

A NOTE ON THE PAPER
« THE POULSEN SIMPLEX »
OF LINDENSTRAUSS,
OLSEN AND STERNFELD

by Wolfgang LUSKY

It was shown in [5] that there is only one metrizable Poulsen simplex S (i.e. the extreme points $ex\ S$ are dense in S) up to affine homeomorphism. Thus, S is universal in the following sense: Every metrizable simplex is affinely homeomorphic to a closed face of S ([5], [6]).

The Poulsen simplex can be regarded as the opposite simplex to the class of metrizable Bauer simplices ([5]). There is a certain analogy in the class of separable Lindenstrauss spaces (i.e. the preduals of L_1 -spaces); the Gurarii space G is uniquely determined (up to isometric isomorphisms) by the following property: *G is separable and for any finite dimensional Banach spaces $E \subset F$, linear isometry $T: E \rightarrow G$, $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a linear extension $\tilde{T}: F \rightarrow G$ of T with $(1 - \varepsilon)\|x\| \leq \|\tilde{T}(x)\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|x\|$ for all $x \in F$.* ([3], [7]).

G is universal: Any separable Lindenstrauss space X is isometrically isomorphic to a subspace $X \subset G$ with a contractive projection $P: G \rightarrow X$ ([9], [6]).

Furthermore G is opposite to the class of separable $C(K)$ -spaces. There is another interesting property of G :

For any smooth points $x, y \in G$ there is a linear isometry T from G onto G with $T(x) = y$. ($x \in G$ is smooth point if $\|x\| = 1$ and there is only one $x^* \in G^*$ with

$$x^*(x) = 1 = \|x^*\|).$$

In their last remark the authors of [5] point out that here the analogy between G and $A(S) = \{f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \mid f \text{ affine continuous}\}$ seems to break down.

The purpose of this note is to show that under the aspect of rotation properties there is still some kind of analogy between G and $A(S)$.

Take $s_0 \in \text{ex } S$ and consider

$$A_0(S; s_0) = \{f \in A(S) \mid f(s_0) = 0\},$$

for any normed space X let $B(X) = \{x \in X \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$ and $\partial B(X) = \{x \in X \mid \|x\| = 1\}$. In particular

$$\partial B(A(S))_+ = \{f \in \partial B(A(S)) \mid f \geq 0\}$$

We show :

THEOREM.

(a) Let $f, g \in \partial B(A(S))_+$ so that $f, 1 - f, g, 1 - g$ are smooth points of $A(S)$. Then there is an isometric isomorphism T from $A(S)$ onto $A(S)$ with

(i) $T(f) = g$

(ii) $T(A_0(S; s_0)) = A_0(S; s_1)$ where $f(s_0) = 0 = g(s_1)$

(iii) $T(1) = 1$

(b) Let $f \in \partial B(A_0(S; s_0))_+$ and $g \in \partial B(A_0(S; s_1))$ so that neither $g \leq 0$ nor $g \geq 0$ hold. Then there is no isometric isomorphism T from $A(S)$ onto $A(S)$ with $T(f) = g$.

(c) The elements $f \in A_0(S; s_0)$, so that $f, 1 - f$ are smooth points of $A(S)$, form a dense subset of $\partial B(A_0(S; s_0))_+$.

The proof of the Theorem which is based on a method used in [5] and [7] is a consequence of the following lemmas and proposition 6. From now on let $s_0 \in \text{ex } S$ be fixed and set $A_0(S) = A_0(S; s_0)$. We shall retain a notation of [5]:

By a peaked partition we mean positive elements $e_1, \dots, e_n \in A_0(S)$ so that $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i e_i \right\| = \max_{i \leq n} |\lambda_i|$ for all $\lambda_i \in \mathbf{R}; i \leq n$. Notice that this definition just means « peaked partition of unity in $A(S)$ » ([5]) if we add $e_0 = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n e_i$. Call a l_∞^n -subspace $E \subset A_0(S)$ ([6]) positively generated if E is spanned by a peaked partition. If $l_\infty^{m+1} \cong \tilde{E} \subset A(S)$

is spanned by the peaked partition of unity $\{f_0, f_1, \dots, f_m\}$ and contains e_0, e_1, \dots, e_n then we may arrange the indices $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$ so that

$$(*) \quad e_i = f_i + \sum_{j=1}^{m-n} k_j f_{j+n}; \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, n;$$

where $k_j \geq 0$ for all j and $\sum_{j=1}^{m-n} k_j \leq 1$ ([6] Lemma 1.3 (i)).

LEMMA 1. — Let $E, F \subset A_0(S)$ be finite dimensional subspaces so that E is a positively generated l_∞ -space. For any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a positively generated l_∞ -space $\hat{E} \subset A_0(S)$ so that $E \subset \hat{E}$ and $\inf \{\|x - y\| \mid y \in \hat{E}\} \leq \epsilon \|x\|$ for all $x \in F$.

