

# Weak sequential convergence in the dual of a Banach space does not imply norm convergence

Bengt Josefson

We shall prove that for every infinite-dimensional Banach space  $E$  there is a sequence in  $E'$ , the dual space, which tends to 0 in the weak topology  $\sigma(E', E)$  but not in the norm topology. This is well known for separable or reflexive Banach spaces. See also [3] for other examples. The theorem has its main applications in the theory of holomorphic functions on infinite-dimensional topological vector spaces (TVS).

Let  $l^\infty$  be the Banach space of all complex-valued, bounded functions on the natural numbers  $\mathbf{N}$ ;  $z = (z_j)_{j=1}^\infty$  denotes a point in  $l^\infty$ . Let  $c_0$  be the Banach space  $c_0 = \{z \in l^\infty; z_j \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } j \rightarrow \dots \infty\}$ ,  $c = \{z \in l^\infty; \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} z_j \text{ exists}\}$  and  $l^1 = \{z \in c_0, \sum_{j=1}^\infty |z_j| < \infty\}$ . Let  $L(F, F_1)$  denote the set of all bounded linear mappings from  $F$  into  $F_1$  and let  $\mathfrak{H}(F)$  denote the set of Gâteaux-analytic, locally bounded functions on  $F$ , where  $F$  and  $F_1$  are locally convex TVS. See [5]. A set  $B \subset F$  is called *bounding* if  $\sup_{z \in B} |f(z)| < \infty$  for every  $f \in \mathfrak{H}(F)$ . Put  $\mathfrak{H}_b(F) = \{f \in \mathfrak{H}(F); f \text{ is bounded on bounded subsets of } F\}$ .

**Theorem.** *To every infinite-dimensional Banach space  $E$  there exist  $\varphi_j \in E'$  such that  $\|\varphi_j\| = 1$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_j(z) = 0$  for every  $z \in E$ .*

**Corollary 1.** *No neighbourhood of  $0 \in F$ , where  $F$  is a locally convex TVS, is a bounding set.*

*Proof.* See [2].

**Corollary 2.**  $\mathfrak{H}_b(E) \neq \mathfrak{H}(E)$  for very infinite-dimensional Banach space  $E$ .

*Proof.* See [2].

*Proof of the Theorem.* Let  $F \subset E$  be a separable, infinite-dimensional subspace. From [1] and [2] it follows that there are  $z^{(j)} \in F$  and  $\psi_j \in E'$  such that  $\|\psi_j\| = 1$ ,  $\|z^{(j)}\| = 1$ ,  $\psi_j(z^{(j)}) = 1$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \psi_j(z) = 0$  for every  $z \in F$ . Let  $\psi \in L(E, l^\infty)$  be the

mapping  $\psi(z) = (\psi_1(z), \psi_2(z), \dots, \psi_j(z), \dots)$ . Put  $D = \psi(B_E)$  where  $B_E$  is the closed unit ball in  $E$ . We shall say that  $E$  has *property A* if there are linear functionals as in the theorem. We recall that  $l^\infty$  has property *A* which follows from the fact that there is  $\varphi \in L(l^\infty, l^2(B))$ , where  $\text{card } B = \text{card } \mathbf{R}$  and  $l^2(B)$  is the Hilbert space on  $B$ , such that  $\varphi$  is onto [6]. In the rest of the proof we shall prove that if there is no  $\varphi_0 \in L(l^\infty, l^\infty)$  such that  $\varphi_0(D)$  is separable and not compact then  $D$  is like the unit ball in  $l^\infty$  in the sense that we may use a technique to prove that  $E$  has property *A* which is similar to that used to prove that  $l^\infty$  has property *A*. More explicitly, if there is no  $\varphi_0$  as above Lemma 6 gives that  $X_n$  in the Proposition may be taken such that  $(X_n)$  is not dominated by a geometric series and then the sequence of mappings  $(\varphi_n)$  in the Proposition and Lemma 4 replace  $\varphi \in L(l^\infty, l^2(B))$ . If, on the other hand, there is  $\varphi_0 \in L(l^\infty, l^\infty)$  such that  $\varphi_0(D)$  is separable but not compact then it follows trivially that  $E$  has property *A*.

*Definition 1.* Put, for  $z \in l^\infty$  and  $M \subset \mathbf{N}$ ,  $\text{supp } z = \{j \in \mathbf{N}; z_j \neq 0\}$  and  $\text{Proj}_{[M]} z = (z'_j)_{j \in \mathbf{N}}$  where  $z'_j = z_j$  if  $j \in M$  and  $z'_j = 0$  if  $j \notin M$ . Let  $l^\infty(M) = \{z \in l^\infty; z_j = 0 \text{ if } j \notin M\}$ .

*Definition 2.* Put, for  $z \in l^\infty$  and  $M \subset \mathbf{N}$ ,  $N_M(z) = \overline{\lim}_{j, k \rightarrow \infty, j, k \in M} |z_j - z_k|$  ( $N_M(z) = 0$  if  $M$  is finite).

*Definition 3.* A set  $A \subset l^\infty$  is called a *1-set* if for all finite subsets  $\{a^{(1)}, \dots, a^{(k)}\}$  of  $A$  the vector of components  $(a_j^{(1)}, \dots, a_j^{(k)}) \in \mathbf{C}^k$  assumes exactly the values  $(\pm 1, \pm 1, \dots, \pm 1)$  for all possible  $2^k$  choices of signs.

