

# Best approximation and intersections of balls in Banach spaces

David T. Yost

Let  $E$  be a Banach space,  $M$  a closed subspace of  $E$  with the 3-ball property. It is known that  $M$  is proximal in  $E$ , and that its metric projection admits a continuous selection. This means that there is a continuous (generally non-linear) map  $\pi : E \rightarrow M$  satisfying  $\|x - \pi(x)\| = d(x, M)$  for all  $x$  in  $E$ . Here it is shown that the same conclusion holds under a much weaker hypothesis on  $M$ , which we call the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property. We also establish that if  $M$  has the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property in  $E$ , then there is a continuous Hahn-Banach extension map from  $M^*$  to  $E^*$ .

## Introduction

Let  $M$  be a closed subspace of a Banach space  $E$ . This paper clarifies the relationship between approximative properties of  $M$ , and intersection properties of balls pertaining to  $M$ . Recall that  $M$  is said to be an  $L$ -summand (respectively, an  $M$ -summand) of  $E$  if there is a linear projection  $Q$  from  $E$  onto  $M$  such that  $\|x\| = \|Qx\| + \|x - Qx\|$  (respectively,  $\|x\| = \max\{\|Qx\|, \|x - Qx\|\}$ ) for all  $x \in E$ . If  $M^0$ , the polar of  $M$ , is an  $L$ -summand of  $E^*$ , then  $M$  is said to be an  $M$ -ideal in  $E$ . We say that  $M$  has the  $n$ -ball property in  $E$  if given  $n$  closed balls  $B(a_i, r_i)$  such that  $M \cap B(a_i, r_i)$  is non-empty for each  $i$ , and  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n B(a_i, r_i)$  has non-empty interior, then  $M \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n B(a_i, r_i)$  is

---

Received 27 March 1979.

non-empty. These notions were introduced by Alfsen and Effros [1], who showed that an  $M$ -ideal has the  $n$ -ball property for every  $n$  and, conversely, that any subspace with the 3-ball property is already an  $M$ -ideal.

Let  $H(\cdot)$  denote the family of all closed, bounded, convex, and non-empty subsets of a given Banach space. The metric projection  $P = P_M : E \rightarrow H(M) \cup \{\emptyset\}$  is the set-valued map defined by  $P(a) = M \cap B(a, d(a, M))$ . Thus  $P(a)$  is the set of points in  $M$  which are nearest to  $a$ .  $M$  is said to be proximal in  $E$  if  $P(a) \neq \emptyset$ , for all  $a \in E$ . Then a proximity map  $\pi : E \rightarrow M$  is any (not necessarily continuous) selection for  $P$ . Note that  $P(a+x) = P(a) + x$  whenever  $x \in M$ . We say that a selection  $\pi$  is quasi-additive if  $\pi(a+x) = \pi(a) + x$  whenever  $x \in M$ .

Alfsen and Effros [1, Corollary 5.6] and Ando [2, Theorem 2.1] independently showed that every  $M$ -ideal is proximal. Holmes, Scranton, and Ward [6, Theorem 2.2] improved this by showing that the metric projection onto an  $M$ -ideal admits a continuous, homogeneous selection.

We will say that  $M$  has the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property in  $E$  if the conditions  $a_1 \in M$ ,  $M \cap B(a_2, r_2) \neq \emptyset$ , and  $\|a_1 - a_2\| < r_1 + r_2$  imply that  $M \cap B(a_1, r_1) \cap B(a_2, r_2) \neq \emptyset$ . After translating and scaling it is evident that this is equivalent to requiring  $M \cap B(0, 1) \cap B(a, r) \neq \emptyset$  whenever  $M \cap B(a, r) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\|a\| < r + 1$ . Our main result is that every subspace with the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property is proximal, and that its metric projection admits a continuous, homogeneous, quasi-additive selection. In Section 2 we give examples of closed subspaces of Banach spaces which possess the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property. Not all of these subspaces are  $M$ -ideals, so our result has wider applicability than that of [6]. We also show that if  $M$  has the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property in  $E$ , then there is a continuous, homogeneous map  $\psi : M^* \rightarrow E^*$  such that each  $\psi(f)$  is a norm preserving extension of  $f$ . Under additional hypotheses, we are able to establish the Lipschitz continuity and linearity of certain proximity maps and Hahn-Banach extension maps.

Except when specific mention is made to the contrary, scalars may be real or complex. By  $C(X, E)$  we denote the Banach space of continuous

functions from the compact, Hausdorff space  $X$  into the Banach space  $E$ . If  $S$  is a sequence space, then  $S(E)$  will denote the Banach space of all sequences  $(x_n)$  from  $E$  such that the sequence  $(\|x_n\|)$  is in  $S$ .

$B(E, F)$  is the space of bounded, linear operators from  $E$  to  $F$ , and  $K(E, F)$  is the subspace of compact operators. We use  $d_H$  for the Hausdorff metric on  $H(E)$ ,

$$d_H(A, B) = \sup\{\{d(x, A) : x \in B\} \cup \{d(x, B) : x \in A\}\}.$$

By Michael's Selection Theorem we mean [11, Theorem 3.2"].

