

6. The Lax-Milgram Theorem for Banach Spaces. II

By S. RAMASWAMY

School of Mathematics, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research

(Communicated by Kôzaku YOSIDA, M. J. A., Jan. 12, 1981)

§0. This paper is a sequel to [1] wherein we proved the Lax-Milgram theorem for a continuous and coercive bilinear form on a Banach space over R . Here, we deal with the question of how far coercivity is necessary for the validity of the Lax-Milgram theorem. We construct a counter-example to show that coercivity is not necessary even on Hilbert spaces for the validity of the Lax-Milgram theorem. However, we prove that it is necessary in case the bilinear form 'a' is symmetric and positive-definite in the sense that $a(x, x) > 0 \forall x \neq 0$.

The counter-example was constructed for me by Dr. V.S. Sunder. It is a pleasure for me to thank him for his help.

§1. Let V be a normal space over R . Let $\|x\|$ denote the norm of the element $x \in V$. Let V' be the dual of V . Let 'a' be a continuous bilinear form on V . We do not necessarily assume that $a(x, x) > 0 \forall x \neq 0$.

We have the maps A and B from V to V' defined as $Ax(y) = a(y, x)$ and $Bx(y) = a(x, y)$. A and B are both continuous from V to V' . Let A^* (resp. B^*) be the adjoint of A (resp. B). A^* and B^* are maps from V'' (the double dual of V) to V' . It is easily seen that B (resp. A) is the restriction of A^* (resp. B^*) to V .

Motivated by the Lax-Milgram [1], we make the following definition.

Definition 1. V is said to have the *right* (resp. *left*) *Lax-Milgram property* with respect to 'a' if $\forall f \in V', \exists$ a unique $u \in V$ such that $f(v) = a(v, u)$ (resp. $f(v) = a(u, v)$) $\forall v \in V$.

When 'a' is symmetric, it is clear that to say V has the right Lax-Milgram property is the same as to say that V has the left Lax-Milgram property. In this case, we simply speak of "*the Lax-Milgram property*".

The definition states that V has the right (resp. left) Lax-Milgram property with respect to 'a' iff A (resp. B) is one-one and onto, i.e. iff A (resp. B) is an isomorphism of V and V' in the algebraic sense.

Definition 2. A bilinear form 'a' on V is said to be *non-degenerate* if $\forall y \neq 0, \exists x, z \in V$ such that $a(x, y) \neq 0$ and $a(y, z) \neq 0$.

If 'a' has the property that $a(x, x) > 0 \forall x \neq 0$, then it is clearly non-