

.2.29 Exercise

Let $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space. Prove that

$B_1 = \{x \in L : \|x\| \leq 1\}$ is closed (i) The set

$A_1 = \{x \in L : \|x\| < 1\}$ is open (ii) The set

$C = \{x \in L : \|x\| = 1\}$ is closed (iii) The set

:Solution

(i) $B_1 = \{x \in L : \|x\| \leq 1\}$ is a closed set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, $A_1 = \{x \in L : \|x\| < 1\}$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, A_1 is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5)

(ii) $A_1 = \{x \in L : \|x\| < 1\}$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, A_1 is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5)

(iii) $C = \{x \in L : \|x\| = 1\}$ is a closed set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, C is a closed set (by Definition 1.2.5)

(iii) $C = \{x \in L : \|x\| = 1\}$ is a closed set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, C is a closed set (by Definition 1.2.5)

$C = \{x \in L : \|x\| = 1\}$ is a closed set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, C is a closed set (by Definition 1.2.5)

$L \setminus C = \{x \in L : \|x\| < 1\} \cup \{x \in L : \|x\| > 1\}$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, $L \setminus C$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5)

$L \setminus C = \{x \in L : \|x\| < 1\} \cup \{x \in L : \|x\| > 1\}$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, $L \setminus C$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5)

$L \setminus C = \{x \in L : \|x\| < 1\} \cup \{x \in L : \|x\| > 1\}$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, $L \setminus C$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5)

$L \setminus C = \{x \in L : \|x\| < 1\} \cup \{x \in L : \|x\| > 1\}$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, $L \setminus C$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5)

is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, $L \setminus C$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5)

$L \setminus C = \{x \in L : \|x\| < 1\} \cup \{x \in L : \|x\| > 1\}$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5) So, $L \setminus C$ is an open set (by Definition 1.2.5)

.2.30 Definition

Let L be a normed space and $A \subseteq L$. A point $x \in L$ is called **limit point**

of A if for each open set G containing x , we have $(G \cap A) \setminus \{x\} \neq \emptyset$

The set of all limit points of A is denoted by A' and is called **derived**

set. The closure of A is denoted by \bar{A} and is defined as $\bar{A} = A \cup A'$

.2.31 Proposition

Let L be a normed linear space and $A \subseteq L$. Then $x \in \bar{A}$ if and only if

$$\exists y \in A, \|x - y\| < r \quad \forall r > 0$$

— *Proof.* (\Rightarrow) Let $x \in \bar{A} = A \cup A'$

. If $x \in A'$ then for each open set G , $x \in G$, $(G \cap A) \setminus \{x\} \neq \emptyset$

, \emptyset . Thus, we have $B_r(x) \cap A \setminus \{x\} \neq \emptyset$. Since $B_r(x)$ is an open set then $\forall r > 0$

$$\text{(I)} \quad y \in B_r(x) \cap A, y \neq x \Rightarrow \|y - x\| < r$$

$$\text{(II)} \quad \exists y \in A \text{ such that } \|y - x\| < r$$

. From **(I)** and **(II)**, we get the required result

$\exists y \in A$ such that $\|y - x\| < r$, that is $\forall r > 0$ if for each $r > 0$ (\Leftarrow)

$$(A, y \in B_r(x))$$

. $\Rightarrow x \in A'$. Thus, $x \in A, (B_r(x) \cap A) \setminus \{x\} \neq \emptyset \quad \forall r > 0 \Rightarrow \square$

Convergence in Normed Space 2.5

.2.32 Definition

Let $\langle x_n \rangle$ be a sequence in a normed space $(L, \|\cdot\|)$. Then $\langle x_n \rangle$ is said to

be **convergent** in L if $\exists x \in L$ such that $\forall \epsilon > 0$

$$\exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ such that } \forall n > k \|x_n - x\| < \epsilon,$$

We write $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ or $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x_n) = x$; that is

$$\Leftrightarrow x_n \rightarrow x \iff \|x_n - x\| \rightarrow 0$$

$\langle x_n \rangle$ is **divergent** if it is not convergent)

.2.33 Theorem

If $\langle x_n \rangle$ is a convergent sequence in $(L, \|\cdot\|)$, then its limit is unique. i.e.,

.If $\langle x_n \rangle \rightarrow x$ and $\langle x_n \rangle \rightarrow y$ then $x = y$

$\in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such k_2, k_1 . Since $\langle x_n \rangle \rightarrow x$ and $\langle x_n \rangle \rightarrow y$, then $\exists k_0$ Proof. Let $\epsilon >$

that

$$\frac{\epsilon}{2} \forall n > k_2 \text{ and } \|x_n - y\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \forall n > k_2, \|x_n - x\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

$$\}, \text{ so } \forall n > k_2, k_1 \text{ Let } k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$$

$$\|x - y\| = \|x_n - y - x_n + x\| = \|(x_n - y) - (x_n - x)\|$$

$$= \epsilon_2 + \frac{1}{2} \|x_n - y\| + \|x_n - x\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$$

., so $x = y$. Thus, $\|x - y\| = 0 \forall \epsilon > 0 \Rightarrow \|x - y\| < \epsilon \Rightarrow x = y$ \square

.2.34 Theorem

Let $A \subseteq L$ where L is a normed space, let $x \in L$. Then

$x \in A \iff \exists \langle x_n \rangle$ a sequence in A such that $\langle x_n \rangle \rightarrow x$

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let $x \in A = A \cup A$

(I) If $x \in A$ then the sequence $\langle x, x, x, \dots \rangle \rightarrow x$

φ . If $x \notin A$, i.e., $x \in A'$ then for each open set G , $x \in G, (G \cap A) \setminus \{x\} \neq \varphi$.

Set, we have $B_r(x) \cap A \setminus \{x\} \neq \varphi$ Since $B_r(x)$ is an open set then $\forall r >$

$\frac{1}{n} (B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x) \cap A) \setminus \{x\} \neq \varphi$. Then $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+, (B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x) \cap A) \setminus \{x\} \neq \varphi$

Let $x_n \in (B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x) \cap A) \setminus \{x\}$, hence $x_n \in A$, s.t $\|x_n - x\| < \frac{1}{n} \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ (*)

$>$ Thus, $\exists \langle x_n \rangle \in A$ such that $\|x_n - x\| < \frac{1}{n} \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

$\forall \epsilon > 0$ To show $\langle x_n \rangle \rightarrow x$; that is $\|x_n - x\| < \epsilon$,

so by Archmedian theorem $\exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\frac{1}{k} < \epsilon$ Let $\frac{1}{k} < \epsilon$

Hence, $\forall n > k, \frac{1}{n} < \frac{1}{k} < \epsilon$

From **(*)**, $\forall n > k, \|x_n - x\| < \frac{1}{n} < \frac{1}{k} < \epsilon$. Thus, $x_n \rightarrow x$ **(II)**

.From **(I)** and **(II)**, we get the required result

'If $\exists \langle x_n \rangle$ a sequence in A such that $\langle x_n \rangle \rightarrow x$. To prove $x \in A = \overline{A} \cup A (\Leftrightarrow)$

