# Functional Analysis

Alef Sterk a.e.sterk@rug.nl

Lecture 14 Monday 25 March 2024

### Topics:

- §1.6: Hahn-Banach for linear spaces
- §7.1: Hahn-Banach for normed spaces

# Are dual spaces always nontrivial?

**Definition:** if X is a NLS, its dual space is defined as

$$X' = B(X, \mathbb{K}) = \{f : X \to \mathbb{K} : f \text{ is linear and bounded } \}$$

**Examples:** the following maps belong to the dual of  $\mathcal{C}([a,b],\mathbb{K})$ :

$$f(\varphi) = \int_a^b \varphi(t) dt$$
 and  $g(\varphi) = \varphi(a)$ 

**Question:** can we have  $X' = \{0\}$  for some NLS?

[Spoiler alert: no!]

# Can we find functionals with specific properties?

**Aim:** find  $f \in X'$  that satisfies a property "P"

### Approach:

- choose a suitable linear subspace  $V \subset X$
- construct  $f \in V'$  that satisfies "P"
- extend  $f: V \to \mathbb{K}$  to all of X

**Question:** can the extension  $f: X \to \mathbb{K}$  chosen to be bounded? [Spoiler alert: yes!]

### Partial orders

### Assume X is a nonempty set

**Definition:**  $\leq$  is called a partial order on X if:

- 1.  $x \prec x$  for all  $x \in X$
- 2.  $x \prec y$  and  $y \preceq x \Rightarrow x = y$
- 3.  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq z \Rightarrow x \leq z$

 $\preceq$  is called a total order if for all  $x, y \in X$  we have

$$x \leq y$$
 or  $y \leq x$ 

**Example:** we can define a partial order on  $\mathbb{N}$  by

$$x \leq y \Leftrightarrow x \leq y$$

This is also a total order

Similar for  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{Q}$ , and  $\mathbb{R}$ 

### Partial orders

**Example:** let 
$$X = \{A : A \subset \mathbb{N}\}$$

We can define a partial order on X by

$$A \leq B \Leftrightarrow A \subset B$$

This is NOT a total order:

$$A = \{1, 2\}$$
  $B = \{2, 3\}$   $\Rightarrow$  neither  $A \leq B$  nor  $B \leq A$ 

### Partial orders

**Example:** we can define a partial order on  $\mathcal{F}([0,1],\mathbb{R})$  by

$$f \leq g \Leftrightarrow f(x) \leq g(x) \quad \forall x \in [0,1]$$

This is NOT a total order:

$$\left. \begin{array}{c} f(x) = x \\ g(x) = 1 - x \end{array} \right\} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{neither } f \leq g \quad \text{nor } g \leq f$$

**Definition:** if  $\prec$  is a partial order on X and  $V \subset X$ , then  $y \in X$  is called:

- upper bound for V if:  $x \prec y \quad \forall x \in V$
- maximal element of X if:  $y \prec x \Rightarrow y = x$

**Lemma:** let  $X \neq \emptyset$  be partially ordered

If every totally ordered subset of X has an upper bound in X, then X has a maximal element

Hahn-Banach theorem •00000000000000

#### Hahn-Banach Theorem: assume that

- X is a linear space
- $V \subset X$  is a proper linear subspace
- $p: X \to [0, \infty)$  is a semi-norm
- $f \in L(V, \mathbb{K})$  satisfies the bound

$$|f(x)| \le p(x) \quad \forall x \in V$$

Then there exists  $F \in L(X, \mathbb{K})$  such that

$$F \upharpoonright V = f$$
 and  $|F(x)| \le p(x)$   $\forall x \in X$ 

[Note: *F* is not necessarily unique!]

**Proof:** assume  $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ 

Pick  $x_0 \in X \setminus V$ ,  $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and define

$$F_0(x + \lambda x_0) = f(x) + \lambda y_0, \quad x \in V, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$$

Hence  $F_0$  linear and  $F_0 \upharpoonright V = f$ 

The choice  $y_0 = \inf\{p(x + x_0) - f(x) : x \in V\}$  gives

$$|F_0(x + \lambda x_0)| \le p(x + \lambda x_0), \quad \forall x \in V, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$$

[See lecture notes]

Hahn-Banach theorem 000000000000

**Proof (ctd):** consider the following partially ordered set:

$$P = \left\{ egin{array}{ll} V \subset \operatorname{\mathsf{dom}} g \ \operatorname{\mathsf{properly}} \ g \in L(\operatorname{\mathsf{dom}} g, \mathbb{R}) & : & g \! \upharpoonright \! V = f \ & |g(x)| \leq p(x) & orall \, x \in \operatorname{\mathsf{dom}} g \ \end{array} 
ight\}$$

$$P \neq \varnothing$$
 as  $F_0 \in P$ 

$$g \leq h \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{dom} g \subset \operatorname{dom} h \text{ and } h \mid \operatorname{dom} g = g$$

