case, we must have  $\bar{\mu}(E) = \mu^*(E) = \infty$ . Thus  $\bar{\mu} = \tilde{\mu}$ .  $\square$

## 1.5. Borel Measures on the Real Line

### EXERCISE 1.25

If  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , the following are equivalent.

- (a)  $E \in \mathcal{M}_\mu$ .
- (b)  $E = V \setminus N_1$  where  $V$  is a  $G_\delta$  set and  $\mu(N_1) = 0$ .
- (c)  $E = H \cup N_2$  where  $H$  is an  $F_\sigma$  set and  $\mu(N_2) = 0$ .

**SOLUTION.** Folland proves this claim when  $\mu(E) < \infty$ , so assume that  $\mu(E) = \infty$ . Since  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, there is a sequence  $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathcal{M}_\mu$  with  $\mu(E_n) < \infty$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $E = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n$ . Then there are sequences  $(H_n)$  of  $F_\sigma$  sets and  $(N_n)$  of null sets such that  $E_n = H_n \cup N_n$ . Then  $H = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} H_n$  is also an  $F_\sigma$  set and  $N = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} N_n$  a null set, and  $E = H \cup N$ .

Applying this to  $E^c$  yields a similar decomposition  $E^c = H \cup N$ . But then  $E = H^c \setminus N$ , and  $H^c$  is a  $G_\delta$  set.  $\square$

## 2 • Integration

### 2.1. Measurable Functions

**EXERCISE 2.10**

The following implications are valid iff the measure  $\mu$  is complete:

- (a) If  $f$  is measurable and  $f = g$   $\mu$ -a.e., then  $g$  is measurable.
- (b) If  $f_n$  is measurable for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $f_n \rightarrow f$   $\mu$ -a.e., then  $f$  is measurable.

**SOLUTION.** (a) Assume that  $\mu$  is complete, and let  $f, g: (X, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{F})$  be functions from a measure space to a measurable space where  $f$  is  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ -measurable. Let  $N = \{f \neq g\}$  and assume that  $\mu(N) = 0$ . Given  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  we must show that  $g^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{E}$ . But notice that

$$g^{-1}(B) = f^{-1}(B) \cup \{f \notin B, g \in B\} \setminus \{f \in B, g \notin B\},$$

and that the latter two sets are subsets of  $N$ , hence measurable. Thus  $g^{-1}(B)$  is also measurable.

Conversely, let  $N \subseteq X$  be a  $\mu$ -null set. Then  $\mathbf{1}_N = 0$   $\mu$ -a.e., so  $\mathbf{1}_N$  and therefore  $N$  is measurable. Hence  $\mu$  is complete.

(b) Assume that  $\mu$  is complete, and consider the set  $A$  of points  $x \in X$  such that  $f_n(x)$  does not converge to  $f(x)$ . Then  $f_n \mathbf{1}_{A^c} \rightarrow f \mathbf{1}_{A^c}$  pointwise everywhere, so Proposition 2.7 (or Corollary 2.9) implies that  $f \mathbf{1}_{A^c}$  is measurable. By assumption we have  $\mu(A) = 0$ , so  $f \mathbf{1}_{A^c} = f$   $\mu$ -a.e. and part (a) implies that  $f$  is measurable.

Conversely, let  $N \subseteq X$  be a  $\mu$ -null set and consider the sequence  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $f_n = 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . This converges  $\mu$ -a.e. to  $\mathbf{1}_N$  so  $N$  is measurable. Hence  $\mu$  is complete.  $\square$

**2.7. Integration in Polar Coordinates**

**REMARK 2.1.** We give a heuristic derivation of the radial measure  $\rho_d$ . Let  $dA$  be an area element in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . In polar coordinates  $(r, \theta)$  this has a radial size of  $dr$  and an angular size of  $r d\theta$ . Notice that since  $\theta$  is an angle, we multiply it by the distance  $r$  from the origin. Hence

$$dA = r d\theta dr = (r dr) d\theta.$$

Going up one dimension we introduce another angular coordinate  $\varphi$ , which contributes a factor  $f(\theta, \varphi) r d\varphi$  to the volume element, where  $f$  is some function of the angular coordinates. Similarly when going up yet another dimension: this again introduces a factor  $r$ , and now  $f$  is a function of yet another angular coordinate. In  $d$  dimensions we have  $d-1$  angular coordinates  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}$ , so the volume element is on the form

$$dV = f(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}) r^{d-1} dr d\theta_1 \cdots d\theta_{d-1}.$$

The radial part is thus  $r^{d-1} dr$ , so it makes sense to define the radial measure  $\rho_d$  on  $(0, \infty)$  by

$$\rho_d(E) = \int_E r^{d-1} dr. \quad \lrcorner$$

### 3 • Signed Measures and Differentiation

#### 3.1. Signed Measures

##### EXERCISE 3.2

If  $\nu$  is a signed measure,  $E$  is  $\nu$ -null iff  $|\nu|(E) = 0$ . Also, if  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  are signed measures,  $\nu \perp \mu$  iff  $|\nu| \perp \mu$  iff  $\nu^+ \perp \mu$  and  $\nu^- \perp \mu$ .

**SOLUTION.** Assume that  $E$  is  $\nu$ -null, and let  $P \cup N$  be a Hahn decomposition for  $\nu$ . Then

$$\nu^+(E) = \nu(E \cap P) = 0,$$

since  $E \cap P \subseteq E$ . Similarly we get  $\nu^-(E) = 0$ , so  $|\nu|(E) = 0$ . Conversely, assume that  $|\nu|(E) = 0$ . Then  $\nu^\pm(F) = 0$  for all measurable  $F \subseteq E$ , and so  $\nu(F) = 0$ .

The other claims follow directly from the above.  $\square$

##### EXERCISE 3.3

Let  $\nu$  be a signed measure on  $(X, \mathcal{M})$ .

(a)  $L^1(\nu) = L^1(|\nu|)$ .

(b) If  $f \in L^1(\nu)$ ,

$$\left| \int f d\nu \right| \leq \int |f| d|\nu|.$$

(c) If  $E \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$|\nu|(E) = \sup \left\{ \left| \int_E f d\nu \right| : |f| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

**SOLUTION.** (a) This follows directly from the definition of  $L^1(\nu)$ .

(b) For  $f \in L^1(\nu)$  we have

$$\left| \int f d\nu \right| = \left| \int f d\nu^+ - \int f d\nu^- \right| \leq \int |f| d\nu^+ + \int |f| d\nu^- = \int |f| d|\nu|,$$

since  $|\nu| = \nu^+ + \nu^-$ .

(c) If  $|f| \leq 1$ , then

$$\left| \int_E f \, d\nu \right| \leq \int_E |f| \, d|\nu| \leq |\nu|(E),$$

showing one inequality. For the other inequality, let  $P \cup N$  be a Hahn decomposition for  $\nu$ , and let  $f = \mathbf{1}_P - \mathbf{1}_N$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E f \, d\nu &= \int_E (\mathbf{1}_P - \mathbf{1}_N) \, d\nu^+ - \int_E (\mathbf{1}_P - \mathbf{1}_N) \, d\nu^- \\ &= \nu^+(E \cap P) - \nu^+(E \cap N) - \nu^-(E \cap P) + \nu^-(E \cap N) \\ &= \nu^+(E) + \nu^-(E) = |\nu|(E). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

#### EXERCISE 3.4

If  $\nu$  is a signed measure and  $\lambda, \mu$  are positive measures such that  $\nu = \lambda - \mu$ , then  $\lambda \geq \nu^+$  and  $\mu \geq \nu^-$ .

**SOLUTION.** Let  $P \cup N$  be a Hahn decomposition for  $\nu$ . Then

$$\nu^+(E) = \nu(E \cap P) = \lambda(E \cap P) - \mu(E \cap P) \leq \lambda(E \cap P) \leq \lambda(E),$$

and similarly for  $\nu^-$ .  $\square$

#### EXERCISE 3.5

If  $\nu_1, \nu_2$  are signed measures that both omit the value  $\infty$  or  $-\infty$ , then  $|\nu_1 + \nu_2| \leq |\nu_1| + |\nu_2|$ .

**SOLUTION.** First notice that

$$\nu_1 + \nu_2 = (\nu_1^+ + \nu_2^+) - (\nu_1^- + \nu_2^-),$$

so by the previous exercise we have

$$|\nu_1 + \nu_2| = (\nu_1 + \nu_2)^+ + (\nu_1 + \nu_2)^- \leq (\nu_1^+ + \nu_2^+) + (\nu_1^- + \nu_2^-) = |\nu_1| + |\nu_2|. \quad \square$$

#### EXERCISE 3.7

Suppose that  $\nu$  is a signed measure on  $(X, \mathcal{M})$  and  $E \in \mathcal{M}$ .

