

Banach spaces with no proximal subspaces of codimension 2

C.J.Read

Department of Pure Mathematics, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK
solocavediver@gmail.com; <http://solocavediver.com/math>

Abstract

The classical theorem of Bishop-Phelps asserts that, for a Banach space X , the norm-achieving functionals in X^* are dense in X^* . Béla Bollobás's extension of the theorem gives a quantitative description of just how dense the norm-achieving functionals have to be: if $(x, \varphi) \in X \times X^*$ with $\|x\| = \|\varphi\| = 1$ and $|1 - \varphi(x)| < \varepsilon^2/4$ then there are $(x', \varphi') \in X \times X^*$ with $\|x'\| = \|\varphi'\| = 1$, $\|x - x'\| \vee \|\varphi - \varphi'\| < \varepsilon$ and $\varphi'(x') = 1$.

This means that there are always “proximal” hyperplanes $H \subset X$ (a nonempty subset E of a metric space is said to be “proximal” if, for $x \notin E$, the distance $d(x, E)$ is always achieved - there is always an $e \in E$ with $d(x, E) = d(x, e)$); for if $H = \ker \varphi$ ($\varphi \in X^*$) then it is easy to see that H is proximal if and only if φ is norm-achieving. Indeed the set of proximal hyperplanes H is, in the appropriate sense, dense in the set of all closed hyperplanes $H \subset X$.

Quite a long time ago [Problem 2.1 in his monograph “The Theory of Best approximation and Functional Analysis” Regional Conference series in Applied Mathematics, SIAM, 1974], Ivan Singer asked if this result generalized to closed subspaces of finite codimension - if every Banach space has a proximal subspace of codimension 2, for example. In this paper I will show that there is a Banach space X such that X has no proximal subspace of finite codimension $n \geq 2$. So we have a converse to Bishop-Phelps-Bollobás: a dense set of proximal hyperplanes can always be found, but proximal subspaces of larger, finite codimension need not be.

1 Introduction.

I'm grateful to David Blecher for awakening me to the joys of proximality in the context of operator algebras (norm-closed subalgebras of $B(H)$), and to Gilles Godefroy for alerting me to this particular problem.

The original Bishop-Phelps theorem is [1], and Bollobás' improved version of the theorem is [3]. The place where the problem solved in this paper was originally posed is in Ivan Singer [6]. Gilles Godefroy's exhaustive survey article on isometric preduals in Banach spaces, which discusses this problem among many others, is [5]. Our work with David Blecher involving proximality of ideals in operator algebras is [2]. This is a successful attempt to generalize, to a noncommutative setting, the classical Glicksberg peak set theorem in uniform algebras (Theorem 12.7 in Gamelin [4]).

All the Banach spaces in this paper are over the real field. At risk of stating the obvious, a proximal subset is necessarily closed; so we lose no generality later on by assuming that a (hypothetical) proximal subspace of finite codimension is the intersection of the kernels of finitely many continuous linear functionals.

Let $c_{00}(\mathbb{Q})$ denote the terminating sequences with rational coefficients (a much-loved countable set), and let $(\mathbf{u}_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of elements of $c_{00}(\mathbb{Q})$ which lists every element infinitely many times. For $\mathbf{x} \in c_{00}(\mathbb{Q})$, write $u^{-1}\{\mathbf{x}\}$ for the infinite set $\{k \in \mathbb{N} : \mathbf{u}_k = \mathbf{x}\}$.

Let $(a_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers. We impose a growth condition: if $\mathbf{u}_k \neq 0$, we demand that

$$a_k > \max \operatorname{supp} \mathbf{u}_k, \text{ and } a_k \geq \|\mathbf{u}_k\|_1, \quad (1)$$

where $\operatorname{supp} \mathbf{u}$ denotes the (finite) support of $\mathbf{u} \in c_{00}(\mathbb{Q})$, and $\|\mathbf{u}\|_1$ denotes the l^1 norm.

