

# SOME ISOMORPHICALLY POLYHEDRAL ORLICZ SEQUENCE SPACES

BY

DENNY H. LEUNG

*Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, Singapore 0511*

*e-mail(bitnet): mathh@nusvm*

## ABSTRACT

A Banach space is polyhedral if the unit ball of each of its finite dimensional subspaces is a polyhedron. It is known that a polyhedral Banach space has a separable dual and is  $c_0$ -saturated, i.e., each closed infinite dimensional subspace contains an isomorph of  $c_0$ . In this paper, we show that the Orlicz sequence space  $h_M$  is isomorphic to a polyhedral Banach space if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} M(Kt)/M(t) = \infty$  for some  $K < \infty$ . We also construct an Orlicz sequence space  $h_M$  which is  $c_0$ -saturated, but which is not isomorphic to any polyhedral Banach space. This shows that being  $c_0$ -saturated and having a separable dual are not sufficient for a Banach space to be isomorphic to a polyhedral Banach space.

A Banach space is said to be **polyhedral** if the unit ball of each of its finite dimensional subspaces is a polyhedron. It is **isomorphically polyhedral** if it is isomorphic to a polyhedral Banach space. Fundamental results concerning polyhedral Banach spaces were obtained by Fonf [1, 2].

**THEOREM 1 (Fonf):** *A separable isomorphically polyhedral Banach space is  $c_0$ -saturated and has a separable dual.*

Recall that a Banach space is  **$c_0$ -saturated** if every closed infinite dimensional subspace contains an isomorph of  $c_0$ . Fonf also proved a characterization of isomorphically polyhedral spaces in terms of certain norming subsets in the dual. In order to state the relevant results, we introduce some terminology due to Rosenthal [4, 5]. The (closed) unit ball of a Banach space  $E$  is denoted by  $U_E$ .

---

Received April 13, 1993

**Definition:** Let  $E$  be a Banach space.

- (1) A subset  $W \subseteq E'$  is **precisely norming** (p.n.) if  $W \subseteq U_{E'}$ , and for all  $x \in E$ , there is a  $w \in W$  such that  $\|x\| = |w(x)|$ .
- (2) A subset  $W \subseteq E'$  is **isomorphically precisely norming** (i.p.n.) if  $W$  is bounded and
  - (a) there exists  $K < \infty$  such that  $\|x\| \leq K \sup_{w \in W} |w(x)|$  for all  $x \in E$ ,
  - (b) the supremum  $\sup_{w \in W} |w(x)|$  is attained at some  $w_0 \in W$  for all  $x \in E$ .

It is easy to see that  $W \subseteq E'$  is i.p.n. if and only if there is an equivalent norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $E$  so that  $W$  is p.n. in  $(E, \|\cdot\|)$ .

**THEOREM 2 (Fonf):** *Let  $E$  be a separable Banach space. Then  $E$  is isomorphically polyhedral if and only if  $E'$  contains a countable i.p.n. subset.*

This paper is devoted mainly to the problem of identifying the isomorphically polyhedral Orlicz sequence spaces. In §1, a characterization theorem for isomorphically polyhedral Banach spaces having a shrinking basis is proved. This result is applied in §2 to obtain examples of isomorphically polyhedral Orlicz spaces. In §3, a non-isomorphically polyhedral,  $c_0$ -saturated Orlicz sequence space is constructed. Since every  $c_0$ -saturated Orlicz sequence space has a separable dual, this shows that the converse of Theorem 1 fails, answering a question posed by Rosenthal [4].

Standard Banach space terminology, as may be found in [3], is employed. If  $(e_n)$  is a basis of a Banach space  $E$ , and  $\|\cdot\|$  is a norm on  $E$  equivalent to the given norm, we say that  $(e_n)$  is **monotone** with respect to  $\|\cdot\|$  if  $\|\sum_{n=1}^k a_n e_n\| \leq \|\sum_{n=1}^{k+1} a_n e_n\|$  for every real sequence  $(a_n)$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Terms and notation regarding Orlicz spaces are discussed in §2.