(a)  $\nu^+(E) = \sup\{\nu(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{M}, F \subseteq E\}$  and  $\nu^-(E) = -\inf\{\nu(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{M}, F \subseteq E\}$ .

(b) We have

$$|\nu|(E) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n |\nu(E_i)| \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, E_1, \dots, E_n \text{ disjoint}, \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = E \right\}.$$

**SOLUTION.** (a) We prove the first identity, the second is proved similarly. Denote the supremum on the right-hand side by  $\mu(E)$ , and let  $P \cup N$  be a Hahn decomposition for  $\nu$ . Since  $E \cap P \subseteq E$  we have

$$\nu^+(E) = \nu(E \cap P) \leq \mu(E).$$

Furthermore, for  $F \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $F \subseteq E$  notice that

$$\nu(F) = \nu^+(F) - \nu^-(F) \leq \nu^+(F) \leq \nu^+(E),$$

showing that  $\mu(E) \leq \nu^+(E)$ .

(b) Denote the quantity on the right-hand side by  $\rho(E)$ , and let  $P \cup N$  be a Hahn decomposition for  $\nu$ . The disjoint union  $E = (E \cap P) \cup (E \cap N)$  yields

$$\rho(E) \geq |\nu(E \cap P)| + |\nu(E \cap N)| = \nu^+(E) + \nu^-(E) = |\nu|(E).$$

Conversely, let  $E_1, \dots, E_n$  be disjoint sets in  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = E$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, n$  we have

$$|\nu(E_i)| = |\nu^+(E_i) - \nu^-(E_i)| \leq \nu^+(E_i) + \nu^-(E_i) = |\nu|(E_i),$$

implying that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |\nu(E_i)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |\nu|(E_i) = |\nu|(E).$$

It follows that  $\rho(E) \leq |\nu|(E)$ . □

## 4 • Point Set Topology

### 4.4. Compact Spaces

#### EXERCISE 4.38

Suppose that  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is a compact Hausdorff space and  $\mathcal{T}'$  is another topology on  $X$ . If  $\mathcal{T}'$  is strictly stronger than  $\mathcal{T}$ , then  $(X, \mathcal{T}')$  is Hausdorff but not compact. If  $\mathcal{T}'$  is strictly weaker than  $\mathcal{T}$ , then  $(X, \mathcal{T}')$  is compact but not Hausdorff.

**SOLUTION.** First assume that  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}'$ , and further assume that  $(X, \mathcal{T}')$  is compact. If  $U \in \mathcal{T}'$  we then must show that  $U \in \mathcal{T}$ . Notice that  $X \setminus U$  is closed in  $\mathcal{T}'$  and hence compact, so it is also compact in the weaker topology  $\mathcal{T}$ . Since  $\mathcal{T}$  is Hausdorff  $X \setminus U$  is closed, but then  $U \in \mathcal{T}$ .

Next assume that  $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  and that  $(X, \mathcal{T}')$  is Hausdorff. Let  $U \in \mathcal{T}$  and fix  $x \in U$ . For each  $y \notin U$  there is a pair of disjoint neighbourhoods  $V_y$  of  $x$  and  $W_y$  of  $y$  in  $\mathcal{T}'$ . The collection  $\{W_y \mid y \notin U\}$  is an open cover of  $X \setminus U$ , and since this is closed in  $\mathcal{T}$  it is also compact, so there is a finite subcover  $W_{y_1}, \dots, W_{y_n}$ . Letting  $V_x = V_{y_1} \cap \dots \cap V_{y_n}$ , the set  $V_x$  is completely contained in  $U$ . But then  $U$  is the union of the sets  $V_x$  as  $x$  ranges over  $U$ , so  $U$  is a union of elements from  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Hence it is itself open in  $\mathcal{T}'$ .  $\square$

#### 4.5. Locally Compact Hausdorff Spaces

##### EXERCISE 4.49

Let  $X$  be a compact Hausdorff space and  $E \subseteq X$ .

- (a) If  $E$  is open, then  $E$  is locally compact in the relative topology.
- (b) b
- (c) c

**SOLUTION.** (a) Since every point in  $X$  has a compact neighbourhood (namely  $X$  itself),  $X$  is locally compact. So if  $x \in E$  and  $E$  is open, then Proposition 4.30 yields a compact neighbourhood  $K \subseteq E$  of  $x$ . But then  $K$  is also a compact neighbourhood of  $x$  in  $E$ , showing that  $E$  is locally compact.

(b) b

(c) c  $\square$

**REMARK 4.1.** Let  $X$  be a compact Hausdorff space, and let  $x_0 \in X$  be any point in  $X$ . Exercise 4.49(a) then shows that  $X \setminus \{x_0\}$  is locally compact, so we may consider the one-point compactification  $(X \setminus \{x_0\})^*$ . We claim that  $(X \setminus \{x_0\})^* \cong X$ .

Denote the adjoined point by  $\infty$  and consider the inclusion map  $i: X \setminus \{x_0\} \rightarrow X$  extended to  $(X \setminus \{x_0\})^*$  by letting  $i(\infty) = x_0$ . This is a bijection, and restricted to  $X \setminus \{x_0\}$  it is a homeomorphism onto its image. We claim that  $i$  is itself a homeomorphism, and since both its domain and codomain are compact Hausdorff it suffices to show that it is continuous. So let  $U \subseteq X$  be open. If  $x_0 \notin U$  then  $i^{-1}(U) = (i|_{X \setminus \{x_0\}})^{-1}(U)$ , which is open in  $X \setminus \{x_0\}$ , hence open in  $(X \setminus \{x_0\})^*$ . Otherwise  $x_0 \in U$  then  $\infty \in i^{-1}(U)$ , and we need to show that  $i^{-1}(U)^c = i^{-1}(U^c)$  is compact. But  $U^c$  is a closed, hence compact, subset of  $X \setminus \{0\}$ , so its preimage under the homeomorphism  $i|_{X \setminus \{x_0\}}$  is also compact.  $\square$

## EXERCISE 4.52

The one-point compactification of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is homeomorphic to the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^n$ .

**SOLUTION.** Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n$  be any point on the sphere. By stereographic projection,  $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \{x_0\}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are homeomorphic. But then [Remark 4.1](#) shows that

$$(\mathbb{R}^n)^* \cong (\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \{x_0\})^* \cong \mathbb{S}$$

as desired.  $\square$

## 4.7. The Stone–Weierstrass Theorem

**REMARK 4.2.** Notice that we never use the Hausdorff assumption in the proof of the Stone–Weierstrass theorem. However, if  $X$  is a topological space and there exists a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of functions in  $C(X)$  or  $C(X, \mathbb{R})$  that separates points in  $X$ , then  $X$  is automatically Hausdorff: For let  $x \neq y$  be points in  $X$ , and let  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  be such that  $f(x) \neq f(y)$ . Choosing disjoint neighbourhoods  $U_x$  and  $U_y$  of  $x$  and  $y$  respectively,  $f^{-1}(U_x)$  and  $f^{-1}(U_y)$  are disjoint neighbourhoods of  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$ . Hence  $X$  is Hausdorff.

In other words, Hausdorff is not a necessary condition in the statement of the theorem, but rather follows from the other hypotheses.

In contrast, the compactness hypothesis is used very explicitly in the proof of [Lemma 4.49](#).  $\lrcorner$

## EXERCISE 4.66

Let  $1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n t^n$  be the Maclaurin series for  $(1 - t)^{1/2}$ .

- (a) The series converges absolutely and uniformly on compact subsets of  $(-1, 1)$ , as does the termwise differentiated series  $-\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n c_n t^{n-1}$ . Thus, if  $f(t) = 1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n t^n$ , then  $f'(t) = -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n c_n t^{n-1}$ .
- (b) By explicit calculation,  $f(t) = -2(1 - t)f'(t)$ , from which it follows that  $(1 - t)^{-1/2} f(t)$  is constant. Since  $f(0) = 1$ ,  $f(t) = (1 - t)^{1/2}$ .

**SOLUTION.** (a) We first compute the coefficients  $c_n$ . If  $g(t) = (1 - t)^{1/2}$ , then we claim that

$$g^{(n)}(t) = -\frac{(2n-3)(2n-5)\cdots(3)(1)}{2^n} (1-t)^{-(2n-1)/2}$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \in (-1, 1)$ . Indeed, this follows easily by induction. Hence

$$c_n = \frac{1}{n!} g^{(n)}(0) = -\frac{1}{n!} \frac{(2n-3)(2n-5)\cdots(3)(1)}{2^n}.$$

Now let  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ . Then

$$\left| \frac{c_{n+1}\rho^{n+1}}{c_n\rho^n} \right| = \frac{n!}{(n+1)!} \frac{2n-1}{2} \rho = \frac{2n-1}{2n} \rho \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho < 1.$$

The ratio test then implies that the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \rho^n$  converges, so it follows from the Weierstrass M-test that the series  $1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n t^n$  converges absolutely and uniformly on the interval  $[-\rho, \rho]$ , and hence on all compact subsets of  $(-1, 1)$ . We similarly find that

$$\left| \frac{(n+1)c_{n+1}\rho^n}{nc_n\rho^{n-1}} \right| = \frac{n!}{(n+1)!} \frac{n+1}{n} \frac{2n-1}{2} \rho = \frac{n+1}{n} \frac{2n-1}{2n} \rho \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho < 1,$$

so the series  $-\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nc_n t^{n-1}$  also converges as claimed.

