

## THE SPACE OF FUNCTIONS WITH A LIMIT AT EACH POINT

Miloš S. Kurilić

Institute of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, University of Novi Sad  
Trg Dositeja Obradovića 4, 21000 Novi Sad, Yugoslavia

### Abstract

We consider the set  $\Lambda(X, Y)$  of functions  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  which have a limit at each point of  $X$ . If  $X$  is a compact space,  $\Lambda(X, Y)$  is a Banach algebra. The representation of bounded linear functionals on  $\Lambda(X, Y)$  is given.

*AMS Mathematics Subject Classification (1991):* 46E99, 54C30, 54C35.

*Key words and phrases:* Banach algebras, representation theorems, bounded functionals.

## 1. Introduction

In all further considerations,  $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  will denote a topological space without isolated points, while  $(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$  will be a Hausdorff space. These conditions will ensure the uniqueness of the limit  $\lim_x f$ , where  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $x \in X$ . We consider the set

$$\Lambda(X, Y) = \{f \in Y^X : \forall x \in X \exists y_x \in Y \quad y_x = \lim_x f\}$$

which is larger than  $C(X, Y)$ . This is shown by the following well-known examples.

**Example 1.1.** Let  $Q = \{q_n : n \in N\}$  be the space of rationals and let  $f : Q \rightarrow R$  be defined by  $f(q_n) = 1/n$ ,  $n \in N$ . Then, for each  $q \in Q$  we have  $\lim_q f = 0 \neq f(q)$ . So,  $f$  is discontinuous at each point although  $f \in \Lambda(Q, R)$ .

**Example 1.2.** The function  $f : R \rightarrow R$  given by:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1/n & \text{if } x = q_n, n \in N; \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in R \setminus Q \end{cases}$$

is continuous at each point of  $R \setminus Q$  and it is discontinuous at each rational point. Moreover,  $\lim_x f = 0$  for all  $x \in R$ , thus  $f \in \Lambda(R, R)$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** Suppose  $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  is a  $T_1$ -space,  $(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$  is a regular space,  $D \subset X$ ,  $D' = X$  and  $f : D \rightarrow Y$  where

$$\forall x \in X \exists y_x \in Y \quad y_x = \lim_{t \rightarrow x}^{t \in D} f(t).$$

Then, the function  $F : X \rightarrow Y$  defined by  $F(x) = y_x$ , for all  $x \in X$ , is continuous.

*Proof.* a) By the assumption for each  $x \in X$  there is  $y_x \in Y$  such that

$$(1) \quad \forall W \in \mathcal{U}(y_x) \exists V \in \mathcal{U}(x) f(V \setminus \{x\} \cap D) \subset W.$$

Let us prove the continuity of  $F$  at arbitrary point  $x \in X$ . Let  $U \in \mathcal{U}(y_x)$ . Since  $Y$  is a regular space there is  $W \in \mathcal{U}(y_x)$  such that  $\overline{W} \subset U$ , and by (1), there exists  $V \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  satisfying

$$(2) \quad d \in V \setminus \{x\} \cap D \Rightarrow f(d) \in W.$$

Suppose that  $z \in V$  and  $F(z) = y_z \notin \overline{W}$ . Then  $y_z \in Y \setminus \overline{W} \in \mathcal{U}(y_z)$  and (1) gives  $G \in \mathcal{U}(z)$  such that

$$(3) \quad d \in G \setminus \{z\} \cap D \Rightarrow f(d) \in Y \setminus \overline{W}.$$

$z = x$  would imply  $y_z = y_x \in W \cap Y \setminus \overline{W} = \emptyset$ , therefore  $z \neq x$  and  $z \in G \cap V \setminus \{x\} \in \mathcal{U}(z)$ . Since  $D' = X$  there is a  $d \in D \cap G \cap V \setminus \{x, z\}$  and from (2) and (3) it follows that  $f(d) \in W \cap Y \setminus \overline{W} = \emptyset$  which is impossible. Thus  $F(V) \subset \overline{W} \subset U$  and  $F$  is continuous at the point  $x$ .  $\square$

As a special case of the previous theorem, for  $D = X$ , we have

**Corollary 1.1.** *If  $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  is a  $T_1$ -space,  $(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$  is a regular space and  $f \in \Lambda(X, Y)$ , then the function  $F : X \rightarrow Y$  given by  $F(x) = y_x$  is continuous.  $\square$*