## 1. A characterization theorem

This section is devoted to proving the following characterization theorem. Readers familiar with the proofs of Fonf's Theorems will find the same ingredients used here.

**THEOREM 3:** *Let  $(e_n)$  be a shrinking basis of a Banach space  $(E, \|\cdot\|)$ . The following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $E$  is isomorphically polyhedral.

(b) *There exists an equivalent norm  $||| \cdot |||$  on  $E$  such that  $(e_n)$  is a monotone basis with respect to  $||| \cdot |||$ , and for all  $\sum a_n e_n \in E$ , there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$||| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e_n ||| = ||| \sum_{n=1}^m a_n e_n |||.$$

*Proof:* Let  $(P_n)$  be the projections on  $E$  associated with the basis  $(e_n)$ . The sequence  $(P_n)$  is uniformly bounded with respect to any equivalent norm on  $E$ . Also,  $(P_n)$  converges strongly to the identity operator on  $E$ , which we denote by  $1$ . Since  $(e_n)$  is shrinking,  $(P'_n)$  converges to  $1'$  strongly as well.

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b): By renorming, and using Theorem 2, we may assume that  $E'$  contains a p.n. sequence  $(w_k)$ . Fix sequences  $(\epsilon_k)$  and  $(\delta_k)$  in  $(0, 1)$  which are both convergent to 0, and so that  $(1 + \epsilon_k)(1 - 2\delta_k) > 1$  for all  $k$ . For each  $k$ , choose  $n_k$  such that  $\|(1 - P_n)w_k\| \leq \delta_k$  for all  $n \geq n_k$ . Define a seminorm  $||| \cdot |||$  on  $E$  by

$$(1) \quad |||x||| = \sup_k (1 + \epsilon_k) \max_{1 \leq n \leq n_k} |\langle P_n x, w_k \rangle|.$$

Since  $(w_k) \subseteq U_{E'}$ ,  $|||x||| \leq 2\|x\| \sup \|P_n\|$ . On the other hand, if  $x \neq 0$ , choose  $k$  such that  $\|x\| = |w_k(x)|$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\| &= |w_k(x)| \leq |\langle x, P'_{n_k} w_k \rangle| + |\langle x, (1 - P_{n_k})' w_k \rangle| \\ &\leq |\langle P_{n_k} x, w_k \rangle| + \delta_k \|x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(2) \quad |||x||| \geq (1 + \epsilon_k)(1 - \delta_k)\|x\| > \|x\|.$$

Hence  $||| \cdot |||$  is an equivalent norm on  $E$ . It is clear that  $(e_n)$  is monotone with respect to  $||| \cdot |||$ . We claim that this norm satisfies the remaining condition in (b). To this end, we first show that the supremum in the definition (1) is attained. This is trivial if  $x = 0$ . Fix  $0 \neq x \in E$ . Choose  $k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \dots$  and  $(j_i)$ ,  $1 \leq j_i \leq n_{k_i}$  for all  $i$ , so that

$$|||x||| = \lim_i (1 + \epsilon_{k_i}) |\langle P_{j_i} x, w_{k_i} \rangle|.$$

We divide the proof into cases.

CASE 1:  $\lim_i k_i = \lim_i j_i = \infty$ . In this case,  $P_{j_i} x \rightarrow x$  in norm. Therefore

$$\limsup_i |\langle P_{j_i} x, w_{k_i} \rangle| = \limsup_i |\langle x, w_{k_i} \rangle| \leq \|x\|.$$

Also,  $\epsilon_{k_i} \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus,  $|||x||| \leq \|x\|$ , contrary to (2).

