

# Math 73/103: Fall 2020

## Lecture 5

Dana P. Williams

Dartmouth College

September 23, 2020

# Getting Started

- We should be recording!
- This a good time to ask questions about the previous lecture, complain, or tell a story.
- As I mentioned, I hope that you have the bandwidth to keep your video on during the class meeting. This makes it seem a little more “real” for me. But this is voluntary.
- I am still fighting with gradescope. For today’s assignment, please upload it directly to canvas.

# Separable Spaces

## Definition

A metric space  $X$  is called **separable** if it has a countable dense subset.

## Example

Note that  $\mathbf{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{C}^n$  are separable. In fact,  $\ell^p$  is separable for all  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . However,  $\ell^\infty$  is not separable.

## Proof.

To see that  $\ell^p$  is separable, consider the set  $D'$  of sequences taking values in  $\mathbf{Q} + i\mathbf{Q}$  and which are eventually zero. To see the  $\ell^\infty$  can't be separable, notice that for each  $A \subset \mathbf{N}$ , let  $x_A$  be the sequence such that  $x_A(k) = 1$  if and only if  $k \in A$ . Then  $E = \{x_A \in \ell^\infty : A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{N})\}$  is uncountable and  $A \neq B$  implies  $\|x_A - x_B\|_\infty = 1$ . Thus the balls  $B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_A)$  form an uncountable set of disjoint open balls. If  $D$  is dense, then  $\bar{D}$  must meet every such ball and be uncountable.  $\square$

# Subsequences

- Given a sequence  $(x_n)$ , a subsequence is determined by choosing  $\{n_k\} \subset \mathbf{N}$  such that  $n_k < n_{k+1}$  for all  $k$ . Then our subsequence is  $(x_{n_k})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ .
- To get a **sub**subsequence, we need  $\{k_j\} \subset \mathbf{N}$  such that  $k_j < k_{j+1}$ . Then we get  $(x_{n_{k_j}})_{j=1}^{\infty}$ . Clearly this is ugly and hard to grock even in  $\text{\LaTeX}$ .
- Sometimes it is profitable to realize that a subsequence is determined by an infinite subset  $S_1 = \{n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < \dots\} \subset \mathbf{N}$ .
- Then a subsubsequence is determined by choosing an infinite subset  $S_2 \subset S_1$ : then  $S_2 = \{n_{k_1} < n_{k_2} < \dots\}$ . This makes it clear that a subsubsequence is actually a subsequence.

## Remark

If  $S_1 = \{n_1 < n_2 < \dots\}$  determines a subsequence  $(x_{n_k})$ , then we can write

$$\lim_{n \in S_1} x_n = a \quad \text{or} \quad (x_n)_{n \in S_1} \rightarrow a$$

is place of the old standby  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_k} = a$ . You should convince yourself that  $\lim_{n \in S_1} x_n = a$  if and only if for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  and  $n \in S_1$  implies that  $\rho(x_n, a) < \epsilon$ .

## Lemma

Let  $(x_n)$  be a sequence in a metric space  $X$  and let  $S_1$  be an infinite subset of  $\mathbf{N}$  as above. Suppose that  $S_2$  is an infinite subset of  $\mathbf{N}$  such that  $\{n \in S_2 : n \notin S_1\}$  is finite. Then if  $\lim_{n \in S_1} x_n = a$ , we also have  $\lim_{n \in S_2} x_n = a$ .

## Theorem (Arzelà–Ascoli Lemma)

*Suppose that  $X$  is a separable metric space. Let  $(f_n)$  be a pointwise bounded equicontinuous sequence in  $C(X)$ . Then  $(f_n)$  has a subsequence  $(f_{n_k})$  such that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_{n_k}(x)$  exists for all  $x \in X$ .*

## Proof.

Let  $D = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  be (countable) dense subset of  $X$ . By assumption,  $(f_n(x_1))_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  is a bounded sequence of complex numbers. Hence it has a convergent sequence determined by an infinite subset  $S_1 \subset \mathbf{N}$ . Let  $a_1 = \lim_{n \in S_1} f_n(x_1)$ . But  $(f_n(x_2))_{n \in S_1}$  is also bounded. Hence there is an infinite subset  $S_2 \subset S_1$  such that  $\lim_{n \in S_2} f_n(x_2) = a_2$ . Furthermore,  $\lim_{a \in S_2} f_n(x_1) = a_1$ !

