## EMBEDDING WEAKLY COMPACT SETS INTO HILBERT SPACE<sup>†</sup>

BY

Y. BENYAMINI<sup>#\*</sup> AND T. STARBIRD<sup>\*\*\*</sup>

## ABSTRACT

We give an example of a weakly compact set in a Banach space, which does not embed topologically as a weakly compact subset of Hilbert space. We also show that a weakly compact set embeds in a super-reflexive space iff it embeds in Hilbert space.

It was proved in [2] that every weakly compact subset of a Banach space is (affinely) homeomorphic to a weakly compact subset of a reflexive Banach space. In this paper we study the existence of homeomorphic embedding into a super-reflexive space. We show that the existence of such an embedding is equivalent to the existence of an embedding into a Hilbert space. The main part of the paper is an example of a weakly compact set which does not embed in Hilbert space (in its w topology).

If  $\Gamma$  is a set,  $c_0(\Gamma)$  will denote the Banach space of all functions f on  $\Gamma$  such that for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  the set  $\{\gamma \in \Gamma : |f(\gamma)| > \varepsilon\}$  is finite. The norm in  $c_0(\Gamma)$  is the sup norm. By  $l_2(\Gamma)$  we shall denote the Hilbert space of all square summable elements in  $c_0(\Gamma)$  with the usual norm. The weak topology on a weakly compact subset of  $c_0(\Gamma)$  is exactly the topology of point-wise convergence.

We shall also consider weakly compact subsets of  $c_0(\Gamma)$  that will consist only of characteristic functions of finite sets. In this case we shall identify a set with its characteristic function, and consider the sets as being elements in  $c_0(\Gamma)$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*</sup> This work was done while the authors were visiting Ohio State University. We wish to thank the Department of Mathematics at Ohio State University for their kind hospitality.

<sup>&</sup>quot;The work of the first author was partially supported by NSF Grant MPS-74-24249.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>111</sup> The work of the second author is a part of his Ph.D. Thesis prepared at the University of California at Berkeley.

Received August 21, 1975

A compact Hausdorff space will be called an Eberlein compact if it is homeomorphic to a weakly compact subset of a Banach space. The main structure theorem on Eberlein compacts is due to Amir and Lindenstrauss [1]:

Every Eberlein compact is homeomorphic to a weakly compact subset of  $c_0(\Gamma)$  for some  $\Gamma$ .

The cardinality of a set A will be denoted by #A.

An Eberlein compact K will be called uniform if there is an embedding of K into  $c_0(\Gamma)$  and a function  $N(\varepsilon)$  such that for all k in K and for all  $\varepsilon > 0, \# \{\gamma : |k(\gamma)| > \varepsilon\} < N(\varepsilon)$ .

The density character of the Banach space X (i.e. the minimal cardinality of a dense subset in X) will be denoted by  $\dim(X)$ .

THEOREM. The following conditions on a compact Hausdorff space K are equiva ent:

(1) K embeds as a w-compact subset in a Hilbert space.

(2) K is a uniform Eberlein compact.

(3) K embeds as a w-compact subset in a super-reflexive space.

PROOF. Clearly (1) implies (2) and (3).

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1): Assume the function  $N(\varepsilon)$  and the embedding of K into  $c_0(\Gamma)$  are given. Since K is weakly compact it is bounded in  $c_0(\Gamma)$  and we can assume that  $||k|| \leq 1$  for all k in K. Let  $f: [-1,1] \rightarrow [-1,1]$  be a continuous, strictly monotone and odd function such that for all  $n, f(n^{-1}) \leq (2^n N(1/(n+1))^{-1/2})$  and define a mapping  $\phi: K \rightarrow l_2(\Gamma)$  by  $\phi(k)(\gamma) = f(k(\gamma))$ . Fix any k in K and let  $A_n = \{\gamma: (n+1)^{-1} < |k(\gamma)| \leq n^{-1}\}$ . Then

$$\|\phi(k)\|_{l_{2}(\Gamma)}^{2} = \sum_{\gamma} |f(k(\gamma))|^{2} = \sum_{n} \sum_{\gamma \in A_{n}} |f(k(\gamma))|^{2} \leq \sum_{n} \# A_{n} \cdot |f(n^{-1})|^{2}$$
$$\leq \sum 2^{-n} = 1.$$

Thus  $\phi$  maps K into  $l_2(\Gamma)$  and it is clearly 1-1 and  $\omega$ -continuous.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2): Let X be a super-reflexive space such that dim  $(X) = \mu$ , and let K be a weakly compact subset of X.

