

The rational Gurarii space and its linear isometry group

Ondřej Kurka Maciej Malicki

Abstract

We show that the linear isometry group of the rational Gurarii space does not have a comeager conjugacy class. This is because the class of partial isometries in rational polyhedral spaces does not have the weak amalgamation property. Our methods demonstrate also that the class of rational polyhedral spaces does not have the Hrushovski property.

1 Introduction

This note is motivated by a question posed by Sabok [8] whether the linear isometry group $\text{LIso}(\mathbf{G})$ of the Gurarii space \mathbf{G} has the automatic continuity property. Recall that a Polish (i.e., separable and completely metrizable) group G has the automatic continuity property if all its homomorphisms into separable topological groups are continuous. Automatic continuity connects the algebraic and the topological structure of a group; in particular, it implies the uniqueness of its Polish topology.

Automatic continuity was first studied in the context of C^* -algebras and Banach algebras. For example, Sakai [8], proving a conjecture of Kaplansky [2], showed that any derivation on a C^* -algebra is norm-continuous. Johnson and Sinclair [1] showed automatic continuity for derivations on semi-simple Banach algebras. More recently, Tsankov [10] investigated automatic continuity for the unitary group $U(\mathbf{H})$ of the separable Hilbert space \mathbf{H} , and Sabok [8] did the same for the isometry group $\text{Iso}(\mathbf{U})$ of the Urysohn space \mathbf{U} . In that paper, he developed a general framework (see also [4] for a similar but simpler approach), where properties of automorphism groups of complete metric structures are

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): 54H11, 46B20, 03E15

Keywords: rational Gurarii space, linear isometry group, conjugacy classes, weak amalgamation property

The first named author was supported by the Czech Science Foundation, project no. GAČR 22-07833K, and by the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (RVO 67985840). The second author was partially supported by the National Center of Science, Poland under the Weave-UNISONO call in the Weave programme [grant no 2021/03/Y/ST1/00072].

studied via certain countable substructures, and their automorphism groups. Ultimately, his proof relies on a result proved by Solecki [9] that the class \mathcal{U}_0 of finite metric spaces with rational distances has the Hrushovski property, hence, the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{U}_0)$ of the rational Urysohn space \mathbf{U}_0 , which is the Fraïssé limit of \mathcal{U}_0 , has the automatic continuity property. As a matter of fact, an intermediate property, called ample generics, plays a crucial role there. Recall that a Polish group G has ample generics if it has a comeager diagonal n -conjugacy class for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., there exists a comeager orbit under the action of G on G^n by diagonal conjugation. It was proved by Kechris and Rosendal [3] that a group with ample generics has the automatic continuity property. Let us mention that Tsankov's work on $U(\mathbf{H})$ also requires that certain countable counterpart of the separable Hilbert space, studied by Rosendal [6], has ample generics.

The Gurarii space \mathbf{G} is the unique separable Banach space that contains a copy of every finite-dimensional Banach space, and is approximately ultrahomogeneous. In the context of automatic continuity, and the methods developed by Sabok, it is natural to consider the rational Gurarii space \mathbf{G}_0 , defined as the Fraïssé limit of the class \mathcal{N}_0 of finite-dimensional linear spaces over the rationals with rational polyhedral norms. Its completion is the Gurarii space, analogously to the relationship between the rational Urysohn space and the Urysohn space. Interesting in its own right, it could also prove helpful as a tool in studying the Gurarii space and its linear isometry group. However, as we show in this note, the class \mathcal{N}_0 does not have the Hrushovski property. As a matter of fact, $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{G}_0)$ does not have a comeager conjugacy class. These results suggest that Sabok's approach may not work for the Gurarii space. On the other hand, perhaps some other notion of rational Gurarii space would turn out more suitable for this purpose.

2 Fraïssé classes

In model theory, a structure M is a set with relations, functions, and constants. The symbols denoting these objects, together with their arities, are referred to as the signature of M . It is well known that the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(M)$ of a countable structure M , with the topology inherited from M^M , where M is regarded as a discrete space, is a Polish group.

Let \mathcal{K} be a class of finitely generated structures in a fixed signature that is countable up to isomorphism, and closed under isomorphism. We say that \mathcal{K} is hereditary if it is closed under taking substructures. It is directed if any two $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$ can be embedded into a single $C \in \mathcal{K}$; it has amalgamation if for every $A, B, C \in \mathcal{K}$ and embeddings $\alpha: A \rightarrow B$ and $\beta: A \rightarrow C$ there is $D \in \mathcal{K}$ and embeddings $\gamma: B \rightarrow D$, $\delta: C \rightarrow D$ such that $\gamma \circ \alpha = \delta \circ \beta$. Finally, \mathcal{K} has weak amalgamation if for every $A \in \mathcal{K}$ there is $A' \in \mathcal{K}$ and an embedding $\phi: A \rightarrow A'$ such that for every $B, C \in \mathcal{K}$ and embeddings $\alpha: A' \rightarrow B$, $\beta: A' \rightarrow C$ there is $D \in \mathcal{K}$ and embeddings $\gamma: B \rightarrow D$, $\delta: C \rightarrow D$ such that $\gamma \circ \alpha \circ \phi = \delta \circ \beta \circ \phi$. The class \mathcal{K} is called a Fraïssé class if it is hereditary, directed, and has amalgamation.

By the classical theorem due to Fraïssé, if \mathcal{K} is a Fraïssé class, then there exists a unique up to isomorphism countable structure M such that \mathcal{K} is the class of finitely generated structures embeddable in M , and M has the extension property, i.e., for any $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$ with $A \subseteq B$, and embedding $\alpha : A \rightarrow M$, there is an embedding $\beta : B \rightarrow M$ that extends α . We call this M the Fraïssé limit of \mathcal{K} .

A class \mathcal{K} of structures has the n -Hrushovski property, if for any $A \in \mathcal{K}$, and any n -tuple f_1, \dots, f_n of partial automorphisms of A , there exists $B \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $A \subseteq B$, and every f_i can be extended to an automorphism of B . The class \mathcal{K} has the Hrushovski property if it has the n -Hrushovski property for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

For a class \mathcal{K} of structures, let \mathcal{K}_1 be the class of all partial automorphisms of elements from \mathcal{K} , i.e., pairs $(A, f : B \rightarrow C)$ such that $A, B, C \in \mathcal{K}$, $B, C \subseteq A$, and f is an isomorphism between B and C . Then $\alpha : A \rightarrow A'$ is an embedding of $(A, f : B \rightarrow C)$ into $(A', f' : B' \rightarrow C')$ if it embeds A into A' and $\alpha \circ f \subseteq f' \circ \alpha$. In the same way, we define classes \mathcal{K}_n of elements of the form $(A, f_1 : B_1 \rightarrow C_1, \dots, f_n : B_n \rightarrow C_n)$, where $A \in \mathcal{K}$ and f_i are partial automorphisms of A . Directedness, amalgamation and weak amalgamation can be defined for \mathcal{K}_n analogously to \mathcal{K} .

