Solutions to some exercises from Walter Rudin's $Functional\ Analysis$

gitcordier

July 25, 2020

Contents

1	Top	ological Vector Spaces	1
	1.1	Exercise 7. Metrizability & number theory	2
	1.2	Exercise 9. Quotient map	4
	1.3	Exercise 10. An open mapping theorem	5
	1.4	Exercise 16. Uniqueness of topology for test functions	6
bibliography			8

CONTENTS

Chapter 1

Topological Vector Spaces

1.1 Exercise 7. Metrizability & number theory

Let be X the vector space of all complex functions on the unit interval [0,1], topologized by the family of seminorms

$$p_x(f) = |f(x)| \quad (0 \le x \le 1).$$

This topology is called the topology of pointwise convergence. Justify this terminology. Show that there is a sequence $\{f_n\}$ in X such that (a) $\{f_n\}$ converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$, but (b) if $\{\gamma_n\}$ is any sequence of scalars such that $\gamma_n \to \infty$ then $\{\gamma_n f_n\}$ does not converge to 0. (Use the fact that the collection of all complex sequences converging to 0 has the same cardinality as [0,1].) This shows that metrizability cannot be omitted in (b) of Theorem 1.28.

Proof. Our justification consists in proving that τ -convergence and pointwise convergence are the same one. To do so, remark first that the family of the seminorms p_x is separating. By [1.37], the collection \mathscr{B} of all finite intersections of the sets

$$V^{((x,k)} \triangleq \{p_x < 2^{-k}\} \quad (x \in [0,1], k \in \mathbf{N})$$
 (1.1)

is then a local base for a topology τ on X. Given $\{f_n : n = 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, we set

$$off(U) \triangleq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} [f_n \notin U] \quad (U \in \tau),$$
 (1.2)

with the convention $off(U) = \infty$ whether the sum has no finite support. So,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathsf{off}(U^{(i)}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} [f_n \notin U^{(i)}] \ge \mathsf{off}(U^{(1)} \cap \dots \cap U^{(m)})$$
 (1.3)

We first assume that $\{f_n\}$ τ -converges to some f in X, i.e.

$$off(f+V) < \infty \quad (V \in \mathcal{B}).$$
 (1.4)

The special cases $V = V^{(x,k)}$ mean the pointwise convergence of $\{f_n\}$. Conversely, assume that $\{f_n\}$ does not τ -converges to any g in X, *i.e.*

$$\forall g \in X, \exists V^{(g)} \in \mathscr{B}: \mathsf{off}(g + V^{(g)}) = \infty. \tag{1.5}$$

Given g, $V^{(g)}$ is then an intersection $V^{(x^{(1)},k^{(1)})} \cap \cdots \cap V^{(x^{(m)},k^{(m)})}$. Thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{off}(g + V^{(x^{(i)}, k^{(i)})}) \stackrel{(1.3)}{\geq} \text{off}(g + V^{(g)}) \stackrel{(1.5)}{=} \infty.$$
 (1.6)

One of the sum $\operatorname{off}(g+V^{(x^{(i)},k^{(i)})})$ must then be ∞ . This implies that convergence of f_n to g fails at point x_i . g being arbitrary, we so conclude that f_n does not converge pointwise. We have just proved that τ -convergence is a rewording of pointwise convergence. We now aim to prove the second part. From now on, k, n and p run on N_+ . Let $\operatorname{dyadic}(x)$ be the usual dyadic expansion of a real number x, so that $\operatorname{dyadic}(x)$ is an aperiodic binary sequence iff x is irrational. Define

$$f_n(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} 2^{-\sum_{k=1}^n dyadic(x)_{-k}} & (x \in [0,1] \setminus \mathbf{Q}) \\ 0 & (x \in [0,1] \cap \mathbf{Q}) \end{cases}$$
 (1.7)

so that $f_n(x) \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} 0$ and take scalars γ_n such that $\xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} \infty$, *i.e.* at fixed p, γ_n is greater than 2^p for almost all n. Next, choose $n^{(p)}$ among those almost all n that are large enough to satisfy

$$n^{(p-1)} - n^{(p-2)} < n^{(p)} - n^{(p-1)}$$
 (1.8)