**Example 1.3.** *If  $f$  is the function from the Example 1.1, then  $F(x) = 0 \neq f(x)$ , for all  $x \in X$ .*

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $(Y, d)$  be a metric space and  $f \in \Lambda(X, Y)$ . Then*

a) *For all  $r > 0$ , the set  $\Delta_r = \{x \in X \mid d(y_x, f(x)) > r\}$  has no accumulation points in  $X$ .*

b)  *$\Delta_r$  is a closed, discrete subspace of  $X$  and  $|\Delta(f)| \leq e(X)$ , where  $\Delta(f) = \{x \in X : f \text{ is discontinuous at } x\}$  and  $e(X) = \sup\{|D| : D \subset X \text{ is closed and discrete}\}$ .*

c) *If  $X$  is a separable metrizable space, then  $|\Delta(f)| \leq \omega$ .*

d) *For all  $r > 0$ ,  $\Delta_r$  is a nowhere dense set.*

e) *If the space  $X$  is metrizable with a complete metric, then the mapping  $f$  is continuous on a set of the second category.*

f) *If  $(X, \mathcal{O})$  is a compact space, then  $\Delta_r$  is a finite set (for each  $r > 0$ ) and  $f$  is a bounded function.*

*Proof.* a) Suppose that for some  $r > 0$  we have  $\Delta'_r \neq \emptyset$ , i.e.

$$(4) \quad \exists x \in X \quad \forall U \in \mathcal{U}(x) \quad \exists x_U \in U \setminus \{x\} \cap \Delta_r.$$

Then, there is a net  $\langle x_U \mid U \in \mathcal{U}(x) \rangle \rightarrow x$ . By the continuity of  $F$  from Corollary 1.1 we have  $\langle y_{x_U} \mid U \in \mathcal{U}(x) \rangle \rightarrow y_x$ , hence there is  $W \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  such that

$$(5) \quad \forall G \in \mathcal{U}(x) (G \subset W \Rightarrow d(y_{x_G}, y_x) < r/2).$$

Since  $\lim_x f = y_x$ , there is  $V \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  satisfying

$$(6) \quad \forall t \in V \setminus \{x\} \quad d(f(t), y_x) < r/2.$$

If  $O \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  and  $O \subset V \cap W$ , then  $x_O \in W \cap V \setminus \{x\}$  and by (5) and (6)

$$d(y_{x_O}, f(x_O)) \leq d(y_{x_O}, y_x) + d(y_x, f(x_O)) < r.$$

A contradiction to  $x_O \in \Delta_r$ .

b) From (4), for each  $x \in \Delta_r$  there is  $U \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  such that  $U \cap \Delta_r = \{x\}$  so, the discreteness is verified. Since  $\overline{\Delta_r} = \Delta_r \cup \Delta'_r = \Delta_r$ ,  $\Delta_r$  is closed. Finally, for all  $n \in N$  we have  $|\Delta_{1/n}| \leq e(X)$ , hence  $|\Delta(f)| = |\bigcup_{n \in N} \Delta_{1/n}| \leq \omega e(X) = e(X)$ .

c) In a separable metric space we have  $e(X) = d(X) = \omega$ .

d) Suppose that  $z \in \text{int} \overline{\Delta_r} = \text{int} \Delta_r$ . Choose  $U \in \mathcal{U}(z)$  such that  $U \cap \Delta_r = \{z\}$ . Then  $U \cap \text{int} \Delta_r = \{z\}$ , which is impossible because  $X$  has no isolated points.

e) Follows from (d),  $\Delta(f) = \bigcup_{n \in N} \Delta_{1/n}$  and the Baire Category Theorem.

f)  $\Delta_r$  is finite because of (a). Let  $\Delta_1 = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  and let  $F$  be the function from Corollary 1.1. Then

$$\forall x \in X \setminus \Delta_1 \quad d(f(x), F(x)) \leq 1$$

and for all  $x, y \in X \setminus \Delta_1$  we have

$$d(f(x), f(y)) \leq d(f(x), F(x)) + d(F(x), F(y)) + d(F(y), f(y)) \leq 2 + \rho(F(X)).$$

Now,  $F(X)$  is a compact set in  $Y$ , thus it must be bounded. So,  $\rho(f(X \setminus \Delta_1)) \leq 2 + \rho(F(X)) < \infty$  and since  $f(\Delta_1)$  is a bounded set we have  $\rho(f(X)) < \infty$ .  $\square$

## 2. $\Lambda(X, R)$ as a Banach algebra

The space of all bounded real-valued functions  $B(X, R)$  with the norm

$$\|f\| = \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|$$

is a commutative Banach algebra with the unit.

