

Chebyshev Subspaces in the Space of Compact Operators

DAVID A. LEGG

*Department of Mathematics, Purdue University, Fort Wayne Campus,
Fort Wayne, Indiana*

BRUCE E. SCRANTON

*Department of Mathematics, Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana*

AND

JOSEPH D. WARD

Department of Mathematics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana

Communicated by E. W. Cheney

INTRODUCTION

Noncommutative approximation and, in particular, approximation in spaces of operators has received considerable attention recently, as evidenced in [4–6, 8] and other articles. The purpose of this paper is to characterize the semi-Chebyshev subspaces of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$, the algebra of compact operators on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. The underlying Hilbert space may be either real or complex. However, the notation corresponding to a complex Hilbert space will be used throughout the paper. Our conditions are reminiscent of those used in classifying the semi-Chebyshev subspaces of $C[a, b]$ and c_0 and lead to the result that there exist Chebyshev subspaces of every finite dimension in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$, \mathcal{H} separable. An intrinsic characterization of the finite-dimensional Chebyshev subspaces is then obtained. However, unlike $C[a, b]$ and c_0 , there does not seem to be any satisfactory concept of an interpolation subspace in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$. In Section 3, the finite-codimensional proximal subspaces of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ are characterized, leading to the interesting result that, just as in the case of c_0 , there are no finite-codimensional Chebyshev subspaces in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$. The final result indicates that all closed finite-codimensional subspaces of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ are very strongly non-Chebyshev.

DEFINITIONS AND NOTATION. Throughout this paper we will use the representation of the dual space of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ as τ .c., the space of trace class operators. From [9] we note the following pertinent results: any $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ may be expressed in its Schmidt expansion as $C = \sum \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n$ with the sum over a countable index set, $\lambda_n > 0$ for all n , $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ (if the index set is infinite), and $\{u_n\}$, $\{v_n\}$ are orthonormal sets. $T \in \tau$.c. if $T \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$, $T = \sum \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n$, and $\sum \lambda_n < \infty$; the norm in τ .c. is $\|T\| = \sum \lambda_n$ and if $T \in \tau$.c. and $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$, $T(C) = \sum \langle TCu_n, u_n \rangle$, where $\{u_n\}$ is any orthonormal basis in \mathcal{H} . Let T^* denote the adjoint of T , $|T| = (T^* T)^{1/2}$, $\sigma(T) =$ spectrum of T , and $\pi_0(T) =$ the point spectrum of T . Let V be a closed subspace of a Banach space E and let $\mathcal{P}(T) = \{\text{set of best approximants to } T \text{ from } V\}$. Then V is semi-Chebyshev, Chebyshev, or proximal in E if cardinality $\mathcal{P}(T)$ is ≤ 1 , $= 1$, ≥ 1 for all $T \in E$. The subspace V is said to be factor reflexive if X/V is reflexive. Also, let $V^0 = \{T \in E: 0 \in \mathcal{P}(T)\}$, $S(V^\perp) = \{\phi \in E^* \mid \|\phi\| = 1, \phi(V) = 0\}$ and $U(E) =$ the closed unit ball of E .

1. EXTRINSIC CHARACTERIZATIONS

The following two theorems should be compared to the theorems concerning Chebyshev subspaces of $C(X)$ given in [2, 7]. Theorems 1 and 2 are based on generalizations of the concepts of α sets and θ sets given in [2]. For what follows we assume that V is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$.

DEFINITION 1. A *generalized α set* is the maximal pair of subspaces $(M, N) \subset \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$ such that X (resp. X^*) attains its norm on M (resp. N) for some $X \in S(V^0)$ (that M and N are subspaces readily follows from the Schmidt decomposition of X .)

DEFINITION 2. A *generalized θ set* is the pair of subspaces

$$(\mathcal{R}(T), \mathcal{R}(T^*)) \subset \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$$

for some $T \in S(V^\perp)$ that attains its norm on $S(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}))$.

We say that C is zero on a generalized α set if $C(M) = 0 = C^*(N)$. (C being 0 on a generalized θ set has the analogous meaning.)