(start with $n^{(-1)} = n^{(0)} = 0$) and so obtain

$$2^p < \gamma_{n^{(p)}}: \ 0 < n^{(p)} - n^{(p-1)} \underset{p \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} \infty. \tag{1.9} \label{eq:1.9}$$

The indicator χ of $\{n^{(1)}, n^{(2)}, \dots\}$ is then aperiodic, *i.e.*

$$\mathbf{x}^{(\gamma)} \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \chi_k 2^{-k} \tag{1.10}$$

is irrational. Consequently,

$$dyadic(x^{(\gamma)})_{-k} = \chi_k. \tag{1.11}$$

We now easily see that

$$\chi_1 + \dots + \chi_{n(p)} = p, \tag{1.12}$$

which, combined with (1.7), yields

$$f_{n(p)}(x^{(\gamma)}) = 2^{-p}.$$
 (1.13)

Finally,

$$\gamma_{n(p)} f_{n(p)}(x^{(\gamma)}) > 1.$$
 (1.14)

We have so established that the subsequence $\{\gamma_{n^{(p)}}f_{n^{(p)}}\}$ does not tend pointwise to 0, hence neither does the whole sequence $\{\gamma_n f_n\}$. In other words, (b) holds, which is in violent contrast with [1.28]: X is then not metrizable. So ends the proof.

1.2 Exercise 9. Quotient map

Suppose

- (a) X and Y are topological vector spaces,
- (b) $\Lambda: X \to Y$ is linear.
- (c) N is a closed subspace of X,
- (d) $\pi: X \to X/N$ is the quotient map, and
- (e) $\Lambda x = 0$ for every $x \in N$.

Prove that there is a unique $f: X/N \to Y$ which satisfies $\Lambda = f \circ \pi$, that is, $\Lambda x = f(\pi(x))$ for all $x \in X$. Prove that f is linear and that Λ is continuous if and only if f is continuous. Also, Λ is open if and only if f is open.

Proof. The equation $\Lambda = f \circ \pi$ has necessarily a unique solution, which is the binary relation

$$f \triangleq \{(\pi x, \Lambda x) : x \in X\} \subset X/N \times Y. \tag{1.15}$$

To ensure that f is actually a mapping, simply remark that the linearity of Λ implies

$$\Lambda x \neq \Lambda x' \Rightarrow \pi x' \neq \pi x'. \tag{1.16}$$

It straightforwardly derives from (1.15) that f inherits linearity from π and Λ . Now remark that

$$\pi x = N \stackrel{\text{(f linear)}}{\Rightarrow} f(\pi x) = 0 \stackrel{\text{(1.15)}}{\Rightarrow} \Lambda x = 0 \Rightarrow \pi x = N$$
 (1.17)

and so conclude that f is also one-to-one. Now assume f to be continuous. Then so is $\Lambda = f \circ \pi$, by (a) of [1.41]. Conversely, if Λ is continuous, then for each neighborhood V of 0_Y there exists a neighborhood U of 0_X such that

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{U}) = f(\pi(\mathbf{U})) \subset \mathbf{V}. \tag{1.18}$$

Since π is open (see (a) of [1.41]), $\pi(U)$ is a neighborhood of $N = 0_{X/N}$: This is sufficient to establish that the linear mapping f is continuous. If f is open, so is $\Lambda = f \circ \pi$, by (a) of [1.41]. Conversely, let

$$W \triangleq \pi(V) \subset X/N \quad (V \text{ neighborhood of } 0_X)$$
 (1.19)

range over all neighborhoods of N, as Λ is kept open: So is

$$\Lambda(V) = f(\pi(V)) = f(W). \tag{1.20}$$

The linear mapping f is then open.