For $E \subset \mathbb{N}$ we write A_E for the set $\{a_k : k \in E\}$; for $\mathbf{x} \in c_{00}(\mathbb{Q})$ we write $A_{\mathbf{x}}$ for $A_{u^{-1}\{\mathbf{x}\}}$. $A_{\mathbf{x}}$ is an infinite set, and in view of (1), for each $\mathbf{x} \in c_{00}(\mathbb{Q}) \setminus \{0\}$ we have

$$\min A_{\mathbf{x}} > \max \operatorname{supp} \mathbf{x}, \quad \min A_{\mathbf{x}} \geq \|\mathbf{x}\|_1. \quad (2)$$

Given sequences (\mathbf{u}_k) , (a_k) as described above, we define a new norm $\|\cdot\|$ on c_0 as follows:

$$\|\mathbf{x}\| = \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-a_k^2} |\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle|. \quad (3)$$

Here $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 = \sup_n |x_n|$ is the usual norm on c_0 ; (e_j) are the unit vectors; and the duality $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle$ is the $\langle c_0, l^1 \rangle$ duality. Now in view of (1), we have $\|\mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k}\|_1 = 1 + \|\mathbf{u}_k\|_1 \leq 1 + a_k$, so $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-a_k^2} \|\mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k}\|_1 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-a_k^2} (1 + a_k) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 + n) \cdot 2^{-n^2} < 2$. Accordingly, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 3\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \quad (4)$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in c_0$. For our main theorem in this paper, we shall show:

Theorem 1.1 *The Banach space $(c_0, \|\cdot\|)$ has no proximal subspace H of finite codimension $n \geq 2$.*

2 Gâteaux derivatives

Recall that if X is a real vectorspace, $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \in X$ and $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then the Gâteaux derivative (of f , at \mathbf{x} , in direction \mathbf{u}) is defined as

$$df(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(\mathbf{x} + h\mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x})}{h}, \quad (5)$$

when that limit exists. We will make use of the one-sided forms of this derivative:

$$df_+(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(\mathbf{x} + h\mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x})}{h}, \quad (6)$$

and

$$df_-(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{f(\mathbf{x} + h\mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x})}{h}. \quad (7)$$

Obviously $df_-(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) = -df_+(\mathbf{x}; -\mathbf{u})$ for all f, \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} such that either derivative exists. Of particular interest to us is when $X = c_0$ and $f(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|$ as defined in (3) (the “usual” norm on c_0 will always be referred to as $\|\cdot\|_0$ in this paper). The derivatives $d_{\pm}f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})$ for this function f will be written $d_{\pm}\|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}\|$. Now it is a fact that the derivative $d_{\pm}\|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}\|$ exists everywhere. To see this, let us prove some small lemmas.

Lemma 2.1 *If $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0$ denotes the c_0 -norm, the derivative $d_+\|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}\|_0$ exists at all points $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \in c_0$. In fact, if $\mathbf{x} = 0$ then the derivative is $\|\mathbf{u}\|_0$; whereas if $\mathbf{x} \neq 0$, we may write $E_+ = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : |x_n| = \|\mathbf{x}\|_0, u_n x_n > 0\}$ and $E_- = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : |x_n| = \|\mathbf{x}\|_0, u_n x_n \leq 0\}$, and we have*

$$d_+\|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}\|_0 = \begin{cases} \max\{|u_n| : n \in E_+\}, & \text{if } E_+ \neq \emptyset; \\ -\min\{|u_n| : n \in E_-\}, & \text{if } E_+ = \emptyset, E_- \neq \emptyset. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Proof. This is an easy calculation which we omit (note that E_+ and E_- cannot both be empty!).

Lemma 2.2 *Let X be a Banach space and $\varphi \in X^*$. Then the Gâteaux derivative of $f(\mathbf{x}) = |\varphi(\mathbf{x})|$ exists at all points $(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) \in X \times X$. We have*

$$d_+f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) = f(\mathbf{u})\sigma(\varphi(\mathbf{u})\varphi(\mathbf{x})),$$

where the sign

$$\sigma(t) = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } t \geq 0; \\ -1, & \text{if } t < 0. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Proof. This is an even simpler calculation, which we also omit.