## Proof Continued.

Continuing inductively we get  $S_{k+1} \subset S_k$  such that

$$\lim_{m \in S_{k+1}} f_m(x_j) = a_j \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq k+1$$

Let  $r_k$  be the  $k^{\text{th}}$ -term in  $S_k$ . Let  $S = \{r_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ . Note that there are at most  $k-1$  terms in  $S$  not in  $S_k$ . Thus by our sequence lemma,

$$\lim_{n \in S} f_n(x_j) = a_j \quad \text{for all } j.$$

At this point, we can replace  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  by  $(f_n)_{n \in S}$  and assume from here on that

$$\lim_{n \in \mathbf{N}} f_n(x_j) = a_j \quad \text{for all } x_j \in D.$$

## Proof Continued.

Let  $x_0 \in X$ . Since  $x_0$  is arbitrary, it will suffice to prove that  $(f_n(x_0))$  is Cauchy. Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since  $(f_n)$  is equicontinuous at  $x_0$ , there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\rho(x, x_0) < \delta$  implies  $|f_n(x) - f_n(x_0)| < \epsilon/3$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Since  $D$  is dense in  $X$ , there is a  $j$  such that  $\rho(x_j, x_0) < \delta$ . Since  $(f_n(x_j))$  is convergent, it is Cauchy. Hence there is a  $N$  such that  $n, m \geq N$  implies that  $|f_n(x_j) - f_m(x_j)| < \epsilon/3$ . Now if  $n, m \geq N$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f_n(x_0) - f_m(x_0)| &\leq |f_n(x_0) - f_n(x_j)| + |f_n(x_j) - f_m(x_j)| + \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad |f_m(x_j) - f_m(x_0)| \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} = \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□



# The Theorem

## Remark

Suppose that  $X$  is a compact metric space. Then  $C(X) = C_b(X)$  is a complete metric space with respect to the uniform norm. Moreover, by a homework problem,  $X$  is separable and we can apply the Arzelà–Ascoli lemma to  $C(X)$ .

## Theorem (The Arzelà–Ascoli Theorem)

*Let  $X$  be a compact metric space. Let  $(f_n)$  be a pointwise bounded equicontinuous sequence. Then  $(f_n)$  has a subsequence converging uniformly to some  $f \in C(X)$ .*

## Remark

It is interesting to note that a uniformly convergent sequence in  $C(X)$  is necessarily uniformly bounded (by a homework problem). Hence our pointwise bounded equicontinuous sequence above must actually be uniformly bounded.

## Lemma

Suppose that  $(X, \rho)$  is compact and that  $\mathcal{F} \subset C(X)$  is equicontinuous on  $X$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is **uniformly equicontinuous** in that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a  $\delta$  such that  $\rho(x, y) < \delta$  implies that  $|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ .

## Proof.

We will leave this as a homework exercise—see the proof that continuous functions on compact spaces are necessarily uniformly continuous. □

## Proof of the AA Theorem.

Since compact metric spaces are separable, the AA Lemma applies and we can assume  $(f_n)$  has a subsequence  $(f_{n_k})$  such that  $f_{n_k}(x) \rightarrow f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$  and some function  $f$  on  $X$ . To ease the notational burden, there is no harm in replacing  $(f_n)$  with this subsequence so that  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ . In particular, we can assume  $(f_n(x))$  is Cauchy for all  $x \in X$ . Since  $C(X)$  is complete, we just have to show that  $(f_n)$  is uniformly Cauchy. That is, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , we want to find  $N$  such that  $n, m \geq N$  implies

$$|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| < \epsilon \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

## Proof Continued.

By uniform equicontinuity, there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\rho(x, y) < \delta$  implies that  $|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| < \epsilon/3$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Since  $X$  is totally bounded, there are  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$  such that  $\{B_\delta(x_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  covers  $X$ . Then there is a  $N$  such that  $n, m \geq N$  implies  $|f_n(x_j) - f_m(x_j)| < \epsilon/3$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Now if  $x \in X$  and  $n, m \geq N$ , there is a  $j$  such that  $x \in B_\delta(x_j)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| &\leq |f_n(x) - f_n(x_j)| + |f_n(x_j) - f_m(x_j)| \\ &\quad + |f_m(x_j) - f_m(x)| \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} = \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

# Break Time

- Definitely time for a break.
- Questions?
- Start recording again.

## Corollary

*Let  $X$  be a compact metric space. Suppose that  $\mathcal{F} \subset C(X)$  be closed in  $C(X)$  as well as equicontinuous on  $X$  and pointwise bounded. Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is a compact subset of  $C(X)$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{F}$  is uniformly bounded.*

## Proof.

It suffices to see that  $\mathcal{F}$  is sequentially compact. Let  $(f_n)$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{F}$ . By the AA-Theorem,  $(f_n)$  has a uniformly convergent subsequence  $(f_{n_k})$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed,  $f = \lim_k f_{n_k} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact.

Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact in  $C(X)$ , it must be bounded (with respect to the metric induced from  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ ). Hence  $\mathcal{F}$  is uniformly bounded. □

# Compactness Theorem

## Theorem

*Suppose that  $(X, \rho)$  is a compact metric space. Then  $\mathcal{F} \subset C(X)$  is compact if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed, uniformly bounded, and equicontinuous.*

## Proof.

( $\Leftarrow$ ): This direction follows from the Corollary. In fact, we can replace uniformly bounded with pointwise bounded.

