Proposition 51.15 is proven in Rockafellar [138] (Theorem 23.1). The proof is not difficult but not very informative.

Remark: As a convex function of u, it can be shown that the effective domain of the function $u \mapsto f'(x; u)$ is the convex cone generated by dom(f) - x.

We will now state without proof some of the most important properties of subgradients and subdifferentials. Complete details can be found in Rockafellar [138] (Part V, Section 23).

In order to state the next proposition, we need the following definition.

Definition 51.16. For any convex set C in \mathbb{R}^n , the support function $\delta^*(-|C|)$ of C is defined by

$$\delta^*(x|C) = \sup_{y \in C} \langle x, y \rangle, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

According to Definition 50.11, the conjugate of the indicator function I_C of a convex set C is given by

$$I_C^*(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} (\langle x, y \rangle - I_C(y)) = \sup_{y \in C} \langle x, y \rangle = \delta^*(x|C).$$

Thus $\delta^*(-|C|) = I_C^*$, the conjugate of the indicator function I_C .

The following proposition relates directional derivatives at x and the subdifferential at x.

Proposition 51.16. Let $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ be a convex function. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if f(x) is finite, then a vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a subgradient to f at x if and only if

$$f'(x;y) \ge \langle y, u \rangle$$
 for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Furthermore, the closure of the convex function $y \mapsto f'(x;y)$ is the support function of the closed convex set $\partial f(x)$, the subdifferential of f at x:

$$\operatorname{cl}(f'(x;-)) = \delta^*(-|\partial f(x)).$$

Sketch of proof. Proposition 51.16 is proven in Rockafellar [138] (Theorem 23.2). We prove the inequality. If we write $z = x + \lambda y$ with $\lambda > 0$, then the subgradient inequality implies

$$f(x + \lambda u) \ge f(x) + \langle z - x, u \rangle = f(x) + \lambda \langle y, u \rangle,$$

so we get

$$\frac{f(x+\lambda y)-f(x)}{\lambda} \ge \langle y, u \rangle.$$

Since the expression on the left tends to f'(x;y) as $\lambda > 0$ tends to zero, we obtain the desired inequality. The second part follows from Corollary 13.2.1 in Rockafellar [138].