### 1. Existence of continuous selections

We establish the results stated in the abstract.

LEMMA 1.1. *Suppose  $M$  has the  $\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property in  $E$ . Then*

- (i)  *$M$  is proximal in  $E$ ,*
- (ii) *for all  $a, b \in E$  we have  $d_H(a-P(a), b-P(b)) \leq 3d(a-b, M)$ .*

*The constant 3 is, in general, best possible.*

Proof. (i) Let  $a \in E$ ,  $\delta = d(a, M)$ . We inductively construct a sequence  $(x_n) \subset M$  satisfying

$$(1) \quad \|x_n - x_{n+1}\| \leq 2^{-n}$$

and

$$(2) \quad \|x_n - a\| \leq \delta + 2^{-n}.$$

Obviously a suitable  $x_1$  exists. Suppose  $x_n$  is given, and satisfies

(2). Then we have  $x_n \in M$ ,  $M \cap B(a, \delta + 2^{-n-1}) \neq \emptyset$  and

$\|x_n - a\| < \delta + 2^{-n-1} + 2^{-n}$ . Since  $M$  has the  $\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property,

$M \cap B(x_n, 2^{-n}) \cap B(a, \delta + 2^{-n-1}) \neq \emptyset$ . Any point  $x_{n+1}$  in this intersection will satisfy (1) and (2).

The induction completed, (1) implies that  $(x_n)$  is Cauchy, and hence converges to some  $x \in M$ . Then (2) yields  $\|x - a\| = \delta$ . Thus  $P(a) \neq \emptyset$ .

(ii) Let  $a, b \in E$  with  $d(a-b, M) < \epsilon$ . It suffices to show that, given  $x \in P(a)$ , we can find  $y \in P(b)$  with  $\|(a-x)-(b-y)\| < 3\epsilon$ . If  $b \in M$ , then  $P(b) = \{b\}$  and we must take  $y = b$ . Then  $\|a-x-b+y\| = \|a-x\| = d(a, M) = d(a-b, M) < \epsilon$  as required. If  $b \notin M$ , then  $\delta = d(b, M) > 0$ . Choose  $z \in M$  with  $\|a-b+z\| < \epsilon$ . Then  $z+x \in M$ ,  $M \cap B(b, \delta) \neq \emptyset$  by (i), and

$$\|z+x-b\| \leq \|a-b+z\| + \|x-a\| < \epsilon + d(a, M) < 2\epsilon + \delta.$$

Since  $M$  has the  $1/2$ -ball property, we can find

$$y \in M \cap B(b, \delta) \cap B(z+x, 2\epsilon).$$

Clearly  $y \in P(b)$ . Finally

$$\|a-x-b+y\| \leq \|y-(x+z)\| + \|a-b+z\| < 2\epsilon + \epsilon.$$

To show that this estimate is sharp, consider the real Banach space  $E = \mathcal{L}_\infty(3)$  (that is,  $E = \mathbf{R}^3$ , with the sup norm), with  $M$  the one-dimensional subspace spanned by  $(1, 1, 0)$ . It is elementary to check that  $M$  has the  $1/2$ -ball property in  $E$ . Let  $a = (0, 0, 3)$ ,  $b = (1, -1, 2)$ , and  $x = (-3, -3, 0)$ . Then

$$P(b) = \{(\lambda, \lambda, 0) : -1 \leq \lambda \leq 1\}$$

and so  $d(a-x, b-P(b)) = 3$ . Now  $x \in P(a)$ , so  $d_H(a-P(a), b-P(b)) \geq 3$ .

But  $d(a-b, M) \leq \|a-b\| = 1$ . //

We remark that if  $M$  has the 2-ball property in  $E$ , then the estimate of Lemma 1.1 can be sharpened to  $d_H(a-P(a), b-P(b)) \leq d(a-b, M)$ . The preceding example then shows that the  $1/2$ -ball property is strictly weaker than the 2-ball property.

**THEOREM 1.2.** *If  $M$  has the  $1/2$ -ball property in  $E$ , then*

- (i) *there is a continuous, homogeneous map  $\psi : E/M \rightarrow E$  satisfying  $\psi(a+M) \in a+M$  and  $\|\psi(a+M)\| = \|a+M\|$  for all  $a \in E$ ,*
- (ii) *there is a continuous, homogeneous, quasi-additive proximity map  $\pi : E \rightarrow M$ ,*
- (iii) *there is a continuous, homogeneous Hahn-Banach extension map  $\psi : M^* \rightarrow E^*$ .*

Proof. (i) Define  $\eta : E/M \rightarrow H(E)$  by  $\eta(a+M) = a - P_M(a)$ . Since  $M$  is proximal,  $\eta$  is well-defined. By Lemma 1.1,  $\eta$  is continuous with respect to the Hausdorff metric on  $H(E)$ , and is therefore lower semicontinuous. Michael's selection theorem ensures the existence of  $\psi$ , a continuous selection for  $\eta$ . An argument of Kadison [see 11, p. 376] shows that  $\psi$  can be chosen homogeneous. Clearly  $\psi$  has the stated properties.

