# Extremal Problems for the Vector-Valued $\left\langle L^{1} / H_{0}^{1}, H^{\infty}\right\rangle$ Duality 

Wolfgang Hensgen

# Universität Regensburg, NWF 1-Mathematik, 93040 Regensburg, Germany. <br> E-mail: wolfgang.hensgen@mathematik.uni-regensburg.de <br> Communicated by E. W. Cheney 

Received October 25, 1993; accepted in revised form April 5, 1995

Let $X$ be a complex Banach space and $L^{1}(X):=L^{1}(\mathbb{T} ; X)$ the Bochner space on the circle $\mathbb{T}$. The $X$-valued Hardy space $\mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X):=\left\{f \in L^{1}(X): \hat{f}(n)=0 \forall n \leqslant 0\right\}$ is proximinal in $L^{1}(X)$ if $H$ has ARNP and is contractively complemented in $X^{\prime \prime}$. It is semi-Chebyshev if $X$ is strictly convex. With $H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ the dual space of $L^{1}(X) / \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$, extremal kernels and functions for this duality are studied. Proximinality fails for $X:=L^{1} / H_{0}^{1}$; this is equivalent to the assertion that for $\Lambda:=$ $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z} \cup \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}, L_{A}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ is not proximinal in $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$. A class of subsets $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^{2}$ is described for which this non-proximinality holds. © 1996 Academic Press, Inc.

## 1. Introduction and Preliminaries

A classical theorem first proved in 1941 by Doob [Do, Theorem 3] and reproved by many authors (Khavinson, see [Kh, 9.]; Rogosinski and Shapiro [RS]; Pták, see [Khe]) states that $H_{0}^{1}:=\left\{f \in L^{1}(\mathbb{T}): \hat{f}(n)=0\right.$ $\forall n \leqslant 0\}$ is a Chebyshev subspace of $L^{1}=L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$, the Lebesgue space of the circle group $\mathbb{T}$. (A subset $A$ of a metric space $M$ is called semi-Chebyshev resp. proximinal if for every $x \in M$ at most resp. at least one best approximation in $A$ exists, and Chebyshev if proximinal and semi-Chebyshev, see [Si2, Definitions 2.1, 3.1].) In other words, every coset in $L^{1} / H_{0}^{1}$ contains exactly one representative of the least possible ( $=$ coset ) norm. Taking into account the duality $\left(L^{1} / H_{0}^{1}\right)^{\prime}=H^{\infty}:=\left\{h \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{T}): \hat{h}(n)=0 \forall n<0\right\}$, this is the solution of the following "extremal problem": given a "kernel" $f \in L^{1}$, consider the functional $h \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{T}} f h d \lambda$ on $H^{\infty}(\lambda=$ Haar measure $)$ and find uniquely an "equivalent" kernel $f_{0} \in L^{1}$ (i.e. giving the same functional, $\Leftrightarrow f_{0}-f \in H_{0}^{1}$ ) with $\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{1}$ realizing the functional ( = coset) norm. Such an $f_{0}$ is called an extremal kernel. A "dual extremal function" is a function $h \in H^{\infty}$ with $\|h\|_{\infty} \leqslant 1$ and $\int f h d \lambda$ realizing the functional norm; it also exists uniquely. This theory is presented in detail in the books of Duren [Du, Chapter 8] and Garnett [Ga, IV], and the first aim of this article,
mainly part of the author's habilation thesis [H3], is to give a vectorvalued generalization (§2). In §3 I discuss an example leading to a proximinality problem in two-variable (scalar-valued) Fourier analysis which might be of independent interest. A short summary of results is postponed to the end of this section. For more details on the preliminaries the reader is referred to [H3].
1.1. Spaces $L^{1}(X)$ and $M(X)$. Let $X$ be a complex Banach space (dual $X^{\prime}$, unit ball $B_{X}$ ), then $L^{1}(X)=L^{1}(\lambda ; X)$ denotes the usual LebesgueBochner space [DU, II] and $M(X)=M(\Sigma ; X)$ the space of ( $\sigma$-additive) $X$-valued measures of bounded variation defined on the Borel $\sigma$-algebra $\Sigma$ of $\mathbb{T}$. Under the variation norm on $M(X), L^{1}(X) \subset M(X)$ isometrically via $f \mapsto f \cdot \lambda$, and Singer's theorem [Si 1, pp. 398ff.] states that $(f, m) \mapsto \int\langle f, d m\rangle$ is a dual pairing on $C(\mathbb{T} ; X) \times M\left(\Sigma ; X^{\prime}\right)$ rendering $M\left(\Sigma ; X^{\prime}\right)$ the dual space of $\left(C(\mathbb{T} ; X),\|\cdot\|_{\infty}\right)$.
1.2. $L^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}, X\right)$, the Dual of $L^{1}(X)$. A function $f: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow X^{\prime}$ is called weak*- $\lambda$-measurable, if $\forall x \in X$ the function $\langle x, f\rangle: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is $\lambda$-measurable. For such a function, there exists $|f|:=\sup _{x \in B_{X}}|\langle x, f\rangle|$, the supremum being taken in the order-complete vector lattice $L^{0}(\lambda ; \mathbb{R})$ of $\lambda$-measurable functions modulo $\lambda$-null functions [KA, p. 42f.]. Note that $|f|(t) \leqslant\|f(t)\|_{X^{\prime}}$ a.e. and the inequality may be strict. However, if $X$ is separable, or if $f$ is strongly measurable, then $|f|$ equals $\|f(\cdot)\|$ a.e. (see $[\mathrm{H} 3,1.3]$ ).