**Theorem 2.1.** *If  $(X, \mathcal{O})$  is a compact, then  $\Lambda(X, R)$  is a Banach subalgebra of  $B(X, R)$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 1.2(f) we have  $\Lambda(X, R) \subset B(X, R)$ . Also, if  $\lim_x f$  and  $\lim_x g$  exist, then  $\lim_x (\alpha f + \beta g)$  and  $\lim_x fg$  exist, hence  $\Lambda(X, R)$  is a subalgebra of  $B(X, R)$ .

Let us prove that  $\Lambda(X, R)$  is a closed subset of  $B(X, R)$ . Suppose  $\langle f_n \mid n \in N \rangle \rightarrow f$ , where  $f_n \in \Lambda(X, R)$ ,  $n \in N$ , i.e.

$$(7) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \exists n_0 \in N \forall n \geq n_0 \forall x \in X \mid f_n(x) - f(x) \mid < \epsilon.$$

A convergent sequence is bounded, thus there is  $M > 0$  such that

$$(8) \quad \forall n \in N \exists x \in I \mid f_n(x) \mid < M.$$

Let  $x_0 \in X$  and  $y_{x_0}^n = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f_n$ ,  $n \in N$ . Since  $\mid \cdot \mid$  is a continuous function, from (8) we have  $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} \mid f_n \mid = \mid y_{x_0}^n \mid \leq M$ . So,  $\langle y_{x_0}^n \mid n \in N \rangle$  is a bounded real sequence.

Suppose that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are the accumulation points of the sequence  $\langle y_{x_0}^n \mid n \in N \rangle$ . By (7), for  $\epsilon = \mid \alpha - \beta \mid / 6$  there is  $n_0 \in N$  satisfying

$$(9) \quad \forall n \geq n_0 \forall x \in X \mid f_n(x) - f(x) \mid < \epsilon.$$

Choose  $n_1, n_2 \geq n_0$  such that  $\mid y_{x_0}^{n_1} - \alpha \mid, \mid y_{x_0}^{n_2} - \beta \mid < \epsilon$ . Since  $y_{x_0}^{n_i} = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f_{n_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , there is  $U \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$  such that for each  $x \in U \setminus \{x_0\}$  we have  $\mid f_{n_i}(x) - y_{x_0}^{n_i} \mid < \epsilon$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Choose such  $x \in U \setminus \{x_0\}$  (this is possible because  $x_0$  is not an isolated point). Now, we have:  $\mid \alpha - \beta \mid \leq \mid \alpha - y_{x_0}^{n_1} \mid + \mid y_{x_0}^{n_1} - f_{n_1}(x) \mid + \mid f_{n_1}(x) - f(x) \mid + \mid f(x) - f_{n_2}(x) \mid + \mid f_{n_2}(x) - y_{x_0}^{n_2} \mid + \mid y_{x_0}^{n_2} - \beta \mid < 6\epsilon = \mid \alpha - \beta \mid$ , a contradiction! The sequence  $\langle y_{x_0}^n \mid n \in N \rangle$  converges.

Let  $\langle y_{x_0}^n \mid n \in N \rangle \rightarrow y_{x_0}$ . We will prove that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f = y_{x_0}$ , i.e.

$$(10) \quad \forall \epsilon' > 0 \exists U \in \mathcal{U}(x_0) \forall x \in U \setminus \{x_0\} \mid f(x) - y_{x_0} \mid < \epsilon'.$$