CASE 2:  $\lim_i k_i = \infty, \lim_i j_i \neq \infty$ . By using a subsequence, we may assume that  $j_i = j$  for all  $i$ . Then

$$|||x||| = \lim_i (1 + \epsilon_{k_i}) |\langle P_j x, w_{k_i} \rangle| \leq \|P_j x\|.$$

Now choose  $k$  such that  $\|P_j x\| = |\langle P_j x, w_k \rangle|$ . If  $j \leq n_k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |||x||| &\geq (1 + \epsilon_k) |\langle P_j x, w_k \rangle| \\ &= (1 + \epsilon_k) \|P_j x\| > \|P_j x\|, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Now assume  $j > n_k$ ; then

$$\begin{aligned} \|(P_j - P_{n_k})' w_k\| &\leq \|(1 - P_j)' w_k\| + \|(1 - P_{n_k})' w_k\| \\ &\leq 2\delta_k. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_j x\| &= |\langle P_j x, w_k \rangle| \\ &\leq |\langle P_{n_k} x, w_k \rangle| + 2\delta_k \|x\| \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon_k)^{-1} |||x||| + 2\delta_k |||x|||. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$|||x||| \leq \|P_j x\| \leq ((1 + \epsilon_k)^{-1} + 2\delta_k) |||x||| < |||x|||,$$

reaching yet another contradiction. Consequently, we must have

CASE 3:  $\lim_i k_i \neq \infty$ . By using a subsequence, we may assume that the sequence  $(k_i)$  is constant. Then it is clear that the supremum in (1) is attained.

Now for any  $x \in E$ , choose  $k$  so that the supremum in (1) is attained at  $k$ . Then it is clear that  $|||x||| = |||P_{n_k} x|||$ .

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a): Let  $(\eta_n)$  and  $(\epsilon_n)$  be sequences convergent to 0, with  $1 > \eta_n > \epsilon_n > 0$  for all  $n$ . For each  $n$ , there is a finite  $W_n \subseteq U_{(E, |||\cdot|||)}$  such that

$$(3) \quad (1 + \epsilon_n)^{-1} |||x||| \leq \max_{w \in W_n} |w(x)| \leq |||x|||$$

for all  $x \in \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ . Define a seminorm  $\rho$  on  $E$  by

$$(4) \quad \rho(x) = \sup_n (1 + \eta_n) \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \max_{w \in W_j} |\langle P_j x, w \rangle|.$$

We will show that  $\rho$  is an equivalent norm on  $E$ , and the set

$$W = \{(1 + \eta_n)P'_j w: n \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq j \leq n, w \in W_j\}$$

is a countable p.n. subset of  $(E, \rho)'$ . Then  $E$  is isomorphically polyhedral by Fonf's Theorem (Theorem 2). Now let  $x \in E$ . By (b), there exists  $m$  such that  $|||x||| = |||P_m x|||$ . Hence, by (3), and the fact that  $(e_n)$  is monotone with respect to  $|||\cdot|||$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |||x||| &= |||P_m x||| \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon_m) \max_{w \in W_m} |\langle P_m x, w \rangle| \\ (5) \quad &\leq (1 + \eta_m) \max_{w \in W_m} |\langle P_m x, w \rangle| \\ &\leq \rho(x) \\ &\leq 2|||x|||. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\rho$  is an equivalent norm on  $E$ . Next we show that the supremum in (4) is attained. Fix  $x \in E$ . Choose sequences  $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots, (j_k)$ , and  $(w_k)$  such that  $1 \leq j_k \leq n_k, w_k \in W_{n_k}$  for all  $k$ , and  $\rho(x) = \lim_k (1 + \eta_{n_k})|\langle P_{j_k} x, w_k \rangle|$ . First assume that  $\lim_k n_k = \infty$ . Then  $\eta_{n_k} \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $(e_n)$  is monotone with respect to  $|||\cdot|||$ , we have  $\rho(x) \leq |||x|||$ . But there exists  $k$  such that  $|||x||| = |||P_k x|||$ , and there is a  $w \in W_k$  such that  $|||P_k x||| \leq (1 + \epsilon_k)|w(P_k x)|$ . Thus

$$\rho(x) \geq (1 + \eta_k)|w(P_k x)| \geq \frac{1 + \eta_k}{1 + \epsilon_k} |||x||| > |||x|||,$$

a contradiction. Therefore,  $\lim_k n_k \neq \infty$ . By going to a subsequence, we may assume that  $(n_k)$  is bounded. Using a further subsequence if necessary, we may even assume it is constant. Thus the supremum in (4) is attained. From this it readily follows that the set  $W$  is a p.n. subset of  $(E, \rho)'$ . The countability of  $W$  is evident. ■