Definition 2.3 *For a real normed space X and a function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define the Lipschitz constant*

$$\text{Lip}_1 f = \sup\left\{\frac{|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{y})|}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|} : \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}\right\}. \quad (10)$$

Lemma 2.4 *Let X be a real normed space, and $(f_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ a sequence of functions from X to \mathbb{R} , such that $d_+ f_n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})$ exists at each $(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) \in X \times X$. Suppose $\sum_{n=0}^\infty \text{Lip}_1 f_n < \infty$, and $\sum_{n=0}^\infty f_n(0)$ converges. Then the function $f = \sum_{n=0}^\infty f_n$ exists everywhere on X , and $d_+ f = \sum_{n=0}^\infty d_+ f_n$ exists everywhere also.*

Proof. The sum $\sum_{n=0}^\infty f_n(\mathbf{x})$ converges because $\sum_{n=0}^\infty f_n(0)$ converges, and $|f_n(\mathbf{x}) - f_n(0)| \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \cdot \text{Lip}_1 f_n$ so $\sum_{n=0}^\infty f_n(\mathbf{x}) - f_n(0)$ converges also. Since $|d_+ f_n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})| \leq \|\mathbf{u}\| \cdot \text{Lip}_1 f_n$, we find that the sum $\sum_{n=0}^\infty d_+ f_n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})$ converges; we claim the sum is $d_+ f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})$. For given $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \neq 0$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, we can choose N so large that $\|\mathbf{u}\| \cdot \sum_{n=N+1}^\infty \text{Lip}_1 f_n < \varepsilon/3$, so

$$\left| \sum_{n=N+1}^\infty d_+ f_n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) \right| < \varepsilon/3 \quad (11)$$

and for every $h > 0$,

$$\left| \sum_{n=N+1}^\infty (f_n(\mathbf{x} + h\mathbf{u}) - f_n(\mathbf{x}))/h \right| \leq \|\mathbf{u}\| \cdot \sum_{n=N+1}^\infty \text{Lip}_1 f_n < \varepsilon/3 \quad (12)$$

also. As $h \rightarrow 0+$, we know $(\sum_{n=1}^N f_n(\mathbf{x} + h\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{n=1}^N f_n(\mathbf{x}))/h \rightarrow \sum_{n=1}^N d_+ f_n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})$, so we can choose $\delta > 0$ such that whenever $0 < h < \delta$, we have

$$\left| \left(\sum_{n=1}^N f_n(\mathbf{x} + h\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{n=1}^N f_n(\mathbf{x}) \right) / h - \sum_{n=1}^N d_+ f_n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) \right| < \varepsilon/3. \quad (13)$$

Adding up (11), (12) and (13), we find that whenever $0 < h < \delta$, we have $|(f(\mathbf{x} + h\mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x}))/h - \sum_{n=1}^\infty d_+ f_n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})| < \varepsilon$. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 2.5 *The new norm $\|\cdot\|$ on c_0 has a one-sided derivative $d_+ \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}\|$ everywhere. Furthermore,*

$$d_+ \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}\| = d_+ \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 + \sum_{k=1}^\infty 2^{-a_k^2} \sigma_k |\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle|, \quad (14)$$

where $\sigma_k = \sigma_k(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) = \sigma(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle)$, and the function σ is as in (9).

Proof. If we write $f_0(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_0$ and $f_k(\mathbf{x}) = 2^{-a_k^2} |\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle|$, then the Lipschitz constants for f_k are 1 (if $k = 0$) or $2^{-a_k^2} \|\mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k}\|_1 \leq (1 + a_k) \cdot 2^{-a_k^2}$ for $k > 0$. Accordingly $\sum_{k=0}^\infty \text{Lip}_1 f_k < \infty$, and the derivatives $d_+ f_k$ are given by Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2. We have $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \sum_{k=0}^\infty f_k(\mathbf{x})$ so $d_+ \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}\| = \sum_{n=0}^\infty d_+ f_n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})$ by Lemma 2.4. This sum works out to expression (14). \square

