

## 5. Separation Theorems

### 5.1 The Hahn -Banach Theorem

Let  $X$  be a linear space over  $F$ . If  $F = \mathbb{C}$ , then by complex - liner functional on  $X$ . According to our first lemma, real-linear functionals can be characterized as the real parts of associated complex-linear functionals.

#### Lemma (6.1.1)

Let  $X$  be a complex linear space.

- (1) If  $f$  is a complex-linear functional on  $X$  and  $u$  is the real part of  $f$ , then  $u$  is the real linear functional on  $X$  and  $f(x) = u(x) - iu(ix) \dots (1)$  for all  $x \in X$
- (2) If  $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is real-linear on  $X$  and  $f$  is defined by the equation (1), then,  $f$  is a complex linear functional on  $X$
- (3) If  $\dots$  is a seminorm on  $X$ ,  $f, u$  are related as in equation (1), then  $|u(x)| \leq \dots(x)$  for all  $x \in X$  iff  $|f(x)| \leq \dots(x)$  for  $x \in X$
- (4) If  $X$  is normed space,  $f, u$  are related as in equation (1) and either  $f$  or  $u$  is bounded, then both functionals are bounded and  $\|f\| = \|u\|$
- (5) If  $X$  is a complex topological linear space. A complex-linear functional on  $X$  is in  $X^*$  iff its real part is continuous, and that every real linear  $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the real part of a unique  $f \in X^*$

#### Proof :

(1) Let  $v = \text{Im}(f)$

Since  $u = \text{Re}(f) \Rightarrow f(x) = u(x) + iv(x)$  for all  $x \in X$

if  $f(ix) = iu(ix) + i^2v(ix) = -v(ix) + iu(ix)$  and  $f(ix) = u(ix) + iv(ix) \Rightarrow if(x) = u(ix) + iv(ix)$

$\Rightarrow -v(ix) + iu(ix) = u(ix) + iv(ix) \Rightarrow u(ix) = -v(ix), v(ix) = u(x)$

$\Rightarrow f(x) = u(x) + iv(x) = u(x) - iu(ix)$

Let  $x, y \in X$  and  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$

Since  $f$  is linear functionals

$f(rx + sy) = rf(x) + sf(y) = r(u(x) - iu(ix)) + s(u(y) - iu(iy)) = ru(x) + Su(y) - i(ru(ix) + Su(iy))$

Also  $f(rx + sy) = u(rx + sy) - iu(i(rx + sy)) \Rightarrow u(rx + sy) = ru(x) + Su(y) \Rightarrow u$  is

linear

(2) Let  $x, y \in X$  and  $r, s \in \mathbb{C}$

$\Rightarrow f(rx + sy) = u(rx + sy) - iu(i(rx + sy)) = ru(x) + Su(y) - i(i ru(x) + i Su(y))$

$= r(u(x) - iu(ix)) + s(u(y) - iu(iy)) = rf(x) + sf(y)$

$\Rightarrow f$  is a complex-linear functional on  $X$

(3) Suppose that  $|f(x)| \leq \dots(x)$  for  $x \in X$

Since  $u(x) = \text{Re}(f(x)) \Rightarrow u(x) \leq |f(x)|$  for  $x \in X \Rightarrow u(x) \leq \dots(x)$

Since

$-u(x) = u(-x) = \text{Re}(f(-x)) \leq |f(-x)| = |f(x)| \Rightarrow -u(x) \leq \dots(x) \Rightarrow u(x) \geq -\dots(x)$

$\Rightarrow -\dots(x) \leq u(x) \leq \dots(x) \Rightarrow |u(x)| \leq \dots(x)$

Conversely, If  $|u(x)| \leq \dots(x)$  for all  $x \in X$

$$\text{Let } f(x) = re^{ix}, \quad r \geq 0 \Rightarrow |f(x)| = |re^{ix}| = |r||e^{ix}| = r \times 1 = r$$

$$\text{Since } f(x) = re^{ix} \Rightarrow r = e^{-ix} f(x) = f(e^{-ix} x) \Rightarrow |f(x)| = f(e^{-ix} x)$$

$$\text{Since } f(x) = u(x) - iu(ix) \Rightarrow r = f(e^{-ix} x) = u(e^{-ix} x) - iu(ie^{-ix} x)$$

$$\text{Since } r \text{ is real} \Rightarrow u(ie^{-ix} x) = 0 \Rightarrow r = u(e^{-ix} x) \Rightarrow |f(x)| = r = u(e^{-ix} x)$$

$$\text{Since } u(x) \leq \dots(x) \Rightarrow u(e^{-ix} x) \leq \dots(e^{-ix} x)$$

$$\Rightarrow |f(x)| \leq p(e^{-ix} x) = \dots(x) \text{ for } x \in X$$

(4) If  $f$  is bounded, then as  $|u(x)| \leq |f(x)|$  for all  $x \in X$ ,  $u$  is bounded and  $\|u\| \leq \|f\|$ .

For each

$x \in X$  there exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\|\lambda\| = 1$  and  $f(\lambda x) = \lambda f(x) = |f(x)|$ , then

$$f(\lambda x) \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ so}$$

$$|f(x)| = f(\lambda x) = \text{Re}(f(\lambda x)) = u(\lambda x) \leq \|u\| \|\lambda x\| = \|u\| \|x\|. \text{ Hence } \|f\| \leq \|u\|, \text{ and therefore } \|f\| = \|u\|$$

Finally, if  $u$  is bounded, then for all  $x \in X$  with  $\|x\| \leq 1$  we have

$$|f(x)| \leq |u(x)| + |u(ix)| \leq \|u\|(\|x\| + \|ix\|) \leq 2\|u\|. \text{ So } f \text{ is bounded. By the foregoing, } \|f\| = \|u\|.$$

### Theorem (5.1.2)

Let  $M$  be a proper subspace of a linear space  $X$  over  $F$ , and let  $x_0 \in X$ ,  $x_0 \notin M$ .