*Remark:* The assumption that the basis  $(e_n)$  is shrinking is used only in the proof of (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b). If  $(e_n)$  is assumed to be unconditional and (a) holds, then  $(e_n)$  must be shrinking. For otherwise  $E$  contains a copy of  $\ell^1$ , which contradicts (a) by Fonf's Theorem (Theorem 1). Thus the assumption of shrinking is not needed if  $(e_n)$  is unconditional.

**2. Orlicz sequence spaces**

In this section, we apply Theorem 3 to identify a class of isomorphically polyhedral Orlicz sequence spaces. Terms and notation about Orlicz sequence spaces follow that of [3]. An **Orlicz function**  $M$  is a continuous non-decreasing convex function defined for  $t \geq 0$  such that  $M(0) = 0$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} M(t) = \infty$ . If  $M(t) > 0$  for all  $t > 0$ , then it is **non-degenerate**. Clearly a non-degenerate Orlicz function must be strictly increasing. The **Orlicz sequence space**  $\ell_M$  associated with an Orlicz function  $M$  is the space of all sequences  $(a_n)$  such that  $\sum M(|a_n|/\rho) < \infty$  for some  $\rho > 0$ , equipped with the norm

$$\|x\| = \inf\{\rho > 0: \sum M(|a_n|/\rho) \leq 1\}.$$

Let  $e_n$  denote the vector whose sole nonzero coordinate is a 1 at the  $n$ -th position. Then clearly  $(e_n)$  is a basic sequence in  $\ell_M$ . The closed linear span of  $\{e_n\}$  in  $\ell_M$  is denoted by  $h_M$ . Alternatively,  $h_M$  may be described as the set of all sequences  $(a_n)$  such that  $\sum M(|a_n|/\rho) < \infty$  for every  $\rho > 0$ . Additional results and references on Orlicz spaces may be found in [3]. For a real null sequence  $(a_n)$ , let  $(a_n^*)$  denote the decreasing rearrangement of the sequence  $(|a_n|)$ .

**THEOREM 4:** *Let  $M$  be a non-degenerate Orlicz function such that there exists a finite number  $K$  satisfying  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} M(Kt)/M(t) = \infty$ . Then  $h_M$  is isomorphically polyhedral.*

*Proof:* For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$b_k = \inf\left\{\frac{M(Kt)}{M(t)}: 0 < t \leq M^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)\right\}.$$

Then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} b_k = \infty$ . Thus there is a sequence  $(\eta_k)$  decreasing to 1 such that  $\eta_k > (1 - b_{k+1}^{-1})^{-1}$  for all  $k$ . Define a seminorm on  $h_M$  by

$$(6) \quad |||(a_n)||| = \sup_k \eta_k \|(a_1^*, \dots, a_k^*, 0, \dots)\|,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the given norm on  $h_M$ . It is clear that  $|||\cdot|||$  is an equivalent norm on  $h_M$ , and that  $(e_n)$  is a monotone basis with respect to  $|||\cdot|||$ . It suffices to show that  $|||\cdot|||$  satisfies the remaining condition in part (b) of Theorem 3. We first show that if  $(a_n)$  is a positive decreasing sequence in  $h_M$ , then there is a  $k$  such that