*Definition 4.* Let  $\{a^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  be a 1-set and  $r$  a positive integer. Let  $\{M_j(r, \{a^{(k)}\}); j=1, 2, \dots, 2^{r-1}\}$  be the partitioning of  $\mathbf{N}$  into  $2^{r-1}$  disjoint parts such that  $(a_s^{(1)}, \dots, a_s^{(r-1)}) = (a_i^{(1)}, \dots, a_i^{(r-1)})$  if and only if  $s, i \in M_j(r, \{a^{(k)}\})$  for some  $j$ . Put  $M(1, \{a^{(k)}\}) = \mathbf{N}$ .

We note that  $\|\sum_{k=1}^\infty \lambda_k a_k\| \cong \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^\infty |\lambda_k|$  if  $\{a_k\}$  is a 1-set. In fact, C. O. Kiselman has proved that the constant  $1/2$  can be replaced by  $2/\pi$  and this is best possible.

**Lemma 1.** *If  $E$  does not have property A there exist an infinite set  $V \subset \mathbf{N}$  and a number  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for every infinite  $U \subset V$ ,  $\sup_{z \in D} N_U(z) > \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that the lemma is false. Then there are infinite sets  $U_j$  such that  $U_j \subset U_{j-1} \not\subset U_j$  and  $\sup_{z \in D} N_{U_j}(z) < 2^{-j}$ . There is an infinite set  $U \subset \mathbf{N}$  such that  $U \cap U_j$  is finite for every  $j \in \mathbf{N}$ . Hence  $\sup_{z \in D} N_U(z) = 0$  which is a contradiction.

We may assume that  $V = \mathbf{N}$ . Let  $e \in l^\infty$  be  $\{1, 1, \dots, 1, \dots\}$ .

**Lemma 2.** *There exist an index set  $B$ ,  $H_k \subset B$ ,  $\varphi \in L(l^\infty, l^2(B))$  where  $l^2(B)$  is the Hilbert space on  $B$ ,  $C_1 > 0$ ,  $C_2 > 0$  and a 1-set  $\{a^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset l^\infty$  such that  $\text{card } B =$*

$= \text{card } \mathbf{R}, B \setminus H_k$  is finite,

$$H_k \subset H_{k-1} \subset \dots \subset H_0 = B, \quad \|\varphi\| < C_2, \quad \|\text{Proj}_{[H_{k-1} \setminus H_k]} \varphi(a^{(k)})\| > C_1,$$

$$\sum_j \|\text{Proj}_{[H_k]} \varphi(\text{Proj}_{[M_j(k+1, \{a^{(r)}\})]} e)\| < 10^{-4} \cdot k^{-k-1} \cdot \varepsilon \cdot C_1$$

and  $\varphi(e) = \varphi(z) = 0$  if  $z \in c_0$ . Here  $\varepsilon$  is the constant in Lemma 1.

*Proof.* From [6] it follows that there is  $\varphi_1 \in L(l^\infty, l^2(B))$  such that  $\varphi_1$  is onto. Since  $\text{card } B > \text{card } \mathbf{N}$  it follows there are  $C_1 > 0, b^{(k)} \in l^\infty$  and  $H_k \subset B$  such that  $H_k \subset H_{k-1}, B \setminus H_k$  is finite,

$$\|b^{(k)}\| < \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\text{Proj}_{[H_{k-1} \setminus H_k]} \varphi_1(b^{(k)})\| > C_1.$$

Let  $\{a^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  be a 1-set and  $F \subset l^\infty$  the subspace generated by  $a^{(k)}$  and  $c$ . Then  $a \in F$  if and only if  $a = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \lambda_k a^{(k)} + x$  where  $x \in c$  and  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k, \dots) \in l^1$ . Let  $\psi \in L(F, l^\infty)$  be the mapping defined by  $\psi(a^{(k)}) = b^{(k)}$  and  $\psi(x) = 0$  if  $x \in c$ . We have  $\|\psi\| \leq 1$  because

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^\infty \lambda_k \cdot a^{(k)} + x \right\| \cong \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^\infty |\lambda_k| \quad \text{if } x \in c.$$

But  $l^\infty$  has the norm preserving extension property hence  $\psi$  can be extended to  $\psi_1 \in L(l^\infty, l^\infty)$  such that  $\|\psi_1\| = \|\psi\|$ . Put  $\varphi = \varphi_1 \circ \psi_1$ .

Assume now that we have found  $(j_k)_{k=1}^s \subset \mathbf{N}$ , where  $s \in \mathbf{N}$ , and  $(H'_k)_{k=1}^s \subset B$  such that  $H'_{k-1} \supset H'_k, H'_k = H_{j_{p_k}}$  for some  $j_{p_k} \in \mathbf{N}$ ,

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H'_{k-1} \setminus H'_k]} \varphi(a^{(j_k)})\| > C_1 \quad \text{if } k \leq s$$

and

$$\sum_l \|\text{Proj}_{[H'_k]} \varphi(\text{Proj}_{[M_l(k+1, \{a^{(j_n)}\})]} e)\| < \frac{C_1 \cdot \varepsilon}{10^4 \cdot k^{k+1}} \quad \text{if } k \leq s.$$

Choose now  $j_{s+1} \in \mathbf{N}$  and then  $H'_{s+1} = H_{j_{p_{s+1}}}$  for some  $j_{p_{s+1}} \in \mathbf{N}$  such that

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H'_s \setminus H'_{s+1}]} \varphi(a^{(j_{s+1})})\| > C_1$$

and

$$\sum_l \|\text{Proj}_{[H'_{s+1}]} \varphi(\text{Proj}_{[M_l(s+2, \{a^{(j_n)}\})]} e)\| < \frac{C_1 \cdot \varepsilon}{10^4 \cdot (s+1)^{s+2}}$$

which of course is possible according to the construction of  $\varphi$  and the fact that a vector in  $l^2(B)$  is "small" outside a finite subset of  $B$ . Hence  $\{a^{(j_k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  and  $(H'_k)$  have the desired properties. Q.E.D.