Define  $M_0 = [M \cup \{x_0\}] = \{m + \lambda x_0 : m \in M, \lambda \in F\}$ , then

(1)  $M_0$  is a subspace of  $X$

(2) If  $g \in M'$ , then there exists  $f_0 \in (M_0)'$  such that  $f_0(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$ .

Moreover if  $X$  is a normed space then  $\|f_0\| = \|g\|$

**Proof :**

**Case (1) :**  $X$  is real linear space, i.e.  $F = \mathbb{R}$

(1) It is obvious

(2) Define  $f_0 : M_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , by  $f_0(x) = f_0(m + \lambda x_0) = g(m) + \lambda r_0$ ,  $r_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . We must to prove

(i)  $f_0$  is linear :

Let  $x, y \in M_0$  and  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $x = m_1 + \lambda_1 x_0$ ,  $y = m_2 + \lambda_2 x_0$

$$rx + sy = r(m_1 + \lambda_1 x_0) + s(m_2 + \lambda_2 x_0) = (rm_1 + sm_2) + (r\lambda_1 + s\lambda_2)x_0$$

$$f_0(rx + sy) = g(rm_1 + sm_2) + (r\lambda_1 + s\lambda_2)r_0 = rg(m_1) + sg(m_2) + r(\lambda_1 r_0) + s(\lambda_2 r_0) \\ = r(g(m_1) + \lambda_1 r_0) + s(g(m_2) + \lambda_2 r_0) = rf_0(x) + sf_0(y)$$

$$\Rightarrow f_0 \text{ is linear} \Rightarrow f_0 \in (M_0)'$$

(ii)  $f_0(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$

$$\text{Let } x \in M \Rightarrow x = x + (0)x_0 \Rightarrow f_0(x) = f_0(x + (0)x_0) = g(x) + (0)r_0 = g(x)$$

Now if  $X$  is a normed space, we now prove that  $\|f_0\| = \|g\|$

$$\text{Now } \|f_0\| = \sup\{|f_0(x)| : x \in M_0, \|x\| \leq 1\}$$

since  $M \subseteq M_0 \Rightarrow \sup\{|f_0(x)| : x \in M_0, \|x\| \leq 1\} \geq \sup\{|f_0(x)| : x \in M, \|x\| \leq 1\}$

$$\Rightarrow \|f_0\| \geq \sup\{|f_0(x)| : x \in M, \|x\| \leq 1\}$$

Since  $f_0(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$

$$\Rightarrow \sup\{|f_0(x)| : x \in M, \|x\| \leq 1\} = \sup\{|g(x)| : x \in M_0, \|x\| \leq 1\} = \|g\|$$

$$\Rightarrow \|f_0\| \geq \|g\|$$

Let  $x_1, x_2 \in M$ , then

$$g(x_2) - g(x_1) = g(x_2 - x_1) \leq \|g\| \|x_2 - x_1\| = \|g\| \|(x_2 + x_0) - (x_1 + x_0)\|$$

$$\Rightarrow g(x_2) - g(x_1) \leq \|g\| \|x_2 + x_0\| + \|g\| \|(x_1 + x_0)\| = \|g\| \|x_2 + x_0\| + \|g\| \|x_1 + x_0\|$$

Thus  $-g(x_1) - \|g\| \|x_1 + x_0\| \leq -g(x_2) + \|g\| \|x_2 + x_0\|$ . Since this inequality holds for arbitrary  $x_1, x_2 \in M$ , we see that  $\sup_{y \in M} \{-g(y) - \|g\| \|y + x_0\|\} \leq \inf_{y \in M} \{-g(y) + \|g\| \|y + x_0\|\}$

Choose  $r_0$  to be real number such that

$$\sup_{y \in M} \{-g(y) - \|g\| \|y + x_0\|\} \leq r_0 \leq \inf_{y \in M} \{-g(y) + \|g\| \|y + x_0\|\}$$

It follows that  $-g(y) - \|g\| \|y + x_0\| \leq r_0 \leq -g(y) + \|g\| \|y + x_0\|$  for all  $y \in M$

$$\text{Putting } y = \frac{x}{r}, \text{ we have } -g\left(\frac{x}{r}\right) - \|g\| \left\|\frac{x}{r} + x_0\right\| \leq r_0 \leq -g\left(\frac{x}{r}\right) + \|g\| \left\|\frac{x}{r} + x_0\right\| \quad (1)$$

If  $r > 0$ , then right hand inequality in (1) gives  $r_0 \leq -g\left(\frac{x}{r}\right) + \|g\| \left\|\frac{x}{r} + x_0\right\|$

$$\Rightarrow r_0 \leq -\frac{1}{r}g(x) + \frac{1}{r}\|g\| \|x + rx_0\| \Rightarrow g(x) + rx_0 \leq \|g\| \|x + rx_0\| \Rightarrow f_0(x + rx_0) \leq \|g\| \|x + rx_0\|$$

$$\Rightarrow f_0(z) \leq \|g\| \|z\|, \text{ where } z = x + rx_0$$

If  $r < 0$ , then left hand inequality in (1) gives  $-g\left(\frac{x}{r}\right) - \|g\| \left\|\frac{x}{r} + x_0\right\| \leq r_0$

$$\Rightarrow -\frac{1}{r}g(x) - \frac{1}{r}\|g\| \|x + rx_0\| \geq r_0 \Rightarrow -\frac{1}{r}g(x) + \frac{1}{r}\|g\| \|x + rx_0\| \geq r_0 \Rightarrow rx_0 \leq -g(x) + \|g\| \|x + rx_0\|$$

$$\Rightarrow g(x) + rx_0 \leq \|g\| \|x + rx_0\| \Rightarrow f_0(z) \leq \|g\| \|z\|, \text{ where } z = x + rx_0$$