$$(7) \quad \|(a_n)\| \leq \eta_k \|(a_1, \dots, a_k, 0, \dots)\|.$$

Assume otherwise. There is no loss of generality in assuming that  $\|(a_n)\| = 1$ . Then  $\sum M(a_n) = 1$  and  $\sum_{n=1}^k M(\eta_k a_n) \leq 1$  for all  $k$ . In particular, note that the second condition implies  $a_k \leq M^{-1}(1/k)$  for all  $k$ , since  $\eta_k \geq 1$  and  $(a_n)$  is decreasing. Now choose  $m$  such that  $\|(0, \dots, 0, a_m, a_{m+1}, \dots)\| \leq K^{-1}$ . Then  $\sum_{n=m}^\infty M(Ka_n) \leq 1$ . Also  $M(Ka_n) \geq b_m M(a_n)$  for all  $n \geq m$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sum M(a_n) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{m-1} M(a_n) + \sum_{n=m}^\infty M(a_n) \\ &\leq \eta_{m-1}^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{m-1} M(\eta_{m-1} a_n) + b_m^{-1} \sum_{n=m}^\infty M(Ka_n) \\ &\leq \eta_{m-1}^{-1} + b_m^{-1} \\ &< 1, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Hence (7) holds for some  $k$ . Now for a general element  $(a_n) \in h_M$ , choose  $m$  such that

$$\|(a_n)\| = \|(a_n^*)\| \leq \eta_m \|(a_1^*, \dots, a_m^*, 0, \dots)\|.$$

Note that since  $\lim_k \eta_k \|(a_1^*, \dots, a_k^*, 0, \dots)\| = \|(a_n)\|$ , the supremum in equation (6) is attained, say, at  $j$ . Then choose  $i$  large enough that  $a_1^*, \dots, a_j^*$  are found in  $\{|a_1|, \dots, |a_i|\}$ . With this choice of  $i$ ,

$$\| |(a_1, \dots, a_i, 0, \dots)| \| \geq \eta_j \|(a_1^*, \dots, a_j^*, 0, \dots)\| = \| |(a_n)| \|$$

by choice of  $j$ . Since the reverse inequality is obvious,

$$\| |(a_n)| \| = \| |(a_1, \dots, a_i, 0, \dots)| \|,$$

as required. ■

### 3. A counterexample

**THEOREM 5:** *Let  $M$  be a non-degenerate Orlicz function. Suppose there exists a sequence  $(t_n)$  decreasing to 0 such that*

$$\sup_n \frac{M(Kt_n)}{M(t_n)} < \infty$$

*for all  $K < \infty$ . Then  $h_M$  is not isomorphically polyhedral.*

*Proof:* Suppose that  $h_M$  is isomorphically polyhedral. By Theorem 3 and the remark following it, one obtains a norm  $||| \cdot |||$  on  $h_M$  as prescribed by part (b) of the theorem. Fix  $\alpha > 0$  so that  $|||x||| \leq \alpha \Rightarrow \|x\| \leq 1$ . Choose a sequence  $(\eta_k)$  strictly decreasing to 1. Let  $n_1 = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N}: \eta_1 |||t_n e_1||| \leq \alpha\}$ . If  $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_k$  are chosen so that  $\eta_k |||\sum_{j=1}^k t_{n_j} e_j||| \leq \alpha$ , then  $\eta_{k+1} |||\sum_{j=1}^k t_{n_j} e_j||| < \alpha$ . Hence

$$\{n \geq n_k: \eta_{k+1} |||\sum_{j=1}^k t_{n_j} e_j + t_n e_{k+1}||| \leq \alpha\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Now define

$$(8) \quad n_{k+1} = \min\{n \geq n_k: \eta_{k+1} |||\sum_{j=1}^k t_{n_j} e_j + t_n e_{k+1}||| \leq \alpha\}.$$

This inductively defines a (not necessarily strictly) increasing sequence  $(n_k)$  satisfying

$$(9) \quad \eta_k |||\sum_{j=1}^k t_{n_j} e_j||| \leq \alpha$$

for all  $k$  and the minimality condition (8). In particular, for all  $k$ ,  $|||\sum_{j=1}^k t_{n_j} e_j||| \leq \alpha$ , so  $\|\sum_{j=1}^k t_{n_j} e_j\| \leq 1$  by the choice of  $\alpha$ . Therefore  $\sum_{j=1}^k M(t_{n_j}) \leq 1$  for all  $k$ . For all  $K < \infty$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^k M(Kt_{n_j}) \leq \sup_m \frac{M(Kt_m)}{M(t_m)} \sum_{j=1}^k M(t_{n_j}) \leq \sup_m \frac{M(Kt_m)}{M(t_m)}.$$