Define $\mathscr{L}^{\infty}\left(\lambda ; X^{\prime}, X\right):=\left\{f: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow X^{\prime}\right.$ weak* measurable: $\left.|f| \in L^{\infty}(\lambda)\right\}$ equipped with the seminorm $\|f\|_{\infty}:=\||f|\|_{\infty}$, and finally $L^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}, X\right)=$ $L^{\infty}\left(\lambda ; X^{\prime}, X\right):=\mathscr{L}^{\infty}\left(\lambda ; X^{\prime}, X\right) /\|\cdot\|_{\infty}^{-1}(0)$.

For $f \in L^{1}(X), g \in L^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}, X\right)$, the function $\langle f(\cdot), g(\cdot)\rangle=:\langle f, g\rangle$ is a well-defined (!) member of $L^{1}$ and $|\langle f, g\rangle| \leqslant|f||g|$ a.e. [H1, (0.5) $5^{0}$ ]. Under the pairing $(f, g) \mapsto \int\langle f, g\rangle d \lambda$ on $L^{1}(X) \times L^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}, X\right)$, the space $L^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}, X\right)$ becomes the dual of $L^{1}(X)$ (Bukhvalov [B1, Theorem 0.1], Ionescu-Tulcea [IT, VII. 4 Theorem 7, Corollary], Schwartz [Sc, Corollaire (2.3)], see also [DS, VI.8.7]).
1.3. Hardy Spaces, $A R N P$. As a general notation, if $E(\cdot)$ is any of the spaces $L^{1}(X), L^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}, X\right)$, or $M(X)$ and if $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$, then $E_{A}(\cdot)$ is the subspace of members of $E(\cdot)$ whose Fourier coefficients vanish off $\Lambda$. (If $E(\cdot)=$ $L^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}, X\right)$, the integral defining the coefficients is the Gel'fand or weak* integral [DU, p. 53].) The Hardy spaces in this article are $\mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X):=L_{\mathbb{N}}^{1}(X)$ resp. $H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right):=L_{\mathbb{N}_{0}}^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}, X\right)$. The Banach space $X$ has the analytic RadonNikodým property ARNP introduced by Bukhvalov and Danilevich [B1], [BD], [H1] iff $\mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)=M_{\mathbb{N}}(X)$ (see [H1, (2.10)]). The basic examples of ARNP spaces are RNP spaces (because $m \in M_{\mathbb{N}}(X) \Rightarrow m \ll \lambda$ by the F. and M. Riesz theorem [Du, Theorem 3.8]), weakly sequentially complete

Banach lattices [BD, Theorem 3], [H 1, (3.5)], and preduals of von Neumann algebras [HP, 2.3].
1.4. $H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ Is the Dual of $L^{1}(X) / \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$. Modulo general Banach space theory [Du, Theorem 7.2] this amounts to saying that $H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right) \subset$ $L^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}, X\right)=L^{1}(X)^{\prime}$ is the annihilator of $\mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X) \subset L^{1}(X)$. Clearly the annihilator is contained in $H^{\infty}(X)^{\prime}$. Conversely, let $f \in \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X), g \in H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ be given.