We say that a Polish group G has a dense (non-meager, etc.) diagonal n -conjugacy class if there is a dense (non-meager, etc.) orbit in the action of G on G^n defined by $g \cdot (g_1, \dots, g_n) = (gg_1g^{-1}, \dots, gg_ng^{-1})$, $g, g_1, \dots, g_n \in G$. The group G has ample generics if it has a comeager diagonal n -conjugacy class for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The following characterization was proved for Fraïssé limits of classes \mathcal{K} of finite structures in [3], and generalized to classes \mathcal{K} of finitely generated structures (and any countable structures M) in [5]:

Theorem 2.1. *Let M be the Fraïssé limit of a Fraïssé class \mathcal{K} .*

1. *There exists a dense diagonal n -conjugacy class in $\text{Aut}(M)$ iff \mathcal{K}_n is directed,*
2. *there exists a non-meager diagonal n -conjugacy class in $\text{Aut}(M)$ iff \mathcal{K}_n has weak amalgamation.*

3 Two classes of linear spaces

Let L be the signature consisting of functional symbols $f_{q_1, \dots, q_n}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $q_i \in \mathbb{Q}$, and a constant symbol $\mathbf{0}$. Let N be the signature obtained by expanding L by unary relational symbols $\|\cdot\|_q$, $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. Every linear space V over \mathbb{Q} can be regarded as a structure in the signature L by defining functions $f_{q_1, \dots, q_n}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = q_1x_1 + \dots + q_nx_n$, and $\mathbf{0}$ as the zero vector. Analogously, a linear space over \mathbb{Q} with a rational norm $\|\cdot\|$ can be regarded as a structure in the signature N by putting $\|x\|_q$ iff $\|x\| = q$.

Let \mathcal{L}_0 be the class of finitely-dimensional linear spaces over \mathbb{Q} , and with linear embeddings as morphisms. Let \mathcal{N}_0 be the class of finitely-dimensional

linear spaces over \mathbb{Q} with rational polyhedral norms, and with linear isometric embeddings as morphisms. The following is well known and easy to verify:

Proposition 3.1. \mathcal{L}_0 and \mathcal{N}_0 are directed and have amalgamation, i.e., they are Fraïssé classes.

The Fraïssé limit \mathbf{L}_0 of \mathcal{L}_0 is the infinite-dimensional countable linear space over \mathbb{Q} . The Fraïssé limit \mathbf{G}_0 of \mathcal{N}_0 is a normed linear space over \mathbb{Q} that we will call the rational Gurarii space. Clearly, $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{L}_0)$ is the linear isomorphism group of \mathbf{L}_0 , and $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{G}_0)$ is the linear isometry group of \mathbf{G}_0 .

Recall that the Gurarii space is a separable Banach space \mathbf{G} having the property that for any $\epsilon > 0$, finite dimensional Banach spaces $E \subseteq F$, and isometric embedding $\phi : E \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$, there is a linear embedding $\Phi : F \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$ extending ϕ such that in addition $(1 - \epsilon) \|x\| < \|\Phi(x)\| < (1 + \epsilon) \|x\|$, for all $x \in F \setminus \{0\}$. Observe that, since \mathbf{G}_0 has the extension property, we have:

Proposition 3.2. The completion \mathbf{G} of \mathbf{G}_0 is the Gurarii space.

First, we point out that $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{L}_0)$, similarly to $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{H}_0)$, where \mathbf{H}_0 is a countable counterpart of the separable Hilbert space studied in [6], has ample generics.

Proposition 3.3. The class \mathcal{L}_0 has the Hrushovski property. In particular, $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{L}_0)$ has ample generics.

Proof. We show that \mathcal{L}_0 has the n -Hrushovski property for $n = 1$. The proof for $n > 1$ is analogous. Fix $(X, f : E \rightarrow F) \in (\mathcal{L}_0)_1$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $E \cup F$ generates X . Fix a basis x_0, \dots, x_n in X such that, for some $j, k \leq n$, $\{x_0, \dots, x_k\}$ spans E , and $\{x_j, \dots, x_n\}$ spans F (i.e., $\{x_j, \dots, x_k\}$ spans $E \cap F$). We extend f by putting $f^{-1}(x_i) = f(x_{n-i})$ for $i < j$.

It follows that there is a cofinal family in $(\mathcal{L}_0)_1$ with amalgamation, so, in particular, $(\mathcal{L}_0)_1$ has weak amalgamation. Indeed, for $(A, f : B \rightarrow C) \in (\mathcal{L}_0)_1$, fix $(A_0, f_0 : A_0 \rightarrow A_0) \in (\mathcal{L}_0)_1$ such that f_0 extends f . Then, for any $(A_1, f_1 : B_1 \rightarrow C_1), (A_2, f_2 : B_2 \rightarrow C_2) \in (\mathcal{L}_0)_1$ such that f_1, f_2 extend f_0 , we can assume that $A_1 \cap A_2 = A_0$. Write $A_1 = A_0 \oplus A'_1$, $f_1 = (f_0, f'_1)$, $A_2 = A_0 \oplus A'_2$, $f_2 = (f_0, f'_2)$. It is immediate that $(A_0 \oplus A'_1 \oplus A'_2, (f_0, f'_1, f'_2))$ is the required amalgam. Note that directedness amounts to amalgamation over the trivial space, so $(\mathcal{L}_0)_1$ is directed as well.

In the same way, we can show that $(\mathcal{L}_0)_n$ is directed and has weak amalgamation for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., by Theorem 2.1, that $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{L}_0)$ has ample generics. \square

Theorem 3.4. The class \mathcal{N}_0 does not have the 1-Hrushovski property, and $(\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ does not have weak amalgamation. In particular, $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{G}_0)$ does not have a comeager conjugacy class.

Proof. The major part of the proof that $(\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ does not have weak amalgamation will be accomplished in the next section, where we prove Lemma 4.1. According to this lemma, it is sufficient to find an example of $\mathcal{O} = (C, f : A \rightarrow B)$ for which there is no extension D of C that admits an extension $g : D \rightarrow D$ of f that is a surjective linear isometry. Such an example demonstrates at the same

time that \mathcal{N}_0 does not have the 1-Hrushovski property. Although the following example is quite simple, perhaps it is not clear where the method comes from. A kind of clarification will be provided later in Proposition 3.5.