**Proof (ctd):** assume  $Q \subset P$  is totally ordered

Define the map

$$h: \bigcup_{g \in Q} \operatorname{dom} g \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad h(x) := g(x) \text{ if } x \in \operatorname{dom} g, \quad g \in Q$$

$$\Rightarrow$$
  $|h(x)| = |g(x)| \le p(x)$ 

Hahn-Banach theorem 0000000000000

**Proof (ctd):** *h* is well-defined

Assume: 
$$x \in \text{dom } g_1$$
 and  $x \in \text{dom } g_2$   $(g_1, g_2 \in Q)$ 

$$Q$$
 totally ordered  $\Rightarrow$  w.l.o.g.  $g_1 \prec g_2$ 

$$\Rightarrow$$
 dom  $g_1 \subset \operatorname{\mathsf{dom}} g_2$  and  $g_2 \upharpoonright \operatorname{\mathsf{dom}} g_1 = g_1$ 

Hahn-Banach theorem 00000000000000

$$\Rightarrow g_1(x) = g_2(x) = h(x)$$

### **Proof (ctd):** $h \in L(\text{dom } h, \mathbb{R})$ since

$$x_1, x_2 \in \operatorname{dom} h \implies \exists g_1, g_2 \in Q \text{ such that } \begin{cases} x_1 \in \operatorname{dom} g_1 \\ x_2 \in \operatorname{dom} g_2 \end{cases}$$
 $Q \text{ totally ordered} \implies \operatorname{w.l.o.g.} \ g_1 \preceq g_2 \implies \operatorname{dom} g_1 \subset \operatorname{dom} g_2 \implies x_1, x_2 \in \operatorname{dom} g_2 \implies \lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 \in \operatorname{dom} g_2 \subset \operatorname{dom} h \implies h(\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2) = g_2(\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2) = \lambda g_2(x_1) + \mu g_2(x_2) = \lambda h(x_1) + \mu h(x_2)$ 

**Proof (ctd):** *h* is an upper bound for *Q* 

$$g\in Q$$
  $\Rightarrow$   $\operatorname{dom} g\subset\operatorname{dom} h$  and  $g(x)=h(x)$   $\forall\,x\in\operatorname{dom} g$  by definition  $\Rightarrow$   $\operatorname{dom} g\subset\operatorname{dom} h$  and  $h\!\upharpoonright\operatorname{dom} g=g$   $\Rightarrow$   $g\preceq h$ 

Hahn-Banach theorem 000000000000000

**Proof (ctd):** assume  $Q \subset P$  totally ordered and define

$$h: \bigcup_{g \in Q} \operatorname{dom} g \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad h(x) := g(x) \text{ if } x \in \operatorname{dom} g$$

#### Conclusion:

- $h \in L(\text{dom } h, \mathbb{R})$  is well-defined
- $h \in P$  is an upper bound of Q

Zorn's lemma  $\Rightarrow P$  has a maximal element F

Hahn-Banach theorem 000000000000000

**Proof (ctd):** assume dom  $F \neq X$ 

Pick  $x_0 \in X \setminus \text{dom } F$ 

Make 1-dimensional extension  $\widetilde{F}$  of F to span $\{\text{dom } F, x_0\}$ 

$$\widetilde{F} \in P$$
 and  $F \preceq \widetilde{F}$  but  $F \neq \widetilde{F} \implies F$  not maximal!

Contradiction, so dom F = X

**Proof (ctd):** assume  $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ , then

$$f(x) = \operatorname{Re} f(x) + i \operatorname{Im} f(x) = \operatorname{Re} f(x) - i \operatorname{Re} f(ix)$$
$$|\operatorname{Re} f(x)| < |f(x)| < p(x) \qquad \forall x \in V$$

There exists an  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear map  $\Phi: X \to \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\Phi \upharpoonright V = \operatorname{Re} f$$
 and  $|\Phi(x)| \le p(x)$   $\forall x \in X$ 

