

## Homework Assignment #3

### Due Wednesday, February 3rd

INSTRUCTIONS: As usual, for the “true/false” questions, just circle the correct answer. No justifications are required, but don’t guess. Your score is based on #right minus #wrong.

1. **TRUE or FALSE:** The dual of any normed vector space is a Banach space.
2. **TRUE or FALSE:** If  $X$  and  $Y$  are Banach spaces and  $T : X \rightarrow Y$  is a surjective linear map, then  $T$  is bounded.

**ANS:** FALSE: But constructing a counter example is tedious. Let  $X$  be any infinite dimensional Banach space. Then  $X$  has a basis  $\{x_a\}_{a \in A}$  as a vector space over  $\mathbf{F}$ . (It is a consequence of the Baire Category Theorem that  $A$  must be *uncountable!* You might want to prove that for yourself.) Let  $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be any countable subset of  $A$ . We can define a linear functional  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{F}$  simply by arbitrarily specifying what  $\varphi$  does to each  $x_a$ . In particular, I can define

$$\Phi(x_a) = \begin{cases} n\|x_{a_n}\| & \text{if } a = a_n, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $y_n = (n\|x_{a_n}\|)^{-1}x_{a_n}$ . Then  $y_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $X$ . But  $\varphi(y_n) = 1$  for all  $n$ . Therefore,  $\varphi(y_n) \not\rightarrow 0$ . Therefore  $\varphi$  is not continuous at 0, and therefore not bounded.

3. **TRUE or FALSE:** If  $Y$  is a closed subspace of a normed vector space  $X$  and if  $x \in X \setminus Y$ , then there is a  $\varphi \in X^*$  such that  $\varphi(y) = 0$  for all  $y \in Y$  and  $\varphi(x) = 1$ .
4. **TRUE or FALSE:** Suppose that  $X$  and  $Y$  are Banach spaces and that  $T_n : X \rightarrow Y$  is a bounded linear map for  $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ . Suppose that there is a linear operator  $T_0 : X \rightarrow Y$  such that for each  $x \in X$ , we have  $T_n x \rightarrow T_0 x$ . Then  $T_0$  is bounded.

**ANS:** Since  $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is pointwise bounded, by the Principle of Uniform Boundedness, there is a  $M$  such that  $\|T_n\| \leq M$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Now it follows easily that  $\|T_0\| \leq M$ .

5. Suppose that  $Y$  is a subspace of a normed vector space  $X$ . Show that the closure of  $Y$  is given by

$$\bar{Y} = \bigcap \{ \ker \varphi : \varphi \in X^* \text{ and } Y \subset \ker \varphi \}.$$

6. Work E.2.3.2 in the text. It may be helpful to think of  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  as  $C_0(\mathbf{N})$ . Then if  $x \in C_c(\mathbf{N})$ , we have  $x = \sum x_n \delta_n$ , where the  $x_n$  are scalars and  $\delta_n$  is the function taking the value 1 at  $n$  and 0 elsewhere.

**ANS:** This shouldn't be so hard. Recall that  $\mathfrak{c}$  and  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  are subspaces of  $\ell^\infty$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathfrak{c}_{00} := C_c(\mathbf{N})$  can be viewed as a dense subspace of either  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  or  $\ell^1$ .

Furthermore, if  $x \in \ell^\infty$  and  $y \in \ell^1$ , then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n y_n| \leq \|x\|_\infty \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y_n| = \|x\|_\infty \|y\|_1. \quad (1)$$

Therefore, if  $y \in \ell^1$ , then we can define  $\varphi_y : \mathfrak{c}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{F}$  by

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

and  $\|\varphi_y\| \leq \|y\|_1$ . Of course, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a  $N$  such that

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

For  $z \in \mathbf{F}$ , let  $\text{sgn}(z)$  equal  $z/|z|$  if  $z \neq 0$ , and 0 otherwise. (Thus  $\overline{\text{sgn}(z)}z = |z|$  for all  $z$ .) Define  $x \in \mathfrak{c}_0$  by

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

Then  $x$  has norm at most one, and

$$\varphi_y(x) = \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| \geq \|y\|_1 - \epsilon.$$

Therefore  $\|\varphi_y\| = \|y\|_1$ , and  $y \mapsto \varphi_y$  is an isometry of  $\ell^1$  into  $\mathfrak{c}_0^*$ . (It is obviously linear and one-to-one since it is isometric.) We just have to see that it is surjective.

