

Artur Wachowicz, Institute of Mathematics, Łódź Technical University, ul.
Wólczańska 215, 93-005 Łódź, Poland. email: aw314@poczta.fm

MULTIPLYING BALLS IN $C^{(N)}[0, 1]$

Abstract

Let $C^{(n)}[0, 1]$ stand for the Banach space of functions $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with continuous n -th derivative. We prove that if B_1, B_2 are open balls in $C^{(n)}[0, 1]$ then the set $B_1 \cdot B_2 = \{f \cdot g : f \in B_1, g \in B_2\}$ has non-empty interior in $C^{(n)}[0, 1]$. This extends the result of [1] dealing with the space of continuous functions on $[0, 1]$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $C^{(n)} = C^{(n)}[0, 1]$ denote the Banach space of functions $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with continuous n -th derivative, equipped with the norm

$$\|f\| = \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} \max_{x \in [0, 1]} |f^{(i)}(x)|.$$

Let us recall that for $f, g \in C^{(n)}$ the inequality

$$\|f \cdot g\| \leq 2^n \|f\| \cdot \|g\|$$

holds. For $[a, b] \subset [0, 1]$, we also consider the space $C^{(n)}[a, b]$ of all functions $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with continuous n -th derivative, equipped with an analogous norm (the interval $[0, 1]$ is replaced by $[a, b]$), and we denote the norm in $C^{(n)}[a, b]$ by $\|\cdot\|_{[a, b]}$. Let $B(f, r)$ stand for an open ball in $C^{(n)}$ (with center f and radius r), then we denote $B(f, r)|_{[a, b]} = \{g \in C^{(n)}[a, b] : \|g - f\|_{[a, b]} < r\}$. If $D, E \subset C^{(n)}$ we write $D \cdot E = \{f \cdot g : f \in D, g \in E\}$. Finally, let int denote the interior in $C^{(n)}$.

Observe that if $f(x) = x - 1/2$, $x \in [0, 1]$, then $f^2 \notin \text{int}(B(f, \frac{1}{2}) \cdot B(f, \frac{1}{2}))$ (see [1]). So, analogously as in the space $C[0, 1]$, the result of multiplication of two open balls in $C^{(n)}$ need not be an open set. Observe also that if B_1, B_2 are open balls in $C^{(n)}$ and $\Phi : C^{(n)} \times C^{(n)} \rightarrow C^{(n)}$ is the operation

Mathematical Reviews subject classification: Primary: 46J10, 46B25; Secondary: 26A15
Key words: Baire category, multiplication, residual set
Received by the editors July 17, 2008
Communicated by: Brian S. Thomson

of multiplication, and (for example) there is a function $f \in B_1$ such that $f(x) \neq 0$ for any $x \in [0, 1]$, then $\Phi(\{f\} \times B_2)$ is an open set in $C^{(n)}$ (a function $\Phi_f : C^{(n)} \rightarrow C^{(n)}$, defined by formula $\Phi_f(g) = f \cdot g$, $g \in C^{(n)}$, is a linear continuous bijection), and therefore $\Phi(B_1 \times B_2) = B_1 \cdot B_2$ is a set with non-empty interior. So, interesting considerations appear in the case when both balls B_1 and B_2 consist only of functions having zeros.

Our main goal is to show that if $B(f, r), B(g, r)$ are open balls in $C^{(n)}$ then $B(f, r) \cdot B(g, r)$ has non-empty interior in $C^{(n)}$. In [1] an analogous theorem was proved for open balls in the space $C[0, 1]$ of continuous functions. Here we use a similar method, but the details are different and more difficult. Let us start from the following remark.

Remark 1. *Without loss of generality we may assume that functions f, g are polynomials with disjoint non-empty sets of zeros, and that there is a partition $x_0 = 0 < x_1 < \dots < x_m = 1$ of $[0, 1]$ such that*

$$(\forall k \in \{1, \dots, m\}) (k \text{ is odd} \Rightarrow (\forall x \in [x_{k-1}, x_k]) f(x) \neq 0) \quad (1)$$

and

$$(\forall k \in \{1, \dots, m\}) (k \text{ is even} \Rightarrow (\forall x \in [x_{k-1}, x_k]) g(x) \neq 0). \quad (2)$$

In our further considerations we will need the following:

Lemma 1. *Let $\varphi, h \in C^n$, $x_0 \in [0, 1]$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $|\varphi^{(j)}(x_0) - h^{(j)}(x_0)| < \varepsilon$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Then the function $k : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by the formula*

$$(\forall x \in [0, 1]) \quad k(x) = h(x) + \sum_{j=0}^n (\varphi^{(j)}(x_0) - h^{(j)}(x_0)) \frac{(x - x_0)^j}{j!}$$

fulfills the following two conditions:

- (i) $k^{(j)}(x_0) = \varphi^{(j)}(x_0)$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$;
- (ii) $k \in B(h, \varepsilon e)$.