THEOREM 1. $V \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ is semi-Chebyshev if and only if 0 is the only element of V that vanishes on a generalized α -set.

For the proof we need the following lemma:

LEMMA 1. Let $M \subset \mathcal{H}$ be the subspace on which $X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ attains its norm and suppose $X(M) = N$; then $X(M^\perp) \subset N^\perp$, where M^\perp is the orthogonal complement of M .

Proof of lemma. Write X in its Schmidt expansion, i.e., $X = \sum \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n$. Then $M = \text{span}\{u_n \mid \lambda_n = \lambda_1\}$ and the result is clear by the form of the expansion.

Proof of theorem. (\Leftarrow) This implication can be obtained by the same argument as in [2], applied both to the operators and to their adjoints.

(\Rightarrow) Suppose $0 \neq C \in V$ is zero on the generalized α set associated with X . Thus $\mathcal{R}(C) \subset (\ker C^*)^\perp \subset N^\perp$, $M \subset \ker C$, and $\|X|_{M^\perp}\| = \|X\| - \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. We may assume that $\|C\| \leq \epsilon$. By Lemma 1, for any $u \in \mathcal{H}$, we may write $u = u_1 + u_2$, $u_1 \in M$, and $u_2 \in M^\perp$ and we have:

$$\|(X - C)u\|^2 = \|(X - C)u_1 + (X - C)u_2\|^2 = \|Xu_1\|^2 + \|(X - C)u_2\|^2.$$

Thus, $\|X - C\| = \max\{\|X|_M\|, \|(X - C)|_{M^\perp}\|\} = \|X\|$. Hence, $C \neq 0$ is also a best approximant to X . Q.E.D.

Before proving our next theorem we need the following:

LEMMA 2. $T \in \tau.c.$ attains its norm on $X \in S(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}))$ if and only if corresponding to the Schmidt decomposition of $T = \sum_1^N \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n$, we have $X(v_n) = u_n$, $n = 1, \dots, N$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) This is a simple computation.

(\Rightarrow) Because the trace class operators that attain their norm are exactly the finite-rank operators, we have the Schmidt decomposition

$$T = \sum_1^N \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n.$$

Therefore,

$$\|T\| = \sum_1^N \lambda_n = T(X) = \sum_1^N \lambda_n \langle Xv_n, u_n \rangle \leq \sum_1^N \lambda_n.$$

It is evident that the above inequality is an equality only if $X(v_n) = u_n$, $n = 1, \dots, N$. Q.E.D.

THEOREM 2. A subspace $V \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ is semi-Chebyshev if and only if 0 is the only element of V that vanishes on a generalized θ set.

Proof. Suppose there exists a nonzero $C \in V$ such that C vanishes on a

generalized θ set corresponding to some T . Since T attains its norm, the Schmidt expansion of T has the form

$$T = \sum_1^N \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n .$$

Consider the operator $X = \sum_1^N u_n \otimes \bar{v}_n$. Since $T(X) = 1 = \|X\|$, by [10, p. 18] we have that $X \in V^0$. Now note that the α set associated with X is $(\text{span}\{v_n\}_1^N, \text{span}\{u_n\}_1^N) = (\mathcal{R}(T), \mathcal{R}(T^*))$. Since C vanishes on the generalized θ set associated with T , C vanishes on the generalized α set associated with X ; hence, by Theorem 1, V is not semi-Chebyshev.

To prove the converse, suppose V is not semi-Chebyshev. Then by [10, p. 105], there exists $T \in S(V^\perp)$, $X \in S(V^0)$, and $0 \neq C \in V$ such that $T(X) = \|X\| = \|X - C\| = 1$. By Lemma 2, if T has the form $T = \sum_1^N \lambda_n v_n \otimes u_n$, we have $X(v_n) = u_n$ and $(X - C)(v_n) = u_n$. Hence, $C(v_n) = 0 \ n = 1, \dots, N$, i.e., $C(\mathcal{R}(T)) = 0$. Since

$$T^*(X^*) = \|X^*\| = \|X^* - C^*\| = 1,$$

we have $C^*(\mathcal{R}(T^*)) = 0$, and thus, C vanishes on the generalized θ set associated with T . Q.E.D.