Let $C = \mathbb{Q}^2$ with the norm $\|(x, y)\| = |x| + |y|$. Let $A = \{(t, 0) : t \in \mathbb{Q}\}$, $B = \{(t, t) : t \in \mathbb{Q}\}$ and $f(t, 0) = (\frac{1}{2}t, \frac{1}{2}t)$, $t \in \mathbb{Q}$. Assume that suitable D and g exist. Since the norm of D is polyhedral, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^n = id_D$. Let us consider $a_i = (2^{-i}, 0)$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Then

$$\|a_0 - f(a_{n-1})\| = \|(1, 0) - (\frac{1}{2}2^{-(n-1)}, \frac{1}{2}2^{-(n-1)})\| = |1 - 2^{-n}| + 2^{-n} = 1,$$

$$\|a_{i+1} - f(a_i)\| = \|(2^{-(i+1)}, 0) - (\frac{1}{2}2^{-i}, \frac{1}{2}2^{-i})\| = |2^{-(i+1)} - 2^{-(i+1)}| + 2^{-(i+1)} = 2^{-(i+1)}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = \|a_0 - f(a_{n-1})\| &= \|g^n(a_0) - g(a_{n-1})\| = \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} g^{n-i}(a_i) - g^{n-(i+1)}(a_{i+1}) \right\| \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \|g^{n-i}(a_i) - g^{n-(i+1)}(a_{i+1})\| = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \|g(a_i) - a_{i+1}\| = \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \|f(a_i) - a_{i+1}\| = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} 2^{-(i+1)} = 1 - 2^{-(n-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. □

In the next proposition, we provide more aspects of the results stated in Theorem 3.4.

Proposition 3.5. *For every $\mathcal{O} = (C, f : A \rightarrow B) \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$, the following assertions are equivalent:*

(1) *There exist $\mathcal{O}_1 \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ and a morphism $i : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_1$ such that for any $\mathcal{O}_2, \mathcal{O}_3 \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ and morphisms $j : \mathcal{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_2$, $k : \mathcal{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_3$, there are $\mathcal{O}_4 \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ and morphisms $\tilde{j} : \mathcal{O}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_4$, $\tilde{k} : \mathcal{O}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_4$ such that $\tilde{j} \circ j \circ i = \tilde{k} \circ k \circ i$.*

(2) *There exists $(E, g : E \rightarrow E) \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ such that E extends C , and g extends f .*

(3) *There exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$, we have*

$$\|a_0 - f(a_{n-1})\| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \|a_{i+1} - f(a_i)\|.$$

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): This is nothing but Lemma 4.1.

(2) \Rightarrow (1): We put $\mathcal{O}_1 = (E, g : E \rightarrow E)$ and $i = id_C : C \rightarrow E$. Let $\mathcal{O} = (C_2, f_2 : A_2 \rightarrow B_2)_2$, $\mathcal{O}_3 = (C_3, f_3 : A_3 \rightarrow B_3) \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ and morphisms $j : \mathcal{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_2$, $k : \mathcal{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_3$ be given. Considering the norm $\|(c_2, c_3)\| = \|c_2\| + \|c_3\|$ on $C_2 \oplus C_3$, we define

$$C_4 = (C_2 \oplus C_3)/N, \quad \text{where } N = \{(j(e), -k(e)) : e \in E\},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{j} &: C_2 \rightarrow C_4, & \tilde{j}(c_2) &= (c_2, 0) + N, & c_2 &\in C_2, \\
\tilde{k} &: C_3 \rightarrow C_4, & \tilde{k}(c_3) &= (0, c_3) + N, & c_3 &\in C_3, \\
A_4 &= \text{span}(\tilde{j}(A_2) \cup \tilde{k}(A_3)), & B_4 &= \text{span}(\tilde{j}(B_2) \cup \tilde{k}(B_3)).
\end{aligned}$$

To show that

$$f_4(\tilde{j}(a_2)) = \tilde{j}(f_2(a_2)), \quad a_2 \in A_2, \quad f_4(\tilde{k}(a_3)) = \tilde{k}(f_3(a_3)), \quad a_3 \in A_3,$$

well-defines a linear mapping f_4 on A_4 , we need to check that

$$\tilde{j}(a_2) = \tilde{k}(a_3) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \tilde{j}(f_2(a_2)) = \tilde{k}(f_3(a_3)),$$

or equivalently $(a_2, -a_3) \in N \Rightarrow (f_2(a_2), -f_3(a_3)) \in N$ for $a_2 \in A_2, a_3 \in A_3$. For $(a_2, -a_3) \in N$, there is $e \in E$ such that $a_2 = j(e)$ and $a_3 = k(e)$, and so $(f_2(a_2), -f_3(a_3)) = (f_2(j(e)), -f_3(k(e))) = (j(g(e)), -k(g(e))) \in N$. Thus, f_4 is well defined indeed. Let us show that it is an isometry of A_4 onto B_4 . Clearly, $f_4(A_4) \subseteq B_4$, and concerning the opposite inclusion $B_4 \subseteq f_4(A_4)$, for $b_4 \in B_4$ of the form $b_4 = \tilde{j}(b_2) + \tilde{k}(b_3)$, we can put $a_4 = \tilde{j}(f_2^{-1}(b_2)) + \tilde{k}(f_3^{-1}(b_3))$ and obtain $f_4(a_4) = b_4$. Further, let us pick $a_4 \in A_4$, so it is of the form

$$a_4 = \tilde{j}(a_2) + \tilde{k}(a_3) = (a_2, a_3) + N,$$

while

$$f_4(a_4) = \tilde{j}(f_2(a_2)) + \tilde{k}(f_3(a_3)) = (f_2(a_2), f_3(a_3)) + N.$$

Since g is a surjective linear isometry on E , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_4(a_4)\| &= \inf_{e \in E} (\|f_2(a_2) + j(e)\| + \|f_3(a_3) - k(e)\|) \\
&= \inf_{e \in E} (\|f_2(a_2) + j(g(e))\| + \|f_3(a_3) - k(g(e))\|) \\
&= \inf_{e \in E} (\|f_2(a_2) + f_2(j(e))\| + \|f_3(a_3) - f_3(k(e))\|) \\
&= \inf_{e \in E} (\|a_2 + j(e)\| + \|a_3 - k(e)\|) \\
&= \|a_4\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, let us check that the choice $\mathcal{O}_4 = (C_4, f_4 : A_4 \rightarrow B_4)$ works. For $c_2 \in C_2$, we have

$$\|\tilde{j}(c_2)\| = \|(c_2, 0) + N\| = \inf_{e \in E} (\|c_2 + j(e)\| + \|k(e)\|) = \|c_2\|.$$