PROOF. Condition (i) is easy to check. We will prove only (ii). Fix $x \in [0, 1]$. Then $|x - x_0| \leq 1$, hence we have

$$|k(x) - h(x)| \leq \sum_{j=0}^n |\varphi^{(j)}(x_0) - h^{(j)}(x_0)| \frac{|x - x_0|^j}{j!} < \varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{1}{j!} < \varepsilon e.$$

Fix $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then we have

$$|k^{(p)}(x) - h^{(p)}(x)| = \left| \sum_{j=p}^n (\varphi^{(j)}(x_0) - h^{(j)}(x_0)) \frac{(x - x_0)^{j-p}}{(j-p)!} \right| \leq \varepsilon \sum_{j=p}^n \frac{1}{(j-p)!} < \varepsilon e.$$

Therefore $\|k - h\| < e\varepsilon$. □

Remark 2. *In particular, if $0 < x_0 < y_0 \leq 1$ and $\varphi \in B(h, \varepsilon)|_{[0, x_0]}$ then there exists a function $k \in B(h, e\varepsilon)|_{[x_0, y_0]}$ which fulfills condition (i) from Lemma 1. Such a function k will be called an extension of φ to the interval $[x_0, y_0]$.*

Now we prove a basic lemma used in the proof of our main theorem (compare with Lemma 8 from [1]). By $f(x^+)$, $f(x^-)$ we denote the respective one-sided limits of a function f at a point x .

Lemma 2. *For functions f, g fulfilling conditions (1) and (2) (respectively) from Remark 1, the following condition holds:*

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \exists \\ \mu > 0 \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \exists \\ \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m > 0 \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \forall \\ \varepsilon \in (0, \mu] \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \forall \\ \varphi \in B(f \cdot g, \varepsilon) \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \exists \\ \xi, \psi \in C^{(n)} \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \varphi = \xi \cdot \psi, \\ \forall_{i=1, \dots, m} (\|f - \xi\|_i < \beta_i \varepsilon, \|g - \psi\|_i < \beta_i \varepsilon) \end{array} \right),$$

where $\|h\|_i = \|h\|_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]}$ for $h \in C^{(n)}$ and $i = 1, \dots, m$.

PROOF. Our reasoning is divided into m steps. In the i -th step ($i = 1, \dots, m$) we define $\beta_i > 0$ and $\mu_i > 0$. The numbers μ_i will fulfill $\mu_1 > \mu_2 > \dots > \mu_m$. Finally, we will set $\mu = \mu_m$.

Step 1. Let $\mu_1 > 0$. Define $\beta_1 = 2^n \|1/f\|_1$ (by assumption $f \neq 0$ on $[0, x_1]$). If $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu_1]$ and $\varphi \in B(f \cdot g, \varepsilon)$ then for $f_1 = f$, $g_1 = \varphi/f$ on $[0, x_1]$ we have

$$\|f - f_1\|_1 = 0, \|g - g_1\|_1 = \|g - \varphi/f\|_1 \leq 2^n \|1/f\|_1 \|f \cdot g - \varphi\|_1 < \beta_1 \varepsilon. \tag{3}$$

Of course $f_1 \cdot g_1 = \varphi|_{[0, x_1]}$.

Step 2. Observe that for the function φ from step 1, we have

$$g_1 = \frac{\varphi}{f}|_{[0, x_1]} \in B(g, \beta_1 \mu_1)|_{[0, x_1]},$$

so, to extend our consideration to $[x_1, x_2]$ we have to modify μ_1 as follows:

