

Analysis 2 W3-1

fat

March 5, 2024

Recall: X a normed space. $L(X, \mathbb{C}) =$ space of all linear functionals from X to \mathbb{C} .

Proposition 1. $\Lambda \in L(X, \mathbb{C})$.

(a) Λ is bounded $\Leftrightarrow \exists C > 0$ s.t. $|\Lambda x| \leq C\|x\| \ \forall x \in X$.

(b) Λ is continuous $\Leftrightarrow \Lambda$ is continuous at one point.

(c) Λ is continuous $\Leftrightarrow \Lambda$ is bounded.

Proof.

We proved (a).

(b). We only show the other " \Leftarrow ". Suppose that Λ is continuous at x_0 . Fix $x \in X$. Let (x_n) be a sequence in X that converges to x . Define $y_n = x_n - x + x_0$. Then $y_n \rightarrow x_0$. So $\Lambda y_n \rightarrow \Lambda x_0 \Rightarrow \Lambda x_n - \Lambda x \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow \Lambda x_n \rightarrow \Lambda x$. So Λ is continuous at x .

(c). Suppose that Λ is not bounded. $\exists M > 0$ and a sequence (x_n) in X s.t. $\|x_n\| \leq M$ but $|\Lambda x_n| \rightarrow \infty$. May assume $\Lambda x_n \neq 0 \ \forall n$. Define $y_n = x_n/|\Lambda x_n|$. Then $\|y_n\| \rightarrow 0$, but $|\Lambda y_n| = 1$ for all n . Λ is not continuous. On the other hand, suppose that Λ is bounded. By (a), Λ is Lipschitz $\Rightarrow \Lambda$ is continuous.

□

$X^* =$ Set of all bounded linear functionals on X , called the Dual space/topological dual. $X^* \subset L(X, \mathbb{C})$. If X is finite dimensional, then $X^* = L(X, \mathbb{C})$. If X is infinite dimensional, that $X^* \subset L(X, \mathbb{C})$ but $X^* \neq L(X, \mathbb{C})$. Why? Let B be a Hamel basis for X . Normalize the vectors in B s.t. all have norm 1. Pick $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots\}$ from B . Define

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda x_i = i & \forall i \\ \Lambda x = 0 & \text{if } x \in B \setminus \{x_1, \dots\} \end{cases}$$

Extend Λ linearly. ($\forall v \in X, v = a_1 v_1 + \dots + a_n v_n$ where $v_1, \dots, v_n \in B$. $\Lambda v = a_1 \Lambda v_1 + \dots + a_n \Lambda v_n$.) Then Λ is unbounded.

Proposition 2. Let X be a normed space and $\Lambda \in X^*$. Define

$$\|\Lambda\| = \sup_{x \neq 0} \frac{|\Lambda x|}{\|x\|}$$

Then $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm on X^* called the operator norm.

Remark 1. We can define

$$\|\Lambda\| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} |\Lambda x| = \sup_{\|x\| \leq 1} |\Lambda x|$$

From definition, we have $|\Lambda x| \leq \|\Lambda\| \|x\| \forall x \in X$. Exercise: Verify this.

Proof.

We only prove the Δ -ineq. Let $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \in X^*$ and let $x \in X$ with $\|x\| = 1$. Then

$$|(\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2)(x)| \leq |\Lambda_1 x| + |\Lambda_2 x| \leq \|\Lambda_1\| + \|\Lambda_2\|$$

Take sup over all $\|x\| = 1$, done. □

Proposition 3. If X is a normed space, then X^* is a Banach space.

Proof.

Let (Λ_k) be a Cauchy sequence in X^* . Fix $\epsilon > 0$. $\exists K$ s.t. $\|\Lambda_k - \Lambda_l\| < \epsilon \forall k, l \geq K$. For $x \in X$,

$$|\Lambda_k x - \Lambda_l x| \leq \|\Lambda_k - \Lambda_l\| \|x\| < \epsilon \|x\| \forall k, l \geq K \dots (*)$$

So for each $x \in X$, $(\Lambda_k x)$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{C} . $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k x$ exists $\forall x \in X$. Define $\Lambda x = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_k x$. Check: Λ is linear. Let $l \rightarrow \infty$ in $(*)$.

$$|\Lambda_k x - \Lambda x| \leq \epsilon \|x\| \forall k \geq K \dots (!)$$

$$|\Lambda x| \leq (\epsilon + \|\Lambda_K\|) \|x\|$$

This holds for all $x \in X$, so $\Lambda \in X^*$. Finally, we show $\Lambda_k \rightarrow \Lambda$ in norm. from $(!)$, $\|\Lambda_k - \Lambda\| \leq \epsilon \forall k \geq K$. So $\Lambda_k \rightarrow \Lambda$. □

Example 1.