Proof. — We may assume without loss of generality that F is spanned by positive elements. Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be the peaked partition which spans E . Add e_0 as above. By [3] Theorem 3.1. there is $l_\infty^m \cong \tilde{E} \subset A(S)$ with $E \subset \tilde{E}$ and $\inf \{\|x - y\| \mid y \in \tilde{E}\} \leq \epsilon \|x\|$ for all $x \in F$. Hence \tilde{E} is positively generated by a peaked partition of unity $\{f_0, f_1, \dots, f_m\}$ By (*) $f_j(s_0) = 0; 1 \leq i \leq m$. Set $\hat{E} =$ linear span $\{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$. \square

LEMMA 2. — Let $l_\infty^n \cong E \subset F \cong l_\infty^m$ be positively generated subspaces of $A_0(S)$. Let $\Phi \in E^*$ be positive. Then there is a positive extension $\tilde{\Phi} \in F^*$ of Φ with $\|\tilde{\Phi}\| = \|\Phi\|$.

Proof. — Let $\{e_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $\{f_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ be peaked partitions spanning E and F respectively, so that (*) holds. Define then $\tilde{\Phi}(f_i) = \Phi(e_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\tilde{\Phi}(f_j) = 0$ for all $j = n + 1, \dots, m$. \square

LEMMA 3. — Let $\{e_{i,n} \in A_0(S) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ be a peaked partition. Suppose that there is a positive $\Phi \in \text{ex } B(A_0(S)^*)$ so that $\sum_{i=1}^n \Phi(e_{i,n}) < 1$. Then there is a peaked partition $\{e_{i,n+1} \in A_0(S) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n + 1\}$ with

$$e_{i,n} = e_{i,n+1} + \Phi(e_{i,n})e_{n+1,n+1}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. — Let $\Phi_0 \in \text{ex } B(A(S)^*)$ be an element satisfying $\Phi_0(y) = 0$ for all $y \in A_0(S)$. Consider furthermore

$$\Phi_i \in \text{ex } B(A(S)^*); \quad i = 1, \dots, n;$$

with

$$\Phi_i(e_{j,n}) = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j; \\ 0 & i \neq j; \end{cases} \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Define the affine ω^* -continuous function $f: H \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by $f(\pm \Phi_i) = 0; i = 0, 1, \dots, n; f(\pm \Phi) = \pm 1$ where $H = \text{conv}(\{\pm \Phi_i \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, n\} \cup \{\pm \Phi\})$. Set

$$h_1(y^*) = \min \left\{ \frac{1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i y^*(e_{i,n})}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i \Phi(e_{i,n})} \mid \theta_i = \pm 1; i = 1, \dots, n \right\}$$

$$h_2(y^*) = \min \left\{ \frac{1 - y^*(e - e_{i,n})}{\Phi(e_{i,n})} \mid \Phi(e_{i,n}) > 0; i = 1, \dots, n \right\}$$

and consider $g(y^*) = \min(h_1(y^*), h_2(y^*), 1 + y^*(e))$.

Hence $g: B(A(S)^*) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is ω^* -continuous, concave and nonnegative. In addition, $f(y^*) \leq g(y^*)$ holds for all $y^* \in H$.

By [3] Theorem 2.1. there is $e_{n+1,n+1} \in A(S)$ with

$$y^*(e_{n+1,n+1}) \leq g(y^*)$$

for all $y^* \in B(A(S)^*)$ and $y^*(e_{n+1,n+1}) = f(y^*)$ for all $y^* \in H$.

Hence, $\|e - [e_{i,n} - \Phi(e_{i,n})e_{n+1,n+1}]\| \leq 1$ and

$$\|e - e_{n+1,n+1}\| \leq 1.$$

Thus $0 \leq e_{i,n} - \Phi(e_{i,n})e_{n+1,n+1}$ and $0 \leq e_{n+1,n+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Furthermore $\Phi_0(e_{n+1,n+1}) = 0$, hence $e_{n+1,n+1} \in A_0(S)$. That means, $e_{n+1,n+1}$ and $e_{i,n} - \Phi(e_{i,n})e_{n+1,n+1}$ are the elements of a peaked partition in $A_0(S)$. \square

LEMMA 4. — Let $r_1, \dots, r_n > 0$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i < 1$ and a peaked partition $\{e_{1,n}, \dots, e_{n,n}\} \subset A_0(S)$ be given. Then there is a positive element $\Phi \in \text{ex } B(A_0(S)^*)$ with $\Phi(e_{i,n}) = r_i$ for all $i \leq n$.