We can assume that K is contained in the unit ball of X. We shall prove the theorem by transfinite induction on  $\mu$ .

Let  $\{P_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha<\mu}$  be a "long sequence of projections" in X as in [1], and let  $X_{\alpha} = (P_{\alpha+1} - P_{\alpha})X$ , and  $K_{\alpha} = (P_{\alpha+1} - P_{\alpha})(K)$ . Since dim $(X_{\alpha}) < \mu$  for all  $\alpha$  we can find, by the induction hypothesis, a homeomorphism  $\phi_{\alpha}$  of  $K_{\alpha}$  into the unit ball of some Hilbert space  $H_{\alpha}$  with orthonormal basis  $\{e_i\}_{i\in\Gamma_{\alpha}}$ .

It follows from a theorem of James [3] that there is a  $p < \infty$ , such that for every y in X,  $(\Sigma || (P_{\alpha+1} - P_{\alpha})y ||^p)^{1/p} \leq 2 ||y||$ . Define now a mapping  $\phi: K \to (\Sigma \bigoplus H_{\alpha})_{l_p}$  by  $[\phi(k)](\alpha) = \phi_{\alpha}((P_{\alpha+1} - P_{\alpha})k)$ . It is clear that  $\phi$  is 1-1 and  $\omega$ -continuous and thus a homeomorphism.

Fix now any k in K and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $\# \{ \alpha : \| (P_{\alpha+1} - P_{\alpha}) k \| > \varepsilon \} < 2\varepsilon^{-p}$  and for each such  $\alpha$ ,  $\# \{ i \in \Gamma_{\alpha} : \phi(k) > \varepsilon \} < \varepsilon^{-2}$ . And thus  $\phi(K)$  is a uniform Eberlein compact with function  $N(\varepsilon) = 2\varepsilon^{-(p+2)}$ .

Before presenting the example of an Eberlein compact which does not embed in a Hilbert space, we shall need some simple lemmas.

LEMMA 1. Let  $\{A_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{U}}$  be an uncountable collection of finite subsets of a set  $\Gamma$ . Then there exists an uncountable subset  $\mathfrak{U}_1$  of  $\mathfrak{U}$  and a finite subset A of  $\Gamma$ , such that for each  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{U}_1$ ,  $A_{\alpha} = A \cup B_{\alpha}$  and the  $B_{\alpha}$  are pairwise disjoint.

For a proof see [4], p. 87.

LEMMA 2. Let  $\Gamma$  be a set and  $K = \{A\}$  a collection of finite subsets of  $\Gamma$  such that

(1) If  $A \in K$  and  $B \subset A$  then  $B \in K$ .

(2) There is no infinite increasing chain in K.

Then K is a weakly compact set in  $c_0(\Gamma)$  (when we identify sets in K with their characteristic functions).

**PROOF.** Let S be a limit point of K and let F be a finite subset of S. Since the topology is given by pointwise convergence, there exists an A in K such that  $F \subset A$ , and by (1) we have that  $F \in K$ . By (2) this means that S is finite, and thus also  $S \in K$ .

LEMMA 3. Let K be a weakly compact subset of Hilbert space, and let  $D \subset K$  be a discrete set with a unique limit point k. Then for every  $d \in D$  there exists a relatively open subset  $V_d$  of K such that :

(1) For all  $d \in D$ , d is in  $V_d$ .