**Lemma 3.** Let  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  be a fixed number and  $\varphi$ ,  $\{a^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  and  $(H_k)$  be as in Lemma 2 and  $z \in l^{\infty}$  be such that  $\|z\| < 2$  and

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_j \setminus H_k]} \varphi(z)\| > C_3 > \frac{2^{-j} \cdot \varepsilon \cdot C_1}{5}$$

for some  $k > j$ . Then there exist an infinite set  $V \subset \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varphi' \in L(l^{\infty}(V), l^{\infty})$ , a 1-set  $\{b^{(r)}\}_{r=1}^{\infty} \subset l^{\infty}(V)$  and  $h_{r,s} \in \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$\left\| \text{Proj}_{[V]} z - h e - \sum_{r=1}^{j+1} \sum_s h_{r,s} \text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{b^{(v)}\})]} b^{(r)} \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot j^{-j} \cdot C_1}{10^4 \cdot C_2},$$

$$\varphi'(\text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{b^{(v)}\})]} b^{(r)}) = \text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{a^{(v)}\})]} a^{(r)} \quad \text{if } r \leq j$$

$$\varphi'(e) = e, \quad \varphi'(z) \in c_0 \quad \text{if } z \in c_0, \quad \varphi'(b^{(j+r)}) = a^{(k+r)} r > 1$$

and

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_j \setminus H_k]} \varphi \circ \varphi'(z)\| > \frac{C_3}{32}.$$

*Proof.* It is an immediate consequence of the definition of  $N_{M_s(j+1, \{a^{(v)}\})}(z)$  that there exist an infinite set  $V_s \subset M_s(j+1, \{a^{(v)}\})$ , a 1-point  $\delta^s \in l^{\infty}(V_s)$ ,  $p_{1,s} \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $h_{j+1,s} \in \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$|h_{j+1,s}| = \frac{1}{2} N_{M_s(j+1, \{a^{(v)}\})}(z),$$

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[V_s]}(z - p_{1,s} \cdot e - h_{j+1,s} \cdot \delta^s)\| < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot j^{-j} \cdot C_1}{10^4 \cdot C_2} \quad \text{and} \quad N_{V_s}(z - h_{j+1,s} \delta^s) = 0.$$

Put  $V = \bigcup_s V_s$  and  $a_0^{(j+1)} = \sum_s \delta^s$ . It is obvious that we can take  $\{a_0^{(r)}\}_{r=j+2}^{\infty} \subset l^{\infty}(V)$  such that  $\{a_0^{(r)}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$  is a 1-set in  $l^{\infty}(V)$  where  $a_0^{(r)} = \text{Proj}_{[V]} a^{(r)}$  if  $r \leq j$ . Since  $N_{M_s(j+1, \{a^{(v)}\})}(z - h_{j+1,s} a_0^{(j+1)}) = 0$  it follows from the definition that we can find  $h_{j,s} \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $p_{2,s} \in \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$N_{M_s(j, \{a_0^{(v)}\})}(z - \underbrace{\sum_t h_{j+1,t} \cdot \text{Proj}_{[M_t(j+1, \{a_0^{(v)}\})]} a_0^{(j+1)} - h_{j,s} a_0^{(j)}}_{b_s}) = 0$$

and

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[M_s(j, \{a_0^{(v)}\})]}(z - b_s - p_{2,s} e)\| < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot j^{-j} \cdot C_1}{10^4 \cdot C_2}.$$

In the same way we may continue and after  $j+1$  steps we get that there are  $h_{r,s} \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $h \in \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$(1) \quad \left\| \text{Proj}_{[V]}(z - h e - \sum_{r=1}^{j+1} \sum_s h_{r,s} \cdot \text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{a_0^{(v)}\})]} a_0^{(r)}) \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot j^{-j} \cdot C_1}{10^4 \cdot C_2}.$$

$|h_{r,s}| < 2$  because  $\{a_0^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  is a 1-set and because  $\|z\| < 2$ .

In the same manner it follows that there are  $h' \in \mathbf{C}$ ,  $h'_{r,s} \in \mathbf{C}$  and  $z' \in l^\infty$  such that  $|h'| < 2$ ,  $|h'_{r,s}| < 2$ ,

$$z = z' + h'e + \sum_{r=1}^j \sum_s h'_{r,s} \cdot \text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{a^{(l)}\})]} a^{(r)}$$

and

$$\overline{\lim_{t \in M_s(j+1, \{a^{(l)}\})} |z'_t|} = \frac{1}{2} N_{M_s(j+1, \{a^{(l)}\})}(z).$$

Lemma 2 gives that

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_j \setminus H_k]} \varphi(z')\| > C_3 - \frac{C_1 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot j^{-j}}{10^4} > \frac{C_3}{2}.$$