Claim. $\langle f, g\rangle \in H_{0}^{1}$ (in particular $\int\langle f, g\rangle d \lambda=0$ ).
Proof. Let $P_{r}(t):=\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} r^{|n|} e^{\text {int }}$ be the Poisson kernel, then as in the scalar case, $P_{r} * f \rightarrow f(r \rightarrow 1)$ in $L^{1}(X)$ [B1, Theorem 2.1], [H1, Satz (1.11)], $f$ being strongly measurable. This implies $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}$ :

$$
\left\langle P_{r} * f, g\right\rangle^{\wedge}(n)=\int\left\langle P_{r} * f(t), e^{-i n t} g(t)\right\rangle \lambda(d t) \rightarrow\langle f, g\rangle^{\wedge}(n)(r \rightarrow 1) .
$$

By [H2, 4.2] the integral equals $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r^{k}\langle\hat{f}(k), \hat{g}(n-k)\rangle=0$ if $n \leqslant 0$.
1.5. Summary. $\mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$ lies proximinal in $L^{1}(X)$ if $X$ has ARNP and is norm- 1 complemented in the bidual $X^{\prime \prime}$ (2.1). The usual characterization of extremal kernels and functions is given (2.3). The former is unique if $X$ is strictly convex, the latter if $X$ is smooth and an extremal kernel exists (2.5). In $\S 3$ it is shown that for $X=L^{1} / H_{0}^{1}$ (which fails ARNP) $\mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$ is not proximinal in $L^{1}(X)$. This turns out to be equivalent to the assertion that for $\Lambda:=\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z} \cup \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{2}$ the space $L_{A}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ is not proximinal in $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$. The proof of this assertion (in fact, of a general criterion 3.3) consists of a reduction to the fact stated by Kahane that if $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{Z}$ with $1<\# \mathbb{Z} \backslash \Gamma<\infty$ then $L_{\Gamma}^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ is not proximinal in $L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$. Since these seem to be the only known examples of non-proximinal translation-invariant subspaces of $L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ (see [Ka]), this criterion might be interesting in itself.

## 2. Vector-Valued Theory

The theory developped in this section has useful applications in the study of weak compactness in $L^{1}(X) / \bigoplus_{0}^{1}(X)[H 3,3.6]$.
2.1. Theorem. If $X$ has $A R N P$ and is complemented in $X^{\prime \prime}$ by a contractive projection then $\mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$ lies proximinal in $L^{1}(X)$.

The hypotheses are satisfied e.g. if $X$ is a separable (or RNP) dual space, or a weakly sequentially complete Banach lattice, or a predual of a von Neumann algebra (1.3), [LT, 1.c.4], [T, III.2.14].

Proof. $M_{\mathbb{N}}\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is obviously closed in $M\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right)$ for the weak* topology $\sigma\left(M\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right), C\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right)$ (1.1), hence proximinal [Si2, Theorem 2.9]. Considering (see 1.1) $L^{1}(X)$ as a subspace of $M(X) \subset M\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right)$, for a fixed $f \in L^{1}(X)$ there exists $m_{0}^{\prime \prime} \in M_{\mathbb{N}}\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right)$ with $\left\|f-m_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right\| \leqslant\left\|f-m^{\prime \prime}\right\|$, all $m^{\prime \prime} \in M_{\mathbb{N}}\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right)$.

Let $P: X^{\prime \prime} \rightarrow X$ be a projection of norm 1, as assumed, and $m_{0}:=P \circ m_{0}^{\prime \prime} \in M(X)$; clearly $m_{0} \in M_{\mathbb{N}}(X)$. By the ARNP hypothesis, $m_{0}=h_{0} \cdot \lambda$ for some $h_{0} \in \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$. Then for $h \in \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X) \subset M_{\mathbb{N}}\left(X^{\prime \prime}\right),\|f-h\|_{1} \geqslant$ $\left\|f-m_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right\| \geqslant\left\|P \circ\left(f-m_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right)\right\|=\left\|f-h_{0}\right\|_{1}$.

This proof is certainly the simplest (the slightly different approach of [ Kh, 9.], [Du, p. 130 f .] would also work).