Suppose that  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{c}_0^*$ . Define  $y_n := \varphi(\delta_n)$ . For any  $N$ , define

$$x_n^N = \begin{cases} \overline{\text{sgn}(y_n)} & \text{if } n \leq N, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then  $x^N = \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{\text{sgn}(y_n)} \delta_n$ ,  $\|x^N\|_\infty \leq 1$  and  $x^N \in \mathfrak{c}_{00} \subset \mathfrak{c}_0$ . Since

$$\varphi(x^N) = \sum_{n=1}^N |y_n| \leq \|\varphi\|,$$

$y = (y_n)$  is in  $\ell^1$ . Since  $\varphi = \varphi_y$  on  $\mathfrak{c}_{00}$ , and since  $\mathfrak{c}_{00}$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{c}_0$ , we must have  $\varphi = \varphi_y$  as desired. This proves that  $\mathfrak{c}_0^*$  is (isometrically isomorphic to)  $\ell^1$ .

Now start with  $x \in \ell^\infty$ . Then (1) implies that we get a functional  $\psi_x : \ell^1 \rightarrow \mathbf{F}$  defined by

$$\psi_x(y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n y_n,$$

and that  $\|\psi_x\| \leq \|x\|_\infty$ . If  $x \in \ell^\infty$  and if  $\epsilon > 0$ , then there is a  $k$  such that  $|x_k| \geq \|x\|_\infty - \epsilon$ . Since  $\|\delta_k\|_1 = 1$  and since  $|\psi_x(\delta_k)| \leq \|x\|_\infty - \epsilon$ , we see that  $x \mapsto \psi_x$  is an isometry of  $\ell^\infty$  into  $\ell^{1*}$ . To see that this map is surjective, we proceed as above.<sup>1</sup> Given  $\psi \in \ell^{1*}$ , let  $x_n := \psi(\delta_n)$ . Since  $|x_n| \leq \|\psi\|$ ,  $x = (x_n) \in \ell^\infty$ . Since  $\psi = \psi_x$  on  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  and since  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  is dense in  $\ell^1$ , we've shown that  $\psi = \psi_x$  and that  $\ell^{1*}$  is (isometrically isomorphic to)  $\ell^\infty$ .

Now let's look at  $\mathfrak{c}^*$ . Define  $\lambda : \mathfrak{c} \rightarrow \mathbf{F}$  by  $\lambda(x) = \lim_n x_n$ . Then  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{c}^*$  and  $\|\lambda\| = 1$ . Now suppose that  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{c}^*$ . Then the restriction of  $\varphi$  to  $\mathfrak{c}_0 \subset \mathfrak{c}$  is, by the first part of this problem, given by  $\varphi_y$  for some  $y \in \ell^1$ . On the other hand, if  $x \in \mathfrak{c}$ , then  $x - \lambda(x) \cdot 1 \in \mathfrak{c}_0$ , where 1 denotes the constant sequence. If  $L := \varphi(1)$ , then

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi_y(x) + \lambda(x)(L - \sum y_n).$$

Thus every  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{c}^*$  is of the form

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi_y(x) + z\lambda(x)$$

for some  $y \in \ell^1$  and  $z \in \mathbf{F}$ . Furthermore, a straightforward computation shows that  $\|\varphi\| = \|y\|_1 + |z|$ . Thus we get an isometric isomorphism of  $\mathbf{C} \oplus \ell^1$  onto  $\mathfrak{c}^*$  where the norm of the latter is given by  $\|(z, y)\| := |z| + \|y\|_1$ . However it is easy to see that  $\mathbf{C} \oplus \ell^1$  is isometrically isomorphic to  $\ell^1$ : just send  $(z, (y_n))$  to  $(z, y_1, y_2, \dots)$ .

Finally,  $\mathfrak{c}_0$ , and therefore  $\mathfrak{c}$ , can't be reflexive since  $\mathfrak{c}_0$  is separable and  $\mathfrak{c}_0^{**} \cong \ell^{1*} \cong \ell^\infty$  is not.

## 7. Work E.2.3.4 in the text.

**ANS:** Let  $\{\varphi_n\}$  be dense in  $X^*$ , and choose  $x_n \in X$  such that  $\|x_n\| = 1$  and such that  $|\varphi_n(x_n)| \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\varphi_n\|$ . Let  $Y$  be the closed linear span of the  $x_n$ . Then  $Y$  is separable (since the rational span of the  $x_n$  is dense in  $Y$ ). If  $X = Y$ , then we're done. Otherwise, our Corollary 2.3.5 implies that there is  $\varphi \in X^*$  such that  $\|\varphi\| = 1$  and such that  $\varphi(y) = 0$  for all  $y \in Y$ . In particular,  $\varphi(x_n) = 0$  for all  $n$ . But there is a  $n$  such that  $\|\varphi - \varphi_n\| < \frac{1}{8}$ . In particular,  $\|\varphi_n\| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ . But then

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi(x_n)| &= |\varphi_n(x_n) - (\varphi_n(x_n) - \varphi(x_n))| \\ &\geq |\varphi_n(x_n)| - |(\varphi - \varphi_n)(x_n)| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{8} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the fact that  $|\varphi(x_n)| = 0$ . Therefore  $Y = X$  and we're done.