1.3 Exercise 10. An open mapping theorem

Suppose that X and Y are topological vector spaces, dim $Y < \infty$, $\Lambda : X \to Y$ is linear, and $\Lambda(X) = Y$.

- (a) Prove that Λ is an open mapping.
- (b) Assume, in addition, that the null space of Λ is closed, and prove that Λ is continuous.

Proof. (a) Let e range over a base of Y: For each e, there exists x_e in X such that $\Lambda(x_e) = e$, since Λ is onto.So,

$$y = \sum_{e} y_e \Lambda x_e \quad (y \in Y). \tag{1.21}$$

The sequence $\{x_e\}$ is finite hence bounded: Given V a balanced neighborhood of the origin, there exists a positive scalar s such that

$$x_e \in sV$$
 (1.22)

for all x_e. Combining this with (1.21) shows that

$$y \in \sum_{e} \Lambda(V) \quad (y \in Y : |y_e| < s^{-1}).$$
 (1.23)

(b) Since N is closed, π continously maps X onto X/N, another topological (Hausdorf) vector space, see [1.41]. Now take f as in Exercise 9: Since Λ is onto, f is an isomorphism of X/N onto Y. X/N has then dimension dim Y. The inverse isomorphism f^{-1} is then an homeomorphism of $Y \equiv \mathbf{C}^{\dim Y}$ onto X/N; see [1.21]. Consequently, both f and f^{-1} are continuous: So is $\Lambda = f \circ \pi$.

1.4 Exercise 16. Uniqueness of topology for test functions

Prove that the topology of $C(\Omega)$ does not depend on the particular choice of $\{K_n\}$, as long as this sequence satisfies the conditions specified in section 1.44. Do the same for $C^{\infty}(\Omega)$ (Section 1.46).

Comment This is an invariance property: The function test topology only depends on the existence of the supremum-seminorms $|f|_N = \max |f|$, then, eventually, only on the ambient space itself. This should then be regarded as a very part of the textbook [2] The proof consists in combining trivial consequences of the local base definition with the well-known result (e.g. [2.6] in [1]) about intersection of nonempty compact sets.

Lemma Let X be a topological space with a countable local base $\{V_N : N = 1, 2, 3, ...\}$. If $\tilde{V}_N = V_1 \cap \cdots \cap V_N$, then every subsequence $\{\tilde{V}_{\rho(N)}\}$ is a also a decreasing $(i.e.\ \tilde{V}_{\rho(N)} \supset \tilde{V}_{\rho(N+1)})$ local base of X.

Proof. The decreasing property is trivial. Now remark that $V_N \supset \tilde{V}_N \supset \tilde{V}_{N+1}$: The left inclusion shows that $\{\tilde{V}_N\}$ is a local base of X. Then so is $\{\tilde{V}_{\rho(N)}\}$, since $\tilde{V}_N \supset \tilde{V}_{\rho(N)}$. \square

The following special case $V_N = \tilde{V}_N$ is one of the key ingredients:

Corollary 1 (special case) With the same notations, if $\{V_N\}$ is a decreasing local base, then so is $\{V_{\rho(N)}\}$.

Corollary 2 If $\{Q_N\}$ is a sequence of compacts that satisfies the conditions specified in section 1.44, then every subsequence $\{Q_{\rho(N)}\}$ also satisfies theses conditions. Furthermore, if τ_Q is the $C(\Omega)$'s (respectively $C^{\infty}(\Omega)$) topology of the seminorms p_N , as defined in section 1.44 (respectively 1.46), then the seminorms $p_{\rho(N)}$ define the same topology τ_Q .