The key link between Gâteaux derivatives and proximality is as follows:

Lemma 2.6 *Suppose $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach space, $H \subset X$ a subspace, and suppose that for some $\mathbf{x} \in X \setminus H$, and $\mathbf{v} \in H$, the Gâteaux derivatives $d_{\pm}\|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\|$ both exist, are nonzero, and have the same sign. Then $\|\mathbf{x}\| \neq \inf\{\|\mathbf{y}\| : \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{x} + H\}$. \mathbf{x} is not a closest point to zero in the coset $\mathbf{x} + H$.*

Proof. We may consider $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + h\mathbf{v}$ for small nonzero $h \in \mathbb{R}$. Depending on the sign of h , the norm $\|\mathbf{y}\|$ is roughly $\|\mathbf{x}\| + h \cdot d_{\pm}\|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\|$. But the signs of $d_{\pm}\|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\|$ are the same, so if h is chosen correctly, we get $\|\mathbf{y}\| < \|\mathbf{x}\|$. \square

Corollary 2.7 *Suppose $H \subset X$ as in Lemma 2.6, and there is an $\mathbf{x} \in X \setminus H$ such that for every $\mathbf{z} \in H$, there is a $\mathbf{v} \in H$ such that the Gâteaux derivatives $d_{\pm}\|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}; \mathbf{v}\|$ exist, are nonzero, and have the same sign. Then H is not proximal in X .*

Proof. For in this case, there is no element $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{x} + H$ which achieves the minimum distance from that coset to zero. Equivalently, there is no element $\mathbf{z} \in H$ which achieves the minimum distance from H to $-\mathbf{x}$. H is not proximal. \square

3 Approximate linearity of d_{\pm}

It is a feature of the Gâteaux derivative $df(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})$ that it does not have to be linear in \mathbf{u} . This is of course also true of the single-sided derivatives df_{\pm} . So, in this section we develop a result asserting “approximate linearity” of $d_{\pm}\|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\|$ for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v} \in c_0$.

Definition 3.1 *Let $f : c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $d_+f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v})$ exists for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v} \in c_0$. Let $\mathbf{x} \in c_0$, and let $\gamma \in l^1$ be such that the support $E = \{i : \langle e_i, \gamma \rangle \neq 0\}$ is infinite. We shall say $d_+f(\mathbf{x})$ is approximately linear on E (and approximately equal to γ) if there is an “error sequence” $(\varepsilon_i)_{i \in E}$ with $\varepsilon_i > 0$, $\varepsilon_i \rightarrow 0$, such that for all $\mathbf{v} \in c_0$ with $\text{supp } \mathbf{v} \subset E$, we have*

$$|d_+f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}) - \langle \mathbf{v}, \gamma \rangle| \leq \sum_{i \in E} \varepsilon_i |v_i \gamma_i|. \quad (15)$$

Note that if \mathbf{v} is chosen so that $|\langle \mathbf{v}, \gamma \rangle| > \sum \varepsilon_i |v_i \gamma_i|$, then (15) implies that $d_+f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v})$ is nonzero, and has the same sign as $d_-f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}) = -d_+f(\mathbf{x}; -\mathbf{v})$.

Lemma 3.2 *Let $\mathbf{x} \in c_0$ be given, and $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_m \in c_0$ such that $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle \neq 0$ for any $j = 1, \dots, m$. Let $A_{\mathbf{z}_i} = A_{u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_i\}}$ as in §1, and let $A = \cup_{i=1}^m A_{\mathbf{z}_i}$. Then $d_+\|\mathbf{x}\|$ is approximately linear on a cofinite subset $A_0 \subset A$, the derivative being approximately equal to $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \gamma_i e_i^*$, where*

$$\gamma_i = \begin{cases} -2^{-a_k^2} \sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle) & \text{if } i = a_k \in A_0 \cap A_{\mathbf{z}_j} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