(ii) Let  $\psi$  be given by (i), and define  $\pi$  by  $\pi(a) = a - \psi(a+M)$ . Then  $\pi$  is continuous, homogeneous, quasi-additive, and satisfies  $\pi(a) \in P(a)$  for all  $a \in E$ .

(iii) We claim that  $M^0$  has the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property in  $E^*$ . So let  $M^0 \cap B(f, r) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $\|f\| \leq r + 1$ . To show that  $M^0 \cap B(0, 1) \cap B(f, r) \neq \emptyset$  it suffices, by [7, Theorem 1.2], to show that  $|f(a_2)| \leq \|a_1\| + r\|a_2\|$  whenever  $a_1 + a_2 \in M$ . If  $\|a_2\| \leq \|a_1\|$  then

$$|f(a_2)| \leq (r+1)\|a_2\| \leq \|a_1\| + r\|a_2\|.$$

So assume  $\|a_2\| > \|a_1\|$  and fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since  $a_1 + a_2 \in M \cap B(a_2, \|a_1\| + \epsilon)$ , the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property gives us some

$$a \in M \cap B(0, \|a_2\| - \|a_1\|) \cap B(a_2, \|a_1\| + \epsilon).$$

Now  $\|f|_M\| = d(f, M^0) < r$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} |f(a_2)| &= |f(a) - f(a - a_2)| \leq r\|a\| + (r+1)\|a - a_2\| \\ &\leq r(\|a_2\| - \|a_1\|) + (r+1)(\|a_1\| + \epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  establishes the claim.

From (i) we obtain a continuous, homogeneous map  $\psi : E^*/M^0 \rightarrow E^*$  satisfying  $\psi(f+M^0) \in f+M^0$  and  $\|\psi(f+M^0)\| = d(f, M^0) = \|f|_M\|$  for all  $f \in E^*$ . Identifying  $E^*/M^0$  with  $M^*$  completes the proof. //

If  $P_M(a)$  is a singleton for each  $a \in E$ , then  $M$  is said to be a Chebyshev subspace of  $E$ . In this case the proximity map is unique and is usually referred to as the metric projection. Let us say that  $M$  is a

semi- $L$ -summand in  $E$  [7, Section 5] if  $M$  is Chebyshev in  $E$  and the metric projection  $\pi : E \rightarrow M$  satisfies  $\|x\| = \|\pi(x)\| + \|x-\pi(x)\|$  for all  $x \in E$ . It is routine to check that every semi- $L$ -summand (*a fortiori*, every  $L$ -summand) has the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property.

**THEOREM 1.3.** *Let  $M$  be a semi- $L$ -summand in  $E$ . Then*

- (i) *the metric projection  $\pi : E \rightarrow M$  is a contraction,*
- (ii) *there is a linear Hahn-Banach extension map  $\psi : M^* \rightarrow E^*$  and a linear proximity map  $P : E^* \rightarrow M^0$ ,*
- (iii)  *$M^{00}$  is the range of a norm one projection on  $E^{**}$ .*

Proof. (i) Fix  $a, b \in E$  and assume without loss of generality that  $\|\pi(a)-a\| \leq \|\pi(b)-b\|$ . Since  $M$  is Chebyshev,  $\pi$  must be quasi-additive. Thus  $\pi(\pi(a)-b) = \pi(a) - \pi(b)$  and so

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi(a)-\pi(b)\| &= \|\pi(a)-b\| - \|\pi(b)-b\| \\ &\leq \|\pi(a)-a\| + \|a-b\| - \|\pi(b)-b\| \\ &\leq \|a-b\|. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) We have just shown the existence of a Lipschitz continuous retraction of  $E$  onto  $M$  with Lipschitz constant 1. The existence of  $\psi$  follows from [9, Theorem 3 (a)]. If  $Pf = f - \psi(f|M)$  then  $P$  is linear and  $\|f-Pf\| = \|f|M\| = d(f, M^0)$  for all  $f \in E^*$ .

(iii) Define  $Q : E^{**} \rightarrow M^{00}$  by  $QF = F \circ (I-P)$ . //

Lima [7, Section 6] calls  $M$  a semi- $M$ -ideal in  $E$  if  $M^0$  is a semi- $L$ -summand in  $E^*$ , and shows this is equivalent to  $M$  having what he calls the 2-ball property. The reader is warned that the definition of the 2-ball property used in [7] is, formally at least, weaker than that which we employ.

**COROLLARY 1.4.** *Let  $M$  be a semi- $M$ -ideal in  $E$ .*

- (i) *The Hahn-Banach extension map  $\psi : M^* \rightarrow E^*$  is uniquely determined and satisfies  $\|\psi(f)-\psi(g)\| \leq 2\|f-g\|$  for all  $f, g \in E^*$ . The Lipschitz constant 2 can not, in general, be decreased.*
- (ii)  *$M^0$  is the range of a norm one projection on  $E^*$ .*

Proof. (i) Again we identify  $E^*/M^0$  and  $M^*$ . If  $\pi : E^* \rightarrow M^0$  is the (unique) metric projection, then  $\psi : E^*/M^0 \rightarrow E^*$  satisfies  $\psi(f+M^0) = f - \pi(f)$ . Fix  $f+M^0, g+M^0 \in E^*/M^0$ . Adding a suitable element of  $M^0$ , we may assume that  $\pi(f-g) = 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi(f+M^0) - \psi(g+M^0)\| &= \|f-g-\pi(f)+\pi(g)\| \leq 2\|f-g\| \\ &= 2d(f-g, M^0) = 2\|(f+M^0) - (g+M^0)\|. \end{aligned}$$

To show that the estimate is sharp, let  $E$  be the real Banach space  $\ell_1(3)$  and take  $M = \{(x, y, z) : x+y+z = 0\}$ . Then  $E^* = \ell_\infty(3)$  and  $M^0 = \mathbf{R}1$ .