(b) Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} -2(1-t)f'(t) &= 2(1-t) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nc_n t^{n-1} = 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nc_n t^{n-1} - 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nc_n t^n \\ &= 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1)c_{n+1} t^n - 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nc_n t^n \\ &= 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} ((n+1)c_{n+1} - nc_n) t^n. \end{aligned}$$

A short calculation shows that  $(n+1)c_{n+1} - nc_n = c_n/2$ , so the above equals  $f(t)$  as claimed. Thus we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}(1-t)^{-1/2}f(t) = (1-t)^{-1/2}f'(t) + \frac{1}{2}(1-t)^{-3/2}f(t) = 0,$$

showing that  $(1-t)^{-1/2}f(t)$  is constant. But  $f(0) = 1$ , so it follows that  $f(t) = (1-t)^{1/2} = g(t)$ .  $\square$

## 5 • Elements of Functional Analysis

### 5.1. Normed Vector Spaces

**REMARK 5.1.** We give a slightly different proof of Proposition 5.2.

Clearly if  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous, then it is continuous at 0. And if this is so, then there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\|h\| < \delta$  implies  $\|Th\| \leq 1$ , for  $h \in X$ . For all  $x \in X$  we thus have

$$\|Tx\| = \frac{\|x\|}{\delta} \left\| T\left(\delta \frac{x}{\|x\|}\right) \right\| \leq \delta^{-1} \|x\|,$$



so  $T$  is bounded.

We let

$$\|T\| = \sup\{\|Tx\| \mid x \in X, \|x\| \leq 1\}$$

If  $T$  is bounded, then clearly  $\|T\| < \infty$ . If conversely  $\|T\| < \infty$ , then

$$\|Tx\| = \left\| T \frac{x}{\|x\|} \right\| \|x\| \leq \|T\| \|x\|$$

for all  $x \neq 0$ , so  $T$  is bounded. Furthermore, if  $K > 0$  is such that  $\|Tx\| \leq K\|x\|$  for all  $x \in X$ , then  $\|Tx\| \leq K$  whenever  $\|x\| \leq 1$ . But then  $\|T\| \leq K$ .  $\lrcorner$

**REMARK 5.2: Riesz' lemma.**

The statement of the lemma is as follows:

*Let  $X$  be a normed vector space and  $M$  a proper closed subspace of  $X$ .*

*For  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  there exists an  $x \in X$  with  $\|x\| = 1$  such that*

$$\inf_{m \in M} \|x - m\| \geq \alpha.$$

Since the quotient norm on  $X/M$  is given by  $\|x + M\| = \inf_{m \in M} \|x - m\|$ , this is precisely the statement of Exercise 5.12(b) [TODO: reference].

In Exercise 5.19(b) [TODO: reference] we use this to show that an infinite-dimensional normed vector space is not locally compact. It is easy to show that this is equivalent to the closed unit ball  $\bar{B}_1(0)$  being compact.

Conversely, every normed space  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$  of dimension  $d < \infty$  is locally compact: Choose a linear isomorphism  $T: \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow X$  and let it induce a norm  $\|\cdot\|'$  on  $X$ . With this norm  $T$  is an isometry, hence a homeomorphism, so the local compactness of  $\mathbb{C}^d$  is transferred to  $(X, \|\cdot\|')$ . But all norms on finite-dimensional vector spaces are equivalent, so  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$  is also locally compact.

This equivalence of local compactness and finite-dimensionality generalises to Hausdorff topological vector spaces. This is known as *F. Riesz' theorem*.  $\lrcorner$

### EXERCISE 5.3

If  $Y$  is complete, so is  $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ .

**SOLUTION.** We prove the following lemma:

*Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be normed spaces, and let  $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ . If  $(T_n)$  is Cauchy in the operator norm and converges to some  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  in the strong operator topology, then  $T \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$  and  $T_n \rightarrow T$  in the operator norm.*

The map  $T$  is clearly linear. Choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m, n \geq N$  implies that  $\|T_n - T_m\| \leq \varepsilon$ . For  $x \in X$  and  $n \geq N$  we then have

$$\|(T_n - T)x\| = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|(T_n - T_m)x\| \leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|T_n - T_m\| \|x\| \leq \varepsilon \|x\|.$$

Hence  $T_n - T$  is bounded, and then so is  $T$ . Furthermore,  $\|T_n - T\| \leq \varepsilon$ , so  $T_n \rightarrow T$  in the operator norm.

To prove the initial claim it thus suffices to produce, given a Cauchy sequence  $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , a map  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $\text{s-lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n = T$ . But notice that we for  $x \in X$  we have

$$\|T_n x - T_m x\| \leq \|T_n - T_m\| \|x\|$$

for  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so  $(T_n x)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $Y$ . Defining  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  by  $Tx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n x$ ,  $T$  is the strong limit of  $T_n$  by construction.  $\square$

#### EXERCISE 5.4

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are normed spaces, the map  $(T, x) \mapsto Tx$  is continuous from  $\mathcal{B}(X, Y) \times X$  to  $Y$ .

**SOLUTION.** If  $T, S \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$  and  $x, y \in X$ , then

$$\|Tx - Sy\| \leq \|Tx - Ty\| + \|Ty - Sy\| \leq \|T\| \|x - y\| + \|T - S\| \|y\|.$$

The claim follows.

Notice that this proof is identical to the proof that multiplication in a Banach algebra is continuous, but the Banach inequality is replaced with the inequality  $\|Tx\| \leq \|T\| \|x\|$ . The proof is also almost identical to the proof that multiplication on  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$  is continuous, except here we have the *equality*  $|xy| = |x||y|$ .  $\square$

#### EXERCISE 5.6

Suppose that  $X$  is a finite-dimensional vector space. Let  $(e_1, \dots, e_d)$  be a basis for  $X$ , and define  $\|\sum_{i=1}^d a_i e_i\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d |a_i|$ .

- (a)  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is a norm on  $X$ .
- (b) The map  $T: (a_1, \dots, a_d) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^d a_i e_i$  is continuous from  $\mathbb{K}^d$  with the usual Euclidean topology to  $X$  with the topology defined by  $\|\cdot\|_1$ .
- (c) The set  $S = \{x \in X \mid \|x\|_1 = 1\}$  is compact in the topology defined by  $\|\cdot\|_1$ .
- (d) All norms on  $X$  are equivalent.

**SOLUTION.** (a) This is obvious.

- (b) If we equip  $\mathbb{K}^d$  with the 1-norm, then  $T$  is an isometry and thus continuous (in fact a homeomorphism since it is surjective).
- (c) Since the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{K}^d$  (with respect to the 1-norm) is compact and  $T$  is continuous,  $S$  is also compact.
- (d) If  $\|\cdot\|$  is any norm on  $X$ , we need to find  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  such that

$$C_1\|x\|_1 \leq \|x\| \leq C_2\|x\|_1 \quad (5.1)$$

for all  $x \in X$ . This is obvious for  $x = 0$ , and if  $x \neq 0$  we may divide through by  $\|x\|_1$ . The claim is then that

$$C_1 \leq \|x\| \leq C_2$$

for all  $x \in X$  with  $\|x\|_1 = 1$ , i.e. all  $x \in S$ . We first show that  $\|\cdot\|$  is continuous with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_1$ . For  $x = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i e_i$  and  $y = \sum_{i=1}^d b_i e_i$  in  $X$  we have

$$\|x - y\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^d (a_i - b_i) e_i \right\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |a_i - b_i| \|e_i\| \leq \|x - y\|_1 \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} \|e_i\|.$$

Continuity of  $\|\cdot\|$  now follows from the reverse triangle inequality. (In fact, this calculation also proves the second inequality of (5.1), but we give a second argument below.)

Since  $\|\cdot\|$  is continuous and  $S$  is compact with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_1$ ,  $\|\cdot\|$  has a minimum and maximum on  $S$ . That is, there exist  $x_0, x_1 \in S$  such that

$$\|x_0\| \leq \|x\| \leq \|x_1\|$$

for all  $x \in S$ . And since both of  $x_0$  and  $x_1$  are nonzero then so are their norms, proving the claim.  $\square$

#### EXERCISE 5.9

Let  $C^k([0, 1])$  be space of functions on  $[0, 1]$  possessing continuous derivatives up to order  $k$  on  $[0, 1]$ , including onesided derivatives at the endpoints.