The error sequence $(\varepsilon_i)_{i \in A_0}$ can be taken to be

$$\varepsilon_i = 2^{a_k^2} \cdot \sum_{l=k+1}^{\infty} 2^{-a_l^2}, \quad i = a_k \in A_0. \quad (17)$$

Proof. Let \mathbf{v} be any vector supported on A . The error $\delta = d_+ \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\| - \langle \mathbf{v}, \gamma \rangle$ is given by (14) and (16); we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= d_+ \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\|_0 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_j\}} 2^{-a_k^2} \sigma_k |\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle| \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k \in u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_j\}} 2^{-a_k^2} \sigma_k |\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle| + v_{a_k} \sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $\sigma_k = \sigma(\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle)$.

Now by Lemma 2.1, the derivative $d_+ \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\|_0$ is zero unless $v_i \neq 0$ for some $i \in E = \{n : |x_n| = \|\mathbf{x}\|_0\}$. This set E is finite, and \mathbf{v} will be supported on A_0 ; so if we choose our cofinite set $A_0 \subset A$ so that $A_0 \cap E = \emptyset$, we have $d_+ \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\|_0 = 0$. If we also ensure that $A_0 \cap \text{supp } \mathbf{z}_j = \emptyset$ for each $j = 1, \dots, m$, we find that when \mathbf{v} is supported on A_0 , and $k \in u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_j\}$, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}_j - e_{a_k} \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{v}, e_{a_k} \rangle = -v_{a_k}. \quad (19)$$

So if we choose A_0 so that $A_0 \cap (E \cup_{j=1}^m \text{supp } \mathbf{z}_j) = \emptyset$, the expression (18) simplifies somewhat to

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_j\}} 2^{-a_k^2} \sigma_k |\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle| \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k \in u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_j\}} (\sigma_k |v_{a_k}| + v_{a_k} \sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle)); \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

and σ_k itself simplifies to $\sigma_k = \sigma(-\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j - e_{a_k} \rangle \cdot v_{a_k})$. Now $F_j = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : |\langle \mathbf{x}, e_{a_k} \rangle| \geq |\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle|\}$ is a finite set; we may thus also assume that A_0 does not meet any F_j . In that case, $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j - e_{a_k} \rangle$ is nonzero and has the same sign as $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle$, so $\sigma_k = -v_{a_k} \sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle)$. So the second term in (20) disappears, and we have

$$\delta = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_j\}} 2^{-a_k^2} \sigma_k |\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}_k - e_{a_k} \rangle|. \quad (21)$$

Even better, \mathbf{v} is supported on $A = a \cdot \cup_{j=1}^m u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_j\}$, so all terms $\langle \mathbf{v}, e_{a_k} \rangle$ are zero in (21), and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_j\}} 2^{-a_l^2} \sigma_l |\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}_l \rangle|; \\ |\delta| &\leq \sum_{i \in A_0} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_j\}} 2^{-a_l^2} |v_i| \cdot |\langle e_i, \mathbf{u}_l \rangle|. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Now in every case when $i \in A_0$ we have $i = a_k$ for some $k \in u^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}_j\}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$. If $\langle e_{a_k}, \mathbf{u}_l \rangle \neq 0$ then the support $\text{supp } \mathbf{u}_k$ is not contained in $[0, a_k)$. But if $l \leq k$ then the support of \mathbf{u}_l is contained in $[0, a_k)$ by (1). So $k < l$ in every case when $\langle e_{a_k}, \mathbf{u}_l \rangle \neq 0$. Accordingly,

$$|\delta| \leq \sum_{i=a_k \in A_0} \sum_{l>k} 2^{-a_l^2} |v_i| \cdot |\langle e_i, \mathbf{u}_l \rangle| \leq \sum_{i=a_k \in A_0} \sum_{l>k} 2^{-a_l^2} \cdot a_l \cdot |v_i|$$

because $\|\mathbf{u}_l\|_1 \leq a_l$ by (1) again. Now for $i = a_k \in A_0$, we have $|\gamma_i| = 2^{-a_k^2}$ by (16); so writing $\varepsilon_i = 2^{a_k^2} \cdot \sum_{l=k+1}^{\infty} 2^{-a_l^2}$ as in (17), we have $\varepsilon_i \rightarrow 0$ and

