

## Functional Analysis, BSM, Spring 2012

### Exercise sheet: extension of functionals and the Hahn-Banach theorem Solutions

1. Let  $X$  be over the field  $F$  ( $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ ). Let  $z = x - y$ . We need to find a functional  $\Lambda \in X^*$  for which  $\Lambda z = \Lambda x - \Lambda y \neq 0$ . We can easily define such a bounded linear functional on the one-dimensional linear subspace spanned by  $z$ ,  $Y = \{\alpha z : \alpha \in F\}$ . Namely, let

$$\Lambda(\alpha z) = \alpha.$$

It is easy to see that  $\Lambda$  is a linear functional on  $Y$  with  $\Lambda z = 1 \neq 0$  and  $\|\Lambda\| = 1/\|z\|$ . By Hahn-Banach theorem there exists a linear functional  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  on  $X$  with the same properties.

2. Consider the linear subspace spanned by  $x_0$ :  $Y = \{\alpha x_0 : \alpha \in F\}$ . We define a linear functional  $\Lambda$  on  $Y$  by

$$\Lambda(\alpha x_0) = \alpha \|x_0\|.$$

It is clear that  $\Lambda x_0 = \|x_0\|$  and  $\|\Lambda\| = 1$ . By Hahn-Banach theorem there exists a linear functional  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  on  $X$  with the same properties.

3. Clearly,  $M \subset \ell_\infty$ . To see that  $M$  is a linear subspace, we have to check two things:  $x + y \in M$  for any  $x, y \in M$  and  $\alpha x \in M$  for any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}, x \in M$ . Both are clear in this case.

The set  $M$  is not a closed set in  $\ell_\infty$ , since the vectors

$$x_n = (1, 1/2, 1/3, \dots, 1/n, 0, 0, \dots)$$

are all in  $M$ , but they converge (in  $\ell_\infty$ -norm) to

$$x = (1, 1/2, 1/3, 1/4, \dots),$$

which is not in  $M$ .

We claim that the closure of  $M$ ,  $\text{cl}(M)$  is

$$c_0 = \left\{ (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots) : \alpha_n \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = 0 \right\}.$$

On the one hand, we need to show that for any  $x \in c_0$  there exists a sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $M$  such that  $x_n$  converges to  $x$  (in the  $\ell_\infty$ -norm). Pick any  $x = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots) \in c_0$ . The vectors

$$x_n = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n, 0, 0, \dots)$$

are all in  $M$  and

$$\|x - x_n\|_\infty = \|(0, 0, \dots, 0, \alpha_{n+1}, \alpha_{n+2}, \dots)\|_\infty = \sup_{i \geq n+1} |\alpha_i|,$$

which goes to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , because  $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ .

On the other hand, we need that for any convergent sequence  $(x_n)$  with  $x_n \in M$ , the limit point  $x$  lies in  $c_0$ . Let  $x = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots)$ ; we have to show that  $\alpha_i \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be arbitrary. There exists  $n_0$  such that

$$\|x - x_{n_0}\|_\infty < \varepsilon.$$

However,  $x_{n_0}$  is in  $M$ , so there exists  $N$  such that after the  $N$ -th coordinate  $x_{n_0}$  has only zeros. Since the  $\ell_\infty$ -distance of  $x$  and  $x_{n_0}$  is less than  $\varepsilon$ , it follows that for  $i > N$  we have  $|\alpha_i| < \varepsilon$ . We are done.

4. Set  $e = (1, 1, \dots)$  and let  $Y$  be the linear subspace spanned by  $M$  and  $e$ :

$$Y = \{x + \alpha e : x \in M; \alpha \in F\}.$$

First we define  $\Lambda$  on this subspace:

$$\Lambda(x + \alpha e) = \alpha.$$

This is clearly a linear functional on  $Y$ . Is it bounded? We claim that

$$\frac{|\Lambda(x + \alpha e)|}{\|x + \alpha e\|_\infty} = \frac{|\alpha|}{\|x + \alpha e\|_\infty} \leq 1,$$

which would imply that  $\|\Lambda\| \leq 1$ . (In fact,  $\|\Lambda\| = 1$ .) We need that  $\|x + \alpha e\|_\infty \geq |\alpha|$ . We know that  $x \in M$ , so it is 0 in all but finitely many coordinates. It means that  $x + \alpha e$  is  $\alpha$  in all but finitely many coordinates. So the  $\ell_\infty$ -norm of  $x + \alpha e$  is at least  $|\alpha|$ , and this is what we wanted to prove.