(2) There is a countable partition  $D = \bigcup D_n$  such that if  $d_1, \dots, d_{n+1}$  are distinct elements in  $D_n$ , then  $\bigcap_{j=1}^{n+1} V_{d_j} = \emptyset$ .

**PROOF.** We can assume without loss of generality that K is the unit ball of the Hilbert space and that k is the origin. We shall denote by (x, y) the inner product in the space.

Fix  $d_0 \in D$ . Since the origin is the only weak limit point of D, there are at most countably many  $d \in D$  such that  $(d, d_0) \neq 0$ . Thus, if we define an equivalence relation on D by  $d \sim e$  if there are  $d_1 = d, d_2, \dots, d_m = e$  in D such

that  $(d_i, d_{j+1}) \neq 0$ , the equivalence classes are at most countable. Clearly elements in different equivalence classes are orthogonal. We can thus decompose  $D = \bigcup E_m$  where the elements in each  $E_m$  are mutually orthogonal. By decomposing each  $E_m$  we can arrive at a partition  $D = \bigcup D_n$  where the elements in each  $D_n$  are mutually orthogonal and such that if d is in  $D_n$ ,  $||d||^4 > n^{-1}$ . We now define for  $d \in D_n$ ,  $V_d = \{k \in K : (k, d)^2 > n^{-1}\}$ . Now if  $d_1, \dots, d_{n+1} \in D_n$  are distinct and  $k \in \bigcap_{j=1}^{n+1} V_{d_j}$  we would have  $1 \ge ||k||^2 \ge \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} (k, d_j)^2 \ge (n+1)/n > 1$ , a contradiction.

THE EXAMPLE. Let  $\Gamma = [0, 1] \times \prod_{n=2}^{\infty} \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We write an element in  $\Gamma$  as  $(r, n_2, n_3, \dots)$  where  $r \in [0, 1]$  and  $1 \le n_j \le j$ . We denote by  $P_m$  the projection defined by  $P_m$   $(r, n_2, n_3, \dots) = (n_2, \dots, n_m)$ . For each  $m \ge 1$  we define now a set  $K_m$  of subsets of  $\Gamma$  of cardinality  $m: K_1$  is the set of all singletons in  $\Gamma$ . For each sequence  $n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}$ , we define  $K_{n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}} = \{\{d_1, \dots, d_m\} \subset \Gamma : P_m (d_j) = (n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}, j)\}$  and we define  $K_m = \bigcup K_{n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}}$ .

We define now K as follows:  $K = \{A \subset \Gamma : A \subset B \text{ for some } B \text{ in } \cup K_m\}$ .

We shall show that K is a weakly compact set in  $c_0(\Gamma)$  which does not embed in Hilbert space.

To show that K is weakly compact we shall use Lemma 2. The first condition is satisfied by the definition of K. Since sets in  $K_m$  have cardinality exactly m, the second condition will follow once we show that if  $A_1 \in K_{m_1}, A_2 \in K_{m_2}$  and  $m_1 \neq m_2$ , then  $\neq (A_1 \cap A_2) \leq 1$ . But assume  $m_1 > m_2$ ; then all points in  $A_1$ have the same  $m_2$ th coordinate, while different points in  $A_2$  have different  $m_2$ th coordinates.

We now consider  $D = K_1 \subset K$ . It is easy to check that D is a discrete set in the weak topology with a unique limit point—the empty set. Let  $\{V_d\}$  be a collection of open sets in K with  $d \in V_d$  for each  $d \in D$ . We shall show that if  $D_n \subset D$  satisfy the condition that for each distinct  $d_1, \dots, d_{n+1} \in D_n$ ,  $\bigcap_{j=1}^{n+1} V_{d_j} = \emptyset$ , then  $\bigcup D_n \neq D$ . By Lemma 3 this will imply that K does not embed in Hilbert space.