$$|\delta| = |d_+ \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\| - \langle \mathbf{v}, \gamma \rangle| \leq \sum_{i \in A_0} \varepsilon_i |v_i \gamma_i|$$

exactly as in (15). So $d_+ \|\mathbf{x}\|$ is approximately linear on a cofinite subset $A_0 \subset A$, with the derivative $\gamma \in l^1$ given by (16), and the error sequence (ε_i) given by (17). \square

4 Using the Hahn-Banach Theorem.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $H \subset c_0$ be a closed subspace of finite codimension, say $H = \bigcap_{i=1}^N \ker \varphi_i$, where each $\varphi_i \in l^1$. Let $\mathbf{x} \notin H$ be an element of minimum norm in the coset $\mathbf{x} + H$, and let $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_m \in c_{00}$ be such that $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle \neq 0$ for any $j = 1, \dots, m$. Let $A_0 \subset A = \bigcup_{j=1}^m A_{\mathbf{z}_j}$ be a cofinite subset satisfying the conditions of Lemma 3.2, and let $\gamma \in l^1$ be the approximate derivative as in Lemma 3.2, $(\varepsilon_i)_{i \in A_0}$ the error sequence as in (17). Then there is a $\varphi \in \text{lin}\{\varphi_j : i \leq j \leq m\}$ such that for every $i \in A_0$, we have*

$$|\langle e_i, \varphi \rangle - \gamma_i| \leq \varepsilon_i |\gamma_i|. \quad (23)$$

Proof. We consider the weak-* topology on l^1 with respect to its usual predual, c_0 . The set $G = \{\varphi \in l^1 : |\langle e_i, \varphi \rangle - \gamma_i| \leq \varepsilon_i |\gamma_i| \text{ (all } i \in A_0)\}$, and $\langle e_i, \varphi \rangle = 0$ (all $i \notin A_0$) is a weak-* compact convex set. The set $\Phi = \text{lin}\{\varphi_i, i = 1, \dots, N\} + \overline{\text{lin}}\{e_j : j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus A_0\} \subset l^1$ is a weak-* closed subspace, because it is $\{\varphi \in l^1 : \varphi(\mathbf{u}) = 0 \text{ for every } \mathbf{u} \in c_0 \text{ supported on } A_0, \text{ such that } \varphi_i(\mathbf{u}) = 0 \text{ (} i = 1, \dots, N)\}$.

If $\Phi \cap G \neq \emptyset$, then the assertion of the Lemma is satisfied. If $\Phi \cap G = \emptyset$, then the Hahn-Banach Separation Lemma tells us that there is a weak-* continuous $\mathbf{v} \in l^\infty$ separating them; of course the weak-* continuity means that $\mathbf{v} \in c_0$. We may assume $\langle \varphi, \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$ for $\varphi \in \Phi$, but $\langle \varphi, \mathbf{v} \rangle \geq 1$ whenever $\varphi \in G$. Since \mathbf{v} annihilates Φ , the support of \mathbf{v} is contained in A_0 . By approximate linearity of $d_+ \|\mathbf{x}\|$, from (15) we have

$$|d_+ \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\| - \langle \mathbf{v}, \gamma \rangle| \leq \sum_{i \in A_0} \varepsilon_i |v_i \gamma_i|; \quad (24)$$

and the same is true with d_+ replaced by d_- . We cannot have $d_+ \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\|$ and $d_- \|\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{v}\|$ the same sign, or Lemma 2.6 would tell us \mathbf{x} does not

have minimum norm in the coset $\mathbf{x} + H$. So, as observed after (15), we must have

$$|\langle \mathbf{v}, \gamma \rangle| \leq \sum_{i \in A_0} \varepsilon_i |v_i \gamma_i|. \quad (25)$$