## Extremal Kernels and Functions

Consider the dual pairing $\left\langle L^{1}(X) / \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X), H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right\rangle$ which is of the form $\left\langle Z, Z^{\prime}\right\rangle$ (1.4) and thus mutually norming. Fix $f \in L^{1}(X) \backslash \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$; the coset $f+\Vdash_{0}^{1}(X)$ of $f$ in the quotient space will be denoted by $[f]$ in the sequel; $[f] \neq 0$. Following Rogosinski, Shapiro [RS] and Duren [Du, Chapter 8],
2.2. Definition. (1) $f_{0} \in L^{1}(X)$ is called an extremal kernel for [ $f$ ] if $f_{0} \in[f]$ and $\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{1}=\|[f]\|$;
(2) $h_{0} \in H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ is called a (dual) extremal function for [ $f$ ] if $\int\left\langle f, h_{0}\right\rangle d \lambda=\|[f]\|$ and $\left\|h_{0}\right\|_{\infty} \leqslant 1$.

Thus, $f_{0}$ should be an element of smallest norm in [ $f$ ] whereas $h_{0}$ is required to be a support functional of [ $f$ ].

Under the hypotheses of $2.1, f_{0}$ exists for every [ $f$ ]. I will prove in $\S 3$ that without ARNP $f_{0}$ need not exist. On the other hand, $h_{0}$ of course always exists by Hahn-Banach.

A characterization of the following type looks familiar in the theory of extremal problems.
2.3. Proposition. Let $f_{0} \in[f]$ and $h_{0} \in B_{H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)}$. Then $f_{0}$ is an extremal kernel and $h_{0}$ a dual extremal function for $[f]$ if and only if $\left\langle f_{0}(t), h_{0}(t)\right\rangle=$ $\left\|f_{0}(t)\right\|$ a.e. In this case, $\left|h_{0}\right|(t)=1$ a.e. where $f_{0}(t) \neq 0$.

Proof. "only if" By hypothesis,

$$
\int\left|f_{0}\right| d \lambda=\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{1}=\|[f]\|=\int\left\langle f_{0}, h_{0}\right\rangle d \lambda
$$

and $\left\|h_{0}\right\|_{\infty} \leqslant 1$; by $1.2,\left|\left\langle f_{0}, h_{0}\right\rangle\right| \leqslant\left|f_{0}\right|\left|h_{0}\right| \leqslant\left|f_{0}\right|$ a.e., thus $\left\langle f_{0}, h_{0}\right\rangle=\left|f_{0}\right|$ a.e.
"if"

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{1} & =\int\left|f_{0}\right| d \lambda=\int\left\langle f_{0}, h_{0}\right\rangle d \lambda \\
& =\int\left\langle f, h_{0}\right\rangle d \lambda \leqslant\|[f]\|\left\|h_{0}\right\|_{\infty} \leqslant\|[f]\| \leqslant\left\|f_{0}\right\|_{1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Last assertion: By 1.2 again, $\left\|f_{0}(t)\right\|=\left\langle f_{0}(t), h_{0}(t)\right\rangle \leqslant\left\|f_{0}(t)\right\|\left|h_{0}\right|(t) \leqslant$ $\left\|f_{0}(t)\right\|$ a.e. and the last statement follows.
2.4. Corollary. If $X$ has ARNP and is contractively complemented in $X^{\prime \prime}$ then the set $\left\{h \in H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right):|h|(t)=\|h\|_{\infty}\right.$ on a set of positive measure $\}$ is norm dense in $H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$.

Proof. Let $h \in H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=\left(L^{1}(X) / \mathbb{W}_{0}^{1}(X)\right)^{\prime}$ attain its norm $\|h\|_{\infty}$ as a functional on $L^{1}(X) / \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$ in some $[f] \in L^{1}(X) / \mathbb{H}{ }_{0}^{1}(X),\|[f]\|=1$. I claim that $|h|(t)=\|h\|_{\infty}$ on a set of positive measure; the assertion then follows from the Bishop-Phelps theorem [Di, p. 3]. For the claim, I can assume w.l.o.g. $\|h\|_{\infty}=1$. But then $h$ is an extremal function for [ $f$ ]. Choose an extremal kernel $f_{0}$ for [ $f$ ]; this is possible by theorem 2.1. Now by 2.3, $|h|(t)=1=\|h\|_{\infty}$ a.e. on the set of positive measure $\left\{f_{0} \neq 0\right\}$.