- (a) If  $f \in C([0, 1])$ , then  $f \in C^k([0, 1])$  iff  $f$  is  $k$  times continuously differentiable on  $(0, 1)$  and  $f^{(j)}(0+) = \lim_{x \downarrow 0} f^{(j)}(x)$  and  $f^{(j)}(1-) = \lim_{x \uparrow 1} f^{(j)}(x)$  exist for  $j \leq k$ .
- (b)  $\|f\| = \sum_{j=0}^k \|f^{(j)}\|_\infty$  is a norm on  $C^k([0, 1])$  that makes  $C^k([0, 1])$  into a Banach space.

**SOLUTION.** (a) The ‘only if’ part is obvious. Conversely, we show by induction in  $j$  that  $f \in C^j([0, 1])$  for  $j = 0, \dots, k$ . This is true for  $j = 0$  by assumption, so assume that it is true for some  $j$ . For  $x \in (0, 1)$  there is a  $\xi \in (0, x)$  such that  $f^{(j)}(x) - f^{(j)}(0) = f^{(j+1)}(\xi)(x - 0)$ . It follows that

$$\frac{f^{(j)}(x) - f^{(j)}(0)}{x - 0} = f^{(j+1)}(\xi) \xrightarrow{x \downarrow 0} f^{(j+1)}(0+).$$

Thus  $f^{(j)}$  has a one-sided derivative at 0, and since the derivative is precisely the limit  $f^{(j+1)}(0+)$ , this also shows that  $f^{(j+1)}$  is continuous at 0. Similarly at 1, so  $f \in C^{j+1}([0, 1])$  as desired.

(b) Let  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $C^1([0, 1])$  converging to a function  $f$ , such that the sequence  $(f'_n)$  converges uniformly in  $C([0, 1])$  to a function  $g$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n \geq N$  implies that  $\|f'_n - g\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ . For  $n \geq N$  and fixed  $x \in [0, 1]$  we then have

$$\left| \int_0^x f'_n(t) dt - \int_0^x g(t) dt \right| \leq \int_0^x |f'_n(t) - g(t)| dt \leq \varepsilon x.$$

It follows that

$$f(x) - f(0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (f_n(x) - f_n(0)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^x f'_n(t) dt = \int_0^x g(t) dt.$$

Thus we see that  $f \in C^1([0, 1])$  with  $f' = g$ .

Now let  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $C^k([0, 1])$ . Then the sequences  $(f_n^{(j)})$  are Cauchy sequences in  $C([0, 1])$  for  $j = 0, \dots, k$ , and so the sequences have uniform limits. But then we are in the situation above, so it follows by induction that  $f_n^{(j)} \rightarrow f^{(j)}$  uniformly for all  $j$ . Hence  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in  $C^k([0, 1])$ , so this is a Banach space.  $\square$

**REMARK 5.3.** As an application of the above we consider the following: Let  $D: C^k([0, 1]) \rightarrow C^{k-1}([0, 1])$  be the differential operator  $f \mapsto f'$ . We claim that this is bounded with respect to the above norm. For  $f \in C^k([0, 1])$  we have

$$\|Df\| = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|(Df)^{(j)}\|_\infty = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|f^{(j+1)}\|_\infty = \sum_{j=1}^k \|f^{(j)}\|_\infty \leq \|f\|.$$

The usual counterexamples to the boundedness of  $D$  on e.g.  $(C^1([0, 1]), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  do not work here. The norm  $\|\cdot\|$  in effect takes into account the fact that functions that take on similar values may have derivatives that vary wildly.  $\lrcorner$

## EXERCISE 5.12

Let  $X$  be a normed vector space and  $M$  a proper closed subspace of  $X$ .

- (a)  $\|x + M\| = \inf_{m \in M} \|x + m\|$  is a norm on  $X/M$ .
- (b) For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $x \in X$  such that  $\|x\| = 1$  and  $\|x + M\| \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ .
- (c) The projection map  $\pi: X \rightarrow X/M$  has norm 1.
- (d) If  $X$  is complete, so is  $X/M$ .
- (e) The topology defined by the quotient norm is the quotient topology.

**SOLUTION.** (a) Assume first that  $M$  is not necessarily closed. For  $x \in X$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}$  we have

$$\|\alpha(x + M)\| = \|\alpha x + M\| = \inf_{m \in M} \|\alpha x + m\| = |\alpha| \inf_{m \in M} \|x + \alpha^{-1}m\| = |\alpha| \|x + M\|,$$

where the last equality follows since every element in  $M$  is on the form  $\alpha^{-1}m$  for some  $m \in M$ . Hence the map  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $X/M$  is absolutely homogeneous.

For the triangle inequality, let  $x, y \in X$  and  $m, m' \in M$ . Then

$$\|(x + M) + (y + M)\| = \|(x + y) + M\| \leq \|x + y + m + m'\| \leq \|x + m\| + \|y + m'\|,$$

which implies that

$$\|(x + M) + (y + M)\| \leq \|x + M\| + \|y + M\|$$

as desired. Hence  $\|\cdot\|$  is a seminorm on  $X/M$  for any  $M$ .

Finally assume that  $M$  is closed, and let  $x \in X \setminus M$ . Then there exists an  $r > 0$  such that  $B_r(x) \cap M = \emptyset$ , so  $\|x - m\| \geq r$  for all  $m \in M$ . Hence  $\|x + M\| \geq r > 0$  as desired.

(b) Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and pick some  $y \in X \setminus M$ . By definition of the quotient norm there exists an  $m \in M$  such that

$$\frac{\|y + M\|}{\|y - m\|} \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Letting  $x = (y - m)/\|y - m\|$  we have  $\|x\| = 1$  and

$$\|x + M\| = \left\| \frac{y - m}{\|y - m\|} + M \right\| = \frac{\|y + M\|}{\|y - m\|} \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

as desired.

(c) For any  $x \in X$  we have  $\|x + M\| \leq \|x + 0\|$ , so  $\|\pi\| \leq 1$ . But given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , (b) shows that  $\|x + M\| \geq 1 - \varepsilon$  for some  $x \in X$  with  $\|x\| = 1$ , so  $\|\pi\| \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ . Since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary,  $\|\pi\| \geq 1$ .

(d) We use Theorem 5.1. Let  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \xi_n$  be an absolutely convergent series with terms in  $X/M$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists an  $x_n \in X$  such that  $\xi_n = x_n + M$  and such that  $\|x_n\| \leq \|\xi_n\| + 2^{-n}$ . It follows that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x_n\| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\|\xi_n\| + 2^{-n}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|\xi_n\| + 1 < \infty,$$

so by completeness of  $X$ , Theorem 5.1 implies that the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$  converges to some  $x \in X$ . Since  $\|\pi\| \leq 1$ , it follows that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n + M$  converges to  $x + M$ , so  $X/M$  is complete by Theorem 5.1.

(e) The projection map  $\pi: X \rightarrow X/M$  is continuous in the norm topology by (c), so the quotient topology is coarser than the norm topology. To prove the opposite inclusion we show that  $\pi$  is a quotient map. It suffices to show that  $\pi$  is open. To this end we prove the following lemma:

*Let  $X$  be a (semi)normed vector space and  $M$  a subspace of  $X$ . For  $r > 0$  and  $x \in X$  we have*

$$B_r(\pi(x)) = \pi(B_r(x)).$$

By homogeneity it suffices to consider the case  $x = 0$ . By (b) we have  $\|\pi\| = 1$ , so for  $y \in B_r(0)$  we have

$$\|y + M\| \leq \|y\| < r,$$

and so  $y + M \in B_r(0 + M)$ , proving the inclusion ' $\supseteq$ '. For the opposite inclusion, for  $y + M \in B_r(0 + M)$  we have

$$\inf_{m \in M} \|y + m\| = \|y + M\| < r,$$

so there is an  $m \in M$  such that  $\|y + m\| < r$ . Hence  $y + m \in B_r(0)$ , and so

$$y + M = \pi(y + m) \in \pi(B_r(0)),$$

proving the inclusion ' $\subseteq$ '.

In particular, the image of an open ball under  $\pi$  is an open ball. It now follows that  $\pi$  is open, since every open set is a union of open balls.  $\square$

#### EXERCISE 5.15

Suppose that  $X$  and  $Y$  are normed vector spaces and  $T \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ . Let  $\mathcal{N}(T) = \{x \in X \mid Tx = 0\}$ .

- (a)  $\mathcal{N}(T)$  is a closed subspace of  $X$
- (b) Let  $M$  be a closed subspace of  $X$  contained in  $\mathcal{N}(T)$ . There is a unique bounded  $\tilde{T}: X/M \rightarrow Y$  such that  $T = \tilde{T} \circ \pi$ , where  $\pi: X \rightarrow X/M$  is the

projection. Moreover,  $\|\tilde{T}\| = \|T\|$ .