It is interesting to note that every generalized θ set is a generalized α set and every generalized α set contains a generalized θ set. The first statement follows from the proof of the first implication in Theorem 2. For the second statement, let (M, N) be a generalized α set corresponding to X . Thus, there exists a $T \in S(V^\perp)$ so that $T(X) = \|X\| = 1$. If $T = \sum_1^N \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n$, then $X(v_n) = u_n$ for all n by Lemma 2. Thus, X attains its norm on $\mathcal{R}(T)$ implying $\mathcal{R}(T) \subset M$. Similarly $\mathcal{R}(T^*) \subset N$, proving the statement.

As an application of our previous theorems, we have:

THEOREM 3. *Let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space. Then $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ has N -dimensional Chebyshev subspaces for each positive integer N .*

Proof. Let N be fixed and let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis in \mathcal{H} . Define $C_j = \sum_{n=1}^\infty (1/n) e_{Nn+j} \otimes \bar{e}_n, j = 1, \dots, N$. Evidently, C_j is a compact operator for all j and $0 \notin \pi_0(C_j), j = 1, \dots, N$. Let $V_N = \text{span}\{C_j\}_{j=1}^N$. Since $\mathcal{R}(C_j) \perp \mathcal{R}(C_i)$ for $i \neq j$, no linear combination of the C_j has 0 in its point spectrum. By Theorem 1, V_N is Chebyshev.

2. INTRINSIC CHARACTERIZATIONS

There is a very simple intrinsic characterization of the one-dimensional Chebyshev subspaces of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$.

THEOREM 4. *Given a nonzero $C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$, $V = \text{span } C$ is a Chebyshev subspace of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ if and only if $0 \notin \pi_0(C) \cap \pi_0(C^*)$.*

Proof. Suppose V is not Chebyshev. By Theorem 1, there exists $0 \neq C \in V$, which vanishes on a generalized α set. Hence, $0 \in \pi_0(C) \cap \pi_0(C^*)$.

Now suppose $0 \in \pi_0(C) \cap \pi_0(C^*)$. Select unit vectors u, v such that $C(v) = 0 = C^*(u)$. Define $T = v \otimes \bar{u}$. Since $T(C) = \langle Cv, u \rangle = 0$, $T \in S(V^\perp)$ and C is zero on the generalized θ set associated with T , then V is not Chebyshev by Theorem 2. Q.E.D.

We now give an intrinsic characterization of the finite-dimensional Chebyshev subspaces of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$.

THEOREM 5. *An N -dimensional subspace $V \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ is Chebyshev if and only if there does not exist a nonzero $C \in V$, $C_j \in V, j = 1, \dots, N - 1$, and two sets A and B each consisting of m orthonormal elements so that*

- (i) $\text{span}(C, C_1, \dots, C_{N-1}) = V$
- (ii) $0 \neq A = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\} \subset \ker C, \quad B = \{u_1, \dots, u_m\} \subset \ker C^*$
- (iii) *the $(N - 1) \times m$ matrix*

$$M = (\langle C_i v_j, u_j \rangle)_{i=1, \dots, N-1; j=1, \dots, m}$$

has linearly dependent columns.

Proof. Suppose V is not Chebyshev. By Theorem 2, there exists a nonzero $C \in V$ that vanishes on the generalized θ set associated with some $T \in S(V^\perp)$, where $T = \sum_1^M \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n$ and m is finite since T attains its trace norm on $S(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}))$. Pick C_1, \dots, C_{N-1} so that $\text{span}\{C, C_1, \dots, C_{N-1}\} = V$. Let $A = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ and $B = \{u_1, \dots, u_m\}$. Since C vanishes on the generalized θ set associated with T , $A \subset \ker C$ and $B \subset \ker C^*$. Also, since $T \in S(V^\perp)$,

$$0 = T(C_j) = \sum_{i=1}^m \langle TC_j v_i, v_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m \langle C_j v_i, T^* v_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \langle C_j v_i, u_i \rangle.$$

Thus, if M_j denotes the j th column of M , we have $\lambda_1 M_1 + \dots + \lambda_m M_m = 0$.