—

If $x \in A$ then $x \in A$

0 If $x \notin A$. Let G be an open set in L such that $x \in G$. Then $\exists r >$

and $x_n \rightarrow x, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that 0 such that $B_r(x) \subseteq G$. Since $r >$

$\|x_n - x\| < r, \forall n > k$

$\forall n > k$ and since $x_n \in A \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then This implies, $x_n \in B_r(x)$

$(B_r(x) \cap A) \setminus \{x\} \neq \emptyset$. Since $B_r(x) \subseteq G$, then $(G \cap A) \setminus \{x\} \neq$

—

\emptyset . $\therefore x \in A'$, and therefore $x \in \overline{A}$

.2.35 Theorem

Let $\langle x_n \rangle, \langle y_n \rangle$ be two sequences in normed space $(L, \| \cdot \|)$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x$

and $y_n \rightarrow y$. Then

$$\langle x_n \rangle \pm \langle y_n \rangle \rightarrow x \pm y \quad \mathbf{(1)}$$

for any scalar $\lambda \lambda \langle x_n \rangle \rightarrow \lambda x \quad \mathbf{(2)}$

$$\| \langle x_n \rangle \| \rightarrow \| x \| \quad \mathbf{(3)}$$

) Since $x_n \rightarrow x$, then **1Proof.** (

$\forall n > k, \exists k_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\|x_n - x\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \exists k_2$ for each $\epsilon >$

Also since $y_n \rightarrow y$, then

$\forall n > k, \exists k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\|y_n - y\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \exists k_2$ for each $\epsilon >$

}. Then, for each $n > k_2, k_1$ Let $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$

$$\mathbf{(I)} \quad \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ and } \|y_n - y\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ and } \|x_n - x\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Now, for each $n > k$

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

$\epsilon \quad \epsilon$

$\frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ (from (I)) $\epsilon = + >$

Thus, $x_n + y_n \rightarrow x + y$ as required

s.t $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow$ Since $x_n \rightarrow x$, let $\epsilon > 0$, $\forall n > k \forall \epsilon$ (II)

But $\| \lambda x_n - \lambda x \| = |\lambda| \| x_n - x \| < \frac{\epsilon}{|\lambda|} |\lambda| = \epsilon$

(using (I))

Thus, $\lambda \langle x_n \rangle \rightarrow \lambda x$

$\forall n > k$. Since $x_n \rightarrow x, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ s.t $\| x_n - x \| < \epsilon$, let $\epsilon > 0$ (3) (III)

$\forall n > k$. Hence, $\| x_n \| \rightarrow \| x \|$ But $|\| x_n \| - \| x \| | \leq \| x_n - x \| < \epsilon$ \square

(using (III))

.2.36 Definition

Let $\langle x_n \rangle$ be a sequence in a normed space $(L, \| \cdot \|)$. Then $\langle x_n \rangle$ is said to be a **Cauchy sequence** if $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ s.t $\| x_n - x_m \| < \epsilon, \forall n, m > k$

.2.37 Theorem

Every convergent sequence in a normed space $(L, \| \cdot \|)$ is a Cauchy sequence

Proof. Let $\langle x_n \rangle$ be a convergent sequence in L . Then $\exists x \in L$ such that

(I) $n > k \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\| x_n - x \| < \epsilon$ and so $\forall \epsilon > 0$

Now, for $n, m > k$

$\| x_n - x_m \| = \| (x_n - x) + (x - x_m) \| \leq \| x_n - x \| + \| x - x_m \| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$

(using (I))

Thus, $\langle x_n \rangle$ is a Cauchy sequence

.2.38 Definition

Let $\langle x_n \rangle$ be a sequence in a normed space $(L, \| \cdot \|)$. Then $\langle x_n \rangle$ is said to be a **bounded sequence** if $\exists k \in \mathbb{R}, k > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\| x_n \| \leq k$

.2.39 Theorem

.Every Cauchy sequence $\langle x_n \rangle$ in a normed space $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ is bounded

. Since $\langle x_n \rangle$ is a Cauchy sequence, $\exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\forall n, m > k$, $\|x_n - x_m\| < \epsilon$. Hence, $\|x_n - x_{k+1}\| < \epsilon$ for $n > k$.

Considering $m = k+1$,

$\|x_n\| = \|x_n - x_{k+1} + x_{k+1}\| \leq \|x_n - x_{k+1}\| + \|x_{k+1}\| < \epsilon + \|x_{k+1}\|$. By Theorem 2.37, $\langle x_n \rangle$ is bounded.

Thus, $\|x_n\| < \epsilon + \|x_{k+1}\|$ for $n > k$.

Let $M = \max\{\|x_1\|, \dots, \|x_k\|, \epsilon + \|x_{k+1}\|\}$.

Then, $\|x_n\| < M$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. So, $\langle x_n \rangle$ is bounded. \square

Hence, $\|x_n\| \leq M$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. So, $\langle x_n \rangle$ is bounded. \square

.2.40 Corollary

.Every convergent sequence in a normed space $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ is bounded

. Every convergent sequence in a normed space 2.37 *Proof.* From Theorem

, every Cauchy sequence in 2.39 $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ is Cauchy, and from Theorem

.a normed space $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ is bounded. \square

Convexity in Normed Linear Space 2.6

.2.41 Definition

A subset A of a linear space L is said to be **convex** if $\forall x, y \in A, \lambda \in [0, 1]$

then $\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in A$.

.2.42 Example

Let $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$. Is A convex set?

Solution: Let $x, y \in A, \lambda \in [0, 1]$

(I) $\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y \leq \lambda \cdot 1 + (1-\lambda) \cdot 1 = 1$ Since

$(-\lambda)(3-\lambda)y \leq 1 - \lambda \leq 1$ (II)

(By summing up (I) and (II)

$$(\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y) + (-\lambda)(3-\lambda)y \leq \lambda + (1-\lambda)$$

$$\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y \leq 1$$

$\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y \in A$. Hence, A is convex set. Thus, $\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y \in A$.

.2.43 Proposition

Let L linear space. Then

Every subspace of L is convex (1)

(.If $A, B \subset L$ are convex sets then $A \cap B$ is convex (H.W (2)

If $A, B \subset L$ are convex sets then $A + B$ is convex (3)

) Let L be a linear space over a field $F = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} , let A be a subspace of L . **Proof.** (1)

, $\forall x, y \in A$ and $\forall \alpha, \beta \in F$ we have $\alpha x + \beta y \in A$. Hence, by Theorem 1.13

subspace of L . Hence, by Theorem 1.13

we have $\alpha x + \beta y \in A$. Take $\alpha = \lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $\beta = 1 - \lambda$. Hence, $\alpha x + \beta y = \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in A$.

. Thus, A is a convex set.

Let $a_1 \in A, a_2 \in B$. Let $a \in A + B$, then $a = a_1 + a_2$. Let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. To prove $\lambda(a_1 + a_2) \in A + B$.