Consequently,  $\sum_{j=1}^\infty M(Kt_{n_j}) < \infty$  for all  $K < \infty$ . Hence  $x = \sum_{j=1}^\infty t_{n_j} e_j$  converges in  $h_M$ . Clearly  $|||x||| = \lim_k |||\sum_{j=1}^k t_{n_j} e_j||| \leq \alpha$ . We claim that in fact  $|||x||| = \alpha$ . Otherwise, suppose  $|||x||| = \beta < \alpha$ . Since  $(e_n)$  is monotone with respect to  $||| \cdot |||$ ,  $|||\sum_{j=1}^k t_{n_j} e_j||| \leq \beta < \alpha$  for all  $k$ . By the convergence of  $x$ ,  $\lim_j t_{n_j} = 0$ . So one can find  $i$  such that  $|||t_{n_i} e_j||| \leq \alpha - \beta$  for all  $j$ . Then

$$|||\sum_{j=1}^i t_{n_j} e_j + t_{n_i} e_{i+1}||| \leq |||\sum_{j=1}^i t_{n_j} e_j||| + |||t_{n_i} e_{i+1}||| \leq \beta + \alpha - \beta = \alpha.$$

By the minimality condition (8),  $n_{i+1} = n_i$ . Similarly, we see that  $n_j = n_i$  for all  $j \geq i$ . This contradicts the convergence of  $x$  and proves the claim. But now, by (9),  $|||\sum_{j=1}^k t_{n_j} e_j||| < \alpha = |||x|||$  for all  $k$ , contradicting the choice of the norm  $||| \cdot |||$ . ■



We now construct an Orlicz function  $M$  satisfying Theorem 5 while  $h_M$  is  $c_0$ -saturated. We begin with some simple results which help to identify the  $c_0$ -saturated Orlicz sequence spaces.

**PROPOSITION 6:** *Let  $M$  be a non-degenerate Orlicz function. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $h_M$  is  $c_0$ -saturated;
- (b)  $h_M$  does not contain an isomorph of  $\ell^p$  for any  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ;
- (c) for all  $q < \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{0 < \lambda, t \leq 1} \frac{M(\lambda t)}{M(\lambda)t^q} < \infty.$$

*Proof:* Clearly (a) implies (b). If (a) fails, let  $Y$  be an infinite dimensional closed subspace of  $h_M$  which contains no isomorph of  $c_0$ . By [3, Proposition 4.a.7],  $Y$  has a subspace  $Z$  isomorphic to some Orlicz sequence space  $h_N$ . Then  $h_N$  contains no isomorph of  $c_0$ . By [3, Theorem 4.a.9],  $h_N$  contains an isomorph of some  $\ell^p, 1 \leq p < \infty$ . Hence  $Y$  contains a copy of  $\ell^p$ , and (b) fails. The equivalence of (b) and (c) also follows from [3, Theorem 4.a.9]. ■

**PROPOSITION 7:** *Let  $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$  be a decreasing sequence of strictly positive numbers such that*

$$\sup_{m,n} \frac{b_{m+n}}{b_n} K^m < \infty \quad \text{for all } K < \infty.$$

*Define  $M$  to be the continuous, piecewise linear function such that  $M(0) = 0$ ,*

$$M'(t) = \begin{cases} b_n & \text{if } 2^{-n-1} < t < 2^{-n}, \quad n > 0, \\ b_0 & \text{if } 2^{-1} < t. \end{cases}$$