Thus we have show that when  $r \neq 0$ , then  $f_0(z) \leq \|g\| \|z\|$  for all  $z \in M_0$

Since  $g$  is bounded, then  $f_0$  is bounded linear functional

Since  $\|f_0\| = \sup\{|f_0(x)| : x \in M_0, \|x\| \leq 1\}$ , then  $\|f_0\| \leq \|g\|$ . It follows that  $\|f_0\| = \|g\|$

**Case (2) :**  $X$  is complex linear space, i.e.  $F = \mathbb{C}$

Let  $u$  be real part of  $g$ , by lemma(5.1.1), we have  $u \in M'$  and  $g(x) = u(x) - iu(ix)$  for all  $x \in M$ . Moreover  $\|g\| = \|u\|$ . By case(1), there exists  $u_0 \in X'$  such that  $u_0(x) = u(x)$  for all  $x \in M$  and  $\|u_0\| = \|u\|$ , so  $\|g\| = \|u_0\|$ , put  $f_0(x) = u_0(x) - iu_0(ix)$  for  $x \in X$ , by lemma (6.2), we have  $f_0 \in X'$  and  $\|f_0\| = \|u_0\|$ . Since  $\|g\| = \|u_0\| \Rightarrow \|f_0\| = \|g\|$

**Theorem (5.1.3)**

Let  $M$  be a subspace of linear space  $X$  and let  $g \in M'$ , then there exists  $f \in X'$  such that  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$ . Moreover if  $X$  is a normed space then  $\|f\| = \|g\|$

**Proof :**

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the collection of all ordered pairs  $(f_x, M_x)$  such that

- (i)  $M_x$  is a subspace of  $X$  and  $M \subset M_x$  (ii)  $f_x \in (M_x)'$  such that  $f_x(x) = g(x)$  for  $x \in M$
- $\Rightarrow G$  is non-empty and partially ordered by

$$(f_x, M_x) \leq (f_r, M_r) \Leftrightarrow M_x \subset M_r \ \& \ f_x(x) = f_r(x) \quad \forall x \in M_x$$

Let  $\Phi = \{(f_x, M_x)\}$  be a totally ordered set in  $G$ . then it is easy to see that  $\Phi$  has an upper bound  $(\Psi, \cup M_r)$  where  $\Psi(x) = f_r(x)$  for all  $x \in M_r$ . By using Zorn's Lemma, there exists a maximal element  $(f, H)$  in  $G$ . To complete the proof, we must show that  $H = X$ .

Suppose that  $H \neq X$ , then there exists  $a \in X$  such that  $a \notin H$

Put  $H_0 = [H \cup \{a\}]$  by using first part in this proof, we have  $h \in H'_0$  such that  $h(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in H_0$ . But contradicts the maximality of  $(f, H)$ .

Consequently, we must have  $H = X$  and the proof is complete.

**Theorem(5.1.4)**

Let  $M$  be a proper subspace of a real linear space  $X$ , and let  $x_0 \notin M$ , then there exists  $f \in X'$  such that  $f(x_0) = 1$  and  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in M$ .

**Proof :**

Let  $M_0 = [M \cup \{x_0\}] = \{m + \lambda x_0 : m \in M, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , then  $M_0$  is a subspace of  $X$ .

Define  $g : M_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , by  $g(x) = g(m + \lambda x_0) = \lambda$  for all  $x \in M_0$ . We must to prove

- (1)  $g$  is linear : let  $x, y \in M_0$  and  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $x = m_1 + \lambda_1 x_0$  and  $y = m_2 + \lambda_2 x_0$   
 $rx + sy = r(m_1 + \lambda_1 x_0) + s(m_2 + \lambda_2 x_0) = (rm_1 + sm_2) + (r\lambda_1 + s\lambda_2)x_0$   
 $g(rx + sy) = (r\lambda_1 + s\lambda_2) = rg(x) + sg(y) \Rightarrow g \in M'_0$

- (2)  $g(x_0) = 1$  and  $g(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in M$

since  $x_0 = 0 + (1)x_0 \Rightarrow g(x_0) = 1$

Let  $x \in M \Rightarrow x = x + (0)x_0 \Rightarrow g(x) = 0$

If  $M_0 = X$ , then we finish ; either if  $M_0 \neq X$ , then  $M_0$  is a proper subspace of  $X$  and  $g \in M'_0$ , by using theorem (5.1.3), there exists  $f \in X'$  such that  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M_0$ . Hence  $f(x_0) = 1$  and  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in M$ .

**Corollary (5.1.5)**

Let  $X$  be a real linear space. If  $x_0 \in X$  such that  $f(x_0) = 0$  for all  $f \in X'$ , then  $x_0 = 0$

**Proof :**

Let  $x_0 \neq 0$

Put  $M = \{0\} \Rightarrow M$  is a subspace of  $X$  and  $x_0 \notin M$ . By using theorem (5.1.4), there exists  $f \in X'$  such that  $f(x_0) = 1$ . This contradiction  $\Rightarrow x_0 = 0$

### Definition(5.1.6)

Let  $X$  be a linear space over  $F$ . The function  $p : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called sub-linear functional on  $X$  if

- (1)  $p(x+y) \leq p(x) + p(y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$  (Sub-additivity)
- (2)  $p(\lambda x) = \lambda p(x)$  for all  $x \in X$  and for all  $\lambda \geq 0$  (Positive homogeneity)

If in addition,  $P$  satisfies the condition

- (3)  $P(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in X$ , then  $P$  is called a convex functional

A convex functional  $P$  is said to be symmetric if we have  $p(\lambda x) = |\lambda|p(x)$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .

### Example (5.1.7)

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ . Define  $P : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $P(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$  for all  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then  $P$  is a sub-linear functional on  $X$  and Convex Functional.