Let  $\{d^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^\infty \subset l^\infty(V)$  be a 1-set such that there are disjoint infinite sets  $U_{j,l}^{(s)} \subset M_l(j+1, \{d^{(r)}\})$  such that  $\bigcup_{s=1}^4 U_{j,l}^{(s)} = M_l(j+1, d^{(r)})$  and

$$\{\text{Proj}_{[U_{j,l}^{(s)}]} d^{(r)}\}_{r=j+1}^\infty$$

is a 1-set for every  $l$  and  $s$ . Let  $z'' = \{z''_t\}_{t \in V}$  be such that  $z''_t = (i)^s \cdot |h_{j+1,l}|$  if  $t \in U_{j,l}^{(s)}$ . Let  $F \subset l^\infty(V)$  be the subspace which is generated by  $z''$ ,  $d^{(l)}$ ,  $\text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{d^{(l)}\})]} d^{(r)}$   $1 \leq r \leq j$  and  $c$ .  $b \in F$  if and only if

$$b = \gamma_0 \cdot z'' + x + \sum_{r=1}^j \sum_s \gamma_{r,s} \cdot \text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{d^{(l)}\})]} d^{(r)} + \sum_{k=j+1}^\infty \lambda_k d^{(k)}$$

where  $x \in c$   $\gamma_0 \in \mathbf{C}$ ,  $\gamma_{r,s} \in \mathbf{C}$  and  $\lambda = \{\lambda_{j+1}, \dots, \lambda_{j+k}, \dots\} \in l_1$ . Let  $\psi \in L(F, l^\infty)$  be the mapping  $\psi(z'') = z''/2$ ,  $\psi(e) = e$ ,  $\psi(d^{(r)}) = a^{(r)}$ ,  $\psi(z) = 0$  if  $z \in c_0$  and

$$\psi(\text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{d^{(l)}\})]} d^{(r)}) = \text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{a^{(l)}\})]} a^{(r)},$$

$r \leq j$ . It is easy to check that  $\|\psi\| = 1$ . But to has the norm preserving extension property hence  $\psi$  can be extended to  $\psi_1 \in L(l^\infty(V), l^\infty)$  such that  $\|\psi_1\| = 1$ . We may assume that

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_j \setminus H_k]} \varphi \circ \psi_1(\text{Proj}_{[U_{j,l}^{(2)} \cup U_{j,l}^{(4)}]} z'')\| > \frac{C_3}{8}.$$

(Since otherwise

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_j \setminus H_k]} \varphi \circ \psi_1(\text{Proj}_{[U_{j,l}^{(1)} \cup U_{j,l}^{(3)}]} z'')\| > \frac{C_3}{8}.)$$

Hence there is  $t = (t_1, t_2, \dots)$  where  $t_j = 1$  or  $-1$  such that

$$(2) \quad \|\text{Proj}_{[H_j \setminus H_k]} \varphi \circ \psi_1(\text{Proj}_{[U_{j,l}^{(2)} \cup U_{j,l}^{(4)}]} (\sum_s t_s h_{j+1,s} \text{Proj}_{[M_s(j+1, \{b_0^{(n)}\})]} b_0^{(j+)}))\| > \frac{C_3}{16},$$

where  $b_0^{(r)} = d^{(r)}$  if  $r \neq j+1$  and  $b_0^{(j+1)} = \{x_t\}_{t \in V}$  is such that  $x_t = -1$  if  $t \in U_{j,l}^{(2)}$ ,  $x_t = 1$  if  $t \in U_{j,l}^{(4)}$ , and  $x_t = 0$  elsewhere.

Let  $G \subset l^\infty(V)$  be the subspace which is generated by  $c$ ,  $\{a_0^{(r)}\}_{r=1}^\infty$  and

$$\text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{a_0^{(n)}\})]} a_0^{(r)} \quad \text{if } r \leq j+1.$$

As above it follows that there is  $J \in L(G, l^\infty(V))$  which can be extended to  $J_1 \in L(l^\infty(V), l^\infty(V))$  such that  $\|J\| = \|J_1\| = 1$ ,  $J(e) = e$ ,  $J(z) = 0$  if  $z \in c_0$ ,  $J(a_0^{(r)}) = b_0^{(r)}$  if  $r \neq j+1$ ,

$$J(\text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{a_0^{(r)}\})]} a_0^{(r)}) = \text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{b_0^{(r)}\})]} b_0^{(r)} \quad \text{if } r \leq j$$

and

$$J(\text{Proj}_{[M_s(j+1, \{a_0^{(j+1)}\})]} a_0^{(j+1)}) = t_s \cdot \text{Proj}_{[M_s(j+1, \{b_0^{(j+1)}\})]} b_0^{(j+1)}.$$

But then (1) and (2) give that  $\varphi' = \psi_1 \circ J_1$  and  $b^{(r)} = a_0^{(r)}$  have the properties in the lemma. Q.E.D.

**Proposition 1.** *There are  $\varphi_n \in L(l^\infty, l^2(B))$ ,  $H_n \subset B$ ,  $X_n > 0$  and  $z^{(n)} \in D$  such that  $X_n > C_1 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot 2^{-n}$  where  $C_1$  is the constant in Lemma 2 and  $\varepsilon$  the constant in Lemma 1,  $B \setminus H_n$  is finite*

$$H_n \subset H_{n-1} \subset \dots \subset H_0 = B, \quad \sup_{z \in D} \|\text{Proj}_{[H_{k-1}]} \varphi_n(z)\| \leq X_k$$

and

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_{k-1} \setminus H_k]} \varphi_n(z^{(k)})\| > X_k \cdot 10^{-2} \quad \text{if } k \leq n.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi$ ,  $\{a^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  and  $H_k$  be as in Lemma 2. Put  $X_1 = \sup_\varphi \sup_{z \in D} \|\varphi \circ \varphi'(z)\|$  where  $\varphi'$  satisfies the following conditions.

- a) There is an infinite set  $V \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\varphi' \in L(l^\infty(V), l^\infty)$  and  $\|\varphi'\| = 1$ .
- b) There are a 1-set  $\{b^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset l^\infty(V)$  and  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\varphi'(b^{(k)}) = a^{(j+k)}$  if  $k > 1$ .
- c)  $\varphi'(e) = e$  and  $\varphi'(z) = 0$  if  $z \in c_0$ .