*Then the Orlicz sequence space  $h_M$  is  $c_0$ -saturated.*

*Proof:* It is clear that  $M$  is a non-degenerate Orlicz function. For all  $n \geq 0$ ,  $2^{-n-1}b_n \leq M(2^{-n}) \leq 2^{-n}b_n$ . Hence

$$C_q \equiv \sup_{m,n} \frac{M(2^{-m-n})}{M(2^{-n})} 2^{mq} \leq 2 \sup_{m,n} \frac{b_{m+n}}{b_n} (2^{q-1})^m < \infty$$

for any  $q < \infty$ . Now if  $\lambda, t \in (0, 1]$ , choose  $m, n \geq 1$  such that  $t \in (2^{-m}, 2^{-m+1}]$ ,  $\lambda \in (2^{-n}, 2^{-n+1}]$ . Then  $\lambda t \in (2^{-m-n}, 2^{-m-n+2}]$ . If  $m \geq 2$ , then

$$\frac{M(\lambda t)}{M(\lambda)t^q} \leq 2^{2q} \frac{M(2^{-(m-2)-n})}{M(2^{-n})} 2^{(m-2)q} \leq 4^q C_q.$$

If  $m = 1$ , then  $t > 2^{-1}$ . Therefore

$$\frac{M(\lambda t)}{M(\lambda)t^q} \leq t^{-q} \leq 2^q.$$

Thus

$$\sup_{0 < \lambda, t \leq 1} \frac{M(\lambda t)}{M(\lambda)t^q} < \infty,$$

and  $h_M$  is  $c_0$ -saturated by the previous proposition. ■

**THEOREM 8:** *There exists an Orlicz function  $M$  such that  $h_M$  is  $c_0$ -saturated but not isomorphically polyhedral. In particular, a  $c_0$ -saturated space with a separable dual is not necessarily isomorphically polyhedral.*

*Proof:* It is well known that every  $c_0$ -saturated space  $h_M$  has a separable dual. Thus the second statement follows from the first. Let  $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1$ , and let  $\alpha_j = (e/j)^j$  for  $j \geq 3$ . Then  $(\alpha_j)$  is a decreasing sequence. Choose a decreasing sequence  $(c_j)_{j=0}^\infty$  of strictly positive numbers such that  $c_{j+1} \leq \alpha_j \alpha_{2j^2} c_j$  for all  $j \geq 0$ . For convenience, set  $s_n = \sum_{j=1}^n j$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Now define  $b_0 = c_0$ ,  $b_1 = c_1$ , and  $b_{s_n+k} = c_{n+1}/\alpha_{n+1-k}$  whenever  $n \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n+1$ . We first show that the sequence  $(b_j)$  satisfies the conditions in Proposition 7.

**CLAIM 1:**  $(b_j)$  is a decreasing sequence.

One verifies directly that  $b_0 \geq b_1 \geq b_2$ . If  $n \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq k \leq j \leq n+1$ ,

$$b_{s_n+k} = \frac{c_{n+1}}{\alpha_{n+1-k}} \geq \frac{c_{n+1}}{\alpha_{n+1-j}} = b_{s_n+j}$$

since  $(\alpha_m)$  is decreasing. Finally,

$$b_{s_{n+1}+1} = \frac{c_{n+2}}{\alpha_{n+1}} \leq \alpha_{2(n+1)^2} c_{n+1} \leq c_{n+1} = b_{s_n+n+1}$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ . This proves Claim 1.

**CLAIM 2:**  $b_{m+n} \leq \alpha_m b_n$  for all  $m \geq 0, n \geq 2$ .

Express  $n = s_i + k, m + n = s_j + l$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq j, 1 \leq k \leq i + 1$ , and  $1 \leq l \leq j + 1$ . If  $i = j$ , then  $l - k = m$ . Moreover,  $i + 1 - k \geq \max\{l - k, i + 1 - l\}$ , from which it follows that  $\alpha_{i+1-k} \leq \alpha_{l-k} \alpha_{i+1-l}$ . Therefore,

$$b_{m+n} = \frac{c_{i+1}}{\alpha_{i+1-l}} \leq \alpha_m \frac{c_{i+1}}{\alpha_{i+1-k}} = \alpha_m b_n.$$