It is easy to verify that  $M^0$  is a semi- $L$ -summand. In  $E^*/M^0$ , let  $f = (0, 2, 2) + \mathbf{R}1$  and  $g = (-2, 0, -2) + \mathbf{R}1$ . Then  $\|f-g\| = 1$ . Routine checking gives  $\pi(0, 2, 2) = (1, 1, 1)$  and  $\pi(-2, 0, -2) = (-1, -1, -1)$ . Thus  $\psi(f) = (-1, 1, 1)$ ,  $\psi(g) = (-1, 1, -1)$  and so  $\|\psi(f) - \psi(g)\| = 2$ .

(ii) By Theorem 1.3 (iii) there is a norm one projection  $Q : E^{***} \rightarrow M^{000}$ . Let  $f \mapsto \hat{f}$  denote the canonical embedding of  $E^*$  into  $E^{***}$ . Since  $\hat{f} \in M^{000}$  whenever  $f \in M^0$ , the required projection is given by  $f \mapsto Q(\hat{f})|_E$ . //

## 2. Examples

We give examples, mostly in spaces of operators and spaces of continuous functions, of subspaces which have the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property but are not  $M$ -ideals. For some of these examples, previous authors ([3, Corollary 3.19] and [12, 7.5.6]) have used *ad hoc* methods to establish the existence of continuous proximity maps, or simply to establish proximality. The existence of continuous Hahn-Banach extension maps seems to have gone unnoticed. Checking that these subspaces have the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property provides a uniform, and often easier, method of establishing such results. We also give some new example of  $M$ -ideals. Lastly we consider the relationship between the  $n$ -ball property and algebraic structure in subspaces of Banach algebras.

Let us say that a real Banach space  $E$  is a (real) Lindenstrauss space if every collection of pairwise intersecting closed balls in  $E$ ,

whose centres form a compact set, has non-empty intersection.

Lindenstrauss [8, p. 62] showed that a real Banach  $E$  has this property if and only if  $E^* = L_1(\mu)$  for some measure  $\mu$ .

**THEOREM 2.1.** *Let  $E$  be a real Lindenstrauss space,  $X$  and  $Y$  compact Hausdorff spaces, and  $\psi : X \rightarrow Y$  a continuous surjection. Let  $\psi^* : C(Y, E) \rightarrow C(X, E)$  denote the natural isometric embedding,  $\psi^*f = f \circ \psi$ . Then  $M = \psi^*C(Y, E)$  has the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property in  $C(X, E)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose we are given  $f \in C(X, E)$  and  $r > 0$  with  $M \cap B(f, r) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\|f\| \leq r+1$ . Define  $\eta : Y \rightarrow H(E)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(y) &= B(0, 1) \cap \bigcap_{x \in \psi^{-1}(y)} B(f(x), r) \\ &= B(0, 1) \cap \{a \in E : f(\psi^{-1}(y)) \subset B(a, r)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly each  $\eta(y)$  is closed and convex. We must check that  $\eta(y)$  is non-empty. Let  $\psi^*g \in M \cap B(f, r)$ . If  $x_1, x_2 \in \psi^{-1}(y)$  then

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(x_1) - f(x_2)\| &\leq \|f(x_1) - g(y)\| + \|g(y) - f(x_2)\| \\ &\leq 2\|f - \psi^*g\| \leq 2r, \end{aligned}$$

and so  $B(f(x_1), r)$  meets  $B(f(x_2), r)$ . Since  $\|f\| \leq r+1$ ,  $B(0, 1)$  must meet each  $B(f(x), r)$ . Thus the family of balls defining  $\eta(y)$  intersect pairwise. Since the collection of centres  $\{0\} \cup f(\psi^{-1}(y))$  is compact, we have  $\eta(y) \neq \emptyset$ . We claim that  $\eta$  is lower semicontinuous.

So let  $G \subset E$  be open. Let  $y_0 \in \{y : \eta(y) \text{ meets } G\}$  be given, and choose  $a \in \eta(y_0) \cap G$ . Then  $\|a\| \leq 1$ ,  $f(\psi^{-1}(y_0)) \subset B(a, r)$  and  $B(a, \epsilon) \subset G$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . It follows from the compactness of  $X$  that the map  $y \mapsto \psi^{-1}(y)$  is upper semicontinuous. Hence

$N = \{y : f(\psi^{-1}(y)) \subset \text{int } B(a, r+\epsilon)\}$  is an open set containing  $y_0$ . If  $y \in N$ , then  $B(a, \epsilon)$  meets  $B(f(x), r)$  for all  $x \in \psi^{-1}(y)$ . Clearly  $B(a, \epsilon)$  meets  $B(0, 1)$ . Since  $E$  is a real Lindenstrauss space, we deduce that  $\eta(y)$  meets  $B(a, \epsilon)$ , whenever  $y \in N$ . Thus

$N \subset \{y : \eta(y) \text{ meets } G\}$ . It follows that  $\{y : \eta(y) \text{ meets } G\}$  is open, and this proves  $\eta$  is lower semicontinuous.