Let us write $\eta = \langle \mathbf{v}, \gamma \rangle / \sum_{i \in A_0} \varepsilon_i |v_i \gamma_i| \in [-1, 1]$ (noting that the denominator cannot be zero since ε_i, γ_i are never zero for $i \in A_0$, and $\mathbf{v} \neq 0$ is supported on A_0). Define a new $\varphi \in l^1$ by

$$\langle e_i, \varphi \rangle = \begin{cases} \gamma_i(1 - \eta \varepsilon_i \sigma(v_i \gamma_i)), & \text{if } i \in A_0; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

We then have $|\langle e_i, \varphi \rangle - \gamma_i| \leq \varepsilon_i |\gamma_i|$ ($i \in A_0$), so $\varphi \in G$, yet

$$\langle \mathbf{v}, \varphi \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}, \gamma \rangle - \eta \cdot \sum_{i \in A_0} \varepsilon_i v_i \gamma_i \sigma(v_i \gamma_i) = 0. \quad (27)$$

This contradicts the Hahn-Banach separation of \mathbf{v} , which asserts that for such φ we should have $\langle \mathbf{v}, \varphi \rangle \geq 1$. Thus the Lemma is proved. \square

Let us now begin to use our information to investigate proximal subspaces. If $i = a_l$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we shall write $\alpha_i = 2^{-a_l^2}$.

Theorem 4.2 *Let $H \subset (c_0, \|\cdot\|)$ be a proximal subspace of finite codimension, say $H = \bigcap_{i=1}^N \ker \varphi_i$, where $\varphi_i \in l^1$. Let $\mathbf{z}_j \in c_{00}$ ($j = 1, \dots, m$), and $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^m A_{\mathbf{z}_i}$. Write $\Phi = \text{lin}\{\varphi_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$, and let*

$$\Phi_0 = \{\varphi \in \Phi : \sup\{\alpha_i^{-1} |\langle e_i, \varphi \rangle| : i \in A\} < \infty\}. \quad (28)$$

Let $\theta_0 : \Phi_0 \rightarrow l^\infty(A)$ be the linear map such that

$$(\theta_0 \varphi)_i = \alpha_i^{-1} \langle e_i, \varphi \rangle \quad (i \in A); \quad (29)$$

and let $q : l^\infty(A) \rightarrow l^\infty(A)/c_0(A)$ be the quotient map. Write $\theta = q\theta_0$. Let $\mathbf{x} \in H$ be an element such that $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ is minimal in the coset $\mathbf{x} + H$, and suppose $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_i \rangle \neq 0$ for any $i = 1, \dots, m$. Then the image $\theta\Phi_0$ includes the vector $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}} + c_0(A) \in l^\infty(A)/c_0(A)$, where

$$(\sigma_{\mathbf{x}})_i = \sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle) \text{ if } i \in A_{\mathbf{z}_j}, j = 1, \dots, m. \quad (30)$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, there is a $\varphi \in \Phi$ such that for all but finitely many $i \in A$, we have $|\langle e_i, \varphi \rangle - \gamma_i| \leq \varepsilon_i |\gamma_i|$, where for $i = a_l \in A_{\mathbf{z}_j}$ we define $\gamma_i = -2^{-a_l^2} \sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle) = -\alpha_i \sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle)$. Since $\varepsilon_i \rightarrow 0$ it is clear that $\sup\{\alpha_i^{-1} |\langle e_i, \varphi \rangle|\} < \infty$, so $\varphi \in \Phi_0$, and the image $\theta\varphi$ is the vector $-\sigma_{\mathbf{x}} + c_0(A)$, because for $i = a_l \in A_{\mathbf{z}_j}$ we have $(\theta_0 \varphi)_i = \alpha_i^{-1} \langle e_i, \varphi \rangle \in -\sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle) + [-\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i]$. So, $\theta(-\varphi) = \sigma_{\mathbf{x}} + c_0(A)$. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Suppose towards a contradiction that $H \subset (c_0, \|\cdot\|)$ is a proximal subspace of finite codimension $N \geq 2$. Any proximal subspace must be closed, so let us say $H = \bigcap_{i=1}^N \ker \varphi_i$, where the $\varphi_i \in l^1$ are linearly independent. For $r = 0, \dots, N+1$, let us write $\beta_r = r\pi/(2N+2)$, and

