

Recall C-S

$$\|x\| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$$

Lecture 15:

The norm induced by an inner product satisfies triangle inequality (and thus is a norm).

Proof: We already checked positivity and homogeneity. It remains to check triangle inequality.

Fun fact: $w + \bar{w} = 2\Re(w)$ because

$$(x + yi) + (x - yi) = 2x.$$

By C-S inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x+y\|^2 &= \langle x+y, x+y \rangle = \|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2 + 2\Re\langle x, y \rangle \leq \|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2 + 2|\langle x, y \rangle| \\ &\leq \|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2 + 2\|x\| \|y\| = (\|x\| + \|y\|)^2 \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

As in \mathbb{R}^n , since $\frac{\langle x, y \rangle}{\|x\| \|y\|} \leq 1$, the inner product can be interpreted as the cosine of the angle between x and y .

Defn: x and y are *orthogonal*, denoted $x \perp y$, if $\langle x, y \rangle = 0$.

Pythagorean Theorem holds in an inner product space: If $x_1, \dots, x_n \in H$ are mutually orthogonal, then

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \right\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_j\|^2$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \right\|^2 &= \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^n x_j, \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \langle x_j, x_j \rangle + 2\Re \sum_{i < j} \langle x_i, x_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_j\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

since the cross-terms cancel out. \square

Parallelogram Law holds in an inner product space:

$$2||x||^2 + 2||y||^2 = ||x + y||^2 + ||x - y||^2$$

Proof:

$$||x + y||^2 = ||x||^2 + ||y||^2 + 2\Re \langle x, y \rangle$$

$$||x - y||^2 = ||x||^2 + ||y||^2 - 2\Re \langle x, y \rangle$$

Add the preceding identities. \square

Main examples of inner product space:

$$\mathbb{R}^n, \text{ with dot product } \langle x, y \rangle = \sum_i x_i y_i$$

$$\mathbb{C}^n, \text{ with conjugate dot product } \langle x, y \rangle = \sum_i x_i \bar{y}_i$$

$$L^2, \langle f, g \rangle = \int f \bar{g} d\mu$$

Exists by Holder inequality, since $p = 2$ is its own conjugate exponent.

Positivity: $\int f \bar{f} d\mu = \int |f|^2 d\mu = 0$ implies $f = 0$ a.e.

Symmetry:

$$\langle g, f \rangle = \int g \bar{f} d\mu = \overline{\int f \bar{g} d\mu} = \overline{\langle f, g \rangle}$$

Bilinearity:

$$\langle f + g, h \rangle = \int (f + g) \bar{h} d\mu = \int f \bar{h} d\mu + \int g \bar{h} d\mu = \langle f, h \rangle + \langle g, h \rangle.$$

Special case $\ell^2 = L^2(\mathbb{N})$.

Defn: A *Hilbert space* is a complete inner product space (with the metric induced by the norm).

Example: L^2 is complete and therefore as an inner product space is a Hilbert space.

Example: c_c is a subspace of ℓ^2 and thus can be viewed as an inner product space. But it is not closed, and therefore not complete, in the ℓ^2 norm, e.g., $x = (1, 1/2, 1/3, \dots)$ is in ℓ^2 and its truncations

$$x_n = (1, 1/2, \dots, 1/n, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$$

are in c_c and $x_n \rightarrow x$ in ℓ^2 , but $x \notin c_c$.

Note: a necessary condition for an NVS to be an inner product space is that it obeys the parallelogram law.

Prop: L^p obeys the parallelogram law iff $p = 2$.

Cor: L^p is a Hilbert space iff $p = 2$.

Proof for special case ℓ^p .

"If." we already know that ℓ^2 is an inner product space and thus satisfies the parallelogram law.

"Only If:" Let e_1, e_2 be the standard basis vectors

$$e_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0, \dots), e_2 = (0, 1, 0, 0, \dots),$$

The two sides of the parallelogram law for these vectors in ℓ^p are:

$$\|e_1 + e_2\|_p^2 + \|e_1 - e_2\|_p^2 = 2 \cdot 2^{2/p}$$

and

$$2(\|e_1\|_p^2 + \|e_2\|_p^2) = 4$$

They are equal iff $4 = 2 \cdot 2^{2/p}$, equivalently $p = 2$.

So, if ℓ^p is a Hilbert space, then $p = 2$. \square

In fact:

An NVS is an inner product space iff its norm satisfies parallelogram law.

Handwritten note: $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p}$

Proof: "only if" is clear.

"if": formula for inner product from norm; in the real case, this is

$$\langle x, y \rangle = (1/4)(\|x + y\|^2 - \|x - y\|^2)$$

in the complex case, this is

$$\langle x, y \rangle = (1/4)(\|x + y\|^2 - \|x - y\|^2 + i\|x + iy\|^2 - i\|x - iy\|^2)$$

One can show assuming the parallelogram law, these really are inner products (maybe in HW4).

Corollary: A Banach space is a Hilbert space iff its norm satisfies parallelogram law.

average
convex
subset Defn: For a vector space X , a *convex combination* of $x, y \in X$ is a point of the form $tx + (1 - t)y$ such that $t \in [0, 1]$. A subset S of a NVS X is *convex* if whenever $x, y \in S$ then every convex combination of x, y is in S . line line

Example: Any subspace of a vector space is convex.

Theorem: Let K be a nonempty closed convex subset of a Hilbert space H . Let $x \in H \setminus K$. Then $\inf_{y \in K} \|x - y\|$ is achieved uniquely.

HW4: This is false (both existence and uniqueness) in Banach spaces, even when K is a closed subspace.

Proof: Let $\{y_n\}$ be a sequence in K such that $\|x - y_n\|$ converges to $d := \inf$.

We claim that $\{y_n\}$ is Cauchy. If so, then it converges to some $y \in K$ and since $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is continuous (HW4), we have $\|x - y\| = d$ and so the inf is achieved.

the convex
K is
closed Proof of Cauchy:

By parallelogram law, with $y_n - x$ and $y_m - x$ as sides,

$$2(\|y_n - x\|^2 + \|y_m - x\|^2) = \|y_n - y_m\|^2 + \|y_n + y_m - 2x\|^2$$

$$\approx 2d^2 + 2d^2 = 4d^2$$

We can re-write the preceding inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_n - y_m\|^2 &= 2(\|y_n - x\|^2 + \|y_m - x\|^2) - 4\|(y_n + y_m)/2 - x\|^2 \\ &\leq 2(\|y_n - x\|^2 + \|y_m - x\|^2) - 4d^2, \end{aligned}$$

the latter inequality since $(1/2)(y_n + y_m) \in K$, owing to the convexity of K .

Given $\epsilon > 0$, for large n, m ,

$$2(\|y_n - x\|^2 + \|y_m - x\|^2) - 4d^2 \leq 2(d^2 + \epsilon + d^2 + \epsilon) - 4d^2 = 4\epsilon.$$

Thus, $\{y_n\}$ is Cauchy.

Uniqueness: Suppose that $y, y' \in K$ are distinct points that achieve the inf:

$$\|x - y\| = d = \|x - y'\|$$

Then by parallelogram law with sides $x - y$ and $x - y'$,

$$\begin{aligned} 4d^2 &= 2(\|x - y\|^2 + \|x - y'\|^2) = \|2x - y - y'\|^2 + \|y - y'\|^2 \\ &= 4\|x - (y + y')/2\|^2 + \|y - y'\|^2 > 4\|x - (y + y')/2\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and so the distance from x to the midpoint $(y + y')/2$ is strictly smaller than d , a contradiction. \square

Q: Counterexample for closed, but not convex set in Hilbert space?