Proof. — Let $\{x_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ be dense in $A_0(S)$. Set linear span $\{e_{i,n} \mid i \leq n\} = E$. Define $\Phi|_E$ by $\Phi(e_{i,n}) = r_i$ for all i . Assume that we have defined Φ already on a positively generated l_∞^m -subspace $\tilde{E} \supset E$ of $A_0(S)$ so that $\|\Phi|_{\tilde{E}}\| < 1$. Then there is a basis $\{e_{i,m} \mid i \leq m\}$ of \tilde{E} consisting of a peaked partition so that $\Phi(e_{i,m}) > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. Now, let $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2^{m+1} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \Phi(e_{i,m})\right)$. There is a positive linear extension $\Psi \in \text{ex } B(A_0(S)^*)$ of Φ by Lemma 1 and Lemma 2. We derive from $\overline{\text{ex } S} = S$ that $\text{ex } B(A_0(S)^*)_+$ is φ^* -dense in $B(A_0(S)^*)_+$. It follows that there is $\Omega \in \text{ex } B(A_0(S)^*)_+$ with $\Phi(e_{i,m}) \geq \Omega(e_{i,m})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$ and with $\sum_{i=1}^m |\Omega(e_{i,m}) - \Phi(e_{i,m})| \leq \varepsilon$. We infer from Lemma 3 that there is peaked partition

$$\{e_{i,m+1} \in A_0(S) \mid i = 1, \dots, m + 1\}$$

with $e_{i,m} = e_{i,m+1} + \Omega(e_{i,m})e_{m+1,m+1}$; $i = 1, \dots, m$. Set $E_{m+1} = \text{span } \{e_{i,m+1} \mid i \leq m + 1\}$ and extend Φ linearly by defining $\Phi(e_{m+1,m+1}) = (1 + 2^{-m})^{-1}$. Hence $\|\Phi|_{E_{m+1}}\| < 1$. Find a positively generated l_∞^{m+1+k} -space $F \subset A_0(S)$ with $E_{m+1} \subset F$ and $\inf \{\|x_k - y\| \mid y \in F\} \leq (m + 1)^{-1} \|x_k\|$ for all $k \leq m$. Continue this process with F instead of E . Finally we obtain an increasing sequence $E_m \subset A_0(S)$ of positively generated l_∞^m -spaces so that $A_0(S) = \overline{\bigcup E_m}$ where m runs through a subsequence of \mathbf{N} . Furthermore there are peaked partitions $\{e_{i,m} \in E_m \mid i \leq m\}$ so that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(e_{m,m}) = 1$. The latter condition implies that Φ is a positive extreme point of $B(A_0(S)^*)$. \square

COROLLARY. — Let $e_{i,n} \in A_0(S)$ be a peaked partition and let $0 < r_i$; $i = 1, \dots, n$; be real numbers with $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i < 1$. Then there is a peaked partition $\{e_{j,n+1} \in A_0(S) \mid j = 1, \dots, n + 1\}$ with $e_{i,n} = e_{i,n+1} + r_i e_{n+1,n+1}$; $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Remark. — If we omit « $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i < 1$ » then the above corollary is no longer true (see [7], remark after the corollary

of Lemma 2). The previous corollary does not hold either if we drop « $0 < r_i$ for all i ». This follows from the next lemma.

LEMMA 5. — Let $s_0 \in \text{ex } S$ be fixed. Then the set

$$\Lambda(S, s_0) = \{f \in B(A_0(S, s_0)) \mid f$$

and $1 - f$ are smooth points of $\Lambda(S)\}$ is dense in $\partial B(A_0(S, s_0))_+$.

Proof. — Let $g \in \partial B(A_0(S, s_0))_+$ and $s_1 \in \text{ex } S$ so that $g(s_1) = 1$. Set $F = \text{conv}(\{s_0, s_1\})$. Let $\{x_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ be dense in $\{x \in A_0(S, s_0) \mid \|x\| \leq 1; x|_F = 0\}$. Define the affine continuous function $h: F \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by $h(s_0) = 0, h(s_1) = 1$.

Furthermore let $f_1(s) = 1 - 1/2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n}(x_n(s))^2$ and

$$f_2(s) = 1/2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n}(x_n(s))^2$$

for all $s \in S$. Then f_1 and f_2 are continuous; f_1 is concave, f_2 is convex. Furthermore $f_2(s) \leq h(s) \leq f_1(s)$ for all $s \in F$. Hence there is an affine, continuous extension $\tilde{h}: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ of h with $f_2(s) \leq \tilde{h}(s) \leq f_1(s)$ for all $s \in S$ ([1], [2]).