for $r = 1, \dots, N + 1$ let us pick $\mathbf{x}^{(r)} \in c_0$ such that $\langle \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \varphi_1 \rangle = \cos \beta_r$, and $\langle \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \varphi_2 \rangle = \sin \beta_r$. Perturbing each $\mathbf{x}^{(r)}$ by an element of H as necessary, we can assume that each $\|\mathbf{x}^{(r)}\|$ is minimal in the coset $\mathbf{x}^{(r)} + H$. Writing $\zeta_r = (\beta_r + \beta_{r-1})/2$ ($r = 1, \dots, N + 1$), we define the linear functional $\psi_r = \sin \zeta_r \cdot \varphi_1 - \cos \zeta_r \cdot \varphi_2$, so

$$\langle \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \psi_s \rangle = \sin \zeta_s \cos \beta_r - \cos \zeta_s \sin \beta_r = \sin(\zeta_s - \beta_r);$$

thus $\langle \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \psi_s \rangle > 0$ if $s > r$, but $\langle \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \psi_s \rangle < 0$ if $s \leq r$.

Pick a finite sequence $(\mathbf{z}_r)_{r=1}^{N+1} \subset c_{00}$ with $\|\mathbf{z}_r - \psi_r\|_1$ sufficiently small, and we will also find that $\langle \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{z}_s \rangle > 0$ if $s > r$, but $\langle \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{z}_s \rangle < 0$ if $s \leq r$. We find that the sequence $(\sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{z}_s \rangle))_{s=1}^{N+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ is the vector $\mathbf{y}_r = (-1, -1, \dots, -1, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$, where there are r entries -1 followed by $N + 1 - r$ entries $+1$. It is a fact that the \mathbf{y}_r span \mathbb{R}^{N+1} - they are linearly independent.

We can apply Theorem 4.2 with the sequence $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{N+1}$, and \mathbf{x} can be any of the vectors $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(N+1)}$. The map θ is the same for each $\mathbf{x}^{(r)}$ (because the sequence α_i doesn't change, only the signs $\sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{z}_s \rangle)$). Writing $A = \cup_{j=1}^{N+1} A_{\mathbf{z}_j}$, we find that the image $\theta\Phi_0$ must contain, for each $r = 1, \dots, N + 1$, the vector $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}^{(r)}} + c_0(A)$ with

$$(\sigma_{\mathbf{x}^{(r)}})_i = \sigma(\langle \mathbf{x}^{(r)}, \mathbf{z}_j \rangle) = \langle \mathbf{y}_r, e_j \rangle \text{ for all } i \in A_{\mathbf{z}_j}. \quad (31)$$

(where here $(e_j)_{j=1}^{N+1}$ denote the unit vector basis of \mathbb{R}^{N+1}). Because the vectors \mathbf{y}_r are independent, the dimension of $\theta\Phi_0$ must be at least $N + 1$. However $\Phi_0 \subset \Phi$, and $\dim \Phi = N$. This contradiction implies that H is not proximal. \square

References

- [1] Bishop, E. and Phelps, R. R., A proof that every Banach space is subreflexive, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **67** (1961), 97-98.
- [2] Blecher, David P. and Read, Charles John, Operator algebras with contractive approximate identities, II. *J. Funct. Anal.* **264** (2013), no. 4, 1049-1067.
- [3] Bollobás, B., An extension to the theorem of Bishop and Phelps, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **2** (1970) 181-182.
- [4] Gamelin, T.W., Uniform Algebras, second edition, Chelsea, New York, 1984.
- [5] Godefroy, Gilles, Existence and Uniqueness of isometric preduals: a survey. *Contemporary Mathematics* **85** (1989) 131-193.
- [6] Singer, Ivan The theory of best approximation and functional analysis. *Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics* **13**. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, Pa., 1974.