Analogously, $\|\tilde{k}(c_3)\| = \|c_3\|$ for $c_3 \in C_3$, and it follows from the definition of f_4 that both \tilde{j} and \tilde{k} are morphisms. Finally, for $e \in E$,

$$(\tilde{j} \circ j)(e) = (j(e), 0) + N = (0, k(e)) + N = (\tilde{k} \circ k)(e),$$

in particular, $\tilde{j} \circ j \circ i = \tilde{k} \circ k \circ i$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): Since the norm of E is polyhedral, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^n = id_E$. Given $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$, we denote $x_i = g^{n-i}(a_i)$, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \|a_0 - f(a_{n-1})\| &= \|g^n(a_0) - g(a_{n-1})\| = \|x_0 - x_{n-1}\| = \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} x_i - x_{i+1} \right\| \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \|x_i - x_{i+1}\| = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \|g^{n-i}(a_i) - g^{n-i-1}(a_{i+1})\| = \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \|g(a_i) - a_{i+1}\| = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \|f(a_i) - a_{i+1}\|. \end{aligned}$$

(3) \Rightarrow (2): Let E_0 be the space C^n with the norm $\|(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1})\| = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \|c_i\|$, and with the isometry

$$g_0 : (c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \mapsto (c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}, c_0).$$

Let N be the subspace of E_0 generated by vectors of the form

$$(0, \dots, 0, a, -f(a), 0, \dots, 0),$$

respectively,

$$(-f(a), 0, \dots, 0, a),$$

where $a \in A$.

Let E be the quotient E_0/N . Let us denote

$$\tilde{c} = (c, 0, \dots, 0) + N, \quad c \in C.$$

Since $g_0(N) = N$, the mapping

$$g(x + N) = g_0(x) + N, \quad x + N \in E,$$

is well-defined, moreover it is an isometry. For $a \in A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\tilde{a}) &= g((a, 0, \dots, 0) + N) = g_0((a, 0, \dots, 0)) + N \\ &= (0, \dots, 0, a) + N = (f(a), 0, \dots, 0) + N = \widetilde{f(a)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it remains to show that $c \mapsto \tilde{c}$ is an isometry. For $c \in C$, we have

$$\|\tilde{c}\| = \inf_{u \in N} \|(c, 0, \dots, 0) + u\|,$$

thus $\|\tilde{c}\| \leq \|c\|$ by the choice $u = 0$. On the other hand, a general $u \in N$ is of the form

$$u = (a_0 - f(a_{n-1}), a_1 - f(a_0), \dots, a_{n-1} - f(a_{n-2})),$$

for which, by the inequality from (3),


$$\begin{aligned} \|(c, 0, \dots, 0) + u\| &= \|c + a_0 - f(a_{n-1})\| + \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \|a_{i+1} - f(a_i)\| \\ &\geq \|c + a_0 - f(a_{n-1})\| + \|a_0 - f(a_{n-1})\| \geq \|c\|, \end{aligned}$$

arriving at $\|\tilde{c}\| \geq \|c\|$. We obtain $\|\tilde{c}\| = \|c\|$ for $c \in C$, finishing the proof of (2). \square

4 Key lemma

This section is devoted to the proof of the following lemma important for our proof that $(\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ does not have the weak amalgamation property.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{O}_0 = (C_0, f_0 : A_0 \rightarrow B_0) \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ be such that there exist $\mathcal{O}_1 = (C_1, f_1 : A_1 \rightarrow B_1) \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ and a morphism $i : \mathcal{O}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_1$ such that for any $\mathcal{O}_2 = (C_2, f_2 : A_2 \rightarrow B_2)$, $\mathcal{O}_3 = (C_3, f_3 : A_3 \rightarrow B_3) \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ and morphisms $j : \mathcal{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_2$, $k : \mathcal{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_3$, there are $\mathcal{O}_4 = (C_4, f_4 : A_4 \rightarrow B_4) \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ and morphisms $\tilde{j} : \mathcal{O}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_4$, $\tilde{k} : \mathcal{O}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_4$ such that $\tilde{j} \circ j \circ i = \tilde{k} \circ k \circ i$. Then there exists $(E, f : E \rightarrow E) \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ such that E extends C_0 , and f extends f_0 .*



We start with introducing the following notation:

- \mathfrak{D} denotes the space of all finitely supported $\alpha : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow C_1$ with the norm $\|\alpha\|_{\mathfrak{D}} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\alpha(k)\|_{C_1}$,
- $f_{\mathfrak{D}}$ denotes the shift given by $[f_{\mathfrak{D}}(\alpha)](k) = \alpha(k-1)$,
- $\mathfrak{N} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}$ is defined as the subspace generated by all vectors of the form $(\dots, 0, 0, -f_1(a), a, 0, 0, \dots)$, where $a \in A_1$ and it appears at any coordinate,
- $\mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{D}/\mathfrak{N}$,
- $f_{\mathfrak{E}} : \mathfrak{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ is given by $f_{\mathfrak{E}}(\alpha + \mathfrak{N}) = f_{\mathfrak{D}}(\alpha) + \mathfrak{N}$; this is well defined since $f_{\mathfrak{D}}$ maps \mathfrak{N} into \mathfrak{N} , and, moreover, $f_{\mathfrak{E}}$ is an isometry,
- $j_{\mathfrak{E}} : C_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ is given by $j_{\mathfrak{E}}(c) = (\dots, 0, c, 0, \dots) + \mathfrak{N}$, where c appears on the 0th coordinate; it follows from the next claim applied to $k = l = 0$ that $j_{\mathfrak{E}} : C_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ is an isometry.

Claim 4.2. *Let $k \leq l$ be integers and let $\mathfrak{D}_{[k,l]}$ and $\mathfrak{N}_{[k,l]}$ be the subspaces of \mathfrak{D} and \mathfrak{N} of all points supported by $\{k, k+1, \dots, l\}$. Then*

$$\|\alpha + \mathfrak{N}\|_{\mathfrak{E}} = \inf\{\|\alpha + \eta\|_{\mathfrak{D}} : \eta \in \mathfrak{N}_{[k,l]}\}, \quad \alpha \in \mathfrak{D}_{[k,l]}.$$

Consequently, the subspace $\{\alpha + \mathfrak{N} : \alpha \in \mathfrak{D}_{[k,l]}\}$ of \mathfrak{E} is isometric to $\mathfrak{D}_{[k,l]}/\mathfrak{N}_{[k,l]}$, and thus it is polyhedral.