By Michael's selection theorem, there is a continuous function  $h : Y \rightarrow E$  satisfying  $h(y) \in \eta(y)$  for all  $y$ . It is routine to verify that  $\psi^*h \in M \cap B(0, 1) \cap B(f, r)$ . //

**COROLLARY 2.2.** *Let  $X, Y, \psi, E$  be as in Theorem 2.1. Fix  $y_0 \in Y$  and let  $M = \{\psi^*f : f \in C(Y, E) \text{ and } f(y_0) = 0\}$ . Then  $M$  has the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property in  $C(X, E)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f, r, \eta$  be as in the previous proof. If  $\psi^*g \in M \cap B(f, r)$ , then  $\|f(x) - (\psi^*g)(x)\| \leq r$  whenever  $x \in \psi^{-1}(y_0)$ . Thus  $0 \in \eta(y_0)$ . If we define  $\eta_0 : Y \rightarrow H(E)$  by  $\eta_0(y) = \eta(y)$  for  $y \neq y_0$ , and  $\eta_0(y_0) = \{0\}$ , then  $\eta_0$  will be lower semicontinuous. The existence of a continuous selection for  $\eta_0$  shows that  $M \cap B(0, 1) \cap B(f, r) \neq \emptyset$ . //

**COROLLARY 2.3.** *Any closed subalgebra of  $C(X, \mathbb{R})$  has the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property.*

*Proof.* This follows from the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem and Theorem 2.1 (for subalgebras containing the constant functions) or Corollary 2.2 (for subalgebras not containing the constants). //

It follows from [7, Theorem 7.6] that any closed subspace of  $C(X, \mathbb{R})$  with the 2-ball property must be an ideal. Thus the examples given by the preceding results will not, in general, be  $M$ -ideals.

**PROPOSITION 2.4.** *Let  $E$  be any Banach space,  $X$  a compact Hausdorff space,  $Y$  a closed subset of  $X$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $M = \{f \in C(X, E) : f|_Y = 0\}$  has the  $n$ -ball property in  $C(X, E)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that we have  $M \cap B(f_i, r_i) \neq \emptyset$  for  $i \leq n$ , and

$$\text{int } \bigcap_{i=1}^n B(f_i, r_i) \neq \emptyset. \text{ Define } \psi : X \rightarrow H(E) \text{ by } \psi(x) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n B(f_i(x), r_i).$$

Clearly each  $\psi(x)$  is closed, convex, and has non-empty interior. Hence  $\psi(x) = \overline{\text{int } \psi(x)}$  for all  $x \in X$ . Now let  $G$  be any open subset of  $E$ , and let  $x_0 \in \{x : \psi(x) \text{ meets } G\}$ . Then  $\overline{\text{int } \psi(x_0)}$  meets  $G$ , so we can

find  $a \in \text{int } \psi(x_0) \cap G$ . Then  $\|a - f_i(x_0)\| < r_i$  for each  $i$ . By continuity,  $x_0$  has a neighbourhood  $N$  such that  $x \in N \Rightarrow \|a - f_i(x)\| < r_i$ ,

for all  $i$ . Then  $a \in \psi(x)$  whenever  $x \in N$ , so  $N \subset \{x : \psi(x) \text{ meets } G\}$ . This proves that  $\psi$  is lower semicontinuous.

Fix  $x \in Y$ . If  $g_i \in M \cap B(f_i, r_i)$ ; then

$$\|f_i(x)\| = \|f_i(x) - g_i(x)\| \leq \|f_i - g_i\| \leq r_i.$$

This proves that  $0 \in \psi(x)$ .

Now define  $\eta : X \rightarrow H(E)$  by  $\eta(x) = \psi(x)$  for  $x \notin Y$ , and  $\eta(x) = \{0\}$  for  $x \in Y$ . Since  $Y$  is closed, it is easily shown that  $\eta$  is lower semicontinuous. Let  $f \in C(X, E)$  be a continuous selection for

$\eta$ . Then  $f \in M \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n B(f_i, r_i)$ . //

We note that Corollary 2.3 fails in spaces of complex-valued functions.

**PROPOSITION 2.5.** *A closed \*-subalgebra  $A$  in  $C(X, \mathbb{C})$  has the  $1/2$ -ball property if and only if it is an ideal.*

*Proof.* That ideals have the  $1/2$ -ball property is immediate from Proposition 2.4, with  $E = \mathbb{C}$ . Suppose now that  $A$  is not an ideal. We assume that  $A$  does not contain the constant functions. (If  $1 \in A$ , the result follows from a simplification of the following argument.) By the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem, there is a compact Hausdorff space  $Y$ , a continuous surjection  $\psi : X \rightarrow Y$  and a point  $y_0 \in Y$  such that

$A = \{\psi^*f : f \in C(Y, \mathbb{C}) \text{ and } f(y_0) = 0\}$ . If the restriction of  $\psi$  to

$X \setminus \psi^{-1}(y_0)$  is injective, it can readily be shown that  $A$  is an ideal.