Define the C-linear map  $F: X \to \mathbb{C}$  by

$$F(x) = \Phi(x) - i\Phi(ix)$$

**Proof (ctd):** 
$$F(x) = \Phi(x) - i\Phi(ix)$$

Verification that  $F: X \to \mathbb{C}$  is  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear:

$$F(x+y) = F(x) + F(y)$$
 [exercise]  

$$F((a+bi)x) = \Phi(ax+ibx) - i\Phi(-bx+iax)$$

$$= \Phi(ax) + \Phi(ibx) - i\Phi(-bx) - i\Phi(iax)$$

$$= a\Phi(x) + b\Phi(ix) + bi\Phi(x) - ai\Phi(ix)$$

$$= (a+bi)(\Phi(x) - i\Phi(ix))$$

$$= (a+bi)F(x)$$

**Proof (ctd):** for some  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  we have

$$F(x) = |F(x)|e^{i\theta}$$

Verification that F is bounded by p:

$$|F(x)| = F(e^{-i\theta}x)$$

$$= \operatorname{Re} F(e^{-i\theta}x)$$

$$= \Phi(e^{-i\theta}x)$$

$$\leq p(e^{-i\theta}x)$$

$$\leq |e^{-i\theta}|p(x) = p(x) \quad \forall x \in X$$

### **Hahn-Banach Theorem:** if X is a NLS and $V \subset X$ is a linear subspace, then for all $f \in V'$ there exists $F \in X'$ such that

$$F \upharpoonright V = f$$
 and  $||F|| = ||f||$ 

[This version is used in most examples and exercises]

Note: the norms are meant as follows

$$||F|| = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X, x \neq 0} \frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|}{||\mathbf{x}||} \quad \text{and} \quad ||f|| = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in V, x \neq 0} \frac{|f(\mathbf{x})|}{||\mathbf{x}||}$$

**Proof:** define 
$$p: X \to [0, \infty)$$
 by  $p(x) = ||f|| \, ||x||$  then 
$$|f(x)| \leq p(x) \quad \forall x \in V$$

By Hahn-Banach there exists  $F \in L(X, \mathbb{K})$  such that

$$F \upharpoonright V = f$$
 and  $|F(x)| \le p(x) = ||f|| \, ||x|| \quad \forall \, x \in X$ 

Hence  $||F|| \le ||f||$  and  $||f|| \le ||F||$  is trivial

## Linear functionals separate points

**Proposition:** if X is a NLS and  $x, y \in X$  are distinct, then there exists  $f \in X'$  such that

$$||f|| = 1$$
 and  $f(x) \neq f(y)$ 

**Proof:** let  $V = \text{span}\{z\}$ , where  $z = x - y \neq 0$ , and consider

$$f: V \to \mathbb{K}, \quad f(\lambda z) = \lambda ||z||$$

We have

$$\|f\| = \sup_{v \in V, v \neq 0} \frac{|f(v)|}{\|v\|} = \sup_{\lambda \neq 0} \frac{|f(\lambda z)|}{\|\lambda z\|} = \sup_{\lambda \neq 0} \frac{|\lambda| \|z\|}{|\lambda| \|z\|} = 1$$

Apply Hahn-Banach

**Proposition:** if X is a NLS and  $x_0 \in X$  is nonzero, then there exists  $f \in X'$  such that

$$f(x_0) = ||x_0||$$
 and  $||f|| = 1$ 

**Proof:** define  $f : \text{span}\{x_0\} \to \mathbb{K}$  by  $f(\lambda x_0) = \lambda ||x_0||$ , then

$$||f|| = \sup_{\lambda x_0, \, \lambda \neq 0} \frac{|f(\lambda x_0)|}{||\lambda x_0||} = 1$$

Apply Hahn-Banach

**Corollary:** the norm of any nonzero  $x_0 \in X$  can be written as

$$||x_0|| = \sup\{|f(x_0)|: f \in X', ||f|| = 1\}$$

**Proof:** for any  $f \in X'$  we have  $|f(x_0)| \le ||f|| ||x_0||$ , and thus

$$\sup\{|f(x_0)|: f \in X', \|f\| = 1\} \le \|x_0\|$$

Equality follows from the existence of  $f \in X'$  with

$$f(x_0) = ||x_0||$$
 and  $||f|| = 1$ 

**Proposition:** if X is a NLS and  $V \subset X$  is a finite-dimensional linear subspace, then there exists  $P \in B(X)$  such that

$$P^2 = P$$
, ran  $P = V$ 

**Proof:** let  $V = \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ 

By Hahn-Banach there exist  $f_i \in X'$  such that  $f_i(e_i) = \delta_{ii}$ 

Define 
$$P: X \to X$$
 by  $Px = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x)e_i$ 

Then ran P = V since  $P(e_i) = e_i$  for all j = 1, ..., n

**Proof (ctd):** for all  $x \in X$  we have

$$Px = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x)e_i$$

$$P^2x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x)Pe_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x)e_i = Px$$

$$\|Px\| \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} |f_i(x)| \|e_i\| \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|f_i\| \|e_i\|\right) \|x\|$$