### Theorem(5.1.8) Generalized Hahn-Banach Theorem

Suppose

- (1)  $M$  is a subspace of a real linear space  $X$
- (2)  $P$  is a sublinear functional on  $X$
- (3)  $g \in M'$  such that  $g(x) \leq p(x)$  for all  $x \in M$ . Then there exists  $f \in X'$  such that
  - (i)  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$
  - (ii)  $f(x) \leq p(x)$  for all  $x \in X$

**Proof :**

Let  $x_0 \in M$  and  $M_0 = [M \cup \{\lambda x_0\}] = \{m + \lambda x_0 : m \in M, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , then  $M_0$  is a subspace of  $X$ .

Define  $f_0 : M_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , by  $f_0(x) = f_0(m + \lambda x_0) = g(m) + \lambda r_0$ ,  $r_0 \in \mathbb{R}$

It is easy to see that  $f_0$  is linear and  $f_0(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$

Now to prove :  $f_0(x) \leq p(x)$  for all  $x \in M_0$

Let  $m_1, m_2 \in M$

$$g(m_2) - g(m_1) = g(m_2 - m_1) \leq p(m_2 - m_1) = p((m_2 + x_0) + (-m_1 - x_0)) \leq p(m_2 + x_0) + p(-m_1 - x_0)$$

$$-g(m_1) - p(-m_1 - x_0) \leq -g(m_2) + p(m_2 + x_0) \text{ for all } m_1, m_2 \in M$$

$$\text{so that } \sup_{y \in M} \{-g(y) - p(-y - x_0)\} \leq \inf_{y \in M} \{-g(y) + p(y + x_0)\}$$

$$\text{Choose } r_0 \text{ such that } \sup_{y \in M} \{-g(y) - p(-y - x_0)\} \leq r_0 \leq \inf_{y \in M} \{-g(y) + p(y + x_0)\}$$

It follows that  $-g(y) - p(-y - x_0) \leq r_0 \leq -g(y) + p(y + x_0)$  (\*) for all  $y \in M$

Let  $x \in M_0 \Rightarrow x = m + \lambda x_0$

If  $\lambda = 0 \Rightarrow x = m$ , then  $f_0(x) = g(m) \leq p(m) = p(x)$

If  $\lambda \neq 0$ , put  $y = \frac{m}{\lambda} \Rightarrow y \in M$  in (\*) to obtain

$$-g\left(\frac{m}{\lambda}\right) - p\left(-\frac{m}{\lambda} - x_0\right) \leq r_0 \leq -g\left(\frac{m}{\lambda}\right) + p\left(\frac{m}{\lambda} + x_0\right) \quad (**) \text{ for all } m \in M$$

if  $\lambda > 0$ , then the right hand inequality in (\*\*) gives  $r_0 \leq -\frac{1}{\lambda}g(m) + \frac{1}{\lambda}p(m + \lambda x_0) \Rightarrow$

$$\lambda r_0 \leq -g(m) + p(m + \lambda x_0) \Rightarrow g(m) + \lambda r_0 \leq p(m + \lambda x_0) \Rightarrow f_0(x) \leq p(x)$$

and if  $\lambda > 0$ , then the right hand inequality in (\*\*) gives  $-\frac{1}{\lambda}g(m) + \frac{1}{\lambda}p(m + \lambda x_0) \leq r_0$   
 since  $\lambda < 0$ , then  $-g(m) + p(m + \lambda x_0) \geq \lambda r_0 \Rightarrow g(m) + \lambda r_0 \leq p(m + \lambda x_0)$   
 thus when  $\lambda \neq 0$ , obtain  $f_0(x) \leq p(x)$  for all  $x \in M$ . Thus  $f_0 \in M'_0$  and  $f_0(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$ . Hence  $f_0(x) \leq p(x)$  for all  $x \in M_0$ . If  $M_0 = X$  complete proof, either if  $M_0 \neq X$   
 Let  $G$  be the collection of all ordered pairs  $(f_x, M_x)$  such that  
 (i)  $M_x$  is a subspace of  $X$  and  $M \subset M_x$  (ii)  $f_x \in (M_x)'$  such that  $f_x(x) = g(x)$  for  $x \in M$   
 (iii)  $f_x(x) \leq p(x)$  for all  $x \in M_x$ .

$\Rightarrow G$  is non-empty and partially ordered by

$$(f_x, M_x) \leq (f_r, M_r) \Leftrightarrow M_x \subset M_r \ \& \ f_x(x) = f_r(x) \ \forall x \in M_x$$

Let  $\Phi = \{(f_x, M_x)\}$  be a totally ordered set in  $G$ . then it is easy to see that  $\Phi$  has an upper bound  $(\Psi, \cup M_r)$  where  $\Psi(x) = f_r(x)$  for all  $x \in M_r$ . By using Zorn's Lemma, there exists a maximal element  $(f, H)$  in  $G$ . To complete the proof, we must show that  $H = X$ .

Suppose that  $H \neq X$ , then there exists  $a \in X$  such that  $a \notin H$

Put  $H_0 = [H \cup \{a\}]$  by using first part in this proof, we have  $h \in H'_0$  such that  $h(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in H_0$ . But contradicts the maximality of  $(f, H)$ .

Consequently, we must have  $H = X$  and the proof is complete.

### Remark

Let  $M$  be a subspace of a complex linear space  $X$ , such that

(1) The function  $p : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the conditions

(i)  $p(x + y) \leq p(x) + p(y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$  (ii)  $p(\lambda x) = |\lambda|p(x)$  for all  $x \in X$  and for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$

(2)  $g \in M'$  such that  $|g(x)| \leq p(x)$  for all  $x \in M$ ,

Then there exists  $f \in X'$  such that

(i)  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$  (ii)  $|f(x)| \leq p(x)$  for all  $x \in X$

## 5.2 Minkowski' Functional

### Definition(5.2.1)

Let  $A$  be an absorbing subset of a linear space  $X$  over  $F$ . The functional

$\sim_A : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\sim_A(x) = \inf\{\lambda > 0 : x \in \lambda A\}$  for all  $x \in X$  is called the Minkowski's functional of  $A$ .