To prove $\lambda(a_1 + a_2) \in A + B$, we need to show $\lambda a_1 \in A$ and $\lambda a_2 \in B$.

((I) Since A convex and $a_1 \in A$, $\lambda a_1 \in A$. Since B convex and $a_2 \in B$, $\lambda a_2 \in B$. Hence, $\lambda(a_1 + a_2) \in A + B$.

$$\in B_2 - \lambda)b_1 + (1 - \lambda)b_2 \text{ Since } B \text{ convex and } b \in B \text{ then } \lambda b_1 + (1 - \lambda)b_2 \in B \quad (II)$$

By summing up (I) and (II) we get

$$\in A + B_2 - \lambda)b_1 + (1 + \lambda b_2 - \lambda)a_1 + (1 - \lambda)a_2$$

$\in A + B$. Thus, $A + B$ is a convex set. \square

.2.44 Remark

The union of two convex sets is not necessarily convex. For example, let $A = \{(x, y) \mid x \geq 0, y \geq 0\}$ and $B = \{(x, y) \mid x \leq 0, y \geq 0\}$. Then $A \cup B$ is not convex. To show this, take $x = (1, 0) \in A$ and $y = (-1, 0) \in B$.

$$\frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}y = \left(\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) \notin A \cup B$$

.2.45 Proposition

Let $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed linear space. Let $B_r(x_0)$ and $B_r(x_1)$ be two balls in L . Then $B_r(x_0) \cup B_r(x_1)$ is a convex set if and only if $\|x_1 - x_0\| \leq 2r$.

Proof. To prove $B_r(x_0) \cup B_r(x_1)$ is convex, let $x, y \in B_r(x_0) \cup B_r(x_1)$ and let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. We must prove $\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in B_r(x_0) \cup B_r(x_1)$. Then

$$(I) \quad \|\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y - x_0\| \leq r \text{ and } \|y - x_0\| \leq r$$

; that is we must prove $\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in B_r(x_0)$. We must prove $\|\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y - x_0\| \leq r$.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y - x_0\| &= \|\lambda(x - x_0) + (1 - \lambda)(y - x_0)\| \\ &\leq \lambda\|x - x_0\| + (1 - \lambda)\|y - x_0\| \\ &\leq \lambda r + (1 - \lambda)r = r \end{aligned}$$

$$\|\lambda(x - x_0) + (1 - \lambda)(y - x_0)\| \leq \lambda r + (1 - \lambda)r = r$$

$$\|\lambda(x - x_0) + (1 - \lambda)(y - x_0)\| \leq \lambda r + (1 - \lambda)r = r$$

$$\|\lambda(x - x_0) + (1 - \lambda)(y - x_0)\| \leq \lambda r + (1 - \lambda)r = r$$

is convex. Similarly, $\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in B_r(x_1)$ and hence $B_r(x_0) \cup B_r(x_1)$ is a convex set. \square

.2.46 Proposition

Let $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed linear space and $A \subseteq L$ and convex then \overline{A} is
 a convex set

Proof. Let $x, y \in \overline{A}$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. To prove $\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in \overline{A}$. Since $x, y \in \overline{A}$ then by Proposition 2.31, $\exists a, b \in A$ such that

$$(I) \quad \|x - a\| < r \text{ and } \|x - b\| < r$$

Since A is convex then $\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b \in A$. Now, $\|\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y - \lambda a - (1 - \lambda)b\|$

$$\leq \lambda \|x - a\| + (1 - \lambda)\|y - b\|$$

$$< \lambda r + (1 - \lambda)r = r$$

$$r =$$

$$\|\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b - \lambda x - (1 - \lambda)y\| < r$$

Thus, from Proposition 2.31, $\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in \overline{A}$. \square

.2.47 Remark

The converse of the above proposition is not true. For example, let $A = [5, 1] \subset (\mathbb{R}, |\cdot|)$ then $A = [5, 2) \cup (2, 1]$ is a convex set. But A is not convex.

$$\exists x = 3, y = \frac{1}{2} \text{ then } \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y = \frac{1}{2} \text{ since if } x \in A \text{ then } x \geq 5$$

Continuity in Normed Linear Space 2.7

2.48 Definition

A mapping $f : L \rightarrow L'$ is called continuous at $x_0 \in L$ if for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ (depending on x_0) such that $\|f(x) - f(x_0)\| < \epsilon$ whenever $\|x - x_0\| < \delta$.

$$\|f(x) - f(x_0)\| < \epsilon \text{ whenever } \|x - x_0\| < \delta, \forall x \in L, \forall \epsilon > 0$$

(i.e., $f(x) \in B_\epsilon(f(x_0))$ if $x \in B_\delta(x_0)$ for all $x \in L$ and $\epsilon > 0$.)

2.49 Theorem

Let L, L' be normed linear spaces. A mapping $f : L \rightarrow L'$ is continuous at $x_0 \in L$ if and only if $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x_0)$ for every sequence $\{x_n\} \subset L$ with $x_n \rightarrow x_0$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let f be a continuous mapping at x_0 . To prove $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x_0)$ for every sequence $\{x_n\} \subset L$ with $x_n \rightarrow x_0$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. From continuity of f at x_0 , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|f(x) - f(x_0)\| < \epsilon$ whenever $\|x - x_0\| < \delta$.

Since $x_n \rightarrow x_0$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\|x_n - x_0\| < \delta$ for all $n > k$.

Hence, $\|f(x_n) - f(x_0)\| < \epsilon$ for all $n > k$.

Thus, $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x_0)$.

(\Leftarrow) To prove f is continuous at x_0 , suppose $\{x_n\} \subset L$ with $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ and $f(x_n) \not\rightarrow f(x_0)$.

Then there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\|f(x_n) - f(x_0)\| \geq \epsilon_0$ for infinitely many n .

But $x_n \rightarrow x_0$, so for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\|x_n - x_0\| < \delta$ for all $n > k$.

Since f is continuous at x_0 , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|f(x) - f(x_0)\| < \epsilon_0$ whenever $\|x - x_0\| < \delta$.

Thus, $\|f(x_n) - f(x_0)\| < \epsilon_0$ for all $n > k$, which contradicts the assumption that $\|f(x_n) - f(x_0)\| \geq \epsilon_0$ for infinitely many n .

Therefore, f is continuous at x_0 .

\square

Now, $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\|x_n - x_0\| < \frac{1}{n}$.

But $\|f(x_n) - f(x_0)\| \geq \epsilon$. This means $\|x_n - x_0\| < \frac{1}{n}$ but $\|f(x_n) - f(x_0)\| \geq \epsilon$.

Thus, f is continuous at x_0 . \square

.2.50 Theorem

Let $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space and let $f : (L, \|\cdot\|) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, |\cdot|)$ such that $f(x) = \|x\|$ for all $x \in L$. Then f is continuous at $x_0 \in L$. Then $\forall \epsilon > 0$ $\exists \delta > 0$ such that $\|x - x_0\| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon$.