Our version of [TODO: link] (b) is more general than Folland's.

**SOLUTION.** (a) This is obvious since  $T$  is continuous.

(b) Basic linear algebra yields a unique (not necessarily bounded) linear map  $\tilde{T}: X/M \rightarrow Y$  such that  $T = \tilde{T} \circ \pi$ . To compute its norm we use the lemma from the solution to [TODO: Exercise 5.12(e)]. Let  $B = B_1(0) \subseteq X$  and  $\tilde{B} = \pi(B) = B_1(0 + M) \subseteq X/M$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{T}\| &= \sup\{\|\tilde{T}\xi\| \mid \xi \in \tilde{B}\} \\ &= \sup\{\|\tilde{T}\xi\| \mid \xi \in \pi(B)\} \\ &= \sup\{\|\tilde{T}(\pi(x))\| \mid x \in B\} \\ &= \sup\{\|Tx\| \mid x \in B\} \\ &= \|T\|. \end{aligned}$$

Here we use the fact that for an operator  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  it suffices to consider  $x \in X$  with  $\|x\| < 1$  in computing its norm: For assume that  $\|x\| = 1$ , and let  $\varepsilon_n = 1 - 1/n$ . Then  $\|\varepsilon_n x\| < 1$ , and

$$\|Tx\| = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n} \|T(\varepsilon_n x)\| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n} \sup\{\|Ty\| \mid y \in B\} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup\{\|Ty\| \mid y \in B\}.$$

Hence  $\|T\| \leq \sup\{\|Ty\| \mid y \in B\}$ , and the opposite equality is obvious.  $\square$

## 5.2. Linear Functionals

### EXERCISE 5.18

Let  $X$  be a normed vector space.

- (a) If  $M$  is a closed subspace and  $x \in X \setminus M$ , then  $M + \mathbb{C}x$  is closed.
- (b) Every finite-dimensional subspace of  $X$  is closed.

**SOLUTION.** (a) Let  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be sequences in  $M$  and  $\mathbb{C}$  respectively such that  $y_n + \lambda_n x$  converges to some  $z \in X$ . By Theorem 5.8(b) there is a  $\varphi \in X^*$  such that  $\varphi(x) \neq 0$  and  $\varphi|_M = 0$ . Applying  $\varphi$  to the above sequence yields

$$\varphi(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\varphi(y_n) + \lambda_n \varphi(x)) = \left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n \right) \varphi(x),$$

which implies that  $\lambda_n$  converges to  $\varphi(z)/\varphi(x)$ . The sequence  $(y_n)$  is then also convergent with limit in  $M$ , and so

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (y_n + \lambda_n x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( y_n + \frac{\varphi(z)}{\varphi(x)} x \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n + \frac{\varphi(z)}{\varphi(x)} x,$$

which lies in  $M + \mathbb{C}x$  as desired.

(b) We give two different arguments. If  $U$  is a finite-dimensional subspace of  $X$  and  $(e_1, \dots, e_d)$  is a basis for  $U$ , then  $U = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{C}e_i$ . Since  $\{0\}$  is a closed subspace of  $X$ , the desired result follows from the above by induction.

We may also argue as follows: It suffices to show that  $U$  is complete. To this end, let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $U$  and write  $x_n = \lambda_{n1}e_1 + \dots + \lambda_{nd}e_d$ . We claim that the sequence  $(\lambda_{ni})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Cauchy sequence for all  $i$ . For the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $U$  inherited from  $X$  is equivalent to the 1-norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$ , so

$$\|x_m - x_n\| \geq C\|x_m - x_n\|_1 \geq C|\lambda_{mi} - \lambda_{ni}|$$

for some  $C > 0$ . Since  $\mathbb{C}$  is complete, the sequence  $(\lambda_{ni})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to some  $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$ . Letting  $x = \lambda_1e_1 + \dots + \lambda_de_d$ , we claim that  $x_n \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This follows since (choosing the  $e_i$  to be unit vectors)

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_n - x\| &= \|(\lambda_{n1} - \lambda_1)e_1 + \dots + (\lambda_{nd} - \lambda_d)e_d\| \\ &\leq |\lambda_{n1} - \lambda_1| + \dots + |\lambda_{nd} - \lambda_d|, \end{aligned}$$

and the right-hand side converges to zero.  $\square$

#### EXERCISE 5.19

Let  $X$  be an infinite-dimensional normed vector space.

- (a) There is a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $X$  such that  $\|x_n\| = 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\|x_n - x_m\| \geq 1/2$  for  $m \neq n$ .
- (b)  $X$  is not locally compact.

**SOLUTION.** (a) First pick any unit vector  $x_1 \in X$ . By Exercise 5.18 the subspace  $M_1 = \mathbb{C}x_1$  is closed, so Exercise 5.12(b) yields a unit vector  $x_2 \notin M_1$  such that  $\|x_2 + M_1\| \geq 1/2$ . Since  $x_1 \in M_1$  we in particular have  $\|x_2 - x_1\| \geq 1/2$ . Similarly, letting  $M_2 = M_1 + \mathbb{C}x_2$  we get a unit vector  $x_3 \notin M_2$  with  $\|x_3 + M_2\| \geq 1/2$ . Since both  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  lie in  $M_2$  we have  $\|x_3 - x_1\| \geq 1/2$  and  $\|x_3 - x_2\| \geq 1/2$ . Continuing this process yields the desired sequence. [TODO: Exercise references]

(b) Assume towards a contradiction that  $X$  is locally compact. Then  $0 \in X$  has a compact neighbourhood  $K$ , and by multiplying with an appropriate scalar we may assume that  $K$  contains the closed unit ball  $\bar{B}_1(0)$ . Thus  $K$  contains the sequence  $(x_n)$  constructed in part (a). Now Theorem 0.25 implies that  $K$  is sequentially compact, so  $(x_n)$  has a convergent subsequence. But this is impossible since  $\|x_n - x_m\| \geq 1/2$  for  $m \neq n$ , so  $X$  is not locally compact.  $\square$



**REMARK 5.4.** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be normed spaces, and let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ . If  $T$  is an isometry, then clearly  $\|T\| = 1$ . It is easy to think that the converse is also true, perhaps if  $T$  is also assumed to be boundedly invertible, but this is not the case: For instance, equip  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with the supremum norm<sup>1</sup> and consider the operator  $S: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  given by  $S(x, y) = (x, y/2)$ . Then  $\|S\| = 1$ , and  $S^{-1}(x, y) = (x, 2y)$  is also bounded with  $\|S^{-1}\| = 2$ . But  $S$  is clearly not an isometry, since e.g.

$$\|S(0, 2)\|_\infty = \|(0, 1)\|_\infty = 1 \neq 2 = \|(0, 2)\|_\infty.$$

The problem is already apparent, in that the norm of  $S^{-1}$  is *not* 1, so  $S^{-1}$  cannot be an isometry. This motivates the following result:

*Let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$  be a boundedly invertible map between normed spaces such that  $\|T\| = \|T^{-1}\| = 1$ . Then  $T$  is an isometry.*

For if  $x \in X$  and  $y = Tx$ , then

$$\|Tx\| \leq \|T\|\|x\| = \|x\| = \|T^{-1}y\| \leq \|T^{-1}\|\|y\| = \|y\| = \|Tx\|,$$

so  $\|Tx\| = \|x\|$ . ┘

**REMARK 5.5: The categories  $\mathbf{Nor}$  and  $\mathbf{Nor}_1$  of normed spaces.**

A map  $f: (S, \rho) \rightarrow (T, \delta)$  between metric spaces having the property that

$$\delta(f(x), f(y)) \leq \rho(x, y)$$

for all  $x, y \in S$  is variously called a *short map*, a *metric map*, *nonexpansive* or *-expanding*, a *weak contraction*, or just a Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant 1. We consider the category  $\mathbf{Nor}_1$  whose objects are normed spaces and whose arrows are linear maps that are also short maps. Notice that a linear map  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  between normed spaces is short just when  $\|T\| \leq 1$ . Hence  $\mathbf{Nor}_1$  is a subcategory of the category  $\mathbf{Nor}$  of normed spaces and bounded linear maps.

A bounded linear map  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{Nor}$  just when it is boundedly invertible. In  $\mathbf{Nor}_1$  the situation is slightly more complicated: The map  $S$  in Remark 5.4 is a short map but its inverse is not short. Hence the isomorphisms in  $\mathbf{Nor}_1$  are the boundedly invertible maps with short inverses, and this latter assumption cannot be removed. Furthermore, we claim that in this case  $T$  is in fact an isometry. If  $T$  has a bounded inverse  $T^{-1}$ , then

$$1 = \|\text{id}_X\| = \|T^{-1}T\| \leq \|T^{-1}\|\|T\|.$$

---

<sup>1</sup> In Remark 5.5 we will see that this makes  $\mathbb{R}^2$  into the categorical product of  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}$ . This has no relevance to the present discussion, as far as I know.