Take  $\varphi'_0 \in L(l^\infty(V), l^\infty)$  and  $z^{(1)} \in D$  such that  $\|\varphi \circ \varphi'_0(z^{(1)})\| > 32/50 X_1$  and such that  $\varphi'_0$  satisfies conditions a)–c) for a 1-set  $\{b_0^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset l^\infty(V_0)$  and  $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ . We may assume that

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[B \setminus H_{j_0}]} \varphi \circ \varphi'(z^{(1)})\| > \frac{32}{50} X_1,$$

since otherwise we just have to take a bigger  $j_0$ , omit finitely many  $b_0^{(k)}$  and renumber. Now, if we assume  $X_1 > C_1 \cdot \varepsilon$ , a direct application of Lemma 3, where  $\varphi \circ \varphi'_0$  correspond to  $\varphi$  and  $(H_{j_0+k})_{k=1}^\infty$  correspond to  $(H_k)_{k=1}^\infty$  in Lemma 3, we get that there are an infinite set  $V_1 \subset V_0$ , a 1-set  $\{b_{(1)}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset l^\infty(V_1)$  and  $\varphi'_1 \in L(l^\infty(V_1), l^\infty(V_0))$   $h^{(1)}$  and  $h_1^{(1)} \in C$  such that

$$(1) \quad \|\text{Proj}_{[V_1]}(z^{(1)} - h^{(1)}e - h_1^{(1)}b_{(1)}^{(1)})\| < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot C_1}{10^4 \cdot C_2}$$

and  $\psi_1 = \varphi'_0 \circ \varphi'_1$  satisfies a)–c) with  $V$ ,  $\{b^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  and  $j$  replaced by  $V_1$ ,  $\{b_{(1)}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  and  $j_0+1$ . That  $X_1 > C_1 \cdot \varepsilon$  follows because there is  $z^0 \in D$  such that  $N_N(z^0) > 2 \cdot \varepsilon$ , according to Lemma 1, hence there are an infinite set  $V' \subset \mathbb{N}$  and a 1-set  $\{a_0^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset l^\infty(V')$  such that  $N_{V'}(z^0 - h \cdot a_0^{(1)}) = 0$  for some  $h \in C$  such that  $|h| > \varepsilon$ . Assume

now that there are, for every  $t < n$ , an infinite set  $V_t \subset V_{t-1}$ ,  $\psi_t \in L(I^\infty(V_t), I^\infty(V_{t-1}))$ ,  $\varphi_t \in L(I^\infty(V_t), I^2(B))$ , a 1-set  $\{b_{(t)}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset I^\infty(V)$ ,  $z^{(t)} \in D$ ,  $j_t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $X_t > C_1 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot 2^{-t}$ ,  $h^{(t)} \in C$  and  $h_{r,s}^{(t)} \in C$  such that

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_{j(t-1)} \setminus H_{j(t)}]} \varphi_t(z^{(t)})\| > \frac{X_t}{50}, \quad \text{where } j(t) = \sum_{r=1}^t j_r,$$

$$\sum_s \|\text{Proj}_{[H_{j(t)}]} \varphi_t(\text{Proj}_{[M_s(t+1, \{b_{(t)}^{(j)}\})]} e)\| < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot t^{-t} \cdot C_1}{10^4 \cdot C_2}$$

$$\psi_t(\text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{b_{(t)}^{(j)}\})]} b_{(t)}^{(r)}) = \text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{b_{(t-1)}^{(j)}\})]} b_{(t-1)}^{(r)} \quad \text{if } r < t,$$

$$\psi_t(b_{(t)}^{(r)}) = b_{(t-1)}^{(j_t+r)} \quad \text{if } r > t,$$

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[V_t]} (z^{(t)} - h^{(t)}) e - \sum_{r=1}^t \sum_s h_{r,s}^{(t)} \cdot \text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{b_{(t)}^{(j)}\})]} b_{(t)}^{(r)}\| < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot t^{-t} \cdot C_1}{10^4 \cdot C_2}.$$

Then it follows, since  $|h^{(t)}|, |h_{r,s}^{(t)}| < 2$  because  $\sup_{z \in D} \|z\| = 1$ , that

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_{j(k-1)} \setminus H_{j(k)}]} \varphi_t(z^{(k)})\| > \frac{X_k}{100} \quad \text{if } k \leq t.$$

Put  $X_n = \sup_\varphi \sup_{z \in D} \|\text{Proj}_{[H_{j(n-1)}]} \varphi_{n-1} \circ \varphi'(z)\|$  where  $\varphi'$  satisfies the following conditions:

a') There is an infinite set  $V \subset V_{n-1}$  such that  $\varphi' \in L(I^\infty(V), I^\infty(V_{n-1}))$  and  $\|\varphi'\| = 1$ .

b') There are a 1-set  $\{c^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset I^\infty(V)$  and  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\varphi'(c^{(k)}) = b_{(n-1)}^{(j+k)}$  if  $k > n$  and

$$\varphi'(\text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{c^{(j)}\})]} c^{(r)}) = \text{Proj}_{[M_s(r, \{b_{(n-1)}^{(j)}\})]} b_{(n-1)}^{(r)} \quad \text{if } r \leq n-1.$$

c')  $\varphi'(e) = e$  and  $\varphi'(z) = 0$  if  $z \in c_0$ .