Proof. Let $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ in L . Then $\forall \epsilon > 0$ $\exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $n > k \implies \|x_n - x_0\| < \epsilon$.

$$(I) \quad n > k \implies \|x_n - x_0\| < \epsilon$$

$$\implies |f(x_n) - f(x_0)| = \left| \|x_n\| - \|x_0\| \right| \leq \|x_n - x_0\| < \epsilon$$

$$\implies |f(x_n) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon \quad (\text{Using (I)})$$

$\implies f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x_0)$; that is f is continuous at x_0 .

.2.51 Remark

Let L_1, L_2, L_3 be normed spaces and let $f : L_1 \times L_2 \rightarrow L_3$ be a mapping. Then f is continuous at (x_0, y_0) iff whenever $(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow (x_0, y_0)$ in $L_1 \times L_2$, $f(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow f(x_0, y_0)$ in L_3 .

.2.52 Theorem

Let L be a normed space over a field F . Then

The mapping $f : L \times L \rightarrow L$ such that $f(x, y) = x + y$ is continuous at (x_0, y_0) .

The mapping $g : F \times L \rightarrow L$ such that $g(\lambda, x) = \lambda x$ is continuous at (λ_0, x_0) .

Proof. Let $(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow (x_0, y_0)$ in $L \times L$. Then $\|x_n - x_0\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|y_n - y_0\| \rightarrow 0$.

Let $(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow (x_0, y_0)$ in $L \times L$. Then $\|x_n - x_0\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|y_n - y_0\| \rightarrow 0$.

$$\|x_n + y_n - (x_0 + y_0)\| = \|(x_n - x_0) + (y_n - y_0)\|$$

$$\leq \|x_n - x_0\| + \|y_n - y_0\| \rightarrow 0$$

$$\implies \|x_n + y_n - (x_0 + y_0)\| \rightarrow 0$$

$$\|0\| + \|y_n - y_0\| \|x_n - x\| \geq$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$; that is f is continuous at $(0, y_0)$. Thus, $\|f(x_n, y_n) - f(x_0, y_0)\| \rightarrow 0$. Since (x_0, y_0) is arbitrary, f is continuous at (x_0, y_0) .

. Then, $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda$ and $x_n \rightarrow x$. Let $(\lambda_n, x_n) \rightarrow (\lambda, x)$ (2)

$\infty \rightarrow$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\|x_n - x\| \rightarrow 0$. Hence, $|\lambda_n - \lambda| \rightarrow 0$

$$\|0\| = \|\lambda_n x_n - \lambda x_0\| \|g(\lambda_n, x_n) - g(\lambda, x_0)\|$$

$$\|0 - \lambda x_0 + \lambda_n x_0\| \|\lambda_n x_n - \lambda x_0\| =$$

$$\|0\| + (\lambda_n - \lambda) x_0 \|\lambda_n(x_n - x_0)\| =$$

$$\|0\| + |\lambda_n - \lambda| \|x_0 \lambda_n\| \|x_n - x_0\| \geq$$

so that 0 and $|\lambda_n - \lambda| \rightarrow 0$. But $\|x_n - x_0\| \rightarrow 0$

,). Thus as $n \rightarrow \infty$; that is $g(\lambda_n, x_n) \rightarrow g(\lambda, x_0)$. $\|g(\lambda_n, x_n) - g(\lambda, x_0)\| \rightarrow 0$

. (g is continuous at (λ, x_0))

.2.53 Theorem

Let L, L' be normed spaces and let $f : L \rightarrow L'$ be a linear transformation. If f is continuous at any point $x_0 \in L$, then f is continuous at any point $x \in L$.

$\in X$ be an arbitrary point and let $x_n \rightarrow x_0$. *Proof.* Let $x_0 \in X$

(2.49) (using Theorem 2.53). To prove $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x_0)$

$0 \rightarrow 0$, then $x_n - x_0 \rightarrow 0$. Since $x_n \rightarrow x_0$

$(0) \rightarrow f(0)$, thus $f(x_n - x_0) \rightarrow f(0)$. But f is continuous at x_0

$(x_0) \rightarrow f(x_0)$. Since f is a linear transformation, then $f(x_n) - f(x_0) \rightarrow f(0)$

. (It follows that $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x_0)$)

.2.54 Remark

The condition f is a linear transformation in the above theorem is necessary condition. For example: consider the normed space $(\mathbb{R}, ||\cdot||)$. Let f is defined as

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \leq 1 \\ x+1 & \text{if } x > 1 \end{cases}$$

and discontinuous at 0. It is clear that f is continuous at

Also f is not linear transformation because

$$\begin{aligned} f(1+1) &= f(2) = 2+1 = 3 \\ f(1) + f(1) &= 1 + 1 = 2 \\ f(6+5) &= f(11) = 11+1 = 12 \\ f(6) + f(5) &= 6 + 5 = 11 \end{aligned}$$

Hence $f(6+5) \neq f(6) + f(5)$

.2.55 Theorem

Let L and L' be normed spaces and let $f : L \rightarrow L'$ be a linear transformation. Then either f is continuous at each point or discontinuous at each point

Proof. Let $x_1 \in L$ and assume that f is continuous at x_1 . Let $x_2 \in L$ be any point. To prove that f is continuous at x_2 . Let $x_n \rightarrow x_2$ in L . Since f is continuous at x_1 , $f(x_1) \rightarrow f(x_1)$ and hence $x_n - x_1 \rightarrow 0$.
 $(1) \rightarrow f(x_1 + x_n - x_1) \rightarrow f(x_1) + f(x_n - x_1)$
 (2) , and thus, $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x_2)$. Hence, $f(x_n) - f(x_2) \rightarrow 0$.
 Therefore, f is continuous at x_2 . Thus, f can not be continuous at some points and discontinuous at some points \square

.2.56 Example

Let $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{x^2 + y^2}, & \text{if } (x, y) \neq (0, 0) \\ 0, & \text{if } (x, y) = (0, 0) \end{cases}$$

Show that f is not continuous at $(0, 0)$

$n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_n = \frac{1}{n}$ and $y_n = \frac{1}{n}$ **Solution:** Let x

But $(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ and $y_n \rightarrow 0$ Then, $x_n \rightarrow$

$$f(x_n, y_n) = \frac{\frac{1}{n}}{\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{n^2}} = \frac{1}{2}$$

(Hence, $f(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \neq f(0, 0) = 0$). Thus, $f(x_n, y_n) \not\rightarrow f(0, 0)$

Thus, f is not continuous at $(0, 0)$

Boundedness in Normed Linear Space 2.8

. Bounded Set 2.57 Definition

Let L be a normed space and let $A \subset L$. A is called a **bounded set** if $\exists k > 0$ such that $\|x\| \leq k \forall x \in A$

.2.58 Example

Consider $(\mathbb{R}, |\cdot|)$ and let $A = [-1, 1]$. Since $|x| \leq 1$, then A is bounded.