Hence if both  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  are short maps, then  $\|T\| = \|T^{-1}\| = 1$ . But then [Remark 5.4](#) implies that  $T$  is an isometry. Conversely, surjective isometries<sup>2</sup> are clearly short maps whose inverses are also short, so any surjective isometry is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{Nor}_1$ .

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are normed spaces we may equip the Cartesian product  $X \times Y$  with different norms, two of which are of particular importance here, namely the supremum norm<sup>3</sup>  $\|(x, y)\|_\infty = \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}$  and the 1-norm  $\|(x, y)\|_1 = \|x\| + \|y\|$ . We reserve the notation  $X \times Y$  for the Cartesian product equipped with the supremum norm, and we use the notation  $X \oplus Y$  when we equip the Cartesian product with the 1-norm.


We claim that  $X \times Y$  is a categorical product of  $X$  and  $Y$ . First notice that the projections  $\pi_X: X \times Y \rightarrow X$  and  $\pi_Y: X \times Y \rightarrow Y$  are indeed short maps. For instance,

$$\|\pi_X(x, y)\| = \|x\| \leq \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\} = \|(x, y)\|_\infty.$$

Given short linear maps  $T_X: Z \rightarrow X$  and  $T_Y: Z \rightarrow Y$ , the map  $T: Z \rightarrow X \times Y$  given by  $Tz = (T_X z, T_Y z)$  is certainly linear. It is also short, for

$$\|Tz\|_\infty = \|(T_X z, T_Y z)\|_\infty = \max\{\|T_X z\|, \|T_Y z\|\} \leq \|z\|.$$

Notice that the 1-norm would not in general make  $T$  into a short map, but that the supremum norm is in some sense natural: Bounding a pair  $(x, y)$  just means bounding *both*  $x$  and  $y$  separately. Furthermore, it clearly makes the diagram



commute, and it is (even in **Set**) unique with this property, so  $X \times Y$  is indeed a product of  $X$  and  $Y$ .

Next we claim that  $X \oplus Y$  is a coproduct of  $X$  and  $Y$ . The inclusion maps  $i_X: X \rightarrow X \oplus Y$  and  $i_Y: Y \rightarrow X \oplus Y$  are given by  $i_X(x) = (x, 0)$  and  $i_Y(0, y)$ . Notice that e.g.

$$\|i_X(x)\|_1 = \|(x, 0)\|_1 = \|x\| + \|0\| = \|x\|,$$

so the inclusion maps are isometries, in particular short maps. Furthermore, if  $S_X: X \rightarrow W$  and  $S_Y: Y \rightarrow W$  are short linear maps, we define a map  $S: X \oplus$


<sup>2</sup> An isometry is in particular injective, so surjective isometries are bijective. The inverse is also clearly bounded.

<sup>3</sup> We denote any norm on a vector space other than  $X \times Y$  by  $\|\cdot\|$ , relying on context to distinguish.

$Y \rightarrow W$  by  $S(x, y) = S_X x + S_Y y$ . This is then clearly linear, and it is also short since

$$\|S(x, y)\| = \|S_X x + S_Y y\| \leq \|S_X x\| + \|S_Y y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\| = \|(x, y)\|_1.$$

Again notice that the supremum norm would not make  $S$  into a short map. But the 1-norm is natural in the sense that elements of  $X \oplus Y$  are to be thought of, in some sense, *sums* of elements in  $X$  and  $Y$ . Hence the norm of such a sum is (naturally) the sum of the norms. Finally, it clearly makes the diagram



commute, and so  $X \oplus Y$  is a coproduct of  $X$  and  $Y$  as claimed.

For completeness we note that the categories **Ban** and **Ban**<sub>1</sub> of Banach spaces and, respectively, bounded and short linear maps are full subcategories of **Nor** and **Nor**<sub>1</sub>. If  $X$  and  $Y$  are Banach spaces, then so are  $X \times Y$  and  $X \oplus Y$ : If  $((x_n, y_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Cauchy sequence in either, then  $(x_n)$  and  $(y_n)$  are Cauchy in  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively, converging to  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ . We then have

$$\|(x_n, y_n) - (x, y)\|_\infty = \|(x_n - x, y_n - y)\|_\infty = \max\{\|x_n - x\|, \|y_n - y\|\},$$

which goes to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We similarly have

$$\|(x_n, y_n) - (x, y)\|_1 = \|x_n - x\| + \|y_n - y\|,$$

which similarly goes to zero. In either case  $(x_n, y_n)$  converges to  $(x, y)$ . Thus  $X \times Y$  and  $X \oplus Y$  are also a product and coproduct in **Ban** and **Ban**<sub>1</sub>.

Furthermore, if  $X$  and  $Y$  are Banach spaces and  $T \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$  is bijective, then the Open Mapping Theorem implies that  $T^{-1}$  is bounded. The isomorphisms in **Ban** are thus simply the bijections. However, the example in [Remark 5.4](#) shows that an isomorphism in **Ban** with norm 1 might have an inverse with norm greater than 1. Thus there does not seem to be a simpler characterisation of the isomorphisms of **Ban**<sub>1</sub> than the bijections  $T$  such that both  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  have norm 1.  $\lrcorner$

#### EXERCISE 5.21

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are normed vector spaces, define  $\alpha: X^* \oplus Y^* \rightarrow (X \times Y)^*$  by

$$\alpha(\varphi, \psi)(x, y) = \varphi(x) + \psi(y).$$

Then  $\alpha$  is an isometric isomorphism.

This says that the dual functor  $(-)^*: \mathbf{Nor} \rightarrow \mathbf{Nor}$  sends products to coproducts. [TODO: Is this more properly a functor on  $\mathbf{Nor}_1$ ? And what about the dual space, can it contain functionals with norm  $> 1$ ?]

**SOLUTION.** We first show that  $\alpha$  is surjective, so let  $\chi \in (X \times Y)^*$  and define  $\varphi(x) = \chi(x, 0)$  and  $\psi(y) = \chi(0, y)$ . These are then bounded linear functionals: e.g.,

$$|\varphi(x)| = |\chi(x, 0)| \leq \|\chi\| \|(x, 0)\| = \|\chi\| \|x\|,$$

and  $\alpha(\varphi, \psi) = \varphi(x) + \psi(y) = \chi(x, y)$ , so  $\alpha$  is surjective.

Next we show that  $\alpha$  is an isometry. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha(\varphi, \psi)(x, y)| &= |\varphi(x) + \psi(y)| \\ &\leq |\varphi(x)| + |\psi(y)| \\ &\leq \|\varphi\| \|x\| + \|\psi\| \|y\| \\ &\leq (\|\varphi\| + \|\psi\|) \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\} \\ &= \|(\varphi, \psi)\| \|(x, y)\|, \end{aligned}$$

so  $\|\alpha(\varphi, \psi)\| \leq \|(\varphi, \psi)\|$ . Next, let  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$  be unit vectors. Theorem 5.8(b) then furnishes  $\varphi \in X^*$  and  $\psi \in Y^*$  with  $\|\varphi\| = \|\psi\| = 1$ ,  $\varphi(x) = \|x\| = 1$  and  $\psi(y) = \|y\| = 1$ . We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha(\varphi, \psi)(x, y)| &= |\varphi(x) + \psi(y)| \\ &= \|x\| + \|y\| \\ &= 2 \cdot 1 \\ &= (\|\varphi\| + \|\psi\|) \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\} \\ &= \|(\varphi, \psi)\| \|(x, y)\|, \end{aligned}$$

showing that  $\|\alpha(\varphi, \psi)\| \geq \|(\varphi, \psi)\|$ . In total,  $\alpha$  is an isometry. Hence it is also injective and thus an isomorphism.  $\square$

**REMARK 5.6.** Let  $X$  be a vector space over a field  $k$ , and let  $X^*$  be the algebraic dual of  $X$ . If  $U$  is a subspace of  $X$ , then the *annihilator* of  $U$  is the subspace  $U^0$  of  $X^*$  consisting of those functionals  $\varphi$  such that  $\varphi(u) = 0$  for all  $u \in U$ . We use  $U^0$  to describe the algebraic dual  $U^*$  of  $U$ .

Let  $i_U: U \rightarrow X$  be the inclusion map, and consider its pullback

$$\beta = i_U^*: X^* \rightarrow U^*$$

given by precomposition with  $i_U$ . This is surjective, since if  $\psi \in U^*$  then we may extend this to a linear functional on  $X$  by letting  $\psi(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in V$ ,

where  $V$  is any complement of  $U$  in  $X$ . Furthermore, a functional  $\varphi \in X^*$  lies in the kernel of  $\beta$  just if  $\varphi$  vanishes on  $U$ , i.e. if  $\varphi \in U^0$ . The first isomorphism theorem then yields a linear isomorphism

$$\tilde{\beta}: X^*/U^0 \rightarrow U^*.$$

┘

### EXERCISE 5.23

Suppose that  $X$  is a Banach space. If  $M$  is a closed subspace of  $X$  and  $N$  is a closed subspace of  $X^*$ , let  $M^0 = \{\varphi \in X^* \mid \varphi|_M = 0\}$  and  $N^\perp = \{x \in X \mid \varphi(x) = 0 \text{ for all } \varphi \in N\}$ .