It clear to show that

(1)  $\sim_A(x) < \infty$  for all  $x \in X$ , because that  $A$  is an absorbing

(2) If  $x \in \lambda A$ , then  $\sim_A(x) \leq \lambda$ . In special case if  $y \in \sim_A(x)$ , then  $\sim_A(y) \leq \sim_A(x)$

(3) If  $x \notin \lambda A$  for some  $\lambda > 0$ , then  $\sim_A(x) \geq \lambda$

(4) If  $A$  is open in topological linear space  $X$ , then  $\lambda A = \{x \in X : \sim_A(x) < \lambda\}$

### Theorem(5.2.2)

Suppose  $P$  is a seminorm on a linear space  $X$  over  $F$ . If  $A = \{x \in X : P(x) < 1\}$ , then  $P = \sim_A$

**Proof :**

Since  $A$  is convex, absorbing, balanced set  $x \in X$   
 Since  $A$  is absorbing, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $x \in \delta A \Rightarrow \tilde{\rho}_A(x) \leq \delta$   
 and  $\delta^{-1}x \in A \Rightarrow p(\delta^{-1}x) < 1 \Rightarrow p(x) < \delta$ , so that  $\tilde{\rho}_A \leq P$   
 since  $P$  semi-norm, then  $P(x) \geq 0$ , there exist  $r$  such that  $0 < r \leq P(x)$   
 $\Rightarrow P(r^{-1}x) \geq 1 \Rightarrow r^{-1}x \notin A$ , so that  $P(x) \leq \tilde{\rho}_A(x) \Rightarrow P \leq \tilde{\rho}_A$ . Hence  $P = \tilde{\rho}_A$

### Theorem(5.2.3)

Suppose  $A$  is a convex absorbing set in a linear space  $X$  over  $F$ . Define  $H_A(x) = \{\delta > 0 : x \in \delta A\}$  for all  $x \in X$ . If  $r \in H_A(x)$ , then  $s \in H_A(x)$  for all  $s > r$ .

**Proof :**

Since  $r \in H_A(x) \Rightarrow x \in rA \Rightarrow r^{-1}x \in A$

Since  $A$  is a convex and  $0, r^{-1}x \in A$ , then  $s^{-1}x = s^{-1}(s-r)(0) + s^{-1}r(r^{-1}x) \in A$   
 $\Rightarrow x \in sA \Rightarrow s \in H_A(x)$

### Theorem(5.2.4)

Suppose  $A$  is a convex absorbing set in a linear space  $X$  over  $F$ . Then

- (1)  $\tilde{\rho}_A$  is a sublinear functional.
- (2) If  $B = \{x \in X : \tilde{\rho}_A(x) < 1\}$  and  $C = \{x \in X : \tilde{\rho}_A(x) \leq 1\}$ , then  $B \subset A \subset C$  and  $\tilde{\rho}_B = \tilde{\rho}_A = \tilde{\rho}_C$
- (3) If  $A$  is balanced, then  $\tilde{\rho}_A$  is a seminorm.

**Proof :**

(1) Let  $x, y \in X$ . For all  $v > 0$ , there exists  $\delta_1 \in H_A(x)$  and  $\delta_2 \in H_A(y)$  such that

$\delta_1 < \tilde{\rho}_A(x) + v$  and  $\delta_2 < \tilde{\rho}_A(y) + v$ , then

$(\tilde{\rho}_A(x) + v) \in H_A(x)$  and  $(\tilde{\rho}_A(y) + v) \in H_A(y)$ ,  $x \in (\tilde{\rho}_A(x) + v)A$  and  $y \in (\tilde{\rho}_A(y) + v)A$   
 $(\tilde{\rho}_A(x) + v)^{-1}x \in A$  and  $(\tilde{\rho}_A(y) + v)^{-1}y \in A$

Put  $\delta = (\tilde{\rho}_A(x) + v)(\tilde{\rho}_A(x) + \tilde{\rho}_A(y) + 2v)^{-1} \Rightarrow 0 < \delta < 1$

since  $A$  is convex

$\delta(\tilde{\rho}_A(x) + v)^{-1}x + (1 - \delta)(\tilde{\rho}_A(y) + v)^{-1}y \in A \Rightarrow (\tilde{\rho}_A(x) + \tilde{\rho}_A(y) + 2v)^{-1}(x + y) \in A$

It is clear to show that  $\tilde{\rho}_A(0) = 0$ . Let  $x \in X$  and  $r > 0$ , then

$\tilde{\rho}_A(rx) = \inf\{\delta > 0 : rx \in \delta A\} = \inf\{\delta > 0 : x \in r^{-1}\delta A\} = r \inf\{r^{-1}\delta : x \in r^{-1}\delta A, \delta > 0\} = r\tilde{\rho}_A(x)$

(3) since  $A$  is a balanced set, then  $s^{-1}A = A$  for all  $s \in F$  such that  $|s| = 1$

so  $\{\delta > 0 : rx \in \delta A\} = \{\delta > 0 : |r|\delta^{-1}x \in \delta A\} \Rightarrow \tilde{\rho}_A(rx) = |r|\tilde{\rho}_A(x) \Rightarrow \tilde{\rho}_A$  is a semi-norm on  $X$ .