.2.59 Example

Consider $(\mathbb{R}^2, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space such that $\|X\| = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$ be the Euclidean norm, for each $X = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Let $A = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y \geq 1, 1 \leq x \leq 1\}$. Then, A is unbounded.

.2.60 Theorem

Let L be a normed space and let $A \subseteq L$. Then the following statements are equivalent

. A is bounded (1)

If $\langle x_n \rangle$ is a sequence in A and $\langle \alpha_n \rangle$ is a sequence in F such that $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ (2)

. Then $\alpha_n x_n \rightarrow 0$

$x_n \in A, \forall n$ such that $\|x_n\| \leq k$ (3) Since A is bounded, $\exists k > 0$ (Proof: (1) \Rightarrow (3))

.. Hence as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $|\alpha_n| \rightarrow 0$ Since $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$

(since $\|x_n\| \leq k$) $\|\alpha_n x_n\| = |\alpha_n| \|x_n\| \leq |\alpha_n| k \rightarrow 0$ and hence $\alpha_n x_n \rightarrow 0$

Therefore, $\|\alpha_n x_n\| \rightarrow 0$, thus $|\alpha_n| k \rightarrow 0$ But $|\alpha_n| \rightarrow 0$

. $\alpha_n x_n \rightarrow 0$

Suppose A is not bounded. Then, $\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \exists x_k \in A$ such that (1) \Rightarrow (2)

. $\|x_k\| > k$

. But Put $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{\|x_k\|}$. Hence, $\alpha_k \rightarrow 0$

$\|\alpha_k x_k\| = \frac{1}{\|x_k\|} \|x_k\| = 1 > \frac{1}{k} \cdot k = 1$

(which contradicts (2), thus $\alpha_k x_k \not\rightarrow 0$ Then, $\|\alpha_k x_k\| \not\rightarrow 0$ \square)

. Bounded Mapping 2.61 Definition

Let L, L' be two normed space and $f : L \rightarrow L'$ be a linear transformation f is called **bounded mapping** if for each $A \subseteq L$ bounded then $f(A)$ is

. $A \subseteq L \forall$ bounded set in Y

.2.62 Example

. Show that f is a linear transformation $f(x, y) = x + y^2$ Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

and A is bounded. Show that f is not a bounded linear transformation (H.W.). Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$

. $f(A)$ is bounded

such that $\|(x, y)\| \leq k$ and A is bounded, then $\exists k \geq 0$ **Solution:** Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$
 $\leq k \Rightarrow x + y \in A \Rightarrow (x, y) \in A \Rightarrow \forall k^2$
 $\Rightarrow |x| \leq k \leq k^2$, then $x^2 \leq k^2 + y^2 \leq x^2$ Since x **(I)**

$\Rightarrow |y| \leq k \leq k^2$, then $y^2 \leq k^2 + x^2 \leq x^2$ Similarly, y **(II)**

(Note that $\forall (x, y) \in A \Rightarrow f(x, y) = x + y \in f(A)$
 $|f(x, y)| = |x + y| \leq |x| + |y| \leq k + k = 2k$
 by **(I)** and **(II)**

k . Thus, $f(A)$ is bounded, and hence, f is bounded. i.e., $|f(x, y)| \leq$

.2.63 Theorem

Let L, L' be normed spaces and $f : L \rightarrow L'$ be a linear transformation

such that $\|f(x)\| \leq k \|x\| \forall x \in X$. Then f is bounded iff $\exists k > 0$

Proof. (\Rightarrow) If f is bounded and let $A = \{x \in L : \|x\| \leq 1\}$.

It is clear A is bounded, and hence, $f(A)$ is bounded (by definition)

(\Leftarrow) f is a bounded function

(I) $x \in A \forall$ such that $\|f(x)\| \leq k$. Thus, $\exists k > 0$

$\|f(x)\| \leq k \|x\| \forall x \in X$, and thus, $\|f(0_X)\| = 0_{Y}$ then $f(0_X) = 0_{Y}$ if $x = 0$

$\frac{1}{\|x\|} x = \frac{x}{\|x\|}$ such that $\|\frac{x}{\|x\|}\| = 1$, put $y = \frac{x}{\|x\|}$. If $x \neq 0$, $\|x\| = \|x\|$ (2) $\|x\| = \|x\|$

Hence, $y \in A$. Thus, $\|f(y)\| \leq k$ **(II)**

$\|f(y)\| = \|f(\frac{x}{\|x\|})\| = \frac{1}{\|x\|} \|f(x)\| \leq k$

By **(II)**, $\|f(y)\| \leq k$, $\frac{1}{\|x\|} \|f(x)\| \leq k$ i.e., $\|f(x)\| \leq k \|x\|$ as

required

$x \in A \forall$ such that $\|x\| \leq k > 0$. Let A be a bounded set. Then, $\exists k (\Leftarrow)$

Since $\|f(x)\| \leq k \|x\| \forall x \in X$, hence $\|f(x)\| \leq k \|x\| \forall x \in A$. Then we

$\exists k_1, k_2 \forall x \in A$ where $k_2 \forall x \in A$. Thus, $\|f(x)\| \leq k_1$ get $\|f(x)\| \leq k_1 k_2$

that is, $f(A)$ is a bounded set

.2.64 Theorem

Let L, L' be normed spaces and $f : L \rightarrow L'$ be a linear transformation.

.Then f is bounded if and only if f is continuous

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Suppose that f is continuous and not bounded,

.hence $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \exists x_n \in L$ such that $\|f(x_n)\| > n \|x_n\|$

$$= \text{Let } y_n = \frac{x_n}{n \|x_n\|} \quad \left(\frac{\|f(x_n)\|}{n \|x_n\|} > 1 \right) \text{ Then, } \|f(y_n)\| = \frac{\|f(x_n)\|}{n \|x_n\|} > 1 =$$

(0, i.e., $\|f(y_n)\| \not\rightarrow 0$) Thus, $\|f(y_n) - f(0)\| = \|f(y_n)\| > 0$ (I)

$$= \frac{1}{n} \|x_n\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ but } \|f(y_n)\| \not\rightarrow 0$$

. $\mathbf{0}$, and hence, $y_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get $\|y_n\| \rightarrow$

(Since f is a linear transformation) $f(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$ (It follows that $f(y_n) \rightarrow$

$\mathbf{0}$) (i.l. By Theorem

. This contradicts (I), thus, f is bounded

Assume that f is bounded to prove f is continuous for all $x \in L$. Let (\Rightarrow)

such that $\epsilon > 0$, to find $\delta > 0 \in L$ and $\epsilon > 0$ x

$$\|f(x) - f(x_0)\| < \epsilon_0 \quad \forall x \in L, \|x - x_0\| < \delta$$

(f is linear transformation) $\|f(x) - f(x_0)\| = \|f(x - x_0)\|$

(I) $x \in L \forall$ s.t. $\|f(x)\| \leq k \|x\|$ Since f is bounded, then $\exists k >$

$$\|f(x - x_0)\| \leq k \|x - x_0\| \quad \text{Hence, } \|f(x) - f(x_0)\| \leq k \|x - x_0\|$$

$$\|f(x) - f(x_0)\| < \epsilon_0 \quad \text{Since } \|x - x_0\| < \delta \Rightarrow k \delta >$$

$$\text{(By choosing } \delta = \frac{\epsilon}{k} \text{)}$$

$$\|f(x) - f(x_0)\| < \epsilon_0 \quad \forall x \in L, \|x - x_0\| < \delta$$

is an arbitrary, then f is continuous at x_0 . Since $x_0 \in L$. Hence, f is continuous at x

.cont. $\forall x \in L$ \square

.2.65 Theorem

Let L, L' be normed spaces and $f : L \rightarrow L'$ be a linear transformation. If L' is a finite dimensional space then f is bounded (hence, continuous).