Given  $\epsilon' > 0$ , for  $\epsilon = \epsilon' / 3$ , there is  $n_0 \in N$  satisfying (9). Let  $m \in N$  be such that  $m \geq n_0$  and  $\mid y_{x_0}^m - y_{x_0} \mid < \epsilon$ . Then, by (9)

$$\forall x \in X \mid f_m(x) - f(x) \mid < \epsilon.$$

Since  $y_{x_0}^m = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f_m$ , there exists a neighbourhood  $U \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$  such that

$$\forall x \in U \setminus \{x_0\} \mid f_m(x) - y_{x_0}^m \mid < \epsilon.$$

According to the previous inequalities, for each  $x \in U \setminus \{x_0\}$  we have

$$\mid f(x) - y_{x_0} \mid \leq \mid f(x) - f_m(x) \mid + \mid f_m(x) - y_{x_0}^m \mid + \mid y_{x_0}^m - y_{x_0} \mid < 3\epsilon = \epsilon',$$

and (10) is proved. Thus, for each  $x_0 \in X$  there exists  $\lim_{x_0} f$ , hence  $f \in \Lambda(X, R)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.1.** Clearly, the Banach algebra  $C(X, R)$  is a Banach subalgebra of  $\Lambda(X, R)$ . Moreover, for each  $F \in C(X, R)$  and  $r > 0$  there is  $f \in B(F, r) \setminus C(X, R)$  given by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} F(x) & \text{for } x \neq x_0 \\ F(x) + r/2 & \text{for } x = x_0 \end{cases}$$

where  $x_0 \in X$ . ( $B(F, r)$  is an open ball). So,  $C(X, R)$  is a nowhere dense subspace of  $\Lambda(X, R)$ .

For a function  $\varphi : X \rightarrow R$  and  $r > 0$  we define a subset  $S_{\varphi, r} \subset X$  as follows:

$$S_{\varphi, r} = \{x \in X \mid |\varphi(x)| > r\}.$$

Also, we will observe the following vector space of real-valued functions:

$$Z(X, R) = \{\varphi \in {}^X R \mid S_{\varphi, r} \text{ is finite for all } r > 0\}.$$

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{O})$  be a compact Hausdorff space. Then*

$$\Lambda(X, R) = C(X, R) \oplus Z(X, R).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi \in Z(X, R)$ ,  $x_0 \in X$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then  $W = (X \setminus S_{\varphi, \epsilon/2}) \cup \{x_0\}$  is a cofinite set containing  $x_0$ , hence  $W \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$ . Since  $|\varphi(x)| < \epsilon$  for all  $x \in W \setminus \{x_0\}$ , we have  $\lim_{x_0} \varphi = 0$ . So, we proved  $Z(X, R) \subset \Lambda(X, R)$ . Moreover,  $Z(X, R)$  is a subspace of  $\Lambda(X, R)$  because for  $\varphi, \psi \in Z(X, R)$  and  $\alpha \in R$  there holds:

$$S_{\varphi+\psi, r} \subset S_{\varphi, r/2} \cup S_{\psi, r/2} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\alpha\varphi, r} \subset S_{\varphi, r/|\alpha|}.$$

Suppose  $\varphi \in C(X, R) \cap Z(X, R) \setminus \{0\}$ . Then, there is  $x \in X$  such that  $\varphi(x) > 0$  (or  $\varphi(x) < 0$ ) and  $\varphi^{-1}((\varphi(x)/2, \infty)) = S_{\varphi, \varphi(x)/2}$  is an open, finite set. Since  $X$  has no isolated points this is impossible. Thus,  $C(X, R) \cap Z(X, R) = \{0\}$ .

Let  $f \in \Lambda(X, R)$  and let  $F \in C(X, R)$  be the function defined in Corollary 1.1. By Theorem 1.2 (f) the set

$$\Delta_r = \{x \in X \mid |F(x) - f(x)| > r\} = S_{f-F, r}$$

is finite for each  $r > 0$ . Thus,  $\varphi = f - F \in Z(X, R)$  and  $f = F + \varphi$ . Each function  $f \in \Lambda(X, R)$  has the (unique) representation  $f = F + \varphi$ , where  $F \in C(X, R)$  and  $\varphi \in Z(X, R)$ .  $\square$

### 3. Bounded linear functionals on $\Lambda(I, R)$

By  $I$  we will denote an arbitrary segment  $[a, b] \subset R$ . The proof of the following lemma is elementary.