Proof. Let us fix $\alpha \in \mathfrak{D}_{[k,l]}$. The inequality “ \leq ” is clear. To prove “ \geq ”, given $\eta \in \mathfrak{N}$, we want to find $\eta' \in \mathfrak{N}_{[k,l]}$ such that $\|\alpha + \eta'\|_{\mathfrak{D}} \leq \|\alpha + \eta\|_{\mathfrak{D}}$. We can write

$$\eta = (\dots, 0, -f_1(a_{p+1}), a_{p+1} - f_1(a_{p+2}), \dots, a_{q-1} - f_1(a_q), a_q, 0, \dots),$$

where $a_r - f_1(a_{r+1})$ appears at the r th coordinate, once η is supported by $\{p, p+1, \dots, q\}$. Now, if $p < k$, then replacing a_{p+1} by 0 does not increase $\|\alpha + \eta\|_{\mathfrak{D}}$, as $\|-f_1(a_{p+1})\|_{C_1} + \|\alpha(p+1) + a_{p+1} - f_1(a_{p+2})\|_{C_1} = \|a_{p+1}\|_{C_1} + \|\alpha(p+1) + a_{p+1} - f_1(a_{p+2})\|_{C_1} \geq \|\alpha(p+1) - f_1(a_{p+2})\|_{C_1}$. Analogously, if $q > l$, then replacing a_q by 0 does not increase $\|\alpha + \eta\|_{\mathfrak{D}}$, as $\|\alpha(q-1) + a_{q-1} - f_1(a_q)\|_{C_1} + \|a_q\|_{C_1} = \|\alpha(q-1) + a_{q-1} - f_1(a_q)\|_{C_1} + \|f_1(a_q)\|_{C_1} \geq \|\alpha(q-1) + a_{q-1}\|_{C_1}$. Therefore, we can shrink the support of η until it is a subset of $\{k, k+1, \dots, l\}$, without increasing $\|\alpha + \eta\|_{\mathfrak{D}}$. \square

Claim 4.3. $(f_{\mathfrak{E}} \circ j_{\mathfrak{E}})(a) = (j_{\mathfrak{E}} \circ f_1)(a)$ for each $a \in A_1$.

Proof. We have $(f_{\mathfrak{E}} \circ j_{\mathfrak{E}})(a) = f_{\mathfrak{E}}((\dots, 0, a, 0, \dots) + \mathfrak{N}) = f_{\mathfrak{D}}((\dots, 0, a, 0, \dots)) + \mathfrak{N} = (\dots, 0, 0, a, \dots) + \mathfrak{N} = (\dots, 0, f_1(a), 0, \dots) + \mathfrak{N} = j_{\mathfrak{E}}(f_1(a)) = (j_{\mathfrak{E}} \circ f_1)(a)$. \square

Let us consider a sequence $\{u_k^*\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ in the dual unit ball $B_{C_1^*}$ of C_1 such that $u_k^*(f_1(a)) = u_{k+1}^*(a)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a \in A_1$. Then the sequence has the property that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} u_k^*(\eta(k)) = 0$ for each $\eta \in \mathfrak{N}$. It follows that the functional

$$\mathbf{u}^*(\alpha + \mathfrak{N}) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} u_k^*(\alpha(k)), \quad \alpha \in \mathfrak{D},$$

is well-defined, moreover, it belongs to $B_{\mathfrak{E}^*}$. Indeed, for $\alpha \in \mathfrak{D}$, we have $|\mathbf{u}^*(\alpha + \mathfrak{N})| = |\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} u_k^*(\alpha(k))| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|u_k^*\|_{C_1^*} \|\alpha(k)\|_{C_1} \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\alpha(k)\|_{C_1} = \|\alpha\|_{\mathfrak{D}}$, as well as $|\mathbf{u}^*(\alpha + \mathfrak{N})| \leq \|\alpha + \eta\|_{\mathfrak{D}}$ for $\eta \in \mathfrak{N}$, hence $|\mathbf{u}^*(\alpha + \mathfrak{N})| \leq \inf_{\eta \in \mathfrak{N}} \|\alpha + \eta\|_{\mathfrak{D}} = \|\alpha + \mathfrak{N}\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$, which gives $\|\mathbf{u}^*\|_{\mathfrak{E}^*} \leq 1$.

Let $\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_l$ be an enumeration of the extreme points of $B_{C_1^*}$. For $1 \leq n \leq l$, we denote $\psi_{n,0} = \psi_n$ and choose $\psi_{n,-1}, \psi_{n,1} \in B_{C_1^*}$ such that $\psi_{n,-1}(f_1(a)) = \psi_{n,0}(a)$ and $\psi_{n,0}(f_1(a)) = \psi_{n,1}(a)$ for every $a \in A_1$. There are numbers $s_{n,m}$ and $t_{n,m}$ such that $\sum_{m=1}^l |s_{n,m}| \leq 1$ and $\sum_{m=1}^l |t_{n,m}| \leq 1$ for $1 \leq n \leq l$ and

$$\psi_{n,1} = \sum_{m=1}^l s_{n,m} \psi_m, \quad \psi_{n,-1} = \sum_{m=1}^l t_{n,m} \psi_m, \quad 1 \leq n \leq l.$$

Recursively, we define for $j \geq 1$

$$\psi_{n,j+1} = \sum_{m=1}^l s_{n,m} \psi_{m,j}, \quad \psi_{n,-j-1} = \sum_{m=1}^l t_{n,m} \psi_{m,-j}, \quad 1 \leq n \leq l.$$

By induction, $\|\psi_{n,\pm j}\|_{C_1^*} \leq 1$ and $\psi_{n,j}(f_1(a)) = \psi_{n,j+1}(a)$, resp. $\psi_{n,-j-1}(f_1(a)) = \psi_{n,-j}(a)$ for every $a \in A_1$. Therefore, for $1 \leq n \leq l$,

$$\mathbf{u}_n^*(\alpha + \mathfrak{N}) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi_{n,k}(\alpha(k)), \quad \alpha \in \mathfrak{D},$$

defines a functional with $\|\mathbf{u}_n^*\|_{\mathfrak{E}^*} \leq 1$.

Claim 4.4. *For $c \in i(C_0)$, we have*

$$\|x\|_{\mathfrak{E}} = \sup \{ |\mathbf{u}_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x))| : 1 \leq n \leq l, k \in \mathbb{Z} \}, \quad x \in \text{span}\{f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(j_{\mathfrak{E}}(c)) : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Proof. We define

$$\|x\|_{\mathfrak{E}} = \sup \left(\left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|x\|_{\mathfrak{E}} \right\} \cup \left\{ |\mathbf{u}_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x))| : 1 \leq n \leq l, k \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \right), \quad x \in \mathfrak{E},$$

which is an equivalent norm on \mathfrak{E} satisfying $\frac{1}{2} \|x\|_{\mathfrak{E}} \leq \|x\|_{\mathfrak{E}} \leq \|x\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$, and such that $f_{\mathfrak{E}} : \mathfrak{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ is an isometry also with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$. To prove the claim, we show that the norms $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$ coincide on the linear span of the points $f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(j_{\mathfrak{E}}(c))$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Notice first that $\|j_{\mathfrak{E}}(e)\|_{\mathfrak{E}} = \|j_{\mathfrak{E}}(e)\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$ for every $e \in C_1$. Indeed, for some n with $1 \leq n \leq l$, we have $\psi_n(e) = \|e\|_{C_1}$, so $\|j_{\mathfrak{E}}(e)\|_{\mathfrak{E}} \geq \|j_{\mathfrak{E}}(e)\|_{\mathfrak{E}} \geq \mathbf{u}_n^*(j_{\mathfrak{E}}(e)) = \mathbf{u}_n^*((\dots, 0, e, 0, \dots) + \mathfrak{N}) = \psi_{n,0}(e) = \psi_n(e) = \|e\|_{C_1} = \|j_{\mathfrak{E}}(e)\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$.