So  $\Lambda$  is a bounded linear functional on  $Y$  with the desired properties. By Hahn-Banach theorem we can extend it to a bounded linear functional on  $\ell_\infty$ .

5. We claim that the bounded linear operator  $\Lambda \in \ell_\infty^*$  of the previous exercise has the property that  $\Lambda \neq \Lambda_y$  for any  $y \in \ell_1$ . We prove this by contradiction. Assume that  $\Lambda = \Lambda_y$  for some  $y = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots) \in \ell_1$ . Let  $e_n = (0, 0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, 0, \dots)$ . Note that  $e_n \in M$  for all  $n$ . So

$$\Lambda e_n = 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\Lambda e_n = \Lambda_y e_n = \beta_n.$$

We conclude that  $\beta_n = 0$  for all  $n$ . In other words,  $y = 0$ . Thus  $\Lambda = \Lambda_0$  is the constant zero functional, but this contradicts  $\Lambda(1, 1, \dots) = 1$ .

6. Let  $z \in V \setminus M$ . We prove that  $\Lambda$  can be extended to a linear functional  $\Lambda_1$  on

$$M_1 = \{y + \alpha z : y \in M; \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

The rest of the proof (the Zorn's lemma argument) goes the same way as in the original theorem.

If  $\Lambda_1$  extends  $\Lambda$ , then

$$\Lambda_1(y + \alpha z) = \Lambda y + \alpha \Lambda_1 z.$$

So the value of  $\Lambda_1 z$  determines  $\Lambda_1$ . We need to choose  $\Lambda_1 z$  such that

$$\Lambda y + \alpha \Lambda_1 z \leq p(y + \alpha z)$$

for any  $y \in M$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ .

If  $\alpha = 0$ , then we get back our assumption  $\Lambda y \leq p(y)$ .

If  $\alpha > 0$ , then after dividing by  $\alpha$  and rearranging we get that

$$\Lambda_1 z \leq p\left(\frac{y}{\alpha} + z\right) - \Lambda\left(\frac{y}{\alpha}\right).$$

If  $\alpha < 0$ , then after dividing by  $-\alpha$  and rearranging we get that

$$\Lambda_1 z \geq -p\left(\frac{y}{-\alpha} - z\right) + \Lambda\left(\frac{y}{-\alpha}\right).$$

(We needed to distinguish these cases, because  $p(\alpha x) = \alpha p(x)$  holds only for positive  $\alpha$ .)

So we need to choose  $\Lambda_1 z$  in such a way that

$$\inf_{y' \in M} p(y' + z) - \Lambda y' \geq \Lambda_1 z \geq \sup_{y'' \in M} -p(y'' - z) + \Lambda y''.$$

We can do that if and only if for any  $y', y'' \in M$  it holds that

$$p(y' + z) - \Lambda y' \geq -p(y'' - z) + \Lambda y'' \Leftrightarrow p(y' + z) + p(y'' - z) \geq \Lambda(y' + y'').$$

Using the sublinearity of  $p$  and the assumption that  $p(y) \geq \Lambda y$  for  $y \in M$ :

$$p(y' + z) + p(y'' - z) \geq p((y' + z) + (y'' - z)) = p(y' + y'') \geq \Lambda(y' + y'').$$