- (a)  $M^0$  and  $N^\perp$  are closed subspaces of  $X^*$  and  $X$ , respectively.
- (b)  $(M^0)^\perp = M$  and  $(N^\perp)^0 \supseteq N$ . If  $X$  is reflexive,  $(N^\perp)^0 = N$ .
- (c) c
- (d) Define  $\beta: X^* \rightarrow M^*$  by  $\beta(\varphi) = \varphi|_M$ ; then  $\beta$  induces a map  $\tilde{\beta}: X^*/M^0 \rightarrow M^*$ , and  $\tilde{\beta}$  is an isometric isomorphism.

**SOLUTION.** (a) First assume that  $X$  is a normed vector space over  $\mathbb{K}$ , and assume that  $M$  and  $N$  are merely (not necessarily closed) *subsets* of  $X$  and  $X^*$ . Then  $M^0$  and  $N^\perp$  are clearly subspaces. Consider the inclusion map  $i_M: M \rightarrow X$  and its pullback  $\beta = i_M^*: X^* \rightarrow M^*$ . The former clearly has norm 1, so for  $\varphi \in X^*$  the composition  $\varphi \circ i_M$  is bounded. It follows that

$$\|\beta(\varphi)\| = \|\varphi \circ i_M\| \leq \|\varphi\| \|i_M\| = \|\varphi\|$$

so  $\beta$  is bounded. But notice that  $M^0 = \ker \beta$ , so  $M^0$  is closed. Furthermore, notice that

$$N^\perp = \bigcap_{\varphi \in N} \ker \varphi,$$

so  $N^\perp$  is an intersection of closed sets, hence is closed.

(b) Let  $x \in M$ . Then  $\varphi(x) = 0$  for all  $\varphi \in M^0$ , and so  $x \in (M^0)^\perp$ . Conversely, assume that  $M$  is now a closed subspace of  $M$ , and assume that  $x \notin M$ . Theorem 5.8(b) then yields a functional  $\varphi \in X^*$  such that  $\varphi|_M = 0$  and  $\varphi(x) \neq 0$ . But this means that  $\varphi \in M^0$  and that  $x \notin (M^0)^\perp$ .

Furthermore, if  $\varphi \in N$  then clearly  $\varphi(x)$  for all  $x \in N^\perp$ , so  $\varphi \in (N^\perp)^0$  (even if  $N$  is neither closed or a subspace).

TODO:  $X$  reflexive.

(c) c

(d) Since  $\ker \beta = M^0$  and  $\beta$  is surjective,  $\tilde{\beta}$  is a linear isomorphism, and it is bounded since  $\beta$  is. It remains to be shown that it is an isometry. First let  $\varphi \in X^*$  and notice that

$$\|\tilde{\beta}(\varphi + M^0)\| = \|\beta(\varphi)\| = \|\varphi \circ i_M\| \leq \|\varphi\|,$$

since  $\|i_M\| = 1$  (unless  $M = 0$ , but in this case the claim is trivial). Since  $\|\varphi + M^0\|$  is the infimum of  $\|\psi\|$  over all  $\psi \in X^*$  such that  $\psi + M^0 = \varphi + M^0$ , it follows that  $\|\tilde{\beta}(\varphi + M^0)\| \leq \|\varphi + M^0\|$ . For the opposite inequality, consider the seminorm

$$p(x) = \|\tilde{\beta}(\varphi + M^0)\| \|x\|$$

on  $X$ . For  $x \in M$  we have

$$|\varphi(x)| = |\beta(\varphi)(x)| = |\tilde{\beta}(\varphi + M^0)(x)| \leq p(x),$$

so the Hahn–Banach theorem furnishes a  $\psi \in X^*$  that extends  $\varphi|_M$  and satisfies<sup>4</sup>  $|\psi| \leq p$ , i.e.  $\|\psi\| \leq \|\tilde{\beta}(\varphi + M^0)\|$ . In other words,  $\psi|_M = \varphi|_M$  or equivalently  $\psi + M^0 = \varphi + M^0$ . It follows that

$$\|\varphi + M^0\| = \|\psi + M^0\| \leq \|\psi\| \leq \|\tilde{\beta}(\varphi + M^0)\|.$$

In total,  $\tilde{\beta}$  is an isometry. □

#### 5.4. Topological vector spaces

##### REMARK 5.7: Induced vector space topologies.

Let  $X$  be a vector space and  $Y$  a normed vector space over  $\mathbb{K}$ , and let  $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  be the vector space of all linear maps  $X \rightarrow Y$ . Any collection  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  of course induces an initial topology on  $X$ . On the other hand, each map  $T \in \mathcal{F}$  defines a seminorm  $p_T$  on  $X$  given by  $p_T(x) = \|Tx\|$ . We claim that the initial topology on  $X$  induced by  $\mathcal{F}$  is the same as the seminorm topology induced by the family  $\{p_T\}_{T \in \mathcal{F}}$  of seminorms as in Theorem 5.14.

To see this, notice that, for  $x_0 \in X$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} U_{x_0 T \varepsilon} &= \{x \in X \mid p_T(x - x_0) < \varepsilon\} \\ &= \{x \in X \mid \|Tx - Tx_0\| < \varepsilon\} \\ &= T^{-1}(B_\varepsilon(Tx_0)). \end{aligned}$$

The initial topology on  $X$  induced by  $\mathcal{F}$  is generated by the sets on the right-hand side.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the seminorm topology induced by  $\{p_T\}_{T \in \mathcal{F}}$  is generated by the sets on the left-hand side. Hence the two topologies agree.

<sup>4</sup> In the real case this follows since  $p$  is a seminorm.

<sup>5</sup> This is clear if each  $T$  is surjective. But  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous iff the corresponding map with codomain  $T(X)$  is continuous, so it suffices to consider balls in  $Y$  with centres in  $T(X)$ .

The most common application of the above is when  $U$  is a subspace of  $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is the set of evaluation maps  $\text{ev}_x: U \rightarrow Y$  given by  $\text{ev}_x(T) = Tx$  for  $x \in X$ . It is easy to show that the evaluation maps are in fact linear. Since the evaluation maps obviously separate points in  $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ , the resulting topology is Hausdorff (hence  $T_3$  since topological groups are automatically regular; in fact they are completely regular, though this is not trivial to prove). Notice also that the product topology on  $Y^X$  is precisely induced by the evaluation maps, so  $U \subseteq Y^X$  in fact carries the subspace topology and is thus a topology of pointwise convergence. We give some examples of this:

- (a) Let  $X$  be a topological vector space with topological dual  $X^*$ . Then the *weak\*-topology* on  $X^*$  is the initial topology induced by the collection of evaluation maps  $\text{ev}_x: X^* \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ . Since  $\mathbb{K}$  is itself a normed space, the above shows that the weak\*-topology is a seminorm topology.
- (b) Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be normed spaces, and consider the space  $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$  of bounded linear maps  $X \rightarrow Y$ . We equip this space with the *strong operator topology*, defined as the initial topology induced by the evaluation maps  $\text{ev}_x: \mathcal{B}(X, Y) \rightarrow Y$ . More concretely, the topology is induced by seminorms  $T \mapsto \|Tx\|$ , so a net  $(T_i)$  in  $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$  converges to  $T$  iff  $\|T_i x - Tx\| \rightarrow 0$  for all  $x \in X$ .

Notice that the SOT is coarser than the norm topology, since if  $T_i \rightarrow T$  in the norm topology, then

$$\|T_i x - Tx\| \leq \|T_i - T\| \|x\| \rightarrow 0,$$

so  $T_i \rightarrow T$  in the SOT.

- (c) In the same setup, the *weak operator topology* on  $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$  is the initial topology induced by maps  $\Phi_{x, \varphi} = \varphi \circ \text{ev}_x: \mathcal{B}(X, Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  given by  $\Phi_{x, \varphi}(T) = \varphi(Tx)$  for  $x \in X$  and  $\varphi \in Y^*$ , where  $Y^*$  is the topological dual of  $Y$ . That is, contrary to the strong operator topology we do not require the evaluation maps  $\text{ev}_x$  themselves to be continuous, only the compositions  $\varphi \circ \text{ev}_x$ . Hence the WOT is coarser than the SOT, since if  $\text{ev}_x$  is continuous then so is  $\varphi \circ \text{ev}_x$ .