.2.66 Example

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $f(x, y) = x + y^2$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (! f is a linear transformation function (check)). Hence, f is bounded (hence, continuous) and $\dim(\mathbb{R}) = 1$.

Bounded Linear Transformation 2.9

.2.67 Definition

Let L, L' be normed spaces over a field F . The set of all bounded linear transformation mappings from L to L' is defined as $B(L, L')$. $B(L, L') = \{T : T : L \rightarrow L' \text{ is a linear bounded (hence, cont.) trans}\}$

.2.68 Theorem

Prove that $B(L, L')$ is a linear subspace (over a field F) of the space of linear transformation mappings with respect to usual addition and usual scalar multiplication.

$\alpha T_2 + \beta T_1 \in B(L, L')$. To prove $\alpha T_2, \beta T_1 \in B(L, L')$. *Proof.* Let $\alpha, \beta \in F$ and $T_1, T_2 \in B(L, L')$. Since T_1, T_2 are linear transformations, then by Theorem 2.1, $\alpha T_1, \beta T_2$ are linear transformations. Now, $\alpha T_1 + \beta T_2$ is linear transformation. (i), $\alpha T_1, \beta T_2$ are linear trans., by Theorem 2.1, $\alpha T_1 + \beta T_2$ is linear transformation.

Next, we show $\alpha T_1 + \beta T_2$ is bounded.

such that $\forall x \in X$ we have $0 < \alpha, k_1$ are bounded, then $\exists k_2, T_1$ Since T

$$(I) \quad \|x\|_2(x) \leq k_2 \|x\| \text{ and } \|T_1(x)\| \leq k_1 \|T$$

$$\|(\alpha T_2 + \beta T_1)(x)\| = \|(\alpha T_2 + \beta T_1$$

$$\text{(Definition of scalar multiplication)} \|(\alpha T_2 + \beta T_1) \| \alpha T =$$

$$\|(\alpha T_2 + \beta T_1)(x)\| + \|\beta T_1\| \alpha T \geq$$

$$\|(\alpha T_2 + \beta T_1)(x)\| + |\beta| \|T_1\| \alpha \|T\| =$$

$$\|x\|_2 \|x\| + |\beta| k_1 \alpha \|k\| \geq$$

$$\|x\| = k_2 + |\beta| k_1 \alpha \|k\| = \quad (2 + |\beta| k_1 k = |\alpha| k)$$

$\alpha T_2 + \beta T_1$ is bounded and linear transformation, then $\alpha T_2 + \beta T_1$ Since αT

$(B(L, \mathbb{R})$

.2.69 Theorem

Let L, L' be normed space. Prove that $B(L, L')$ is a normed space such

that $\forall T \in B(L, L')$ we have

$$\|T\| = \sup\{\|T(x)\|_{L'} : x \in L, \|x\|_L \leq 1\}$$

(Proof. To prove $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm on $B(L, L')$

$$\|T\| \geq 1 \forall x \in L, \|x\|_L \leq 1 \text{ since } \|T(x)\|_{L'} \geq 0 \quad (1)$$

$$\|T\| = 1 \iff \sup\{\|T(x)\|_{L'} : x \in L, \|x\|_L \leq 1\} = 1 \quad (2)$$

$$\forall x \in L, \|x\|_L \leq 1 \implies \|T(x)\|_{L'} \leq \|T\| \implies$$

$$\forall x \in L, \|x\|_L \leq 1 \implies \|T(x)\|_{L'} \leq \|T\| \implies$$

$$\|T\| = \sup\{\|T(x)\|_{L'} : x \in L, \|x\|_L \leq 1\} \implies$$

$(\in B(L, L_2, T_1)$ Let $T(3)$

$$\|T_1\| = \sup\{\|T_2(x) - T_1(x)\|_{L'} : x \in L, \|x\|_L \leq 1\}$$

$$\|T_1\| \leq \|T_2\| + \|T_1\|$$

$$\|T_1\| \leq \|T_2\| + \|T_1\|$$

$$\|T_1\| = \|T_2\|$$

$$\|T_1\| = \sup\{\|\alpha T(x)\|_{L'} : x \in L, \|x\|_L \leq 1\} \quad (4)$$

$$\|\alpha T\| = \alpha \|T\|$$

$$\alpha \|T\| =$$

□

Chapter 3

Banach Space

3.1 Definition

Let L be a normed space. Then, L is **complete** if every Cauchy sequence in L is convergent to a point in L . The complete normed space is called

Banach space

Examples of Banach Space 3.1

3.2 Example

The space $F^n = \{ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid x_i \in F \}$ with the norm $\|X\| = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$ is a Banach space.

Solution: Let (X_m) be a Cauchy sequence in F^n

$$\dots, X_{m2}, X_{11} X_m = X$$

$$\dots, (x_{m2}, \dots, x_{22}, x_{21n}), (x_1, \dots, x_{12}, x_{11n}) =$$

$m, j > k \forall, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\|X_m - X_j\| < \epsilon$ Then $\forall \epsilon > 0$ (I)

Since $X_m, X_j \in F^n$, then

$$\dots, n \mid i = x_{mi} \in F, \dots, x_{mn}), x_{m1} X_m = (x_m$$

$$\dots, n \mid i = x_{ji} \in F, \dots, x_{jn}), x_{j1} X_j = (x_j$$

$$(\dots, x_{mn} - x_{jn} - x_{j2}, x_{m1} - x_{j1}) \quad X_m - X_j = (x_m$$

From (I), $\|X_m - X_j\| < \epsilon \quad m, j > k \forall$

$$2\|X_m - X_j\| < \epsilon \quad m, j > k \forall$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |x_{mi} - x_{ji}| < \epsilon \quad m, j > k \forall$$

$$, \dots, n \forall i = m, j > k, |x_{mi} - x_{ji}| < \epsilon$$

$$, \dots, n \forall i = m, j > k, |x_{mi} - x_{ji}| < \epsilon$$

\dots, n is a Cauchy sequence in F , $\forall i = 1, \dots, n$ Hence,

Then, x_{mi} is convergent to $x_i \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n$

$> \epsilon$, $\exists k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $|x_{mi} - x_i| < \epsilon/n \quad m_i > k_i \forall$

\dots, k_n . Then Put $N = \max\{k_1, \dots, k_n\}$.