Proposition 4. Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. The dual of l^p is isometrically isomorphic to l^q where $q = \frac{p}{p-1}$.

Proof.

We only prove the case when $p > 1$. Define $e_j = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, 0, \dots)$ where only the j^{th} position is 1. Define $\Phi : (l^p)^* \rightarrow l^q$ as follows: For $\Lambda \in (l^p)^*$, define

$$\Phi(\Lambda) = (\Lambda e_1, \Lambda e_2, \dots)$$

We first verify that $\Phi(\Lambda) \in l^q$. Write $\Phi(\Lambda) = (a_1, a_2, \dots)$. $\exists \theta_j$ s.t. $a_j = e^{i\theta_j} |a_j|$. Define

$$a^N = (e^{-i\theta_1} |a_1|^{q-1}, \dots, e^{-i\theta_N} |a_N|^{q-1}, 0, 0, \dots)$$

Then $a^N \in l^p \forall N$. ($a^N = \sum_{j=1}^N e^{-i\theta_j} |a_j|^{q-1} e_j$).

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda a^N| &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^N e^{-i\theta_j} |a_j|^{q-1} \Lambda e_j \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^N e^{-i\theta_j} |a_j|^{q-1} a_j \right| = \sum_{j=1}^N |a_j|^q \\ \|a^N\|_{l^p} &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^N (|a_j|^{q-1})^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^N |a_j|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned}$$

Recall: $|\Lambda x| \leq \|\Lambda\| \|x\|$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^N |a_j|^q &\leq \|\Lambda\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^N |a_j|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ \Rightarrow \left(\sum_{j=1}^N |a_j|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} &\leq \|\Lambda\| \end{aligned}$$

Let $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\|\Phi(\Lambda)\|_{l^q} \leq \|\Lambda\|$$

That is, $\Phi : (l^p)^* \rightarrow l^q$. Next, we show that Φ is onto. We will construct the inverse explicitly. For each $a \in l^q$, we define $\Psi(a) = \Lambda_a$, where $\Lambda_a \in (l^p)^*$ is given by $\Lambda_a x = \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j x_j \forall x \in l^p$. By Hölder's inequality,

$$|\Lambda_a x| \leq \|a\|_{l^q} \|x\|_{l^p} \forall x \in l^p$$

So $\Lambda_a x$ is well-defined, and $\Lambda_a \in (l^p)^*$. Taking sup over all x with $\|x\|_{l^p} = 1$, we have

$$\|\Psi(a)\| = \|\Lambda_a\| \leq \|a\|_{l^q}$$

Claim. $\Phi(\Psi(a)) = a \forall a \in l^q$.

Proof.

Let $a \in l^q$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\Psi(a)) &= (\Psi(a)e_1, \Psi(a)e_2, \dots) \\ &= (a_1, a_2, \dots) = a \end{aligned}$$

□

Finally, we show Φ is an isometry. Recall:

$$\|\Phi(\Lambda)\|_{l^q} \leq \|\Lambda\|$$

We also have $\Psi(\Phi(\Lambda)) = \Lambda \forall \Lambda \in (l^p)^*$. (Why? $\Psi(\Phi(\Lambda)) = \Psi(\Lambda e_1, \Lambda e_2, \dots) = \Lambda_{(\Lambda e_1, \Lambda e_2, \dots)}$)

$$\forall x \in l^p, \Lambda_{(\Lambda e_1, \Lambda e_2, \dots)} x = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Lambda e_j x_j = \Lambda \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j e_j \right) = \Lambda x$$

) Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda\| &= \|\Psi(\Phi(\Lambda))\| \leq \|\Phi(\Lambda)\|_{l^q} \leq \|\Lambda\| \\ \Rightarrow \|\Phi(\Lambda)\|_{l^q} &= \|\Lambda\| \end{aligned}$$

So Φ is an isometry. □

Fact: $(L^p)^* = L^q$ is $1 \leq p < \infty, q = \frac{p}{p-1}$. What is $(C^0([a, b]))^*$? We will need the Hahn-Banach theorem.

Definition 1. Let X be a vector space (over \mathbb{C}). A function $p : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is called **subadditive** if $p(x + y) \leq p(x) + p(y) \forall x, y \in X$. $p : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is **positively homogeneous** if

$$p(\alpha x) = \alpha p(x) \forall x \in X, \forall \alpha \geq 0$$

A subadditive, positively homogeneous function is also called a **gauge** or a **Minkowski function**.