We can assume without loss of generality that each  $V_d$  is a basic open set, i.e. there is a finite subset  $A_d$  of  $\Gamma$  such that  $A \in V_d$  iff  $A \in K$  and there exists a set  $B \in V_d$  with  $A \cap A_d = B \cap A_d$ . We can also assume that  $d \in A_d$  for each d.

PROPOSITION. Fix  $m \ge 2$  and  $n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}$ . Then at least one of the sets  $D_{m-1} \cap P_m^{-1}(n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}, j), 1 \le j \le m$ , is at most countable.

Before we prove the proposition, let us show how to finish the proof. We define inductively a sequence  $1 \le n_j \le j$  as follows: We let  $n_2$  be such that

 $D_1 \cap P_2^{-1}(n_2)$  is at most countable. Having already defined  $n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}$ , we let  $n_m$  be such that  $D_{m-1} \cap P_m^{-1}(n_2, \dots, n_m)$  is at most countable. But then

$$\left(\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} D_m\right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{m=2}^{\infty} P_m^{-1}(n_2,\cdots,n_m)\right) \subset \bigcup_{m=2}^{\infty} (D_{m-1} \cap P_m^{-1}(n_2,\cdots,n_m))$$

is at most countable. Since  $\bigcap_{m=2}^{\infty} P_m^{-1}(n_2, \dots, n_m)$  is uncountable (there is no restriction on r),  $\bigcup D_m \neq D$ .

PROOF OF THE PROPOSITION. Assume that for each  $1 \le j \le m$  there is an uncountable subset  $\Gamma_i$  of  $D_{m-1} \cap P_m^{-1}(n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}, j)$ . By Lemma 1 we can assume that there are finite sets  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  such that if  $d \in \Gamma_j$  then  $A_d = A_j \cup B_d$  and the sets  $\{B_d\}_{d \in \Gamma_j}$  are pairwise disjoint. Since the set  $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_m$  is finite we can also assume that  $d \notin A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_m$  for each  $d \in \Gamma_1 \cup \dots \cup \Gamma_m$ . We now choose  $d_1, \dots, d_m$ , with  $d_j \in \Gamma_j$  such that  $d_j \notin A_{d_i}$  if  $i \ne j$ . We pick any  $d_1 \in \Gamma_1$ . Since  $B_d$ , is finite and the sets  $\{B_d\}_{d \in \Gamma_2}$  are pairwise disjoint we can find  $d_2 \in \Gamma_2$  such that  $d_1 \notin B_{d_2}$  and  $d_2 \notin B_{d_1}$ . Continuing inductively we can thus find  $d_j \in \Gamma_j$  such that if  $i \ne j, d_i \notin B_{d_j}$ . Since we also have that  $d_i \notin A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_m$  we really have that  $d_i \notin A_{d_i}$  if  $i \ne j$ .

We claim that  $\{d_1, ..., d_m\} \in \bigcap_{j=1}^m V_{d_j}$  which contradicts the assumption on  $D_{m-1}$ . Indeed,  $\{d_1, ..., d_m\}$  is really in K (in fact it is in  $K_{n_2, ..., n_{m-1}}$ ) and since  $d_j \in V_{d_j}$  and  $V_{d_j}$  depends only on  $A_{d_j}$ , the equality  $\{d_1, ..., d_m\} \cap A_{d_j} = \{d_j\} \cap A_{d_j}$  implies that also  $\{d_1, ..., d_m\} \in V_{d_j}$ .

## REFERENCES

1. D. Amir and J. Lindenstrauss, The structure of weakly compact sets in Banach spaces, Ann. of Math. 88 (1968), 35-46.

2. W. J. Davis, T. Figiel, W. B. Johnson and A. Pelczynski, Factoring weakly compact operators, J. Functional Analysis 17 (1974), 311-327.

3. R. C. James, Super-reflexive spaces with bases, Pacific J. Math. 41 (1972), 409-419.

4. I. Juhász, Cardinal Functions in Topology, Math. Centrum Tract. No. 34, Amsterdam, 1971.

YALE UNIVERSITY New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.

AND

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY, CAL., U.S.A.