It can be proved that the conclusion of this corollary (due to Fisher [F, p. 482] in the scalar case) holds also under the (incomparable) assumption that $X^{\prime}$ has ARNP [H3, Corollary 2.12].
2.5. Theorem (Uniqueness). (1) Let $f_{1}, f_{2} \in L^{1}(X)$ be extremal kernels for $[f]$. Then
(a) $\left\|f_{1}(t)\right\|=\left\|f_{2}(t)\right\|$ a.e.
(b) If $X$ is strictly convex then even $f_{1}=f_{2}$ in $L^{1}(X)$.
(2) Let $h_{1}, h_{2} \in H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ be extremal functions for [ $\left.f\right]$. Suppose that there exists (at least) one extremal kernel $f_{0}$ for $[f]$. Then
(a) $\left|h_{1}\right|(t)=\left|h_{2}\right|(t)=1$ a.e. where $f_{0}(t) \neq 0$.
(b) If $X$ is smooth then even $h_{1}=h_{2}$ in $H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$. ( $A$ Banach space is called "smooth" if every point $\neq 0$ has a unique support functional.)

Proof. (1.a) Choose an extremal function $h_{0} \in B_{H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right)}$ for [ $f$ ]. By the proposition, $\left\langle f_{1}(t)-f_{2}(t), h_{0}(t)\right\rangle=\left\|f_{1}(t)\right\|-\left\|f_{2}(t)\right\| \in \mathbb{R} \quad$ a.e. Since the lefthand side is a member of $H_{0}^{1}(1.4)$ is must be 0 a.e.
(b) It remains to prove $f_{1}(t)=f_{2}(t)$ a.e. where $f_{1}(t) \neq 0 \neq f_{2}(t)$. For those $t$, it follows from $\left\langle f_{1}(t), h_{0}(t)\right\rangle=\left\|f_{1}(t)\right\|=\left\|f_{2}(t)\right\|=\left\langle f_{2}(t), h_{0}(t)\right\rangle$ a.e. that $f_{1}(t)=f_{2}(t)$ a.e., by strict convexity of $X$.
(2.a) See Proposition 2.3.
(b) Again by Proposition 2.3, $\left\langle f_{0}(t), h_{1}(t)\right\rangle=\left\|f_{0}(t)\right\|=\left\langle f_{0}(t), h_{2}(t)\right\rangle$ a.e. Since $f_{0} \neq 0$ and $X$ is smooth, this implies $h_{1}(t)=h_{2}(t)$ on a set of positive measure (for fixed representatives of $h_{1}, h_{2} \in H^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}\right) \subset L^{\infty}\left(X^{\prime}, X\right)$ ). Therefore, if $x \in X$ is also fixed, $\left\langle x, h_{1}(t)\right\rangle=\left\langle x, h_{2}(t)\right\rangle$ a.e., by the identity theorem for $H^{\infty}$ [ Du , Theorem 2.2]. This is the assertion.

Remarks. (i) Trivial (two-dimensional) examples show that neither extremal kernel nor function need be unique in general.
(ii) Part (1.b) says in other words that $\mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$ is a semi-Chebyshev subspace of $L^{1}(X)$ if $X$ is strictly convex.
2.6. Corollary. If $X$ has ARNP and is complemented in $X^{\prime \prime}$ by a contractive projection then $L^{1}(X) / \mathbb{-}_{0}^{1}(X)$ is smooth if (and only if) $X$ is smooth.

Proof. Combine 2.5 (2.b) with 2.1. (The "only if" assertion is trivial since $X$ can be identified with a subspace of $L^{1}(X) / \mathbb{G}_{0}^{1}(X)$.)

## 3. Example and a Two-Variable Result

Without the ARNP assumption on $X, \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$ need not be proximinal in $L^{1}(X)$. Although this is not particularly surprising, I am working out an example of this phenomenon, because I found the blend of harmonic analysis and approximation theory needed to establish it rather appealing.

Note that $L^{1} / H_{0}^{1}$ fails ARNP [BD, Proposition 4.3], [H1, 3.3] and is contractively complemented in the bidual [A, Theorem 2], [Go1, p. 229 f].
3.1. Example. For $X:=L^{1} / H_{0}^{1}, \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$ is not proximinal in $L^{1}(X)$.