$$|x_{mi} - x_i| < \frac{\epsilon}{n} \quad m > N, \dots, n \forall i = 1, \dots, n$$

$$|x_{mi} - x_i|^2 < \frac{2\epsilon}{n} \quad m > N, \dots, n \forall i = 1, \dots, n$$

$$\|X_m - X\| = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_{mi} - x_i| < \frac{\epsilon}{n} \quad m > N$$

$$\forall m > N \quad \|X_m - X\| < \epsilon,$$

and $\{X_m\}$ be a Cauchy sequence in F^X . Thus, F^X is a \rightarrow

Banach space

3.3 Example

Show that $(F^n, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach space where $F^n = \mathbb{R}^n$ (or \mathbb{C}^n and $\|X\|$

$$^p \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right\|^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (\text{H.W. for } \mathbb{C}), p \geq 1) \quad X = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

3.4 Example

$\forall X = (|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|)$, The space \mathbb{R}^n (or \mathbb{C}^n) with the norm $\|X\| = \max\{|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|\}$

$(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (or \mathbb{C}^n) is a Banach space

Solution: Let X_m be a Cauchy sequence in F^n

$$\dots, \dots, X_{m2}, X_1 X_m = X$$

$$\dots, \dots, X_{mn2}, X_{m1n}), \dots, (X_{m2}, \dots, X_{22}, X_{21n}), (X_1, \dots, X_{12}, X_{11n}) =$$

$$m, j > k \forall, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ such that } \|X_m - X_j\| < \epsilon \text{ Then } \forall \epsilon > \quad \text{(I)}$$

Since $X_m, X_j \in F^n$, then

$$, \dots, n | i = x_{mi} \in F, \dots, x_{mn}), 2, x_{m1} X_m = (x_m$$

$$, \dots, n | i = x_{ji} \in F, \dots, x_{jn}), 2, x_{j1} X_j = (x_j$$

$$, \dots, x_{mn} - x_{jn2} - x_{j2}, x_{m1} - x_{j1} - X_j = (x_m$$

$$|, \dots, |x_{mn} - x_{jn}| \} < \epsilon_1 - x_{j1} \text{ Then, } \|X_m - X_j\| = \max\{|x_{mi} - x_{ji}| \} . m, j > k \forall$$

$$, \dots, n \text{ and } \forall m, j > k | i = \forall \text{ It follows that } |x_{mi} - x_{ji}| < \epsilon$$

is a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{R} (or \mathbb{C}). So it is convergent to x_i Hence,

$$, \dots, n | i = \forall \text{ in } F$$

$$, \exists k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ such that } |x_{mi} - x_i| < \epsilon \text{ Hence, for any } \epsilon > \quad m_i > k_i \forall$$

$$0, \dots, k_n\}. \text{ Then, for each } \epsilon > 1 \text{ Put } l = \max\{k$$

$$, \dots, n | \forall i = m > l, \forall x_{mi} - x_i| < \epsilon |$$

$$|, \dots, |x_{mn} - x_n| \} < \epsilon_1 - x_1, \|X_m - X\| = \max\{|x_{mi} - x_i|\} \text{ for each } \epsilon > \quad m > N$$

. Thus, X_m be a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{R}^n (or \mathbb{C}^n) and $X_m \rightarrow X$

. Thus, \mathbb{R}^n (or \mathbb{C}^n) is a Banach space

3.5 Example

$\exists \forall f$ The space $C[a, b]$ with the norm $\|f\| = \max\{|f(x)| : x \in [a, b]\}$

. $C[a, b]$ is a Banach space

[Solution: Let f_n be a Cauchy sequence in $C[a, b]$

$$\text{(I)} \quad n, m > k \forall, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ such that } \|f_n - f_m\| < \epsilon \text{ Then } \forall \epsilon >$$

$$> \{, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ such that } \max\{|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| : x \in C[a, b]\} < \epsilon \text{ Hence, } \forall \epsilon >$$

$$\epsilon \quad \forall n, m > k$$

It follows that $|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| < \epsilon \quad \forall x \in C[a, b] \quad \forall n, m > k$

.Hence, $f_n(x)$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{R}

, Since \mathbb{R} is a Banach space, then $f_n(x)$ is convergent to $f(x)$ in \mathbb{R} . Thus

$$n \geq k \forall, \exists k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon \quad \forall$$

$$n \geq k \forall \text{ Thus, } \|f_n - f\| = \max\{|f_n(x) - f(x)| : x \in [a, b]\} < \epsilon$$

.Hence, $f_n \rightarrow f$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, $C[a, b]$ is a Banach space

3.6 Example

$\int_0^1 |f(x)| dx$ is not a Banach space] with the norm $\|f\| = \int_0^1 |f(x)| dx$. The space $C[0, 1]$ with the norm $\|f\| = \int_0^1 |f(x)| dx$ is a normed space (see, Example 1.0). **Solution:** The space $(C[0, 1], \|\cdot\|)$ is a normed space (see, Example 1.0). Let

$$f_n(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 - nx & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < x \leq \frac{1}{n} \\ 0 & \text{if } x > \frac{1}{n} \end{cases}$$

Now, for all $n \geq 2$, f_n is continuous function on $[0, 1]$ where $n \geq 2$

we have $n, m \geq 2$

$$\|f_n - f_m\| = \int_0^1 |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| dx$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| dx + \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{n}} |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| dx + \int_{\frac{1}{n}}^1 |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| dx \\ &= \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |1 - 1| dx + \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{n}} |1 - nx - 1| dx + \int_{\frac{1}{n}}^1 |0 - 0| dx \\ &= \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} 0 dx + \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{n}} |1 - nx| dx + \int_{\frac{1}{n}}^1 0 dx \\ &= \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{n}} |1 - nx| dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| dx \geq \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 |f_m(x)| dx \quad (\text{I})$$

$$\int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| dx \text{ But } \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{1+\frac{1}{n}} \frac{1}{2} + dx \left(\frac{n}{2} + nx + \dots \right) \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 dx \quad 0$$

$$= \frac{nx}{2} \frac{2nx}{2} + \dots$$

$$\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{2} = \dots \quad \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{1}{n2} \quad (\text{II})$$

Similarly $\int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 |f_m(x) - f_n(x)| dx \frac{1}{n2} \quad (\text{III})$

Substitute (II) and (III) in (I) to get $\| f_m - f_n \| \leq$

$\infty \rightarrow$ as m, n

Thus, $\langle f_n \rangle$ is a Cauchy sequence. From the definition of f_n , we note that

$f_n \rightarrow g$ where

$$= \begin{cases} g(x) & \geq \leq 1 \text{ if } \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \cdot 1 \leq \leq \end{cases}$$

]. Then, But g is not continuous. Thus, $\langle f_n \rangle$ does not converge in $C[$

], $\| \cdot \|$) is not a Banach space $C[0,1]$

Some Properties of Banach Space 3.2

3.7 Theorem

Let L be a Banach space and let H be a subspace of L . Then, H is a Banach space if and only if H is a closed set in L .