**Lemma 3.1.** (i)  $\sup(A \cup B) = \max\{\sup A, \sup B\}$ , for all nonempty, bounded  $A, B \subset R$ .

(ii) If  $F \in C(I, R)$  and  $P \subset I$  is a countable set, then  $\sup_{x \in I} |F(x)| = \sup_{x \in I \setminus P} |F(x)|$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.1.** The functional  $\Psi : \Lambda(I, R) \rightarrow R$  is bounded and linear iff there are the unique bounded, linear functionals  $\Gamma : C(I, R) \rightarrow R$  and  $\Phi : Z(I, R) \rightarrow R$  such that for all  $F \in C(I, R)$  and all  $\varphi \in Z(I, R)$

$$\Psi(F + \varphi) = \Gamma(F) + \Phi(\varphi).$$

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Consider the restrictions  $\Gamma = \Psi | C(I, R)$  and  $\Phi = \Psi | Z(I, R)$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) The linearity of  $\Psi$  is obvious. Let  $f = F + \varphi \in \Lambda(I, R)$ . By the previous lemma we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\| &= \sup\{|F(x) + \varphi(x)| : x \in I\} \\ &= \sup(\{|F(x) + \varphi(x)| : x \in \varphi^{-1}(R \setminus \{0\})\} \cup \{|F(x)| : x \in \varphi^{-1}(0)\}) \\ &= \max\left\{ \sup_{\varphi(x) \neq 0} |F(x) + \varphi(x)|, \sup_{\varphi(x)=0} |F(x)| \right\} \\ &\geq \sup_{\varphi(x)=0} |F(x)| = \sup_{x \in I} |F(x)| = \|F\| \end{aligned}$$

because  $\{x \in I \mid \varphi(x) \neq 0\} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S_{\varphi, 1/n}$  is a countable set. Also,  $\|\varphi\| \leq \|\varphi + F\| + \|F\| = \|f\| + \|F\| \leq 2\|f\|$  and  $\Psi$  is bounded because

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(f)| &= |\Psi(F + \varphi)| = |\Gamma(F) + \Phi(\varphi)| \leq \|\Gamma\| \|F\| + \|\Phi\| \|\varphi\| \leq \\ &\leq (\|\Gamma\| + 2\|\Phi\|) \|f\|. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that the set of real-valued functions  $\ell_1(I, R)$  defined by:

$$\ell_1(I, R) = \{h \in {}^I R : |\{x \in I : h(x) \neq 0\}| \leq \omega \wedge \sum_{x \in I} |h(x)| < \infty\}$$

is a vector space with the norm

$$\|h\| = \sum_{x \in I} |h(x)|, \quad h \in \ell_1(I, R).$$

Also, the following statement is folklore.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $h \in \ell_1(I, R)$ . Then the functional  $\Phi : Z(I, R) \rightarrow R$  given by*

$$(**) \quad \Phi(\varphi) = \sum_{x \in I} \varphi(x)h(x), \quad \varphi \in Z(I, R)$$

*is a bounded linear functional on  $Z(I, R)$ .*

*Conversely, if  $\Phi : Z(I, R) \rightarrow R$  is a bounded, linear functional, then there is the unique  $h \in \ell_1(I, R)$  satisfying  $\|h\| = \|\Phi\|$  and (\*\*).  $\square$*

If  $BV(I, R)$  is the space of all real-valued functions of bounded variation, whose domain is  $I = [a, b]$  and

$$NV_0(I, R) = \{v \in BV(I, R) : v(a) = 0 \wedge \forall x \in I \setminus \{a\} \ v(x-0) = v(x)\}$$

then we have the following consequence of Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and the well-known Riesz Theorem:

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $\Psi : \Lambda(I, R) \rightarrow R$  be a bounded, linear functional. Then, there are the unique  $v \in NV_0(I, R)$  and  $h \in \ell_1(I, R)$  such that for each  $f = F + \varphi \in \Lambda(I, R)$*

$$(11) \quad \Psi(F + \varphi) = \int_I Fdv + \sum_{x \in I} \varphi(x)h(x).$$

*Conversely, for each  $v \in NV_0(I, R)$  and  $h \in \ell_1(I, R)$  the mapping  $\Psi$ , defined by (11), is a bounded, linear functional on  $\Lambda(I, R)$ . ( $\int_I Fdv$  is the Riemann-Stieltjes integral).  $\square$*

## References

- [1] Lindenstrauss, J., Tzafriri, L., Classical Banach Spaces, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 338, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1973.



[2] Dunford, N., Schwartz J.T., *Linear Operators*, New York, 1958.

*Received by the editors May 17, 1994.*