**7.** Let  $\Lambda \in Y^*$ . We can assume without loss of generality that  $\|\Lambda\| = 1$ . We will use the generalized Hahn-Banach theorem with  $p(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|x\|$ . This is clearly a sublinear functional (it satisfies both  $p(x+y) \leq p(x) + p(y)$  and  $p(\alpha x) = \alpha p(x)$  for positive  $\alpha$ ). Moreover,  $\Lambda y \leq |\Lambda y| \leq \|\Lambda\| \|y\| = \|y\|$ , so  $\Lambda y \leq p(y)$  for any  $y \in Y$ . Thus all the conditions of the generalized Hahn-Banach theorem are satisfied; there exists a linear functional  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  on  $X$  such that  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  extends  $\Lambda$  and  $\tilde{\Lambda}x \leq p(x) = \|x\|$ . Since  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  is an extension, it is clear that  $\|\tilde{\Lambda}\| \geq \|\Lambda\|$ . We need to show  $\|\tilde{\Lambda}\| \leq \|\Lambda\| = 1$ , that is,

$$|\tilde{\Lambda}x| \leq \|x\|. \quad (1)$$

We already know that

$$\tilde{\Lambda}x \leq \|x\|. \quad (2)$$

Using this for  $-x$  instead of  $x$  we get that

$$-\tilde{\Lambda}x = \tilde{\Lambda}(-x) \leq \|-x\| = \|x\|.$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{\Lambda}x \geq -\|x\|.$$

Combining this with (2) we get (1).

**8.** It is easy to see that

$$p(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n$$

is a sublinear functional on  $\ell_\infty$ . We use the generalized Hahn-Banach theorem in the special case when  $M = 0$ . In this special case the theorem only states that there exists some linear functional  $\Lambda$  on  $\ell_\infty$  with

$$\Lambda(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n. \quad (3)$$

We claim that such a  $\Lambda$  necessarily satisfies the other desired inequality

$$\Lambda(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n. \quad (4)$$

We just need to use (3) for the vector  $(-\alpha_1, -\alpha_2, \dots)$ :

$$-\Lambda(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots) = \Lambda(-\alpha_1, -\alpha_2, \dots) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\alpha_n = -\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n,$$

which implies (4).

To show that  $\Lambda$  is bounded, we notice that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n \leq \|(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots)\|_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n \geq -\|(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots)\|_\infty.$$

It follows that  $|\Lambda x| \leq \|x\|$  for any  $x \in \ell_\infty$ , thus  $\|\Lambda\| \leq 1$ .

Note that such a bounded linear functional  $\Lambda$  has the properties that  $\Lambda y = 0$  for  $y \in M$  and  $\Lambda(1, 1, \dots) = 1$  (see Exercise 4). So the same argument as in Exercise 5 shows that  $\Lambda$  is different from any  $\Lambda_y$ ;  $y \in \ell_1$ .

**9.** Pick an arbitrary vector  $x$  outside  $Y$ . Since  $Y$  is closed,  $d(x, Y) > 0$  (otherwise there would be a sequence  $y_n \in Y$  with  $\|y_n - x\| \rightarrow 0$ , but  $Y$  is closed, so this would mean that  $x$  also lies in  $Y$ ).

Let  $\delta > 0$ . Since  $d(x, Y)$  is the infimum of  $\|x - y\|$ , there exists  $y_0 \in Y$  such that

$$\|x - y_0\| \leq (1 + \delta)d(x, Y).$$

Let

$$e \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{x - y_0}{\|x - y_0\|}.$$

Clearly,  $\|e\| = 1$ . For the distance of  $e$  and an arbitrary  $y \in Y$  we have

$$\|e - y\| = \left\| \frac{x - y_0}{\|x - y_0\|} - y \right\| = \frac{1}{\|x - y_0\|} \left\| x - \underbrace{y_0 - \|x - y_0\| \cdot y}_{\in Y} \right\| \geq \frac{d(x, Y)}{\|x - y_0\|} \geq \frac{d(x, Y)}{(1 + \delta)d(x, Y)} = \frac{1}{1 + \delta},$$

which is at least  $1 - \varepsilon$ , if we choose  $\delta$  small enough.