$$e\beta_1\mu_1 < \min_{x \in [x_1, x_2]} |g(x)|. \quad (4)$$

Let $\mu_2 \in (0, \mu_1)$, where μ_1 fulfills condition (4) (by assumption, $g \neq 0$ on $[x_1, x_2]$). Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu_2]$ and $\varphi \in B(f \cdot g, \varepsilon)$. Analogous to step 1, define functions f_1, g_1 . Of course, condition (3) holds. By Lemma 1 and Remark 2 there exists an extension g_2 of the function g_1 to the interval $[x_1, x_2]$ such that $\|g - g_2\|_2 < e\beta_1\varepsilon$. Moreover, by (4) we have also that $g_2 \neq 0$ on $[x_1, x_2]$. Now define $f_2 = \varphi/g_2$ on $[x_1, x_2]$. One can easily check that $f_1(x_1) = f_2(x_1)$, $f_1^{(j)}(x_1^-) = f_2^{(j)}(x_1^+)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_2 - f\|_2 &\leq 2^n \|1/g_2\|_2 \cdot \|\varphi - f \cdot g_2\|_2 \\ &\leq 2^n \|1/g_2\|_2 \cdot \|\varphi - f \cdot g + f \cdot g - f \cdot g_2\|_2 \\ &< 2^n \|1/g_2\|_2 \cdot (\varepsilon + 2^n \|f\| \cdot e\beta_1\varepsilon) \\ &= 2^n \|1/g_2\|_2 \cdot \varepsilon(1 + 2^n e\beta_1 \|f\|). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Since $g_2 \in B(g, e\beta_1\mu_2)_{[x_1, x_2]}$, there exists a number $M_2 = M_2(f, g)$ (depending only on functions f, g) such that $\|1/g_2\|_2 \leq M_2$. So, we have

$$\|f_2 - f\|_2 < 2^n M_2 \varepsilon (1 + 2^n e\beta_1 \|f\|). \quad (6)$$

Observe that our estimation is independent of φ . Define

$$\beta_2 = \max\{e\beta_1, 2^n M_2(1 + 2^n e\beta_1 \|f\|)\}.$$

Then we get $\|g_2 - g\|_2 < \beta_2\varepsilon$, $\|f_2 - f\|_2 < \beta_2\varepsilon$ and of course $\varphi|_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]} = f_i \cdot g_i$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Step 3. For the function φ from step 2, we have

$$f_2 = \frac{\varphi}{g_2}|_{[x_1, x_2]} \in B(f, \beta_2\mu_2)_{[x_1, x_2]}.$$

We want to extend our consideration to $[x_2, x_3]$, so we have to modify μ_2 as follows:

$$e\beta_2\mu_2 < \min_{x \in [x_2, x_3]} |f(x)|. \quad (7)$$

Let $\mu_3 \in (0, \mu_2)$, where μ_2 fulfills the condition (7) (by assumption we have $f \neq 0$ on $[x_2, x_3]$). Once more fix $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu_2]$ and $\varphi \in B(f \cdot g, \varepsilon)$. Analogous to steps 1 and 2, define functions f_1, g_1, f_2, g_2 . Of course, conditions (3), (5), (6) hold. By Lemma 1 and Remark 2, there exists an extension f_3 of the function

f_2 to the interval $[x_2, x_3]$ such that $\|f - f_3\|_3 < e\beta_2\varepsilon$. Moreover, by (7) we have also that $f_3 \neq 0$ on $[x_2, x_3]$. Now define $g_3 = \varphi/f_3$ on $[x_2, x_3]$. One can easily check that $g_2(x_2) = g_3(x_2)$, $g_2^{(j)}(x_2^-) = g_3^{(j)}(x_2^+)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Analogous to step 2 we get the following estimation:

$$\|g_3 - g\|_3 < 2^n \|1/f_3\|_3 \cdot \varepsilon(1 + 2^n \|g\|e\beta_2).$$

Observe that the estimation is independent of φ . In a similar fashion, since $f_3 \in B(f, \beta_2\mu_3)_{[x_2, x_3]}$ there exists a number $M_3 = M_3(f, g)$ (M_3 depends only on functions f, g) such that $\|1/f_3\|_3 \leq M_3$. Define now $\beta_3 = \max\{e\beta_2, 2^n M_3(1 + 2^n \|g\|e\beta_2)\}$. Then we have $\|f - f_3\|_3 < \beta_3\varepsilon$, $\|g - g_3\|_3 < \beta_3\varepsilon$ and of course $\varphi|_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]} = f_i \cdot g_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

