

Re: must specify free variable for consistent operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$?

Re: must specify free variable for consistent operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-06/msg02816.html>

- *From:* David C. Ullrich <ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 15 Jun 2007 05:06:29 -0500
-

On Fri, 15 Jun 2007 02:05:53 -0000, Dan Greenhoe <dgreenhoe@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jun 13, 9:24 pm, David C. Ullrich <ullr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> >

$$[(Fx)(t)](w) = \int_t x(t) e^{-iwt} dt$$

No! That's wrong, even though you see things written that way in various books (not in books written by careful mathematicians). The point is that functions have Fourier transforms, numbers do not have Fourier transforms. Here x is a function and $x(t)$ is not a function, $x(t)$ is a number (namely the value of the function x evaluated at t .) So that definition should be written

$$(Fx)(w) = \text{etc.}$$

Here x is a function, Fx is another function, and then $(Fx)(w)$ is the value of that other function at w , defined to be that integral.

Got it — thanks ^_^

And I think this kind of notation more easily adapts to operators on arbitrary vector spaces as in

Fx

where F is an operator $F: X \rightarrow Y$ on vector spaces X and Y and $x \in X$.

Does that sound right or like someone pretending to be a real mathematician?

Um, yes.

Re: must specify free variable for consistent operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$?

Re: must specify free variable for consistent operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$?

Say we've defined the Fourier transform Fx of a function x as above. And now we want to talk about the Fourier transform of the function $x(2t)$. You can't write

$$(Fx(2t))(w) = \int x(2t) \exp(-iwt) dt$$

Sad news :(

You could do this:

"If $y(t) = x(2t)$ then $(Fy)(w) = \text{etc}$ ",

I try to avoid introducing new variables if possible --- too much clutter in math proofs sometimes.

Or you could invent a dilation operator D , or maybe

D_2 , defined by

$$(D_2x)(t) = x(2t).$$

$$(FD_2x)(w) = \int x(2t) \exp(-iwt) dt.$$

I like this one better (my humble opinion).

Here FD_2x must mean $F(D_2x)$, since the other grouping, $(FD_2)x$ makes no sense.

My understanding was that this is true by definition (of operator multiplication). That is, if A and B are operators and x is a vector then

$$(AB)x = A(Bx) \text{ by definition.}$$

Right – I didn't know that we were familiar with that standard bit of notation.

Thank you again very much for your help and for spending so much time in providing that help. I greatly appreciate it.

Dan Greenhoe

David C. Ullrich

Re: must specify free variable for consistent operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$?

Re: must specify free variable for consistent operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$?