This assertion is established in several steps. First, it is reduced to a scalar problem in two variables, then further reduced to a minimal extrapolation problem in one variable the answer to which is known. To begin with, I have to consider several natural identifications in which $\hat{\otimes}$ denotes the projective tensor product (see [DU, VIII.1.10], [Kö, $\S 41.5(8)]$, [DS, III.11.16, 17] for justification): For $X:=L^{1} / H_{0}^{1}$, $L^{1}(X)=L^{1} \hat{\otimes} L^{1} / H_{0}^{1}=\left(L^{1} \hat{\otimes} L^{1}\right) /\left(\overline{L^{1} \otimes H_{0}^{1}}\right)=L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right) / L_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$. Let $f \in L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ and $F \in L^{1}(X)$ the element corresponding to $f+L_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ under this chain of identifications. Then for $m \in \mathbb{Z}, X=L^{1} / H_{0}^{1} \ni \hat{F}(m)$ $=\int_{0}^{2 \pi} f(s, \cdot) e^{-i m s} d s / 2 \pi+H_{0}^{1}$, so that $\hat{F}(m)=0 \in L^{1} / H_{0}^{1} \Leftrightarrow \forall n \leqslant 0$ : $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} f(s, t) e^{-i m s} e^{-i n t}(d s / 2 \pi)(d t / 2 \pi)=0$. Altogether, $F \in \mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X) \Leftrightarrow \hat{F}(m)=0$ $\forall m \leqslant 0 \Leftrightarrow \forall m \leqslant 0 \forall n \leqslant 0: \hat{f}(m, n)=0 \Leftrightarrow f \in L_{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z} \cup \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$. In other words, under the identification $L^{1}(X)=L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right) / L_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ above, the subspace $\mathbb{H}_{0}^{1}(X)$ identifies with $L_{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z} \cup \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right) / L_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$. Now I use a result of

Cheney and Wulbert [Si2, Theorem 2.20], saying that if $U \subset V \subset W$ is a chain of inclusions of Banach spaces, where $U$ is proximinal in $W$, then $V$ is proximinal in $W$ if (and only if) $V / U$ is proximinal in $W / U$. Of course, I want to apply this lemma to the chain of inclusions $L_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right) \subset$ $L_{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z} \cup \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right) \subset L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$. This can be done because of the following proposition.

### 3.2. Proposition. $L_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ is proximinal in $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$.

Proof. One of the applications of the Bukhvalov-Lozanovskii theorem says that a subspace $Z \subset L^{1}(\mu)$ is proximinal if $B_{Z}$ is closed for the topology of convergence in measure $\mu$ (a finite measure) [BL, Theorem 1.6'], [B2, Theorem 1.7], [KA, X. 5 Theorem 5]; such a $Z$ is called "nicely placed" in $L^{1}(\mu)$ by Godefroy [Go1], [Go2] who observed that $H_{0}^{1}$ is nicely placed in $L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ [Go1, p. 230]. Therefore, it suffices to establish that $L_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ is nicely placed in $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$. This is a special case of [Go2, Theorem 2.7], or of the observation stated in [HWW, p. 200]: if $Z$ is nicely placed in $L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ then $L^{1}(\mathbb{T} ; Z)$ is nicely placed in $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$. (A third proof is given in [H3, p. 46]).

By now it is established that the assertion of example 3.1 is equivalent to

### 3.3. Example. $L_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N} \cup \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ is not proximinal in $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$.

This is obviously a special case of the following criterion. An affine straight line in $\mathbb{Z}^{2}$ is a set of the form $\Delta=\mathbb{Z}\left(m_{1}, n_{1}\right)+\left(m_{0}, n_{0}\right)$ for relatively prime $m_{1}, n_{1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and arbitrary $m_{0}, n_{0} \in \mathbb{Z}$; with $a=-n_{1}, b=m_{1}, c=$ $a m+b n_{0}, \Delta$ has also the description $\Delta=\left\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2}: a m+b n=c\right\}$.

Theorem. Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^{2}$, and suppose there exists an affine straight line $\Delta \subset \mathbb{Z}^{2}$ which intersects $\subset \Lambda$ in finitely many but at least 2 points. Then $L_{A}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ is not proximinal in $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$.