We claim that the WOT is also Hausdorff. This is not immediate from the above since the generating functions are not evaluation maps. But notice that  $Y^*$  separates points in  $Y$  by Theorem 5.8c. For distinct  $T, S \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  there is a  $x \in X$  with  $Tx \neq Sx$ , and then a  $\varphi \in Y^*$  with  $\varphi(Tx) \neq \varphi(Sx)$ . Hence the functions  $\Phi_{x, \varphi}$  separate points in  $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ .

If  $\mathcal{H}$  is a Hilbert space, then the weak operator topology on  $\mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{H})$  is also induced by maps  $T \mapsto \langle Tx, y \rangle$  by the Riesz–Fréchet theorem (Theorem 5.25). In this case a net  $(T_i)$  converges to  $T$  iff  $\langle T_i x, y \rangle \rightarrow \langle Tx, y \rangle$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $y \in \mathcal{H}$ .  $\lrcorner$

## 5.5. Hilbert Spaces

**REMARK 5.8.** We give a different proof of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality using (very) basic properties of orthogonal projections:

*If  $X$  is a inner product space over  $\mathbb{K}$ , then*

$$|\langle x, y \rangle| \leq \|x\| \|y\| \quad (5.2)$$

*for all  $x, y \in X$ , with equality if and only if  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly dependent.*

This is obvious if  $y = 0$ , so assume not. The *projection* of  $x$  on  $y$  is the unique vector  $p \in \text{span}(y)$  such that  $y \perp x - p$ . This exists and is unique, for notice that for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$  we have

$$0 = \langle x - \alpha y, y \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle - \alpha \langle y, y \rangle$$

if and only if

$$\alpha = \frac{\langle x, y \rangle}{\langle y, y \rangle},$$

so  $p = \alpha y$ . Notice that  $p$  has the property that  $x = p$  if and only if  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly dependent. The ‘only if’ part is obvious, and the converse follows since if  $x = \beta y$  for some  $\beta \in \mathbb{K}$  then, plugging in above, we find that  $\alpha = \beta$ .

Also notice that  $p \perp x - p$ . Writing  $x = p + (x - p)$ , Pythagoras’ theorem thus implies that

$$\|x\|^2 = \|p\|^2 + \|x - p\|^2 \geq \|p\|^2, \quad (5.3)$$

with equality just when  $x = p$ , i.e. when  $x$  and  $y$  are linearly dependent. Inserting the formula above for  $p$ , the inequality (5.3) is equivalent to

$$\|x\| \geq \|p\| = \frac{|\langle x, y \rangle|}{\|y\|} = \frac{|\langle x, y \rangle|}{\|y\|^2} \|y\|$$

which in turn is equivalent to (5.2). ┘

6 •  $L^p$ -spaces6.1. Basic Theory of  $L^p$ -spaces

**REMARK 6.1:** The space  $L^\infty(\mu)$ .

Let  $(X, \mathcal{E}, \mu)$  be a measure space, and let  $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$ . We prefer to define the essential supremum of  $f$  with respect to  $\mu$  as

$$\|f\|_\infty = \inf\{R > 0 \mid |f| \leq R \text{ } \mu\text{-a.e.}\},$$



which is clearly equivalent to Folland's definition. If  $R > \|f\|_\infty$  then  $\mu(\{|f| > R\}) = 0$ , so the set

$$E := \{|f| > \|f\|_\infty\} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ |f| > \|f\|_\infty + \frac{1}{n} \right\}$$

is also a null set.

The function  $\tilde{f} = f \mathbf{1}_{K^c}$  then equals  $f$  a.e., and we clearly have  $\|\tilde{f}\|_\infty = \|f\|_\infty$ . Furthermore, since  $|\tilde{f}| \leq \|f\|_\infty$  everywhere, we also have  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{\sup} \leq \|\tilde{f}\|_\infty$ . The opposite inequality follows since  $\{|\tilde{f}| > R\}$  has positive measure for all  $R < \|\tilde{f}\|_\infty$ . Hence  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{\sup} = \|\tilde{f}\|_\infty$ , so if we only consider functions up to null sets we may replace any  $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$  by a function  $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$  whose supremum agrees with its essential supremum. Furthermore, if  $\|f\|_\infty < \infty$ , i.e. if  $f \in L^\infty(\mu)$ , then  $\tilde{f}$  is bounded.

This yields another interpretation of  $L^\infty(\mu)$ -functions, namely as those functions that arise from bounded measurable functions by altering them on a (measurable)  $\mu$ -null set.

It might seem possible to alter a function  $f$  on a null set and allow it to *attain* its essential supremum. This is only possible if the measure space  $(X, \mathcal{E}, \mu)$  has nonempty null sets. However, consider for instance the space  $(\mathbb{N}, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \tau)$ , where  $\tau$  is the counting measure. On this space the function  $f(n) = 1 - 1/n$  has (essential) supremum 1, but it does not attain it. It also cannot be altered on a nonempty null set, since there are no such sets.  $\lrcorner$

## 8 • Elements of Fourier Analysis

### 8.1. Preliminaries

#### REMARK 8.1: Completeness of the Schwartz space.

We elaborate on the proof of Proposition 8.2. Let  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then the sequence  $(\partial^\alpha f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Cauchy sequence in the uniform norm for all multi-indices  $\alpha$ , since  $\|\partial^\alpha f_n\|_{\sup} = \|f_n\|_{(0, \alpha)}$ . Hence  $\partial^\alpha f_n$  converges uniformly to a function  $g_\alpha$  by completeness in the uniform norm. We then have

$$f_n(x + te_i) - f_n(x) = \int_0^t \partial_i f_n(x + se_i) ds.$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\partial_i f_n$  converges to  $g_{e_i}$  uniformly, so it follows that

$$g_0(x + te_i) - g_0(x) = \int_0^t g_{e_i}(x + se_i) ds.$$

The fundamental theorem of calculus then implies that  $\partial_j g_0$  exists and equals  $g_{e_j}$ , so it follows by induction that  $g_\alpha = \partial^\alpha g_0$ . It remains to be shown that  $\|f_n - g_0\|_{(N, \alpha)} \rightarrow 0$  for all  $N$  and  $\alpha$ .

To this end, let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and choose  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m, n \geq M$  implies that  $\|f_n - f_m\|_{(N, \alpha)} < \varepsilon$ . For every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we thus have

$$(1 + \|x\|)^N |\partial^\alpha f_n(x) - \partial^\alpha f_m(x)| < \varepsilon.$$

Letting  $m \rightarrow \infty$  we get

$$(1 + \|x\|)^N |\partial^\alpha f_n(x) - \partial^\alpha g_0(x)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Taking the supremum we find that  $n \geq M$  implies that  $\|f_n - g_0\|_{(N, \alpha)} \leq \varepsilon$ , showing that  $f_n \rightarrow g_0$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

## 8.2. Convolutions

**REMARK 8.2: Associativity of convolution.**

If  $f, g, h \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ , then we define the function  $k: \mathbb{R}^{3d} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by

$$k(x, y, z) = f(y)g(x - y - z)h(z).$$

This is clearly measurable, so we may consider the function  $K: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  given by

$$K(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |k(x, \cdot, \cdot)| d\lambda_{2d}.$$

By Tonelli's theorem  $K$  is also measurable, so the set

$$\Delta(f, g, h) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid k(x, \cdot, \cdot) \in \mathcal{L}^1(\lambda_{2d})\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid K(x) < \infty\}$$

is measurable. For  $x \in \Delta(f, g, h)$ , Fubini's theorem thus implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (f * g) * h(x) &= (g * f) * h(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g * f(x - z)h(z) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y)g(x - z - y) dy \right) h(z) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y)g(x - z - y)h(z) dy \right) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y)g(x - y - z)h(z) dz \right) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(x - y - z)h(z) dz \right) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y)h * g(x - y) dy \\ &= f * (h * g)(x) \\ &= f * (g * h)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus convolution is associative on  $\Delta(f, g, h)$ . If  $f, g, h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\lambda_d)$ , then it is easy to show that  $\Delta(f, g, h)^c$  is a Lebesgue null-set. However, it is not clear whether (and I don't see why it should be true that)  $\Delta(f, g, h)$  is the same as  $\Delta(f * g, h)$  or  $\Delta(f, g * h)$ .  $\lrcorner$

### 8.3. The Fourier Transform

**REMARK 8.3: Uniform continuity of Fourier transforms.**

Let  $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . For  $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we then have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{f}(\xi) - \hat{f}(\eta)| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)| \left| e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, x \rangle} - e^{-2\pi i \langle \eta, x \rangle} \right| dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)| \left| e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi - \eta, x \rangle} - 1 \right| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $2|f|$  is integrable and dominates the integrand, the dominated convergence theorem implies that the above goes to zero as  $\xi - \eta \rightarrow 0$ .  $\lrcorner$