Thus we may find distinct  $x_0, x_1 \in X$  such that  $\psi(x_0) = \psi(x_1) \neq y_0$ . Let  $y_1 = \psi(x_1)$ , and construct continuous functions  $a : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $b : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

satisfying  $-1 \leq a \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq b \leq 1$ ,  $a(x_n) = (-1)^n$  and  $b(y_n) = n$

( $n = 0, 1$ ). Then  $\|a - i\psi^*b\| \leq \sqrt{2} < 1 + 1/2$ ,  $i\psi^*b \in A$ , and

$A \cap B(a, 1) \neq \emptyset$ . However  $A \cap B(a, 1) \cap B(i\psi^*b, 1/2) = \emptyset$ , which shows that

$A$  does not have the  $1/2$ -ball property. For suppose  $\psi^*f \in A \cap B(a, 1)$ .

Then, for  $n = 0, 1$ ,  $|f(y_1) \pm 1| = |(\psi^*f)(x_n) - a(x_n)| \leq \|\psi^*f - a\| \leq 1$ . Hence

$f(y_1) = 0$ . But then  $\|\psi^*f - i\psi^*b\| \geq |f(y_1) - ib(y_1)| = 1 > 1/2$ . //

By Proposition 2.4,  $c_0(E)$  is an  $M$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{L}_\infty(E)$  if  $E$  is finite dimensional. It is useful to know that this is true for arbitrary  $E$ .

**LEMMA 2.6.** *For any Banach space  $E$ ,  $c_0(E)$  is an  $M$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{L}_\infty(E)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $x = (x(n)) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty(E)$  and  $c_0(E) \cap B(x, r) \neq \emptyset$ , then

$$\limsup \|x(n)\| \leq r. \text{ Suppose } \bigcap_{i=1}^3 B(x_i, r_i) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } c_0(E) \cap B(x_i, r_i) \neq \emptyset$$

for each  $i$ . Then for all  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^3 B(x_i, r_i + \epsilon)$  contains a sequence with only finitely many non-zero terms and so meets  $c_0(E)$ . Although formally weaker than the 3-ball property, the property just established does characterize  $M$ -ideals [7, Theorem 6.9]. //

**COROLLARY 2.7.** *For any Banach space  $E$ ,  $K(E, c_0)$  is an  $M$ -ideal in  $B(E, c_0)$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from the natural identifications  $K(E, c_0) = c_0(E^*)$  and  $B(E, c_0) = \{(f_n) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty(E^*) : f_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ weak}^*\}$ . //

**PROPOSITION 2.8.**  *$K(\mathcal{L}_1)$  has the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property in  $B(\mathcal{L}_1)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that for any operator matrix  $a = (a_{ij}) \in B(\mathcal{L}_1)$  we have  $\|a\| = \sup_{j=1}^\infty \sum_{i=1}^\infty |a_{ij}|$  and  $a \in K(\mathcal{L}_1) \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{j=1}^\infty \sum_{i=n}^\infty |a_{ij}| = 0$ . Fix  $a \in B(\mathcal{L}_1)$  with  $\|a\| \leq r+1$ , and  $K(\mathcal{L}_1) \cap B(a, r) \neq \emptyset$ . We assume that  $\|a\| > r$ , otherwise  $0 \in K(\mathcal{L}_1) \cap B(0, 1) \cap B(a, r)$ .

Fix  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $\sum_{i=1}^\infty |a_{ij}| \leq r$ , put  $x_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i$ . Otherwise choose  $n = n(j)$  and  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$  so that  $\lambda |a_{nj}| + \sum_{i=n+1}^\infty |a_{ij}| = r$ . Putting  $x_{ij} = a_{ij}$  for  $i < n$ ,  $x_{nj} = (1-\lambda)a_{nj}$  and  $x_{ij} = 0$  for  $i > n$ , we have  $\sum_{i=1}^\infty |x_{ij}| = \sum_{i=1}^\infty |a_{ij}| - r$ .

It follows that  $x \in B(\mathcal{L}_1)$  with  $\|x\| \leq \|a\| - r \leq 1$ . For each  $j$ , either  $x_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i$ , or  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_{ij} - x_{ij}| = r$ . Hence  $\|a - x\| \leq r$ .

We must show  $x \in K(\mathcal{L}_1)$ . Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since  $K(\mathcal{L}_1)$  meets  $B(a, r)$ , there is a finite rank operator in  $B(a, r + \epsilon)$ . Thus, for some  $N$ ,

$\sup_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=N}^{\infty} |a_{ij}| < r + \epsilon$ . Fix  $j$ . If  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_{ij}| \leq r$ , or if  $N > n(j)$ ,

then  $\sum_{i=N}^{\infty} |x_{ij}| = 0$ . If  $N \leq n(j)$  then  $\sum_{i=N}^{\infty} |x_{ij}| = \sum_{i=N}^{\infty} |a_{ij}| - r < \epsilon$ .