Conversely, suppose there exists a nonzero $C \in V$ so that $Cv_j = 0 = C^*u_j$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, and $\lambda_1 M_1 + \dots + \lambda_m M_m = 0$. Without loss of generality, assume $\sum_{k=1}^m |\lambda_k| = 1$. If $\lambda_k = p_k e^{i\theta_k}$ in its polar decomposition, set $v_k^1 = e^{i\theta_k} v_k$; thus, we have $p_1 M_1 + \dots + p_m M_m = 0$ with $p_k > 0$ for all k . Now define

$$T = \sum_1^m p_k v_k^1 \otimes \bar{u}_k.$$

It is easy to check that $T \in S(V^\perp)$ and that C is zero on the associated generalized θ set. By Theorem 2, V is not Chebyshev. Q.E.D.

COROLLARY 1. *Let V be an N -dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ and suppose there exists a nonzero $C \in V$ so that $\dim \ker C$ and $\dim \ker C^* \geq N$. Then V is not Chebyshev.*

COROLLARY 2. *If \mathcal{H} is not separable, $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ has no finite-dimensional Chebyshev subspaces.*

Proof. The result follows immediately from the preceding corollary and the Schmidt decomposition of a compact operator.

Many times, an intrinsic characterization of the finite-dimensional Chebyshev subspaces of a space is obtained by showing that these subspaces are interpolating. However, it will be shown that this is not the case in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$.

DEFINITION 3. An N -dimensional subspace V of a Banach space E is an interpolating subspace if for every linearly independent set $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_N\} \subset U(E^*)$ and every set $\{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$ of scalars, there is a unique $y \in V$ for which $Q_i(y) = a_i, i = 1, \dots, N$.

It is well known [1] that the finite-dimensional Chebyshev subspaces of $C(X)$ and c_0 are precisely the interpolating subspaces of those spaces. An analogous situation might be hoped for in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$. In [11], Singer characterized the extreme points of the dual unit ball of any tensor product Banach space normed with the inductive limit topology. For completeness, we give a simple proof of the characterization of the extreme points of the unit ball of $\tau.c.$ which is a special case of Singer's theorem.

THEOREM 6. *The extreme points of the unit ball of $\tau.c.$, denoted by \mathcal{E} , are the rank one operators.*

Proof. Suppose $\|T\| = 1$ and $\text{rank } T \geq 2$. Then $T = \sum \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n$ with $1 > \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 > 0$. Pick $\epsilon > 0$ so that $\lambda_1 + \epsilon < 1$ and $\lambda_2 - \epsilon > 0$. Consider

$$T_1 = (\lambda_1 + \epsilon) v_1 \otimes \bar{u}_1 + (\lambda_2 - \epsilon) v_2 \otimes \bar{u}_2 + \sum_{n \geq 3} \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n$$

and

$$T_2 = (\lambda_1 - \epsilon) v_1 \otimes \bar{u}_1 + (\lambda_2 + \epsilon) v_2 \otimes \bar{u}_2 + \sum_{n \geq 3} \lambda_n v_n \otimes \bar{u}_n.$$

Then $\|T_1\| = \|T_2\| = 1$ and $T = \frac{1}{2}(T_1 + T_2)$ so that $T \notin \mathcal{E}$.