## 5.3 Separation Theorems For Normed Spaces

### theorem(5.3.1)

Let  $M$  be a subspace of a normed space  $X$ . if  $g \in M^*$ , then there exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$  and  $\|f\| = \|g\|$

**Proof :**

**Case (1):** consider  $g$  is a real -linear functional on  $M$

Define  $p : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $p(x) = \|g\| \|x\|$  for all  $x \in X$ . Then  $p$  is a sub linear. We also observe  $|g(x)| \leq \|g\| \|x\| = p(x)$  for all  $x \in M$ . By theorem (5.1.8), there exists  $f \in X'$  such that (i)  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$  (ii)  $f(x) \leq p(x)$  for all  $x \in X \Rightarrow f(x) \leq \|g\| \|x\|$  for all  $x \in X$

$\Rightarrow |f(x)| = \max\{f(x), -f(x)\} \leq \|g\| \|x\|$  for all  $x \in X \Rightarrow f$  is bounded and  $\|f\| \leq \|g\| \Rightarrow f \in X^*$   
 Since  $f$  extends  $g$ , so  $\|f\| \geq \|g\|$  and therefore  $\|f\| = \|g\|$ .

**Case (2) :** when  $g$  is a complex-linear functional on  $M$

Let  $u$  be real part of  $g$ , by lemma(5.1.1), we have  $u \in M^*$  and  $g(x) = u(x) - iu(ix)$  for all  $x \in M$ . Moreover  $\|g\| = \|u\|$ . By case(1), there exists  $u_0 \in M^*$  such that  $u_0(x) = u(x)$  for all  $x \in M$  and  $\|u_0\| = \|u\|$ , so  $\|g\| = \|u_0\|$ , put  $f_0(x) = u_0(x) - iu_0(ix)$  for  $x \in X$ , by lemma (5.1.2), we have  $f_0 \in X^*$  and  $\|f_0\| = \|u_0\|$ . Since  $\|g\| = \|u_0\| \Rightarrow \|f_0\| = \|g\|$

**Theorem (5.3.2)**

If  $x_0$  is a non zero element of a normed space  $X$  over  $F$ , then there exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x_0) = \|x_0\|$  and  $\|f\| = 1$ . In particular  $X^*$  separated points on  $X$ , i.e. if  $x, y \in X$  such that  $x \neq y$ , then there exists an  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x) \neq f(y)$ .

**Proof :**

Let  $M = [x_0] = \{\lambda x_0 : \lambda \in F\}$ , then  $M_0$  is a subspace of  $X$ .

Define  $g : M \rightarrow F$ , by  $g(\lambda x_0) = \lambda \|x_0\|$  for all  $x \in M$

(1)  $g$  is linear : let  $x_1, x_2 \in M$  and  $r, s \in F \Rightarrow x_1 = \lambda_1 x_0, x_2 = \lambda_2 x_0$   
 $g(rx_1 + sx_2) = g(r\lambda_1 x_0 + s\lambda_2 x_0) = g((r\lambda_1 + s\lambda_2)x_0) = (r\lambda_1 + s\lambda_2)\|x_0\| = r\lambda_1\|x_0\| + s\lambda_2\|x_0\|$   
 $= rg(\lambda_1 x_0) + sg(\lambda_2 x_0) = rg(x_1) + sg(x_2)$   
 $\Rightarrow g$  is linear

(2)  $g$  is bounded : let  $x \in M \Rightarrow x = \lambda x_0 \Rightarrow \|x\| = |\lambda| \|x_0\| = |\lambda| \|x_0\|$   
 $|g(x)| = |g(\lambda x_0)| = |\lambda| \|x_0\| = |\lambda| \|x_0\| = \|x\| < 2\|x\| \Rightarrow g$  is bounded

(3)  $\|g\| = 1$ :  $\|g\| = \sup\{|g(x)| : x \in M, \|x\| \leq 1\}$

Since  $|g(x)| = \|x\| \Rightarrow \|g\| = \sup\{\|x\| : x \in M, \|x\| \leq 1\} = 1$

By corollary (5.3.1) exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$  and  $\|f\| = \|g\|$

Since  $g(\lambda x_0) = \lambda \|x_0\|$  for all  $\lambda \in F$ . Put  $\lambda = 1 \Rightarrow g(x_0) = \|x_0\|$

Since  $\|g\| = 1 \Rightarrow \|f\| = 1$

Now let  $x, y \in X$  such that  $x \neq y \Rightarrow x_0 = x - y \neq 0$ , then by above theorem, there exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x_0) = \|x_0\|$

$f(x - y) = \|x - y\| \neq 0 \Rightarrow f(x) - f(y) \neq 0 \Rightarrow f(x) \neq f(y)$ .

**Corollary (5.3.3)**

Let  $X$  be a normed space and suppose  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $f \in X^*$ , then  $x = 0$

**Proof :**

Suppose  $x \neq 0$ . Then by theorem(6.11), there exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x) = \|x\| > 0$  which contradicts the hypothesis that  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $f \in X^*$ . Hence we must have  $x = 0$ .

**Corollary (5.3.4)**

Let  $X$  be a normed space and suppose  $\|x\| = \sup\{|f(x)| : f \in X^*, \|f\| = 1\}$  for all  $x \in X$ .



**Proof :**

If  $x = 0$ , the conclusion is trivial. If  $x \neq 0$ , then for all  $f \in X^*$  with  $\|f\| = 1$  we have

$$|f(x)| \leq \|f\| \|x\| = \|x\|$$

Since, by theorem(5.3.2), there exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $\|f\| = 1$  and  $f(x) = \|x\|$ , the result follows.

**Theorem (5.3.5)**

Let  $M$  be a closed subspace of a normed space  $X$  and  $x_0 \in X$ , but  $x_0 \notin M$ . Then there exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x_0) \neq 0$  and  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in M$ .

**Proof :**

Consider the natural function  $f : X \rightarrow X/M$  by  $f(x) = x + M$ , then  $f$  is continuous linear function.