Now consider the possibility that  $j > i$ . Note first that

$$m = (m + n) - n \leq s_j + j + 1 - (s_i + 1) \leq s_j + j \leq 2j^2.$$

Hence  $\alpha_m \geq \alpha_{2j^2}$ . Using Claim 1 and the properties of the sequence  $(c_j)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} b_{m+n} &\leq b_{s_j+1} = \frac{c_{j+1}}{\alpha_j} \\ &\leq \alpha_{2j^2} c_j \leq \alpha_m c_{i+1} \\ &= \alpha_m b_{s_i+i+1} \leq \alpha_m b_n. \end{aligned}$$

CLAIM 3:

$$\sup_{m,n} \frac{b_{m+n}}{b_n} K^m < \infty \text{ for all } K < \infty.$$

First observe that for  $i \geq 1, 1 \leq k \leq i + 1$ , and  $K < \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} b_{s_i+k} K^{s_i+k} &= \frac{c_{i+1}}{\alpha_{i+1-k}} K^{s_i+k} \leq \alpha_{2i^2} c_i K^{s_i+i+1} \\ &\leq c_0 \alpha_{2i^2} K^{s_i+i+1} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence  $(b_m K^m)_m$  is bounded. Therefore

$$\sup_{n=1,2} \sup_m b_{m+n} K^m / b_n < \infty.$$

On the other hand, using Claim 2,

$$\sup_{n \geq 2} \sup_m \frac{b_{m+n}}{b_n} K^m \leq \sup_m \alpha_m K^m < \infty$$

by direct verification.

Define the function  $M$  using the sequence  $(b_j)$  as in Proposition 7. Using Claims 1 and 3, and the proposition, we see that  $h_M$  is  $c_0$ -saturated. To complete the proof, it suffices to find a sequence  $(t_n)$  as in Theorem 5. We claim that the sequence  $(t_n) = (2^{-s_n})$  will do. Clearly  $(t_n)$  decrease to 0. Fix  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . For all  $n > m$ ,

$$b_{s_n-m} = b_{s_{n-1}+(n-m)} = \frac{c_n}{\alpha_m}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} M(2^m t_n) &= M(2^{-s_n+m}) \leq \frac{b_{s_n-m}}{2^{s_n-m}} \\ &= \frac{c_n}{\alpha_m 2^{s_n-m}} = \frac{2^{m+1}}{\alpha_m} \frac{c_n}{2^{s_n+1}} \\ &= \frac{2^{m+1}}{\alpha_m} \frac{b_{s_n}}{2^{s_n+1}} \leq \frac{2^{m+1}}{\alpha_m} M(t_n) \end{aligned}$$

whenever  $n > m$ . Therefore,

$$\sup_n \frac{M(2^m t_n)}{M(t_n)} < \infty$$

for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . ■

The obvious question to be raised is how to characterize isomorphically polyhedral  $h_M$  in terms of the Orlicz function  $M$ . We suspect that the condition given in Theorem 4 is the correct one. It can be shown that if

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} M(Kt)/M(t) < \infty \quad \text{for all } K < \infty,$$

then for any sequence  $(\eta_k)$  decreasing to 1, the norm given by equation (6) does not satisfy part (b) of Theorem 3.

### References

- [1] V. F. Fonf, *On a property of Lindenstrauss–Phelps spaces*, *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **13** (1979), 79–80 (translated from Russian).
- [2] V. F. Fonf, *Polyhedral Banach spaces*, *Matematicheskie Zametki* **30** (1981), 627–634 (translated from Russian).
- [3] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach Spaces I, Sequence Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977.
- [4] H. Rosenthal, *Class notes, Topics Course in Analysis*, University of Texas at Austin.
- [5] H. Rosenthal, *Some aspects of the subspace structure of infinite dimensional Banach spaces*, in *Approximation Theory and Functional Analysis* (C. Chuy, ed.), Academic Press, New York, 1990.