Example 2. • If X is a normed space, then $p(x) = c\|x\|$ ($c > 0$) is a gauge.

• Let C be a convex set containing O in X . Define

$$p_C(x) = \inf\{\alpha > 0 : x \in \alpha C\}$$

Also, define $p_C(x) = \infty$ if no such α exists.

Claim. p_C is a gauge

Proof.

Positive homogeneity is easy. Let $x, y \in X$. If $p_C(x) = \infty$ or $p_C(y) = \infty$, there is nothing to prove. Assume $p_C(x), p_C(y) < \infty$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. $\exists \alpha, \beta > 0$ s.t. $p_C(x) > \alpha - \epsilon$ and $p_C(y) > \beta - \epsilon$ and $\frac{x}{\alpha} \in C, \frac{y}{\beta} \in C$.

$$\frac{x+y}{\alpha+\beta} = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta} \cdot \frac{x}{\alpha} + \frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta} \cdot \frac{y}{\beta} \in C$$

Hence, $p_C(x+y) \leq p_C(x) + p_C(y)$. □

Theorem 1 (Hahn-Banach). Let X be a vector space and let p be a gauge on X . Suppose that Y is a proper subspace of X . Let $\Lambda \in L(Y, \mathbb{C})$ satisfy

$$\operatorname{Re}(\Lambda x) \leq p(x) \quad \forall x \in Y$$

Then \exists an extension $\tilde{\Lambda}$ of Λ to $L(X, \mathbb{C})$ s.t.

$$\operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\Lambda} x) \leq p(x) \quad \forall x \in X$$

We will assume our vector spaces are over \mathbb{R} first. The \mathbb{C} case follows from the \mathbb{R} case (we will see).

Lemma 1 (One-step extension). Let $\Lambda \in L(Y, \mathbb{R})$ s.t. $\Lambda x \leq p(x) \quad \forall x \in Y$, and let $x_0 \in X \setminus Y$. \exists an extension Λ_1 of Λ on $Y' =$ the space spanned by x_0 and Y s.t. $\Lambda_1 x \leq p(x) \quad \forall x \in Y'$.

Proof.

Every $x \in Y'$ is of the form $x = y + cx_0$ for some $y \in Y$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Any linear functional Λ_1 extending Λ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1 x &= \Lambda_1(y + cx_0) = \Lambda_1 y + c\Lambda_1 x_0 \\ &= \Lambda y + c\Lambda_1 x_0 \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, by assigning any value to $\Lambda_1 x_0$, one obtains an extension of Λ to Y' . However, what we need is to choose an appropriate $\Lambda_1 x_0$ s.t. $\Lambda_1 x \leq p(x) \quad \forall x \in Y'$. To see such a choice is possible, we focus on the case that $c = \pm 1$. Need:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda y \pm \Lambda_1 x_0 &= \Lambda_1(y \pm x_0) \leq p(y \pm x_0) \\ \Leftrightarrow \Lambda_1 x_0 &\leq p(y + x_0) - \Lambda y \text{ and } \Lambda y - p(y - x_0) \leq \Lambda_1 x_0 \quad \forall y \in Y \\ \Leftrightarrow \forall y, z \in Y, \Lambda z - p(z - x_0) &\leq \Lambda_1 x_0 \leq p(y + x_0) - \Lambda y \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \sup_{z \in Y} (\Lambda z - p(z - x_0)) \\ \beta &= \inf_{y \in Y} (p(y + x_0) - \Lambda y) \end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha \leq \beta$, we set $\Lambda_1 x_0$ as any value between α and β

Claim. This gives the desired extension.

Proof.

Need $\Lambda_1 x \leq p(x) \quad \forall x \in Y'$. For $c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1(y \pm cx_0) &= \Lambda y \pm c\Lambda_1 x_0 \\ &= c \left(\Lambda \left(\frac{y}{c} \pm \Lambda_1 x_0 \right) \right) = c \left(\Lambda \left(\frac{y}{c} \pm x_0 \right) \right) \leq cp \left(\frac{y}{c} \pm x_0 \right) = p(y \pm cx_0) \end{aligned}$$

Remains to show $\alpha \leq \beta$. Only need to show

$$\Lambda z - p(z - x_0) \leq p(y + x_0) - \Lambda y \quad \forall y, z \in Y$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \Lambda(y + z) \leq p(y + x_0) + p(z - x_0)$$

$$y + z \in Y$$

$$\Lambda(y + z) \leq p(y + z) = (y + x_0 + z - x_0) \leq p(y + x_0) + p(z - x_0)$$

□

□