Let  $x \in M \Rightarrow f(x) = x + M = M = 0$  (0 denote the zero vector  $M$  of  $X/M$ )

Also since  $x_0 \notin M$ , we have  $f(x_0) = x_0 + M \neq 0$

Hence by theorem(5.3.2), there exists  $g \in (X/M)^*$  such that  $g(x_0 + M) = \|x_0 + M\| \neq 0$

We now define  $f$  by  $f(x) = g(f(x))$  for all  $x \in X$

(1)  $f$  is linear : Let  $x, y \in X$  and  $r, s \in F$

$$f(rx + sy) = g(f(rx + sy)) = g((rx + sy) + M) = g(r(x + M) + s(y + M))$$

$$f(rx + sy) = rg(x + M) + sg(y + M) = rf(x) + sf(y)$$

$\Rightarrow f$  is linear

(2)  $f$  is bounded

$$|f(x)| = |g(f(x))| \leq \|g\| \|f(x)\| \leq \|g\| \|f\| \|x\|$$

Since  $\|f\| \leq 1 \Rightarrow |f(x)| \leq \|g\| \|x\| \Rightarrow f$  is bounded  $\Rightarrow f \in X^*$

Also  $f(x_0) = g(f(x_0)) = g(x_0 + M) = \|x_0 + M\| \neq 0$  and

$f(x) = g(f(x)) = g(x + M) = g(0) = 0$  for all  $x \in M$ .

**Theorem (5.3.6)**

Let  $A$  be a nonempty open convex subset of a normed space  $X$ , and  $x_0 \in X$ , but  $x_0 \notin A$ .

Then there exists an  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x) < f(x_0)$  for all  $x \in A$ .

**Proof :**

By translation, we may assume that  $0 \in A$

Define  $P : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $P(x) = \inf\{\lambda > 0 : x \in \lambda A\}$  for all  $x \in X$ .

It is clear to show that  $P$  is sub-linear and  $P(x) < 1$  iff  $x \in A$ .

Let  $M_0 = [x_0]$ , i.e.  $M_0 = \{\lambda x_0 : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\} \Rightarrow M_0$  is subspace of  $X$ .

Define  $g : M_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $g(\lambda x_0) = \lambda$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \Rightarrow g \in M_0'$  and  $g(x) \leq P(x)$  for all  $x \in M_0$

by using theorem (5.1.8), there exist  $f \in X'$  such that  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M_0$  and

and  $f(x) \leq P(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ .

Since  $A \subseteq X \Rightarrow f(x) \leq P(x)$  for all  $x \in A$

Since  $P(x) < 1$  iff  $x \in A \Rightarrow f(x) \leq 1$  for all  $x \in A$

Since  $x_0 = 1 \cdot x_0 \in M \Rightarrow f(x_0) = g(x_0) = g(1 \cdot x_0) = 1 \Rightarrow f(x) \leq f(x_0)$  for all  $x \in A$

It is clear to show that  $\ker(f)$  is closed, then  $f$  is continuous  $\Rightarrow f \in X^*$

### Theorem (5.3.7)

Let  $A$  be a nonempty closed convex subset of a normed space  $X$ , and  $x_0 \in X$ , but  $x_0 \notin A$ .

Then there exists an  $f \in X^*$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(x) < \alpha < f(x_0)$  for all  $x \in A$ .

**Proof :**

Choose  $r > 0$  such that  $S_r(x_0) \cap A = \emptyset$

Let  $D = A + S_r(0)$

Since  $S_r(0)$  is open, then  $D$  is open

Since  $A$  and  $S_r(0)$  are convex, then  $D$  is convex

Since  $x_0 \in S_r(x_0) \Rightarrow x_0 \notin A$

By theorem(5.3.6), there exists an  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x) < f(x_0)$  for all  $x \in D$ .

Since  $f$  is not identically 0,  $f(b) > 0$  for some  $b \in S_r(0)$

Taking  $\alpha = f(x_0) - f(b)$ , we see that for all  $x \in A$ ,  $f(x) = f(x+b) - f(b) < \alpha < f(x_0)$ .

### Theorem (5.3.8)

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be convex sets of real normed  $X$ . If  $A$  is compact in  $X$  and  $B$  is closed, then there is  $f \in X^*$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(x) \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \leq f(y)$  for all  $x \in A$  and for all  $y \in B$ .

**Proof :**

### Theorem (5.3.9)

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be disjoint, nonempty, convex sets of normed  $X$  such that  $A$  is compact in  $X$  and  $B$  is closed, then there is  $f \in X^*$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(x) > \alpha$  for all  $x \in A$  and  $f(y) < \alpha$  for all  $y \in B$ .

## 5.4 Separation Theorems For Topological Linear Spaces

### Theorem(5.4.1)

Let  $X$  be a topological linear space,  $x_0 \in X$ . If  $V$  is a neighborhood of 0 in  $X$  such that  $x_0 \notin V$ , then there is  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x_0) = 1$  and  $f(x) < 1$  for all  $x \in V$ .

**Proof :**

Since every neighborhood of 0 is absorbing set, then  $V$  is absorbing convex set.

Define  $P : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $P(x) = \inf\{\alpha > 0 : x \in \alpha V\}$  for all  $x \in X$ .

It is clear to show that  $P$  is sub-linear and  $P(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in X$ .

Let  $M_0 = [x_0]$ , i.e.  $M_0 = \{\alpha x_0 : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \Rightarrow M_0$  is subspace of  $X$ .

Define  $g : M_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f(\alpha x_0) = \alpha$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \Rightarrow g \in M_0'$  and  $g(x) \leq P(x)$  for all  $x \in M_0$

by using theorem (5.1.8), there exist  $f \in X'$  such that  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M_0$  and

$-P(-x) \leq f(x) \leq P(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ .

Since  $x_0 = 1 \cdot x_0 \in M \Rightarrow f(x_0) = g(x_0) = g(1 \cdot x_0) = 1$

Since  $V$  is open set  $\Rightarrow \alpha V = \{x \in X : P(x) < \alpha\}$

If  $\alpha = 1 \Rightarrow V = \{x \in X : P(x) < 1\}$ , so  $f(x) \leq P(x) < 1$  for all  $x \in V$ .