Proof. \Rightarrow) If H is a Banach space T.P. $H = \bar{H}$. We know that $H \subseteq \bar{H}$

$\leftarrow, \exists \langle x_n \rangle \in H$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x$. 2.34 Let $x \in H$, then by Theorem

Hence, $\langle x_n \rangle$ is a Cauchy sequence in H . Then, $\exists y \in H$ such that $x_n \rightarrow y$

Thus, $x \in H$ (i.e., $H \subseteq \bar{H}$). Thus, $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $x_n \rightarrow y$, so $x = y$.

— (Therefore, $H = \bar{H}$ (i.e., H is closed

If H is a closed set. Let $\langle x_n \rangle$ be a Cauchy sequence in H , so that $\langle x_n \rangle$ (\Leftarrow

is a Cauchy sequence in L . Hence, it converges; that is $\exists x \in L$ such that

, $x \in \bar{H} = H$. 2.34 $x_n \rightarrow x$. But $\langle x_n \rangle$ is a sequence in H . By Theorem

i.e., $x \in H$. Thus, H is a Banach space \square

3.8 Theorem

.Every finite dimensional normed space is a Banach space

3.9 Corollary

.Every finite dimensional subspace of a Banach space is closed set

Proof. Let L be a Banach space and let H be a finite dimensional subspace

, H 3.7, H is a Banach space. From Theorem 3.8 of L . Then, by Theorem

.is a closed set \square

. Quotient Space 3.10 Definition

Let L be a linear space over F . Let H be a subspace of L

$$\{ \text{Let } L/H = \{x + H : x \in L\}$$

Define addition and scalar multiplication by

$$+ H \in L/H_2 + H, x_1 x \forall + H_2 + x_1 + H = (x_2 + H) + (x_1 + H)$$

$$\cdot + H \in L/H \text{ and } \forall \alpha \in F_1 x \forall + H_1 + H = \alpha \cdot x_1 \alpha \cdot (x$$

.3.11 Proposition

(. Prove that $(L/H, +, \cdot)$ is a linear space over F . (H.W

3.12 Theorem

Let $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ and $H \subseteq L$ be a closed set
where $\|\cdot\|$ space with $\|\cdot\|$

Then $(L/H, +, \cdot)$ is a
normed

$$\|x + H\| = \inf\{\|x + y\| : y \in H\}$$

$\|0\| = 0$ T.P. $\|x + H\| \geq 0$ Proof. (

For any $x + H \in L/H$

$$\forall y \in H \quad \|x + y\| \geq$$

$$\|0\| = \inf\{\|x + y\| : y \in H\} \geq 0$$

$$\|0\| = \inf\{\|x + y\| : y \in H\} \geq 0 \quad \|x + H\|$$

$$\|0\| = 0 \iff x + H = H = 0 \quad \text{T.P. } \|x + H\| (2)$$

$$\|0\| = 0 \iff \inf\{\|x + y\| : y \in H\} = 0 \iff \|x + H\| = 0$$

as $\|0\| = 0$. Hence, $\|x + y_n\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ Hence, $\exists (y_n) \in H$ such that $\|x + y_n\| \rightarrow 0$

$$n \rightarrow \infty$$

Thus, $y_n \rightarrow -x$. Thus, $\exists (y_n) \in H$ such that $y_n \rightarrow -x$. Thus, by Theorem

—

$$\|y_n - (-x)\| \rightarrow 0, \quad -x \in H \quad 2.34$$

Since \overline{H} is closed, then $-x \in \overline{H} = H$, i.e., $-x \in H$

Since H is a subspace then $x \in H$ and $x + H = H$, that is, $x + H = H$

$$y \in H \implies x + y \in H. \text{ i.e., } x + H \subseteq H. (\Leftarrow) \text{ If } x + H = H =$$

$$\|x + H\| = \inf\{\|x + y\| : y \in H\} = \inf\{\|z\| : z \in H\} \text{ Hence, } \|x + H\| =$$

$\|0\| = 0$. Thus, $\|x + H\| = 0$, so $\inf\{\|z\| : z \in H\} = 0 \implies 0 \in H$ and $\|0\| = 0$ Since

$$\|\alpha(x + H)\| = |\alpha| \|x + H\| \text{ T.P. } \|\alpha(x + H)\| (3)$$

) holds 3 then $\|0\| = 0$ If $\alpha =$

then $\|0\| = 0$ If $\alpha \neq 0$

$$\|\alpha(x + H)\| = \inf\{\|\alpha(x + y)\| : y \in H\} = |\alpha| \inf\{\|x + y\| : y \in H\} = |\alpha| \|x + H\|$$

$$\{\inf\{\alpha\|x+y\| : y \in H\} =$$

$$\{\alpha\inf\{\|x+y\| : y \in H\} =$$

((If A is bounded below, then $\inf(\alpha A) = \alpha \inf(A)$)

$$\alpha\|x+H\| =$$

$$+ H \in L/H_2 + H, x_1 \text{ Let } x \text{ (4)}$$

$$\|x_1 + H\|_2 + \|x_1\| = \|(x_1 + H)\|_2 + \|x_1\|$$

$$\inf\{\|x+y\| : y \in H_2 + x_1\} = \inf\{\|x\| =$$

$$\inf\{\|z_1 + z_2\| : z_1 \in H_2, z_2 \in H\} = \inf\{\|z_1 + z_2\| : z_1 \in H_2, z_2 \in H\}$$

$$\inf\{\|z_1 + z_2\| : z_1 \in H_2, z_2 \in H\} = \inf\{\|z_1 + z_2\| : z_1 \in H_2, z_2 \in H\}$$

$$\inf\{\|z_1 + z_2\| : z_1 \in H_2, z_2 \in H\} = \inf\{\|z_1 + z_2\| : z_1 \in H_2, z_2 \in H\}$$

$$\inf\{\|z_1 + z_2\| : z_1 \in H_2, z_2 \in H\} = \inf\{\|z_1 + z_2\| : z_1 \in H_2, z_2 \in H\}$$

.Thus, L/H is a normed space \square

3.13 Proposition

.If $(L, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach space and H is a closed subspace of L Then

$(L/H, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach space

.Proof. $L/H = \{x + H : x \in L\}$. Let X_n be a Cauchy sequence in L/H

$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ Then, $X_n = x_n + H$, where $x_n \in L$,

$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\|X_n - X_m\| < \epsilon \forall n, m > k$

$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\|x_n - x_m + H\| < \epsilon \forall n, m > k$

$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\|x_n - x_m\| < \epsilon \forall n, m > k$

$\inf\{\|x_n - x_m + y\| : y \in H\} < \epsilon \forall n, m > k$

This implies, $\forall y \in H, x_n + y$ is a Cauchy in L

Since L is a Banach space, then $\exists z \in L$ such that $x_n + y \rightarrow z = (z - y) + y$

$$w + y \quad \forall y \in H =$$

. Thus, $x_n + H \rightarrow w + H$. Thus, L/H is a Banach space