It is enough to prove that $\|w\|_{\mathfrak{E}} = \|w\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$ for w of the form $w = \sum_{k=0}^{\nu} w_k f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(j_{\mathfrak{E}}(c))$. We can assume that $\nu \geq 1$. Let us put

$$C_2 = C_3 = \text{span} \bigcup_{k=0}^{\nu} f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(j_{\mathfrak{E}}(C_1)).$$


We equip C_2 with the restriction of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$ and C_3 with the restriction of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$. Then C_2 is polyhedral by Claim 4.2, and to see that C_3 is polyhedral, we prove that

$$\|x\|_{C_3} = \sup \left(\left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|x\|_{\mathfrak{E}} \right\} \cup \left\{ |\mathbf{u}_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x))| : 1 \leq n \leq l, -\nu \leq k \leq 0 \right\} \right), \quad x \in C_3.$$

Given $x = \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} f_{\mathfrak{E}}^r(j_{\mathfrak{E}}(c_r)) \in C_3$, it is sufficient to show that $k \mapsto \max\{|\mathbf{u}_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x))| : 1 \leq n \leq l\}$ is non-increasing for $k \geq 0$ and non-decreasing for $k \leq -\nu$. Let us note that $\mathbf{u}_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x)) = \mathbf{u}_n^*(\sum_{r=0}^{\nu} f_{\mathfrak{E}}^{k+r}(j_{\mathfrak{E}}(c_r))) = \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \psi_{n,k+r}(c_r)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. In the case $k \geq 0$, we have $\mathbf{u}_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^{k+1}(x)) = \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \psi_{n,k+1+r}(c_r) = \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \sum_{m=1}^l s_{n,m} \psi_{m,k+r}(c_r) = \sum_{m=1}^l s_{n,m} \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \psi_{m,k+r}(c_r) = \sum_{m=1}^l s_{n,m} \mathbf{u}_m^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x))$, and consequently $|\mathbf{u}_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^{k+1}(x))| \leq \sum_{m=1}^l |s_{n,m}| |\mathbf{u}_m^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x))| \leq \max\{|\mathbf{u}_m^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x))| : 1 \leq m \leq l\}$. Similarly, for $k \leq -\nu$, we have $\mathbf{u}_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^{k-1}(x)) = \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \psi_{n,k-1+r}(c_r) = \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \sum_{m=1}^l t_{n,m} \psi_{m,k+r}(c_r) = \sum_{m=1}^l t_{n,m} \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \psi_{m,k+r}(c_r) = \sum_{m=1}^l t_{n,m} \mathbf{u}_m^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x))$, and consequently $|\mathbf{u}_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^{k-1}(x))| \leq \sum_{m=1}^l |t_{n,m}| |\mathbf{u}_m^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x))| \leq \max\{|\mathbf{u}_m^*(f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(x))| : 1 \leq m \leq l\}$. Hence, the formula for $\|\cdot\|_{C_3}$ holds, and C_3 is polyhedral indeed.

Next, let $A_2 = A_3 = \text{span} \bigcup_{k=0}^{\nu-1} f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(j_{\mathfrak{E}}(C_1))$, $B_2 = B_3 = \text{span} \bigcup_{k=1}^{\nu} f_{\mathfrak{E}}^k(j_{\mathfrak{E}}(C_1))$, where we consider the restriction of $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$ on A_2, B_2 and the restriction of $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{E}}$

on A_3, B_3 . If we define $i_{12} = i_{13} = j_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $f_2 = f_3 = f_{\mathcal{E}}|_{A_2}$, then $i_{12} : C_1 \rightarrow C_2, i_{13} : C_1 \rightarrow C_3, f_2 : A_2 \rightarrow B_2$ and $f_3 : A_3 \rightarrow B_3$ are isometries. By Claim 4.3, $(f_2 \circ i_{12})(a) = (i_{12} \circ f_1)(a)$ (equivalently $(f_3 \circ i_{13})(a) = (i_{13} \circ f_1)(a)$) for each $a \in A_1$, and so i_{12} and i_{13} are morphisms from \mathcal{O}_1 to $\mathcal{O}_2 = (C_2, f_2 : A_2 \rightarrow B_2)$ and $\mathcal{O}_3 = (C_3, f_3 : A_3 \rightarrow B_3)$.



Now, there is $\mathcal{O}_4 = (C_4, f_4 : A_4 \rightarrow B_4) \in (\mathcal{N}_0)_1$ and morphisms $i_{24} : \mathcal{O}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_4, i_{34} : \mathcal{O}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_4$ such that $i_{24} \circ i_{12} \circ i = i_{34} \circ i_{13} \circ i$. Note that $(i_{24} \circ i_{12})(c) = (i_{34} \circ i_{13})(c)$, that is, $i_{24}(j_{\mathcal{E}}(c)) = i_{34}(j_{\mathcal{E}}(c))$. By induction, we can prove for $0 \leq k \leq \nu$ that $i_{24}(f_{\mathcal{E}}^k(j_{\mathcal{E}}(c))) = i_{34}(f_{\mathcal{E}}^k(j_{\mathcal{E}}(c)))$, since for $0 \leq k \leq \nu - 1$ we can write $i_{24}(f_{\mathcal{E}}^{k+1}(j_{\mathcal{E}}(c))) = (i_{24} \circ f_2)(f_{\mathcal{E}}^k(j_{\mathcal{E}}(c))) = (f_4 \circ i_{24})(f_{\mathcal{E}}^k(j_{\mathcal{E}}(c))) = (f_4 \circ i_{34})(f_{\mathcal{E}}^k(j_{\mathcal{E}}(c))) = (i_{34} \circ f_3)(f_{\mathcal{E}}^k(j_{\mathcal{E}}(c))) = i_{34}(f_{\mathcal{E}}^{k+1}(j_{\mathcal{E}}(c)))$. Finally, it follows that $i_{24}(w) = i_{34}(w)$ and $\|w\|_{C_2} = \|i_{24}(w)\|_{C_4} = \|i_{34}(w)\|_{C_4} = \|w\|_{C_3}$, that is, $\|w\|_{\mathcal{E}} = \|w\|_{\mathcal{E}}$. \square