Take now  $\varphi_0 \in L(I^\infty(V_0), I^\infty(V_{n-1}))$ ,  $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $z^{(n)} \in D$  such that

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_{j(n-1)} \setminus H_{j(n-1)+j_0}]} \varphi_{n-1} \circ \varphi_0(z^{(n)})\| > \frac{32}{50} X_n$$

and such that  $\varphi_0$  satisfies the conditions a')—c') for a 1-set  $\{c_0^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset I^\infty(V_0)$ . The existence of  $j_0$  follows as before. Now, if we assume  $X_n > C_1 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot 2^{-n}$ , an application of Lemma 3, where  $\varphi_{n-1} \circ \varphi_0$  correspond to  $\varphi$  and  $(H_{j(k)})_{k=1}^{n-1} \cup (H_{j(n-1)+j_0+k})_{k=0}^\infty$  correspond to  $(H_k)_{k=1}^\infty$  in the Lemma, give that there are an infinite set  $V_n \subset V_0$ , a 1-set  $\{b_{(n)}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset I^\infty(V_n)$  and  $\varphi'_0 \in L(I^\infty(V_n), I^\infty(V_0))$  such that  $\psi_n = \varphi_0 \circ \varphi'_0$ ,  $\varphi_n = \varphi_{n-1} \circ \psi_n$ ,  $V_n, j_n = j_0 + 1$ ,  $\{b_{(n)}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  and  $z^{(n)}$  satisfy the conditions 1)—5) for some  $h^{(n)} \in C$  and  $h_{r,s}^{(n)} \in C$ .  $X_n > C_1 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot 2^{-n}$  because there is  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_{j(n-1)}]} \varphi_{n-1}(\text{Proj}_{[M_s(n, \{b_{(n-1)}^{(j)}\})]} b_{(n-1)}^{(n)})\| > C_1 \cdot 2^{-n}$$

and because  $\sup_{z \in D} N_{M_s(n, (b_{(n-1)}^{(i)}))}(z) > 2 \cdot \varepsilon$

$$\|\text{Proj}_{[H_{j(k-1)} \setminus H_{j(k)}]} \varphi_n(z^{(k)})\| > \frac{X_k}{100}, \quad \text{if } k \leq n,$$

because of b') and 5). Hence  $\varphi_n, H_{j(n)}, X_n$  and  $z^{(n)}$  have the desired properties. QED

**Lemma 4.** *E has property A if there exists to every given  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  a mapping  $\varphi_t \in L(I^\infty, \mathbb{C}^t)$  and to every given  $\gamma > 0$  a number  $C_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\sup_{z \in D} |\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_t(z)| \leq 1$  for every  $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$  and such that for every  $z \in D$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$   $|\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_t(z)| \leq \gamma$  for at most  $C_\gamma$  different  $n \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume the lemma is false. It is easy to see that we may assume without loss of generality that  $\sup_t \sup_n \sup_{z \in D} |\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_t(z)| < 2$ . It is well known and easily seen that there are uncountably many  $g_\alpha \in G = U_1 \times U_2 \times \dots \times U_t \times \dots$ , where  $U_i = \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ , such that if  $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$   $\text{Proj}_{[j]} g_{\alpha_1} \neq \text{Proj}_{[j]} g_{\alpha_2}$  for at most finitely many  $j$ . Let  $\varphi \in L(E, I^\infty(G))$  be the mapping  $\varphi = \{\varphi_1 \circ \psi, \varphi_2 \circ \psi, \dots, \varphi_t \circ \psi, \dots\}$  where  $\psi \in L(E, I^\infty)$  is the mapping in the beginning of the proof of the theorem. Since  $\{g_\alpha\}_\alpha$  is uncountable it follows from the argument in the proof of Lemma 1 if  $E$  does not have property A that there are  $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \{\alpha\}$ ,  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , infinite sets  $V_j \subset V_{j-1} \subset \mathbb{N}$  and  $z^{(j)} \in D$  such that

$$\lim_{\substack{t \rightarrow \infty \\ t \in \text{Proj}_{[V_j]} g_{\alpha_j}}} \varphi(z^{(j)}) = \varepsilon_0.$$

Let  $\psi_1 \in L(I^\infty, \mathbb{C})$  be such that  $\|\psi_1\| < 1/\varepsilon_0$ ,  $\psi_1(x^{(j)}) = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\psi(z) = 0$  if  $\text{supp } z \cap V_j$  is finite for some  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  where  $x^{(j)} = (x_n^{(j)})_{n=1}^\infty$ ,  $x_n^{(j)} = \varepsilon_0$  if  $n \in V_j$  and  $x_n^{(j)} = 0$  if  $n \notin V_j$ . Let  $\psi_{1,j} \in L(I^\infty(g_{\alpha_j}), \mathbb{C})$  correspond to  $\psi_1$ . From the proof of Lemma 1 it follows, since  $|\psi_{1,j}(\varphi(z^{(j)}))| = \frac{1}{2}$ , that if  $E$  does not have property A there are a subsequence  $\{j_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and  $z \in D$  such that  $|\psi_{1,j_k}(\varphi(z))| > \delta$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence there are, to every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t_r \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $Y_r \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that  $Y_r$  contains  $r$  elements and  $|\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_{t_r}(\psi(z))| > \delta \cdot \varepsilon_0$  if  $n \in Y_r$  since otherwise there are  $z^{(j)} \in I^\infty$  such that  $\text{supp } z^{(j)} \cap \text{supp } z^{(j')} = \emptyset$  if  $j_1 \neq j_2$  and  $|\psi_1(z^{(j)})| > 1$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  which is impossible. Hence we get a contradiction if  $r > C_{\gamma, \varepsilon_0}$ . QED.