Let  $y \in -V \Rightarrow -y \in V \Rightarrow f(-y) < 1 \Rightarrow f(y) > -1$

For all  $y \in -V \Rightarrow |f(x)| < 1$  for all  $x \in W = V \cap (-V)$

Since  $V$  is a neighborhood of 0 in  $X \Rightarrow W$  is a neighborhood of 0 in  $X$ , then  $f$  is bounded function for some neighborhood  $W$  of 0 in  $X$ , so that by using theorem (), we have  $f$  is bounded function  $\Rightarrow f \in X^*$ .

### Theorem(5.4.2)

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be disjoint, nonempty, convex sets in a topological linear space  $X$ . If  $A$  is open in  $X$ , then there is  $f \in X^*$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(x) < \alpha \leq f(y)$  for all  $x \in A$  and for all  $y \in B$ .

**Proof :**

Let  $x_0 = b_0 - a_0$  where  $a_0 \in A, b_0 \in B$

Let  $V = A - B + x_0 \Rightarrow V = (A - a_0) - (B - b_0)$

Since  $A$  and  $B$  are convex sets, then  $V$  is convex set

Since  $A$  is open set, then  $V$  is open set

Since  $a_0 \in A \Rightarrow 0 = a_0 - a_0 \in A - a_0$ , also  $b_0 \in B \Rightarrow 0 = b_0 - b_0 \in B - b_0$

$\Rightarrow 0 \in V \Rightarrow V$  is a convex neighborhood of 0 in  $X$

To prove  $x_0 \notin V$  : let  $x_0 \in V$

$\Rightarrow x_0 \in A - B + x_0 \Rightarrow 0 = x_0 - x_0 \in A - B$

since  $0 = 0 - 0 \Rightarrow 0 \in A, 0 \in B \Rightarrow 0 \in A \cap B \Rightarrow A \cap B \neq \emptyset$

This contradiction  $\Rightarrow x_0 \notin V$

By using theorem (5.4.1), there exist  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x_0) = 1$  and  $f(z) < 1$  for all  $z \in V$

Now

For all  $x \in A$  and for all  $y \in B$

$\Rightarrow x - y + x_0 \in V \Rightarrow f(x - y + x_0) < 1 \Rightarrow f(x) - f(y) + f(x_0) < 1 \Rightarrow f(x) < f(y)$  For

all  $x \in A$  and for all  $y \in B$

Since  $A$  and  $B$  are non-empty disjoint convex sets, then  $f(A), f(B)$  are disjoint convex sets in  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(A) \subset f(B)$

Since every non constant convex functional on  $X$  is open and  $A$  is open in  $X$ , then

$f(A)$  is open in  $\mathbb{R}$

Let  $\alpha$  be a right limit of  $f(A)$ , i.e.  $f(x) < \alpha$  for all  $x \in A$

$\Rightarrow f(x) < \alpha \leq f(y)$  for all  $x \in A$  and for all  $y \in B$

### Corollary (5.4.3)

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be disjoint, nonempty, convex sets in a locally convex  $X$ . If  $A$  is compact in  $X$  and  $B$  is closed, then there is  $f \in X^*$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(x) < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq f(y)$  for all  $x \in A$  and for all  $y \in B$ .

### Exercises(5)

- 5.1 Let  $M$  be a closed subspace of a normed space  $X$  and  $x_0 \in X$ , but  $x_0 \notin M$ . Then there exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x_0) = d$ ,  $\|f\| = 1$  and  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in M$ , where  $d = d(x_0, M)$ , i.e.  $d$  is the distance from  $x_0$  to  $M$ .
- 5.2 Let  $M$  be a closed subspace of a normed space  $X$  and  $x_0 \in X$ , but  $x_0 \notin M$ . Then there exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x_0) = 1$ ,  $\|f\| = \frac{1}{d}$  and  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in M$ , where  $d = d(x_0, M)$ .
- 5.3 Let  $M$  be a subspace of a locally convex space  $X$  and  $x_0 \in X$ . If  $x_0 \notin \overline{M}$  then there exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $f(x_0) = 1$ , but  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in M$ .
- 5.4 If  $X$  is a locally convex space then  $X^*$  separated points on  $X$ .
- 5.5 Let  $M$  be a subspace of a locally convex space  $X$  and  $x_0 \in X$ . If  $x_0 \in \overline{M}$  then  $f(x_0) = 0$  for every continuous linear functional  $f$  on  $X$  that vanishes on  $M$ .
- 5.6 Let  $M$  be a subspace of a locally convex space  $X$ . If  $g \in M^*$ , then there exists  $f \in X^*$  Such that  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in M$ .
- 5.7 Suppose  $A$  is a convex, balanced, closed set in a locally convex space  $X$ ,  $x_0 \in X$ , but  $x_0 \notin A$ . Then there exists  $f \in X^*$  such that  $|f(x)| \leq 1$  for all  $x \in A$ , but  $f(x_0) > 1$ .
- 5.8 Suppose  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a convex balanced local base in a topological linear space  $X$ . Associate to every  $V \in \mathfrak{s}$  its Minkowski functional  $\tilde{\nu}_V$ . Show that  $\{\tilde{\nu}_V : V \in \mathfrak{s}\}$  is a separating family of continuous seminorms on  $X$ .
- 5.9 Suppose  $\mathcal{G}$  is a separating family of seminorms on a linear space  $X$ . Associate to each  $P \in \mathcal{G}$  and each positive integer  $n$  the set  $V(P, n) = \{x \in X : P(x) < \frac{1}{n}\}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{s}$  be the collection of all finite intersections of all the sets  $V(P, n)$ . Show that  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a convex balanced local base for topology  $\dagger$  on  $X$ , which turns into a locally convex space such that (1) Every  $P \in \mathcal{G}$  is continuous, and (2) set  $A \subseteq X$  is bounded iff every  $P \in \mathcal{G}$  is bounded on  $A$ .
- 5.10 Show that a topological linear space  $X$  is normable iff its origin has a convex bounded neighborhood.