---

<sup>1</sup>Since counting measure on  $\mathbf{N}$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, we could have appealed to the fact that  $L^1(X, \mathcal{M}, \mu)^*$  is  $L^\infty(X, \mathcal{M}, \mu)$  whenever the measure space is  $\sigma$ -finite, but that would be overkill.

8. Work E.2.3.5 in the text.

**ANS:** First some comments. For any Banach space  $X$ ,  $\iota : X \rightarrow X^{**}$  is an isometric injection. We say that  $X$  is reflexive if  $\iota$  is surjective. Technically, that is not the same as showing that  $X$  and  $X^{**}$  are isomorphic. Thus saying that since  $X$  reflexive implies that  $X$  and  $X^{**}$  are isomorphic, we have  $X^*$  and  $X^{***}$  isomorphic is not quite enough to show that  $X^*$  is reflexive.

Anyway, to the problem: Assume first that  $X$  is reflexive. To show that  $X^*$  is reflexive, we need to show that the canonical injection  $\iota_{X^*} : X^* \rightarrow X^{***}$  is surjective. To this end, suppose that  $\Phi \in X^{***}$ . Since the composition of bounded maps is bounded, we can define  $\varphi \in X^*$  by

$$\varphi(x) := \Phi(\iota(x)).$$

Thus we'll be done once we prove that  $\iota_{X^*}(\varphi) = \Phi$ . However, since  $\iota(x)$  is a typical element of  $X^{**}$ , we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{X^*}(\varphi)(\iota(x)) &= \iota(x)(\varphi) \\ &= \varphi(x) \\ &= \Phi(\iota(x)). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that  $\iota_{X^*}(\varphi) = \Phi$ , and finishes the first half of the problem.

Now suppose that  $X^*$  is reflexive so that, in the notation above,  $\iota_{X^*} : X^* \rightarrow X^{***}$  is surjective. If  $X$  were not reflexive, then since  $i(X)$  is an isometric image of  $X$ , it is complete and therefore it is a closed proper subspace of  $X^{**}$ . Therefore, by Corollary 2.3.5, there is a  $\Phi \in X^{***}$  such that  $\|\Phi\| = 1$  and such that  $\Phi(\iota(X)) = \{0\}$ . By assumption, we have  $\Phi = \iota_{X^*}(\varphi)$  for some  $\varphi \in X^*$ . But then for all  $x \in X$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Phi(\iota(x)) \\ &= \iota_{X^*}(\varphi)(\iota(x)) \\ &= \iota(x)(\varphi) \\ &= \varphi(x). \end{aligned}$$

But this is absurd, since this implies  $\varphi = 0$  in which case  $\Phi = \iota_{X^*}(\varphi)$  is zero. Thus we must have  $\iota(X)$  equal to all of  $X^{**}$  and  $X$  is reflexive.

9. Work E.2.3.7 in the text.

**ANS:** One of the challenges here is to write your thoughts down coherently and to properly justify the manipulations with sums.

If  $x \in \ell^1$ , then for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  implies

$$\left| \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} x_m \right| \leq \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} |x_m| < \epsilon.$$

Therefore

$$(Tx)_n := \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} x_m$$

defines an element  $Tx$  in  $\mathfrak{c}_0$ . Clearly,  $T : \ell^1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{c}_0$  is linear. Since

$$|(Tx)_n| \leq \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} |x_m| \leq \|x\|_1,$$

we certainly have  $\|Tx\|_{\infty} \leq \|x\|_1$  and  $T \in B(\ell^1, \mathfrak{c}_0)$ .

Now we identify  $\ell^1$  with  $\mathfrak{c}_0^*$  and  $\ell^{\infty}$  with  $\ell^{1*}$  via the maps  $y \mapsto \varphi_y$  and  $x \mapsto \psi_x$  defined in a previous problem. Now if  $x, y \in \ell^1$ , we have — using Fubini's Theorem to justify the manipulations with sums —

$$\begin{aligned} (T^* \varphi_x)(y) &= \varphi_x(Ty) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n (Ty)_n \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} x_n y_m \\ &= \sum_{\{(n,m) \in \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N} : m \geq n\}} x_n y_m \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^m x_n y_m \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} y_m \left( \sum_{n=1}^m x_n \right) \\ &= \psi_z(y), \end{aligned}$$

where  $z \in \ell^{\infty}$  is given by  $z_m := \sum_{n=1}^m x_n$ . Therefore as a map from  $\ell^1 \rightarrow \ell^{\infty}$ , we have  $T^*x = z$ .