Thus  $\sup_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=N}^{\infty} |x_{ij}| < \epsilon$ , as desired. //

If  $E$  and  $F$  are separable sequence spaces (that is,  $c_0$  or  $\mathcal{L}_p$ ,  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ), what is the largest value of  $n$  such that  $K(E, F)$  has the  $n$ -ball property in  $B(E, F)$ ? Hennefeld [5] showed that  $K(\mathcal{L}_p)$  is an  $M$ -ideal in  $B(\mathcal{L}_p)$  if  $1 < p < \infty$ . Minor modifications to his argument yield that  $K(\mathcal{L}_p, \mathcal{L}_q)$  is an  $M$ -ideal in  $B(\mathcal{L}_p, \mathcal{L}_q)$  if  $1 < p < q < \infty$ . By [13, Theorem 6.2]  $K(\mathcal{L}_1)$  fails the 2-ball property in  $B(\mathcal{L}_1)$ . We show that  $K(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_p)$  fails the  $\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property in  $B(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_p)$  if  $1 < p < \infty$ . Since  $K(E, F) = B(E, F)$  in all the remaining cases [10, Proposition 2.c.3], this completely answers the question.

For any matrix  $a = (a_{ij}) \in B(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_p)$  we have

$$\|a\| = \sup_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_{ij}|^p \right\}^{1/p} \quad \text{and} \quad a \in K(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_p) \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} |a_{ij}|^p = 0.$$

Choose  $\lambda$  so that  $1 < \lambda^p < 2^p - 1$  and put  $a_{1j} = \lambda$  for all  $j$ ,  $a_{jj} = 1$  for  $j \neq 1$ , and  $a_{ij} = 0$  for all other  $(i, j)$ . It is easy to verify

that  $\|a\| < 2$  and that  $K(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_p) \cap B(a, 1) \neq \emptyset$ . However

$K(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_p) \cap B(0, 1) \cap B(a, 1) = \emptyset$ . To see this, let

$x \in K(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_p) \cap B(a, 1)$ . Then  $x_{jj} \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , and

$$|\lambda - x_{1j}|^p + |1 - x_{jj}|^p \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_{ij} - x_{ij}|^p \leq 1 \text{ for all } j .$$

Thus  $x_{1j} \rightarrow \lambda$  , so  $\|x\| \geq \lambda > 1$  .

We finish by considering subspaces with the  $n$ -ball property in Banach algebras. It is known [13, Theorem 5.3] that the  $M$ -ideals in a  $C^*$  algebra are precisely the closed two-sided ideals. We give a short proof of this fact. For elementary  $C^*$  algebra theory, we refer the reader to [4, Chapter 5].

**LEMMA 2.9.** *Let  $J$  be an  $M$ -summand in a unital  $C^*$  algebra  $A$  . Then  $J$  is an ideal in  $A$  .*

**Proof.** Let  $Q = I - P$  , where  $P$  is the  $M$ -projection onto  $J$  . We first note that if  $f \in A^*$  is positive, then so are  $P^*f$  and  $Q^*f$  . For

$$\begin{aligned} |(P^*f)(1)| + |(Q^*f)(1)| &\leq \|P^*f\| + \|Q^*f\| = \|f\| \\ &= f(1) = (P^*f)(1) + (Q^*f)(1) . \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $(P^*f)(1) = \|P^*f\|$  and  $(Q^*f)(1) = \|Q^*f\|$  .

Now let  $p = P(1)$  . If  $f \in A^*$  is positive, then  $f(p) = (P^*f)(1) \geq 0$  . Hence  $p$  is positive. We show that  $ap^{\frac{1}{2}} \in J$  for all  $a \in A$  .

Let  $f \in A^*$  be positive. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |f(Q(ap^{\frac{1}{2}}))|^2 &= |(Q^*f)(ap^{\frac{1}{2}})|^2 \leq (Q^*f)(aa^*)(Q^*f)(p^{\frac{1}{2}}p^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &= 0 , \end{aligned}$$

since  $(Q^*f)(p) = f(Qp) = 0$  . Thus  $Q(ap^{\frac{1}{2}})$  lies in the kernel of every positive functional on  $A$  . It follows that  $Q(ap^{\frac{1}{2}}) = 0$  , so  $ap^{\frac{1}{2}} \in J$  .

Thus  $ap \in J = P(A)$  for all  $a \in A$  . Similarly  $a(1-p) \in Q(A)$  for all  $a$  . It follows that  $Pa = ap$  for all  $a$  , so  $J = P(A) = Ap$  is a left ideal. A similar argument shows that  $J$  is a right ideal. //

**PROPOSITION 2.10.** *Let  $A$  be a  $C^*$  algebra,  $J$  a closed subspace of  $A$  . Then  $J$  is an  $M$ -ideal if and only if  $J$  is an ideal.*

**Proof (ONLY IF).** If  $J^0$  is an  $L$ -summand in  $A^*$  , then  $J^{00}$  is an

$M$ -summand in the unital  $C^*$  algebra  $A^{**}$ . By Lemma 2.9,  $J^{00}$  is an ideal in  $A^{**}$ . Hence  $J = J^{00} \cap A$  is an ideal in  $A$ .