Before the next claim, let us make one more remark on the above introduced functionals $\psi_{n,k}$ and numbers $s_{n,m}$ and $t_{n,m}$. Let S be the matrix $(s_{n,m})_{n,m=1}^l$ and T be the matrix $(t_{n,m})_{n,m=1}^l$, and let $s_{n,m}^{(j)}$ and $t_{n,m}^{(j)}$ be the entries of the matrices S^j and T^j . Then it is straightforward to show by induction on $j \geq 0$ that

$$\psi_{n,j} = \sum_{m=1}^l s_{n,m}^{(j)} \psi_m, \quad \psi_{n,-j} = \sum_{m=1}^l t_{n,m}^{(j)} \psi_m, \quad 1 \leq n \leq l,$$

and

$$\sum_{m=1}^l |s_{n,m}^{(j)}| \leq 1, \quad \sum_{m=1}^l |t_{n,m}^{(j)}| \leq 1, \quad 1 \leq n \leq l.$$

Claim 4.5. *For $c \in i(C_0)$, $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\eta \in \mathfrak{N}$ such that $\|c + \eta(0)\|_{C_1} + \sum_{0 < |k| \leq \nu} \|\eta(k)\|_{C_1} < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. We can assume that $\|c\|_{C_1} = 1$. Since there is a cluster point of the sequence $\{(S^j, T^j)\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$, we can choose $\tau > \sigma \geq 0$ such that $\tau \geq 3\sigma, \tau \geq \sigma + 2\nu + 1$ and

$$|s_{n,m}^{(\tau)} - s_{n,m}^{(\sigma)}| \leq \varepsilon/l, \quad |t_{n,m}^{(\tau)} - t_{n,m}^{(\sigma)}| \leq \varepsilon/l, \quad 1 \leq n, m \leq l.$$

Then, for $j \geq 0$, using $S^{\tau+j} - S^{\sigma+j} = S^j(S^{\tau} - S^{\sigma})$, we obtain $|s_{n,m}^{(\tau+j)} - s_{n,m}^{(\sigma+j)}| = |\sum_{o=1}^l s_{n,o}^{(j)}(s_{o,m}^{(\tau)} - s_{o,m}^{(\sigma)})| \leq (\varepsilon/l) \sum_{o=1}^l |s_{n,o}^{(j)}|$. From this and from the same for

T , we get

$$|s_{n,m}^{(\tau+j)} - s_{n,m}^{(\sigma+j)}| \leq \varepsilon/l, \quad |t_{n,m}^{(\tau+j)} - t_{n,m}^{(\sigma+j)}| \leq \varepsilon/l, \quad 1 \leq n, m \leq l.$$

Let us choose $R \in \mathbb{N}$ with $R \geq 2/\varepsilon$, and let

$$x = \sum_{p=0}^{2R-1} (-1)^p f_{\mathfrak{C}}^{p(\tau-\sigma)}(j_{\mathfrak{C}}(c)).$$

That is, $x = \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} [f_{\mathfrak{C}}^{2r(\tau-\sigma)}(j_{\mathfrak{C}}(c)) - f_{\mathfrak{C}}^{(2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)}(j_{\mathfrak{C}}(c))]$, so we have for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $1 \leq n \leq l$ that

$$u_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{C}}^k(x)) = \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} [\psi_{n,2r(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c) - \psi_{n,(2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c)].$$

Let us consider three cases for r :

- If $2r(\tau - \sigma) + k \geq \sigma$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi_{n,2r(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c) - \psi_{n,(2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^l s_{n,m}^{(2r(\tau-\sigma)+k)} \psi_m(c) - \sum_{m=1}^l s_{n,m}^{((2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k)} \psi_m(c) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^l (s_{n,m}^{(2r(\tau-\sigma)+k)} - s_{n,m}^{((2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k)}) \psi_m(c), \end{aligned}$$

and so $|\psi_{n,2r(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c) - \psi_{n,(2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c)| \leq \sum_{m=1}^l (\varepsilon/l) |\psi_m(c)| \leq l(\varepsilon/l) \|c\|_{C_1} = \varepsilon$.

- If $(2r + 1)(\tau - \sigma) + k \leq -\sigma$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi_{n,2r(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c) - \psi_{n,(2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^l t_{n,m}^{(-[2r(\tau-\sigma)+k])} \psi_m(c) - \sum_{m=1}^l t_{n,m}^{(-[(2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k])} \psi_m(c) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^l (t_{n,m}^{(-[2r(\tau-\sigma)+k])} - t_{n,m}^{(-[(2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k])}) \psi_m(c), \end{aligned}$$

and so $|\psi_{n,2r(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c) - \psi_{n,(2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c)| \leq \sum_{m=1}^l (\varepsilon/l) |\psi_m(c)| \leq l(\varepsilon/l) \|c\|_{C_1} = \varepsilon$.

• In the remaining case $2r(\tau - \sigma) + k < \sigma$ and $(2r + 1)(\tau - \sigma) + k > -\sigma$, equivalently $\frac{-\sigma-k}{2(\tau-\sigma)} - \frac{1}{2} < r < \frac{\sigma-k}{2(\tau-\sigma)}$, we use simply $|\psi_{n,2r(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c) - \psi_{n,(2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c)| \leq 2\|c\|_{C_1} = 2$. This may happen for at most one r , since $\frac{\sigma-k}{2(\tau-\sigma)} \leq 1 + \frac{-\sigma-k}{2(\tau-\sigma)} - \frac{1}{2}$, as $\tau \geq 3\sigma$.

Altogether, $|u_n^*(f_{\mathfrak{C}}^k(x))| \leq \sum_{r=0}^{R-1} |\psi_{n,2r(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c) - \psi_{n,(2r+1)(\tau-\sigma)+k}(c)| \leq 2 + (R-1)\varepsilon$, and using this for all $1 \leq n \leq l$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we obtain from Claim 4.4 that

$$\|x\|_{\mathfrak{C}} \leq 2 + (R-1)\varepsilon \leq R\varepsilon + (R-1)\varepsilon < 2R\varepsilon.$$

We have $x = \alpha + \mathfrak{N}$, where $\alpha \in \mathfrak{D}$ has $(-1)^p c$ on the coordinate $p(\tau - \sigma)$ for $0 \leq p \leq 2R - 1$, and 0 elsewhere. For some $\eta \in \mathfrak{N}$, we have $\|\alpha + \eta\|_{\mathfrak{D}} < 2R\varepsilon$. Since $\tau \geq \sigma + 2\nu + 1$, we can write $\sum_{p=0}^{2R-1} [\|(-1)^p c + \eta(p(\tau - \sigma))\|_{C_1} + \sum_{0 < |k| \leq \nu} \|\eta(p(\tau - \sigma) + k)\|_{C_1}] \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\alpha(k) + \eta(k)\|_{C_1} = \|\alpha + \eta\|_{\mathfrak{D}} < 2R\varepsilon$, so we must have $\|(-1)^p c + \eta(p(\tau - \sigma))\|_{C_1} + \sum_{0 < |k| \leq \nu} \|\eta(p(\tau - \sigma) + k)\|_{C_1} < \varepsilon$ for some $0 \leq p \leq 2R - 1$, from which we easily deduce the claim. \square

Let us define recursively

$$E_0 = F_0 = C_1, \quad E_{\nu+1} = f_1^{-1}(B_1 \cap E_\nu), \quad F_{\nu+1} = f_1(A_1 \cap F_\nu),$$

and let

$$E = \bigcap_{\nu=0}^{\infty} E_\nu.$$

Then E_ν is the subspace of C_1 of points on which f_1 can be applied ν times and F_ν is the subspace of C_1 of points on which f_1^{-1} can be applied ν times, so $F_\nu = f_1^\nu(E_\nu)$.