Proof. Let X be $C(\Omega)$ topologized with the seminorms p_N (the case $X = C^{\infty}(\Omega)$ is proved the same way). If $V_N = \{p_N < 1/N\}$, then $\{V_N\}$ is a decreasing local base of X. Moreover,

$$Q_{\rho(N)} \subset \overset{\circ}{Q}_{\rho(N)+1} \subset Q_{\rho(N)+1} \subset Q_{\rho(N+1)}, \tag{1.24}$$

and this yields

$$Q_{\rho(N)} \subset \overset{\circ}{Q}_{\rho(N+1)}. \tag{1.25}$$

In other words, $Q_{\rho(N)}$ satisfies the conditions specified in section 1.44. $\{p_{\rho(N)}\}$ then defines a topology $\tau_{Q_{\rho}}$ for which $\{V_{\rho(N)}\}$ is a local base. So, $\tau_{Q_{\rho}} \subset \tau_{Q}$. Conversely, the above corollary turns $\{V_{\rho(N)}\}$ into a local base of τ_{Q} . Hence $\tau_{Q} \subset \tau_{Q_{\rho}}$.

We are now in a fair position to establish the following:

Theorem The topology of $C(\Omega)$ does not depend on the particular choice of $\{K_n\}$, as long as this sequence satisfies the conditions specified in section 1.44. Neither does the topology of $C^{\infty}(\Omega)$, as long as this sequence satisfies the conditions specified in section 1.46.

Proof. With the second corollary's notations, $\tau_K = \tau_{K_x}$, for every subsequence $\{K_{\varkappa(n)}\}$. Similarly, let $\{L_n\}$ be a sequence of compact subsets of Ω that satisfies the condition specified in [1.44], so that $\tau_L = \tau_{L_\lambda}$ for every subsequence $\{L_{\lambda(n)}\}$. The following definition

$$C_{i,j} \triangleq K_i \setminus \overset{\circ}{L_j} \quad (i,j=1,2,3,\dots)$$
 (1.26)

shapes $\{C_{i,j}: j=1,2,3,\ldots\}$ as a decreasing sequence of compacts. We now suppose (to reach a contradiction) that no $C_{i,j}$ is empty and so conclude that $C_{i,1}\cap C_{i,2}\cap\cdots$ contains a point that is not in any $int(L_j)$. But the conditions specified in [1.44] force $\{int(L_j): j=1,2,3,\ldots\}$ to be an open cover. This contradiction reveals that $C_{i,j}=C_{i,j+1}=C_{i,j+2}=\cdots=\emptyset$ for some $j=j^{(i)}$. We then define $\lambda_i=i+j^{(i)}$, so that

$$K_i \setminus \overset{\circ}{L}_{\lambda_i} = \emptyset, \quad i.e. \quad K_i \subset \overset{\circ}{L}_{\lambda_i}.$$
 (1.27)

Let us reiterate the above proof with K_n and L_n in exchanged roles then similarly find a subsequence $\{\varkappa_j: j=1,2,3,\dots\}$ such that

$$L_{j} \subset \overset{\circ}{K}_{x_{j}}$$
 (1.28)

Combine (1.27) with (1.28) and so obtain

$$K_1 \subset \overset{\circ}{L}_{\lambda_1} \subset L_{\lambda_1} \subset \overset{\circ}{K}_{x \circ \lambda_1} \subset K_{x \circ \lambda_1} \subset \overset{\circ}{L}_{\lambda_{x \circ \lambda_1}} \subset \cdots$$
 (1.29)

Thus the sequence $Q=(K_1,L_{\lambda_1},K_{\kappa\circ\lambda_1},L_{\lambda_{\kappa\circ\lambda_1}},\dots)$ satisfies the conditions specified in section 1.44. It now follows from the corollary 2 that

$$\tau_{K} = \tau_{K_{x}} = \tau_{Q} = \tau_{L_{\lambda}} = \tau_{L}. \tag{1.30}$$

So ends the proof \Box

Bibliography

- [1] Walter Rudin. Real and Complex Analysis. McGraw-Hill, 1986.
- [2] Walter Rudin. Functional Analysis. McGraw-Hill, 1991.