(IF) If  $J$  is an ideal in  $A$ , then  $J^{00}$  is a weak\* closed ideal in the  $W^*$  algebra  $A^{**}$ . Thus  $J^{00} = A^{**}p$  for some central projection  $p$ . Straightforward calculations show that  $A^{**} = J^{00} \oplus A^{**}(1-p)$ , and that the two subspaces are weak\* closed complementary  $M$ -summands. Taking polars, we deduce that  $J^0$  is an  $L$ -summand in  $A^*$ . //

It is natural to ask to what extent the previous result can be generalized to Banach algebras. Smith and Ward [13, Theorem 3.8] showed that in a commutative, unital Banach algebra, every  $M$ -ideal is an ideal. By showing that  $K(\mathbb{Z}_1)$  fails the 2-ball property in  $B(\mathbb{Z}_1)$ , they gave a non-commutative counterexample to the converse problem. Commutative examples are easily obtained by giving a suitable Banach space the zero product, then adjoining an identity. We give a less trivial counterexample.

Let  $A$  be the disc algebra [4, p. 6] and take  $J = \{f \in A : f(0) = 0\}$ . Clearly  $J$  is an ideal in  $A$ . Using the maximum modulus principle, it is easily shown that  $P_J(f) = \{f-f(0)\}$ , for all  $f \in A$ . Consideration of the balls  $B(0, 2)$  and  $B(f, 1)$ , where  $f(z) = z^2 + 2z - 1$ , shows that  $J$  fails the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property.

In fact, the disc algebra even contains a non-proximinal ideal. This time, take  $J = \{f \in A : f(0) = f(1) = 0\}$ . Obviously  $J$  is an ideal in  $A$ . Let  $f(z) = 1 - z$ . For any  $g \in J$  we have, by the maximum modulus principle,  $\|f-g\| > |f(0)-g(0)| = 1$ . Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ , and let  $g(z) = z(z-1)/(1+\epsilon-z)$ . Then  $g \in J$  and  $\|f-g\| = (1+\epsilon)/(1+(\epsilon/2))$ . Thus  $d(f, J) = 1$ , but  $P(f) = J \cap B(f, 1)$  is empty.

Smith and Ward [13, Theorem 3.6] also showed that every  $M$ -ideal in a unital Banach algebra is a subalgebra. This is not so for subspaces with the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball property, even in commutative Banach algebras. Let  $\mathbb{T}$  denote the circle group, and let  $S = \{z \in \mathbb{T} : 0 < \arg z < \pi\}$ . With convolution as multiplication,  $L_1(\mathbb{T})$  is a commutative Banach algebra. Now  $M = \{f \in L_1(\mathbb{T}) : f|_S = 0\}$  is an  $L$ -summand, and so has the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ball

property in  $L_1(\Pi)$ . If  $a \in M$  is defined by  $a(S) = \{0\}$  and  $a(\Pi \setminus S) = \{1\}$  then  $a^2 \notin M$ . Thus  $M$  is not a subalgebra. Although  $L_1(\Pi)$  is not a unital Banach algebra, a unital example is easily obtained via the adjunction of an identity.

### References

- [1] Erik M. Alfsen and Edward G. Effros, "Structure in real Banach spaces. Part I", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **96** (1972), 98-128.
- [2] T. Ando, "Closed range theorems for convex sets and linear liftings", *Pacific J. Math.* **44** (1973), 393-410.
- [3] Jörg Blatter, *Grothendieck spaces in approximation theory* (Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, 120. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1972).
- [4] F.F. Bonsall, J. Duncan, *Complete normed algebras* (Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, 80. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1973).
- [5] Julien Hannefeld, "A decomposition for  $B(X)^*$  and unique Hahn-Banach extensions", *Pacific J. Math.* **46** (1973), 197-199.
- [6] Richard Holmes, Bruce Scranton, and Joseph Ward, "Approximation from the space of compact operators and other  $M$ -ideals", *Duke Math. J.* **42** (1975), 259-269.
- [7] Ásvald Lima, "Intersection properties of balls and subspaces in Banach spaces", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **227** (1977), 1-62.
- [8] Joram Lindenstrauss, *Extension of compact operators* (Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, 48. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1964).
- [9] Joram Lindenstrauss, "On nonlinear projections in Banach spaces", *Michigan Math. J.* **11** (1964), 263-287.
- [10] Joram Lindenstrauss, Lior Tzafriri, *Classical Banach spaces I. Sequence spaces* (Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, 92. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1977).

- [11] Ernest Michael, "Continuous selections. I", *Ann. of Math.* (2) 63 (1956), 361-382.
- [12] Zbigniew Semadeni, *Banach spaces of continuous functions* (Instytut Matematyczny Polskiej Akademii Nauk Monografie Matematyczne, 55. Polish Scientific Publishers, Warszawa, 1971).
- [13] R.R. Smith and J.D. Ward, "M-ideal structure in Banach algebras", *J. Funct. Anal.* 27 (1978), 337-349.

Department of Mathematics,  
University of Edinburgh,  
Edinburgh,  
Scotland.