## Proof.

( $\implies$ ): Now we assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact. Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed in  $C(X)$  (this is a homework exercise). Furthermore,  $\mathcal{F}$  must be bounded in  $C(X)$  and therefore uniformly bounded. The real issue here is to see that  $\mathcal{F}$  is equicontinuous. Assume to the contrary that  $\mathcal{F}$  is not equicontinuous at  $x \in X$ . That means the statement

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0, \text{ s.t. } \rho(x, y) < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}$$

is false. Hence there is a  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  such that for all  $\delta > 0$ , the above implication is false. Hence for all  $n \geq 1$  there is a  $x_n \in X$  and  $f_n \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\rho(x_n, x) < \frac{1}{n}$  and

$$|f_n(x_n) - f_n(x)| \geq \epsilon_0.$$



## Proof Continued.

But  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact, so  $(f_n)$  has a convergent subsequence  $(f_{n_k})$  converging uniformly to  $f \in C(X)$ . Since  $f$  is continuous,  $f(x_{n_k}) \rightarrow f(x)$ . Furthermore there is a  $N$  such that  $k \geq N$  implies  $\|f_{n_k} - f\|_\infty < \epsilon_0/3$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x_{n_k}) - f(x)| &= |f(x_{n_k}) - f_{n_k}(x_{n_k}) + f_{n_k}(x_{n_k}) - f_{n_k}(x) \\ &\quad + f_{n_k}(x) - f(x)| \\ &\geq |f_{n_k}(x) - f_{n_k}(x_{n_k})| \\ &\quad - |f(x_{n_k}) - f_{n_k}(x_{n_k}) + f_{n_k}(x) - f(x)| \\ &\geq \epsilon_0 - \left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{3} + \frac{\epsilon_0}{3}\right) = \frac{\epsilon_0}{3} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

But this eventually contradicts  $f(x_{n_k}) \rightarrow f(x)$ . □

# Break Time

- Definitely time for a break.
- Questions?
- Start recording again.

## Definition

A metric space is called a **Baire space** if the countable intersection of open dense sets is dense. That is, if  $O_n$  is open and dense in  $X$  for all  $n \geq 1$ , then

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} O_n$$

is dense in  $X$ .

## Remark

This is a purely topological property. If  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are equivalent metrics on  $X$ , then  $(X, \rho)$  is Baire if and only if  $(X, \sigma)$  is Baire.

## Definition

If  $E$  is a subspace of a metric space  $X$ , then the interior of  $E$  is

$$\text{Int}(E) = \bigcup \{ U \subset X : U \subset E \text{ and } U \text{ is open in } X \}.$$

## Remark

The interior  $\text{Int}(E)$  is the largest open set in  $X$  contained in  $E$ .

## Example

Viewed as a subset of  $\mathbf{R}$ ,  $\text{Int}(\mathbf{Q}) = \emptyset$ . Let  $E = [0, 1)$ . Then in  $\mathbf{R}$ ,  $\text{Int}(E) = (0, 1)$ . But viewed as a subset of  $X = [0, 1]$ , then  $\text{Int}(E) = E$ .

## Lemma

*A metric space  $X$  is Baire if and only if given countably many closed sets  $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  such that  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$  has nonempty interior in  $X$ , then at least one of the  $F_n$  has nonempty interior.*

# Proof of the Lemma

## Proof.

Note that a closed set  $F_n$  has nonempty interior if and only if  $O_n = X \setminus F_n$  is open and dense. Furthermore,  $X \setminus \bigcup F_n = \bigcap O_n$ . Thus if  $\bigcup F_n$  has interior,  $\bigcap O_n$  is not dense.

Suppose that  $X$  is Baire. Let  $\{F_n\}$  be such that  $\bigcup F_n$  has interior. If each  $F_n$  has empty interior, then each  $O_n$  is dense and  $\bigcap O_n$  would be dense. This contradicts our assumption on  $\bigcup F_n$ . Hence some  $F_n$  has interior as required.

On the other hand, suppose that  $X$  has the property described in the statement of the lemma. Suppose that  $X$  is not Baire. Then there are dense open sets  $O_n$  such that  $\bigcap O_n$  is not dense. But then  $\bigcup F_n$  has interior. Hence one of the  $F_n$  has interior and the corresponding  $O_n$  would not be dense. This contradicts our assumptions and completes the proof. □

# A Curiosity

## Definition

A point in a metric space  $X$  is called **isolated** if  $\{x\}$  is open in  $X$ .

## Example

The subspace  $\mathbf{Z} \subset \mathbf{R}$  consists entirely of isolated points. The interval  $[0, 1]$  has no isolated points.

## Lemma

*Let  $X$  be a Baire space without isolated points. Then  $X$  is uncountable.*

## Proof.

Suppose that  $X = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ . Let  $F_n = \{x_n\}$  so that each  $F_n$  is closed  $X = \bigcup F_n$ . Since  $X$  is open, the union has interior and hence some  $F_n$  has interior. But then  $\{x_n\}$  is open and  $x_n$  is isolated. □

## Theorem (Baire Category Theorem)

*Every complete metric space is a Baire space.*

## Remark

This applies to any metric space that admits an equivalent complete metric or to any metric space homeomorphic to a complete metric space. For example,  $(0, 1)$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathbf{R}$ . Hence it is a Baire space in its standard topology.



# That's Enough for Today

- That is enough for now.