Conversely, let $T = v \otimes \bar{u}$ be a rank one operator and $\|u\| = \|v\| = \|T\| = 1$. Suppose there exists T_1 and T_2 such that $\|T_1\| = \|T_2\| = 1$ and $T = \frac{1}{2}(T_1 + T_2)$. Now we have

$$1 = T(u \otimes \bar{v}) = (u \otimes \bar{v})(T) \leq \|u \otimes \bar{v}\| \left(\frac{\|T_1\|}{2} + \frac{\|T_2\|}{2} \right) \leq 1.$$

Since $\|T_i\| \leq \|T_i\| = 1, i = 1, 2$, it follows that $1 = \|T_1\| = \|T_1\|$. Thus, T is a rank 1 operator by the Schmidt decomposition of T . By Lemma 2, $T_1(u) = v$, hence, $T_1 = v \otimes \bar{u} = T$. Similarly, it follows that $T_2 = T$. Q.E.D.

PROPOSITION 1. *There exists no finite-dimensional interpolating subspace of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$.*

Proof. Let V be an N -dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ and let $0 \neq K \in V$ with Schmidt decomposition $K = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j v_j \otimes \bar{u}_j$. Without loss of generality, assume $m \geq N + 1$. Let

$$T_k = u_1 \otimes \bar{v}_{k+1}, \quad k = 1, \dots, N.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_j \langle T_k K u_j, u_j \rangle = \sum_j \langle K u_j, T_k^* u_j \rangle = \langle v_1, v_{k+1} \rangle = 0, \quad \text{for each } k.$$

Thus, T_k annihilates K for each k ; and hence, V is not interpolating. Q.E.D.

Proposition 1 shows that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ is in stark contrast with $C(X)$ and c_0 , which both have interpolating subspaces.

It is clear that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ fails to have interpolating subspaces because \mathcal{E} has "too many" elements. Various attempts to find an analogous concept of interpolating subspace in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ proved futile.

3. CHEBYSHEV SUBSPACES OF FINITE CODIMENSION

To characterize the Chebyshev subspaces of finite codimension in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$, we first characterize the proximal subspaces of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$. The following theorem is based on two well-known results of Garkavi [10]:

(a) A factor-reflexive linear subspace G of a normed linear space E is proximal if and only if for each

$$\begin{aligned} \text{such that} \quad & \Phi \in (G^\perp)^*, \quad \exists y \in E \\ & \Phi(f) = f(y), \quad \forall f \in G^\perp \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\Phi\| = \|y\|.$$

(b) If G is proximal and factor reflexive, $f \in G^\perp$ attains its norm on the unit ball of E .

THEOREM 8. *If $V \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ is a subspace of finite codimension, then V is proximal in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ if and only if V^\perp has a basis of finite-rank operators.*

Proof. If V is proximal, then by (b) above, every $T \in V^\perp$ attains its norm implying every $T \in V^\perp$ is of finite rank by Lemma 2.

Conversely, suppose the elements of a basis of V^\perp are of finite rank. Let $H \subset \mathcal{H}$ be the smallest subspace of \mathcal{H} containing the ranges of the elements of a basis of V^\perp and the ranges of their adjoints, i.e., $H = \text{span}\{\mathcal{R}(T), \mathcal{R}(T^*); T \in V^\perp\}$. Note that $\dim H < \infty$. Thus, any $T \in V^\perp$ may be written as $T = \hat{T} \otimes 0$ where \hat{T} is an operator matrix in $\tau.c.(H)$ and $\|T\| = \|\hat{T}\|$.

Since V^\perp may be identified isometrically with a subspace of $\tau.c.(H)$, each $S \in (V^\perp)^*$ may be identified norm preservingly with an $\hat{S} \in (\tau.c.(H))^*$. By a theorem of Schatten [9], $\mathcal{B}(H) = (\tau.c.(H))^*$. Thus, given $S \in (V^\perp)^*$ with corresponding \hat{S} in $\mathcal{B}(H)$ and given any $T \in V^\perp$ with corresponding \hat{T} in $\tau.c.(H)$, we may write

$$S(T) = \text{trace}(\hat{S}\hat{T}) = \text{trace}(\hat{T}\hat{S}) = T(\hat{S} \otimes 0),$$

Since $\hat{S} \otimes 0$ has finite rank, $\hat{S} \otimes 0 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$, and

$$\|S\| = \|\hat{S}\|_{\mathcal{B}(H)} = \|\hat{S} \otimes 0\|_{\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})}. \quad \text{Q.E.D.}$$

COROLLARY. *$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ has no Chebyshev subspace of finite codimension.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume V is proximal in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ and of finite codimension. Let H be as in the proof of Theorem 8, $T \in S(V^\perp)$, and $u \in H^\perp, \|u\| = 1$. Define $C = u \otimes \bar{u}, C \in S(V)$. Clearly $C = 0$ on the generalized θ set associated with T so V is not Chebyshev by Theorem 2. Q.E.D.