Proof. I reduce the question to a one-variable problem by showing that if $L_{A}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ were proximinal in $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ then $L_{\Gamma}^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ would have to be proximinal in $L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\Gamma=\mathbb{Z} \backslash \Gamma^{\prime}, 2 \leqslant \# \Gamma^{\prime}<\infty$, which is known to be false [Ka, p. 303, 3.]. The idea of this reduction is easy: embed $L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ into $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ "along $\Delta$ ". That is, with the data describing $\Delta$ as above, define $J: L^{1}(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right), J f(s, t):=e^{i\left(m_{0} s+n_{0} t\right)} f\left(m_{1} s+n_{1} t\right) . J$ is a (well-defined!) isometric embedding onto $L_{\Delta}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$, and for $(m, n)=k\left(m_{1}, n_{1}\right)+\left(m_{0}, n_{0}\right) \in \Delta$ $(k \in \mathbb{Z})$ the relation $\widehat{J f}(m, n)=\hat{f}(k)$ holds $\left(f \in L^{1}(\mathbb{T})\right)$. Now let $\Gamma:=$ $\left\{k \in \mathbb{Z}: k\left(m_{1}, n_{1}\right)+\left(m_{0}, n_{0}\right) \in \Lambda\right\}=\mathbb{Z} \backslash \Gamma^{\prime}$ with $2 \leqslant \# \Gamma^{\prime}<\infty$ by hypothesis. Then $J$ maps $L_{\Gamma}^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ onto $L_{\Delta \cap A}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)=L_{\Delta}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right) \cap L_{A}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$. The situation is as follows:

3.4. Lemma. Consider the following diagram of Bananch spaces and inclusions:

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
Y_{2} & \subset X_{2} \\
\cup & \cup \\
Y_{2} \cap X_{1}=: Y_{1} \subset X_{1}
\end{array}
$$

Suppose there exists a contractive projection $X_{2} \rightarrow X_{1}$ leaving $Y_{2}$ invariant. Then $Y_{2}$ proximinal in $X_{2}$ implies $Y_{1}$ proximinal in $X_{1}$.

Proof. Trivial.
The proof of Theorem 3.3 is finished by establishing
3.5. Lemma. There is a contractive projection $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right) \rightarrow L_{4}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ leaving $L_{A}^{1}\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)$ invariant.

Proof. Define $\mu \in M\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)=C\left(\mathbb{T}^{2}\right)^{\prime}, \mu(f):=\int_{0}^{2 \pi} e^{i c \vartheta} f(a \vartheta, b \vartheta) d \vartheta / 2 \pi$, then $\|\mu\| \leqslant 1$ and $\hat{\mu}=1_{\Delta}$. The sought projection is $f \mapsto \mu * f$.
3.6. Note. It has been said that if $\Gamma=\mathbb{Z} \backslash \Gamma^{\prime}, 2 \leqslant \# \Gamma^{\prime}<\infty$, then it is known [Ka, p. 303, 3.] that $L_{\Gamma}^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ is not proximinal in $L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$. In other words (see [loc.cit.]), the following discrete version of Beurling's "minimal extrapolation problem" does not always have a solution: Given a function $\varphi$ on $\Gamma^{\prime}$ of the form $\varphi=\hat{f} \mid \Gamma^{\prime}$ for some $f \in L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$, find a $g \in L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ of smallest norm with $\hat{g} \mid \Gamma^{\prime}=\varphi$. Kahane [loc.cit.] claims that $\varphi:=1$ has no such "minimal extrapolation" $g$. To see this, by an argument involving an approximate identity for $L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ (e.g., $\left(P_{r}\right)_{r<1}$, see [Sh, 7.3.6]) it is proved first that $\|g\|_{1}=1$, then assuming w.l.o.g. that $0 \in \Gamma^{\prime}$, it follows that $g \geqslant 0$ whence $\hat{g}$ is positive definite. However, by [R, 1.4.1(4 $\left.4^{0}\right)$ ] any positive definite function $\Psi$ on $\mathbb{Z}$ with $\Psi(0)=\Psi(k)=1$ for some $k \neq 0$ must be $k$-periodic. Applied to $\hat{g}$, this contradicts the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma.

Note added in proof. Q. Xu observed that Proposition 3.2 follows also from Theorem 2.1, taking $X:=L^{1}(\mathbb{T})$ there.
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