**Lemma 5.** *If E does not have property A there exist to every  $\gamma > 0$  a number  $C_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$  and number  $T_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$  such that if  $t \geq C_\gamma$  and  $\sup_{z \in D} \sum_{k=1}^{j_n} N_{M_k^{(n)}}(z) \leq 1$ , where  $M_k^{(n)} \subset \mathbb{N}$ , for every  $n \in \{1, \dots, t\}$  then there are  $z^{(j)} \in D$  and  $V \subset \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$  such that  $\sum_{n \in V} \sum_{k=1}^{j_n} N_{M_k^{(n)}}(z^{(j)}) > 2^{T_\gamma - \gamma T_\gamma}$  and such that  $V$  contains  $2^{T_\gamma}$  elements.*

*Proof.* It is easily seen that it is enough to prove the lemma if  $\sum_{k=1}^{j_n} N_{M_k^{(n)}}(z)$  is replaced by  $|\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_t(z)|$  where  $\varphi_t \in L(I^\infty, \mathbb{C}^t)$ . From Lemma 4 it follows easily that there is to every  $\gamma > 0$  a number  $P_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$  such that if  $t \geq P_\gamma$ ,  $\varphi_t \in L(I^\infty, \mathbb{C}^t)$  and  $\sup_{z \in D} |\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_t(z)| \leq 1$  for every  $n \in \{1, \dots, t\}$  then there are  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $z \in D$  such



that  $|\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_t(z)| \cong 2^{-\gamma \cdot T}$  for at least  $2^T$  different  $n \in \{1, \dots, t\}$  where  $T$  perhaps depends on the choice of  $\varphi_t$ . Assume that  $t \cong (P_\gamma)^3$  and let  $T_0$  be the biggest  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $2^T \cong P_\gamma$ . It follows from above that either there is  $z^{(1)} \in D$  such that  $|\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_t(z^{(1)})| \cong 2^{-\gamma \cdot T_0}$  for at least  $2^{T_0}$  different  $n \in \{1, \dots, t\}$  or there are  $z^{r,s} \in D$  and disjoint sets  $V_s^r \subset \{1, \dots, t\}$ , where  $1 \leq r \leq T_0 - 1$  and  $1 \leq s \leq j_r \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\bigcup_{r=1}^{T_0-1} \bigcup_{s=1}^{j_r} V_s^r$  contains more than  $t - P_\gamma$  elements,  $V_s^r$  contains  $2^r$  elements or is empty and  $|\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_t(z^{r,s})| \cong 2^{-r \cdot \gamma}$  if  $n \in V_s^r$ . Hence there is

$$\varphi_1 \in L(C^{s=1}, C_{j_1})$$

such that  $\|\varphi_1\| = 1$  and  $|\text{Proj}_{[s]} \varphi_{t,1}(z^{1,s})| \cong 2^{1-\gamma}$  for every  $s \in \{1, \dots, j_1\}$  where  $\varphi_{t,1} = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_t$ . But then it follows from above that there are  $z^{r,s,1} \in D$  and disjoint sets  $V_s^{r,1} \subset \{1, \dots, t\}$  where  $2 \leq r \leq T_0$  and  $s \leq i_r \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\bigcup_{r=2}^{T_0} \bigcup_s V_s^{r,1}$  contains more than  $t - P_\gamma - 2 \cdot P_\gamma$  elements,  $V_s^{r,1}$  contains  $2^r$  elements or is empty and  $\sum_{n \in V_s^{r,1}} |\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_t(z^{r,s,1})| \cong 2^{r-\gamma}$ . Since  $t - \sum_{k=1}^{T_0} k \cdot P_\gamma > 0$  we can repeat this argument and we get at most  $T_0$  steps that there are  $z^{(1)} \in D$  and  $V \subset \{1, \dots, t\}$  such that  $\sum_{n \in V} |\text{Proj}_{[n]} \varphi_t(z^{(1)})| \cong 2^{T_0 - \gamma T_0}$  where  $V$  contains  $2^{T_0}$  elements. Hence  $C_\gamma = (P_\gamma)^3$ ,  $T_\gamma = T_0$ ,  $z^{(\gamma)} = z^{(1)}$  and  $V$  have the properties in the lemma. QED.

**Lemma 6.** *If  $E$  does not have property A then, for every  $\gamma > 0$ ,  $\sup_{z \in D} \sum_{k=1}^{j_n} N_{M_k^n}(z) > 2^{-\gamma \cdot n} \cdot j_n$  if  $n$  is big enough where  $M_k^{(n)} \subset \mathbb{N}$  are infinite sets such that for fixed  $n$ ,  $M_k^{(n)}$  are disjoint and  $1 \leq k \leq j_n \leq 2^n$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $\gamma_0 < \gamma$  and take  $C_{\gamma_0}$  and  $T_{\gamma_0}$  as in Lemma 5. Let  $l_n \in \mathbb{N}$  be the greatest integer  $l$  such that  $\sum_{r=1}^l C_{\gamma_0} \cdot 2^{(r-1)T_{\gamma_0}} \leq j_n$ . Repeated applications of Lemma 5 give, since  $\sup_{z \in D} N_{M_k^n}(z) > \varepsilon$ , that

$$\sup_{z \in D} \sum_{k=1}^{j_n} N_{M_k^n}(z) > 2^{-\gamma_0 \cdot T_{\gamma_0} \cdot l_n} 2^{l_n \cdot T_{\gamma_0}} \varepsilon > 2^{-n \gamma_0} \cdot \frac{j_n \cdot \varepsilon}{C_{\gamma_0}} > 2^{-\gamma \cdot n} j_n$$

if  $n$  is big enough because  $2^{l_n \cdot T_{\gamma_0}} \leq 2^n$ , hence  $l_n \leq n/T_{\gamma_0}$  and because  $C_{\gamma_0} \cdot 2^{(l_n+1)T_{\gamma_0}} > j_n$ . Q.E.D.