Our last theorem shows to what degree closed subspaces of finite codimension are non-Chebyshev. In what follows, $\mathcal{P}(T)$ will denote the set of best approximants (b.a.'s) to T from V .

THEOREM 9. *Let $V \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ be any closed subspace of finite codimension and $T \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}) \setminus V$. Then $\mathcal{P}(T) = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{P}(T)$ is of infinite dimension.*

Proof. Let K be a b.a. of T from V . We construct an infinite-dimensional set of C_n 's in $V \ni \|T - K\| = \|T - (K + C_n)\|$. Since $T - K$ is a nonzero compact operator $\sigma(|T - K|)$ and $\sigma(|(T - K)^*|)$ contain at least two points (0 and $\|T - K\|$). Let $E(\lambda)$ and $F(\lambda)$ be the corresponding spectral resolutions

of $\|T - K\|$ and $\|(T - K)^*\|$. Now pick $0 < b < \|T - K\|$. Then $E[0, b]$ and $F[0, b]$ are nonzero spectral projections and it is easy to see that

$$E\mathcal{H} = E[0, b]\mathcal{H}, \quad F\mathcal{H} = F[0, b]\mathcal{H}$$

are finite-codimensional subspaces of \mathcal{H} . Let

$$\mathcal{M} = \{S \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}) : S\mathcal{H} \subset F\mathcal{H}, S(I - E)\mathcal{H} = 0\}.$$

It is clear that \mathcal{M} is an infinite-dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$. Since V is of finite codimension pick an infinite-dimensional set $C_n \in V \cap \mathcal{M}$, $C_n \neq 0$, $\|C_n\| \leq \epsilon$ where $b + \epsilon \leq \|T - K\|$. Now for such C_n , since $F(T - K) = (T - K)E$ and $(I - F)(T - K) = (T - K)(I - E)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|T - [K + C_n]\| \\ &= \|F[T - (K + C_n)]E + F[T - (K + C_n)](I - E) \\ &\quad + (I - F)[T - (K + C_n)]E + (I - F)[T - (K + C_n)](I - E)\| \\ &= \|F[T - (K + C_n)]E + F(I - F)[T - K] + (I - F)F[T - K] \\ &\quad + (I - F)[T - K](I - E)\| \\ &= \max\{\|F[T - K]E + FC_nE\|, \|(I - F)[T - K](I - E)\|\} \\ &= \max\{b + \epsilon, \|T - K\|\} = \|T - K\|. \end{aligned} \quad \text{Q.E.D.}$$

REFERENCES

1. D. AULT, *et al.*, *J. Approximation Theory* **3** (1970), 164-182.
2. E. W. CHENEY AND D. E. WULBERT, *Math. Scand.* **24** (1969), 113-140.
3. J. DIXMIER, *Ann. Math.* **51** (1950), 387-408.
4. P. R. HALMOS, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **21** (1972), 951-960.
5. R. HOLMES, B. SCRANTON, AND J. WARD, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **80** (1974), 98-102.
6. C. OLSEN, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* to appear.
7. R. R. PHELPS, *Pac. J. Math.* **13** (1963), 647-655.
8. D. ROGERS, *Not. Amer. Math. Soc.* **20** (1973), A-429.
9. R. SCHATTEEN, "Norm Ideals of Completely Continuous Operators," Springer-Verlag, New York, 1960.
10. I. SINGER, "Best Approximation in Normed Linear Spaces by Elements of Linear Subspaces," Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1970.
11. I. SINGER, *Bull. Des Sciences Math.* **82** (1958), 73-80.