

## ON CONVEX SETS IN LINEAR NORMED SPACES

TRUMAN BOTTS

M. Eidelheit has proved<sup>1</sup> this theorem.

**THEOREM.** *In a linear normed space two convex bodies (that is, convex sets with inner points) having no common inner points are separated<sup>2</sup> by a plane.*

The purpose of this note is to present a quite different and somewhat simpler proof of this result.<sup>3</sup>

It is known<sup>4</sup> for linear normed spaces that

(1) *Through every boundary point of a convex body there passes a plane supporting the body.*

A convex cone with the point  $x_0$  as vertex is defined as a convex body  $C$  containing at least one point  $x \neq x_0$  and such that for each such point  $x$  in  $C$ ,

$$ax + (1 - a)x_0 \in C, \quad a \geq 0.$$

It is easily seen that

(2) *Every supporting plane of a convex cone  $C$  passes through the vertex  $x_0$  of the cone.*

For, let  $L(x) - b = 0$ , where  $L(x)$  is a linear functional and  $b$  is a constant, define a plane of support of  $C$  passing through a boundary point  $y$  of  $C$ . Suppose for definiteness that

$$L(x) - b \leq 0$$

holds for all points  $x$  in  $C$ . Then since every point of the form  $ay + (1 - a)x_0$  ( $a \geq 0$ ) is a boundary point of  $C$ ,

$$L(ay + (1 - a)x_0) - b \leq 0, \quad a \geq 0,$$

---

Presented to the Society, September 5, 1941; received by the editors May 6, 1941.

<sup>1</sup> M. Eidelheit, *Zur Theorie der konvexen Mengen in linearen normierten Räumen*, *Studia Mathematica*, vol. 6 (1936), pp. 104–111.

<sup>2</sup> Two sets are separated by a plane provided they lie in opposite closed half-spaces of the plane.

<sup>3</sup> Added in proof: There has recently been brought to my attention another proof of Eidelheit's theorem by S. Kakutani, *Proceedings of the Imperial Academy of Japan*, vol. 13 (1937), pp. 93–94. The first part of the present proof is closely related to the first part of Kakutani's proof.

<sup>4</sup> See S. Mazur, *Über konvexen Mengen in linearen normierten Räumen*, *Studia Mathematica*, vol. 4 (1933), p. 74.

whence by the linearity of  $L$

$$a(L(y) - b) + (1 - a)(L(x_0) - b) \leq 0, \quad a \geq 0.$$

But  $L(y) - b = 0$ . Hence

$$(1 - a)(L(x_0) - b) \leq 0, \quad a \geq 0,$$

and since the factor  $(1 - a)$  can change sign, we must have

$$L(x_0) - b = 0.$$

Let  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  be convex bodies with no common inner points. Let  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  be inner points of  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ , respectively. There are unique boundary points  $x'_1$  and  $x'_2$  of  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  on the segment  $\overline{x_1x_2}$ . Consider the (perhaps degenerate) segment

$$L \equiv \overline{x'_1x'_2}.$$

Let  $L_1$  be the set of all points  $x \in L$  such that no segment joining  $x$  to an inner point of  $K_1$  contains an inner point of  $K_2$ . The set  $L_1$  is non-empty, since  $x'_1 \in L_1$ . Furthermore, since the complement of  $L_1$  in  $L$  is clearly open in  $L$ ,  $L_1$  is closed in  $L$ . Likewise, if  $L_2$  is analogously defined,  $L_2$  is a non-empty set closed in  $L$ .

Suppose there exists a point  $x \in L - (L_1 + L_2)$ . Then it is possible to join  $x$  to inner points  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  of  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  such that there exist inner points  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  of  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  lying on the (open) segments

$$\overline{xy_2}, \quad \overline{xy_1},$$

respectively. But then the segments

$$\overline{y_1z_1}, \quad \overline{y_2z_2}$$

intersect in a point  $z$  which is interior to both  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ , contradicting the hypothesis. Hence the supposition that  $L - (L_1 + L_2)$  is non-empty is false, and  $L = L_1 + L_2$ .

It now follows from the connectedness of  $L$  that there exists a point  $x_0 \in L_1 \cdot L_2$ . Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be the sets consisting of all points on rays from  $x_0$  through the inner points of  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ , respectively.

(3) *The sets  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are convex cones having no common points except  $x_0$ .*

The fact that  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are convex cones is evident. If  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  had a common point  $y \neq x_0$ , then on the ray from  $x_0$  through  $y$  there would have to be a point interior to  $K_1$  and a point interior to  $K_2$ , contradicting  $x_0 \in L_1 \cdot L_2$ .

Take the point  $x_0$  to be the origin  $\theta$ . Let  $C_1^-$  denote the reflection in the point  $\theta$  of the cone  $C_1$ : that is,  $C_1^-$  is the set of all points of the form  $-x$ ,  $x \in C_1$ . The set  $C_1^-$  is a convex cone with  $\theta$  as vertex. Let  $C$  denote the set of all points of the form

$$ax + (1 - a)y,$$

where  $x \in C_2$ ,  $y \in C_1^-$ , and  $0 \leq a \leq 1$ .

(4) *The set  $C$  is a convex cone with  $\theta$  as vertex. Furthermore,  $C$  contains no point interior to  $C_1$ .*

The first statement in (4) is easily verified. That the second holds is seen as follows. Any point of  $C$  is of the form

$$z = ax + (1 - a)y, \quad x \in C_2, y \in C_1^-, a \in [0, 1].$$

Let  $x_1$  be an inner point of  $C_1$ . From (3) it follows that on the segment  $\overline{xx_1}$  there is a boundary point  $x'_1$  of  $C_1$ . Now by (1)  $C_1$  has a supporting plane  $H_1$  passing through  $x'_1$ . Since the point  $x'_1$  of  $H_1$  is on the segment  $\overline{x_1x}$ , the points  $x_1$  and  $x$  lie in opposite closed half-spaces of  $H_1$ . Since  $x_1$  is interior to  $C_1$ ,  $x_1$  lies in the half-space of  $H_1$  containing  $C_1$ . Hence the set  $C_1$  and the point  $x$  lie in opposite closed half-spaces of  $H_1$ ; that is,  $C_1$  and  $x$  are separated by  $H_1$ . By (2)  $\theta \in H_1$ , so that  $C_1$  and  $y$  are separated by  $H_1$ . Hence  $H_1$  separates the sets  $C_1$  and  $\overline{xy}$ , and the point  $z$ , which is contained in  $\overline{xy}$ , cannot be interior to  $C_1$ .

From (4) and (1) it now follows that  $C$  has a plane of support  $H$  passing through the point  $\theta$ . But  $H$  is then a plane of support of  $C_2$ . Likewise it is a plane of support of  $C_1^-$  and hence of  $C_1$ . Since  $C_1^-$  and  $C_2$  are on the same side of  $H$ ,  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are separated by  $H$ . Therefore  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  are separated by  $H$ .