We have $E_0 \supseteq E_1 \supseteq E_2 \supseteq \dots$, hence there is ν_0 such that $E_\nu = E$ for each $\nu \geq \nu_0$. It follows that $f_1|_E$ is a surjective linear isometry on E . Also, $F_\nu = f_1^\nu(E_\nu) = f_1^\nu(E) = E$ for each $\nu \geq \nu_0$.

Claim 4.6. *For every $\nu \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, there is $\Gamma_\nu > 0$ such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and each sequence a_0, a_1, \dots, a_ν in A_1 with $\|f_1(a_{n-1}) - a_n\|_{C_1} < \varepsilon$ for $1 \leq n \leq \nu$, the distance of a_0 to $E_{\nu+1}$ is less than $\Gamma_\nu \varepsilon$.*

Similarly, for every $\nu \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, there is $\Delta_\nu > 0$ such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and each sequence b_0, b_1, \dots, b_ν in B_1 with $\|f_1^{-1}(b_{n-1}) - b_n\|_{C_1} < \varepsilon$ for $1 \leq n \leq \nu$, the distance of b_0 to $F_{\nu+1}$ is less than $\Delta_\nu \varepsilon$.

Proof. We prove only the first part. For $\nu = 0$, this is clear, as $a_0 \in A_1 = E_{\nu+1}$. Concerning the induction step, let the statement hold for $\nu - 1$ with some $\Gamma_{\nu-1}$. There is $\varrho > 0$ such that for every $b \in B_1$ we have $\text{dist}(b, B_1 \cap E_\nu) \leq \varrho \text{dist}(b, E_\nu)$ (let d be the distance of the unit sphere of $B_1/(B_1 \cap E_\nu)$ to $E_\nu/(B_1 \cap E_\nu)$ in $C_1/(B_1 \cap E_\nu)$, then we have $d \text{dist}(b, B_1 \cap E_\nu) = d\|b + (B_1 \cap E_\nu)\| \leq \text{dist}(b + (B_1 \cap E_\nu), E_\nu/(B_1 \cap E_\nu)) = \text{dist}(b, E_\nu)$, so we can take $\varrho = 1/d$). By the induction hypothesis, we have $\text{dist}(a_1, E_\nu) < \Gamma_{\nu-1} \varepsilon$, so $\text{dist}(f_1(a_0), E_\nu) < (\Gamma_{\nu-1} + 1)\varepsilon$ and $\text{dist}(a_0, E_{\nu+1}) = \text{dist}(f_1(a_0), B_1 \cap E_\nu) \leq \varrho \text{dist}(f_1(a_0), E_\nu) < \varrho(\Gamma_{\nu-1} + 1)\varepsilon$. Hence, we can put $\Gamma_\nu = \varrho(\Gamma_{\nu-1} + 1)$. \square

Claim 4.7. $i(C_0) \subseteq E$.

Proof. Let $c \in i(C_0)$, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary, and let ν be large enough to satisfy $E_{\nu+1} = F_{\nu+1} = E$. By Claim 4.5, there is $\eta \in \mathfrak{N}$ such that $\|c + \eta(0)\|_{C_1} + \sum_{0 < |k| \leq \nu} \|\eta(k)\|_{C_1} < \varepsilon$. We can write $\eta = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (\dots, 0, 0, -f_1(a_k), a_k, 0, 0, \dots)$, where $a_k \in A_1$ appears on the k th coordinate and only finitely many a_k 's are non-zero. We have $\varepsilon > \|c + \eta(0)\|_{C_1} = \|c + a_0 - f_1(a_1)\|_{C_1}$ and $\varepsilon > \|\eta(k)\|_{C_1} = \|a_k - f_1(a_{k+1})\|_{C_1}$ for $0 < |k| \leq \nu$. Applying Claim 4.6 on the sequences $a_0, a_{-1}, \dots, a_{-\nu}$ and $f_1(a_1), f_1(a_2), \dots, f_1(a_{\nu+1})$, we obtain $\text{dist}(a_0, E_{\nu+1}) <$

$\Gamma_\nu \varepsilon$ and $\text{dist}(f_1(a_1), F_{\nu+1}) < \Delta_\nu \varepsilon$. It follows that $\text{dist}(c, E) \leq \|c + a_0 - f_1(a_1)\|_{C_1} + \text{dist}(a_0, E) + \text{dist}(f_1(a_1), E) < (1 + \Gamma_\nu + \Delta_\nu) \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was chosen arbitrarily, we arrive at $c \in E$. \square

To complete the proof of Lemma 4.1, it remains to note that if we identify C_0 with its embedding $i(C_0)$ into C_1 , then Claim 4.7 guarantees that E is an extension of C_0 and the restriction $f_1|_E$ is a surjective linear isometry on E that extends f_0 .

References

- [1] B. E. Johnson and A. M. Sinclair, *Continuity of derivations and a problem of Kaplansky*, Amer. J. Math., 90:1067–1073, 1968.
- [2] I. Kaplansky, *Modules over operator algebras*, Amer. J. Math., 75:839–858, 1953.
- [3] A. S. Kechris, C. Rosendal, *Turbulence, amalgamation, and generic automorphisms of homogeneous structures*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 94 (2007), no. 2, 302–350.
- [4] M. Malicki, *Consequences of the existence of ample generics and automorphism groups of homogeneous metric structures*, J. Symbolic Logic (3) 81 (2016), 876–886.
- [5] M. Malicki, *Remarks on weak amalgamation and large conjugacy classes in non-archimedean groups*, Archive Math. Logic, 61 (2021), 685–704.
- [6] C. Rosendal, *A topological version of the Bergman property*, Forum Math. 21 (2009), no. 2, 299–332.
- [7] M. Sabok, *Automatic continuity for isometry groups*, J. Institute Math. Jussieu. 18 (2019), 561–590.
- [8] S. Sakai, *On a conjecture of Kaplansky*, Tôhoku Math. J. (2), 12:31–33, 1960.
- [9] S. Solecki, *Extending partial isometries*, Israel J. Math. 150 (2005), 315–331.
- [10] T. Tsankov, *Automatic continuity for the unitary group*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 141 (2013) 3673–3680.