*Proof of the theorem, continued.* We shall use the notation in the proposition and its proof. It is easy to see that we may assume that  $X_n$  decreases. There is  $\delta > 0$  such that  $X_n < (1 - 2\delta)^n \cdot C_1$  if  $n$  is big since if  $(X_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is not dominated by a geometric series there is, to every  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n_t \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $X_{n_t}/X_{n_t+t} < 1 + 1/t$  hence

$$\left( \frac{100}{X_{n_t+t}} \varphi'_t \circ \text{Proj}_{[H_{n_t} - \setminus H_{n_t+t-1}]} \varphi_{n_t+t} \right)_{t=1}^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad c_\gamma = \frac{200}{\gamma^2}$$

have the same properties as  $(\varphi_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  and  $C_\gamma$  in Lemma 4 for a suitable choice of  $\varphi'_t \in L(I^2(H_{n_t-1} \setminus H_{n_t+t-1}), \mathbf{C}')$  which is impossible. Divide now, for each  $n$ ,  $\{1, 2, \dots, 2^{n-1}\}$  into  $[2/\delta]+1$  disjoint parts  $U_{r,n}$  ( $[ ]$  denotes the integer part) such that

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(1 - r \cdot \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^n \cdot \|\text{Proj}_{[H_{n-1}]} \varphi_{n-1}(b_{(n-1)}^{(n)})\| \cong \\ & \cong \|\text{Proj}_{[H_{n-1}]} \varphi_{n-1}(\text{Proj}_{[M_s(n, \{b_{(n-1)}^{(s)}\})]} b_{(n-1)}^{(n)})\| \cong \\ & \cong \left(1 - (r-1) \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^n \|\text{Proj}_{[H_{n-1}]} \varphi_{n-1}(b_{(n-1)}^{(n)})\| \quad \text{if } j \in U_{r,n}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\|\text{Proj}_{[H_{n-1}]} \varphi_{n-1}(b_{(n-1)}^{(n)})\| > C_1$  it follows that there is  $r_n \in \mathbf{N}$  such that  $(1 - r_n \delta/2)^n \cong 1/4^n$  and

$$(2) \quad \left\| \text{Proj}_{[H_{n-1}]} \left( \sum_{s \in U_{r_n, n}} \varphi_{n-1}(\text{Proj}_{[M_s(n, \{b_{(n-1)}^{(s)}\})]} b_{(n-1)}^{(n)}) \right) \right\| \cong \frac{\delta}{3} \|\text{Proj}_{[H_{n-1}]} \varphi_{n-1}(b_{(n-1)}^{(n)})\|.$$

Lemma 6 gives that to every  $\gamma > 0$  there is  $z^{(\gamma)} \in D$  such that

$$(3) \quad \sum_{s \in U_{r_n, n}} N_{M_s(n, \{b_{(n-1)}^{(s)}\})}(z^{(\gamma)}) > 2^{-\gamma n} \cdot j_n,$$

if  $n$  is large, where  $j_n$  is the number of elements in  $U_{r_n, n}$ . But then the proposition and the proof of Lemma 3 give that

$$x_n > \frac{\delta}{3} \cdot \left( \frac{1 - r_n \cdot \delta}{1 - (r_n - 1) \cdot \delta} \right)^n \cdot \|\text{Proj}_{[H_{n-1}]} \varphi_{n-1}(b_{(n-1)}^{(n)})\| \cdot 2^{-\gamma n - 1} \cdot j_n$$

according to (1), (2) and (3). But since  $1 - r_n \cdot \delta/2 \cong 1/4$  it follows that  $r_n \cdot \delta \cong 3/2$  hence that

$$\frac{1 - \frac{r_n \cdot \delta}{2}}{1 - \frac{(r_n - 1) \cdot \delta}{2}} \cong 1 - \frac{2\delta}{1 + 2\delta}$$

hence if  $\gamma$  is small and  $n$  is big enough it follows that  $X_n > (1 - 2\delta)^n \cdot C_1$ , because  $\|\text{Proj}_{[H_{n-1}]} \varphi_{n-1}(b_{(n-1)}^{(n)})\| > C_1$ , which is a contradiction. Q.E.D.

**Added in proof**

The results in this paper were announced in May 1973 at an international conference on infinite-dimensional holomorphy in Lexington, Kentucky, USA.

The Theorem has been proved independently by A. Nissenzweig.

**References**

1. COEURÉ, G. Thesis. *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **20** (1970).
2. DINEEN, S. Unbounded holomorphic functions on a Banach space. *J. London Math. Soc.* **4** (1972).
3. LACEY, E. Separable quotients of Banach spaces. *An. da Acad. Brasil. Ci.* **44** (1972).
4. LINDENSTRAUSS, J. *Some aspects of the theory of Banach spaces. Advances in Math.* **5** (1970).
5. NACHBIN, L. *Topology on spaces of holomorphic mappings. Springer-Verlag, Ergebnisse der Math.* **47** (1969).
6. ROSENTHAL, H. On quasi-complemented subspaces with an appendix on compactness on operators from  $L^p(\mu)$  to  $L^r(U)$ . *J. Functional Analysis* **4** (1969).
7. THORP, E. and WHITLEY, R. Operator representations theorems. *Ill. J. Math.* **9** (1965).

Received May 9, 1974

Bengt Josefson  
Department of Mathematics  
Syslomansgatan 8  
UPPSALA, Sweden