The next steps are analogous. Continuing in this way we can define the required numbers μ_1, \dots, μ_m (finally, we put $\mu = \mu_m$), β_1, \dots, β_m , M_2, \dots, M_m , and functions $f_1, \dots, f_m, g_1, \dots, g_m$. More precisely, for numbers β_1, \dots, β_m we have

$$\beta_1 = 2^n \|1/f\|_1 \text{ and } \beta_i = \max\{e\beta_{i-1}, 2^n M_i(1 + 2^n \|g\|e\beta_{i-1})\}$$

if $i \in \{3, \dots, m\}$ is odd, and

$$\beta_i = \max\{e\beta_{i-1}, 2^n M_i(1 + 2^n \|f\|e\beta_{i-1})\}$$

if $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ is even. We define functions ξ, ψ in an obvious way:

$$\xi = f_i \text{ on } [x_{i-1}, x_i] \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m$$

and

$$\psi = g_i \text{ on } [x_{i-1}, x_i] \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Then $\xi, \psi \in C^{(n)}$, $\varphi = \xi \cdot \psi$ on $[0, 1]$ and $\|f - \xi\|_i < \beta_i\varepsilon$, $\|g - \psi\|_i < \beta_i\varepsilon$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. □

Theorem 1. *If $B(f, r)$ and $B(g, r)$ are open balls in $C^{(n)}$ then their algebraic product $B(f, r) \cdot B(g, r)$ has non-empty interior in $C^{(n)}$.*

PROOF. We may assume that f, g are such functions as in Remark 1. By Lemma 2 there exist positive numbers $\mu, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$ corresponding to f, g . For

$$\varepsilon = \min \left\{ \mu, \frac{r}{\max\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m\}} \right\}$$

we shall prove that $B(f \cdot g, \varepsilon) \subset B(f, r) \cdot B(g, r)$. Fix $\varphi \in B(f \cdot g, \varepsilon)$. Since $\varepsilon \leq \mu$ then by Lemma 2 there exist $\xi, \psi \in C^{(n)}$ such that $\varphi = \xi \cdot \psi$ and $\|f - \xi\|_i < \beta_i\varepsilon$, $\|g - \psi\|_i < \beta_i\varepsilon$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Since $\varepsilon \cdot \max\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m\} \leq r$ then $\|f - \xi\|_i < r$ and $\|g - \psi\|_i < r$. □

In [4, Prop. 1] (see also [3, Th. 3]) we proved the following

Theorem 2. *Let X, Z be topological spaces and let $E \subset X$ be a residual set. If $\Phi : Z \rightarrow X$ is a continuous mapping such that the image $\Phi(U)$ is not nowhere dense for any nonempty open set $U \subset Z$, then $\Phi^{-1}(E)$ is a residual set.*

Theorems 1 and 2 immediately imply the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *If $\Phi : C^{(n)} \times C^{(n)} \rightarrow C^{(n)}$ is the operation of multiplication, then $\Phi^{-1}(E)$ is a residual set in $C^{(n)} \times C^{(n)}$ whenever $E \subset C^{(n)}$ is residual.*

Remark 3. *It is also worth reminding the reader that Theorem 1 does not hold if we replace the space $C^{(n)}$ by $C^{(n)}([-1, 1]^2)$ of all functions $f : [-1, 1] \times [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with continuous all partial derivatives of n -th order. For example, if we define $f(x, y) = x$, $g(x, y) = y$, $(x, y) \in [-1, 1]^2$, then $B(f, 1) \cdot B(g, 1)$ is a nowhere dense set in $C^{(n)}([-1, 1]^2)$ (see [2, Th. 2]). We obtain an analogous result replacing the square $[-1, 1]^2$ by k -dimensional cube $[-1, 1]^k$ ($k > 2$) or even by the Hilbert cube $[-1, 1]^\infty$, and using analogous functions f, g -projections on first and second coordinates, respectively.*

The interval $[-1, 1]$ is used here only for simplicity of definitions of f and g . One can give analogous examples for any nondegenerate interval $[a, b]$.

Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank M. Balcerzak and J. Jachymski for their valuable comments.

References

- [1] M. Balcerzak, A. Wachowicz, W. Wilczyński, *Multiplying balls in the space of continuous functions on $[0, 1]$* , *Studia Math.*, **170** (2) (2005), 203–209.
- [2] A. KomisarSKI, *A connection between multiplication in $C(X)$ and the dimension of X* , *Fund. Math.*, **189**(2) (2006), 149–154.
- [3] P. Maličký, *Category version of the Poincaré recurrence theorem*, *Topology Appl.*, **154**(14) (2007), 2709–2713.
- [4] A. Wachowicz, *Preimages of residual sets of continuous functions under operation of superposition*, *Georgian Math. J.*, **12**(4) (2005), 763–768.