Thus $\tilde{h}(s_0) = 0, \tilde{h}(s_1) = 1, 0 < \tilde{h}(s) < 1$ for $s \neq s_0, s_1$. Then $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)g + \varepsilon \tilde{h}}{\|(1 - \varepsilon)g + \varepsilon \tilde{h}\|} = g$. \square

Now, if we take $e_{1,1} \in \Lambda(S, s_0)$ and suppose that there is $\Phi \in \text{ex } B(A_0(S, s_0))^*$ with $\Phi(e_{1,1}) = 0$ then there must be $s_1 \in \text{ex } S$ with $s_1 \neq s_0$ so that $e_{1,1}(s_1) = 0$, which is a contradiction. This concludes our above remark.

PROPOSITION 6. — Let S be the Poulsen simplex and $s, \tilde{s} \in \text{ex } S$. Consider $x \in \Lambda(S, s)$ and $y \in \Lambda(S, \tilde{s})$. Then there is an isometric (linear and order-) isomorphism T :

$$A_0(S, s) \rightarrow A_0(S, \tilde{s}) \quad (\text{onto}) \quad \text{with} \quad T(x) = y.$$

Proof. — In the following we set $X = A_0(S, s)$ and $Y = A_0(S, \tilde{s})$. We claim that there are peaked partitions

$$\{e_{i,n} \mid i \leq n\} \subset X, \quad \{f_{i,n} \mid i \leq n\} \subset Y; \quad n \in \mathbf{N};$$

and real numbers $a_{i,n}; i \leq n; n \in \mathbf{N}$; with

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} e_{i,n} &= e_{i,n+1} + a_{i,n}e_{n+1,n+1} \\ f_{i,n} &= f_{i,n+1} + a_{i,n}f_{n+1,n+1} \\ 0 < a_{i,n}; \quad i \leq n; \quad \sum_{i=1}^n a_{i,n} < 1; \quad n \in \mathbf{N}; \\ e_{1,1} &= x; \quad f_{1,1} = y. \end{aligned}$$

For this purpose we construct peaked partitions

$$\{e_{i,n}^{(j)} \mid i \leq n\} \subset X$$

$\{f_{i,n}^{(j)} \mid i \leq n\} \subset Y; n \in \mathbf{N}; j \leq n$; such that

$$\begin{aligned} (2) \quad e_{i,n}^{(j)} &= e_{i,n+1}^{(j)} + a_{i,n}e_{n+1,n+1}^{(j)} \\ (2') \quad f_{i,n}^{(j)} &= f_{i,n+1}^{(j)} + a_{i,n}f_{n+1,n+1}^{(j)} \\ (3) \quad \|e_{i,n}^{(j)} - e_{i,n}^{(j+1)}\| &\leq 2^{-j} \\ (3') \quad \|f_{i,n}^{(j)} - f_{i,n}^{(j+1)}\| &\leq 2^{-j}. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed by induction :

Let $\{x_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ be dense in X and let $\{y_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ be dense in Y . Assume that

$$\{e_{i,k}^{(p)} \mid i \leq k\}, \quad \{f_{i,k}^{(p)} \mid i \leq k\}$$

and $0 < a_{i,j}; j = 1, \dots, n-1; k \leq p; k, p = 1, \dots, n$; have been introduced already such that $e_{1,1}^{(n)} = x$ and $f_{1,1}^{(n)} = y$. Set $E_n = \text{Span} \{e_{i,n}^{(n)} \mid i \leq n\}$; $F_n = \text{Span} \{f_{i,n}^{(n)} \mid i \leq n\}$

(*) There are positively generated l_∞^k -subspaces $E_k \subset X$ with $E_{k-1} \subset E_k; k = n+1, \dots, m$; so that

$$(4) \quad \inf \{\|x_j - x\| \mid x \in E_m\} \leq 2^{-n}\|x_j\|; \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Consider a system of peaked partitions $\{e_{i,k}^{(k)} \mid i \leq k\}$ spanning E_k and real numbers $0 \leq b_{i,k}$ with

$$(5) \quad e_{i,k-1}^{(k-1)} = e_{i,k}^{(k)} + b_{i,k-1}e_{k,k}^{(k)}; \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} b_{i,k-1} \leq 1; \quad k = n+1, \dots, m.$$

Notice that (6) $0 < \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} b_{i,k-1}$ for all k .

Since otherwise there is $\Phi \in \text{ex } B(X^*)$ with $\Phi|_{E_{k-1}} = 0$ and $\Phi(e_{k,k}^{(k)}) = 1$. As $x \in E_{k-1}$, there are two different $s, s_1 \in \text{ex } S$ with $x(s) = x(s_1) = 0$, a contradiction.

We first perturb $\{e_{i,n}^{(n)} \mid i \leq n\}$:

STEP $(n + 1)$:

Consider

$$(7) \quad x = e_{1,1}^{(n)} = e_{1,n}^{(n)} + \sum_{j=2}^n k_j e_{j,n}^{(n)} = e_{1,n+1}^{(n+1)} + \sum_{j=2}^n k_j e_{j,n+1}^{(n+1)} + \left(b_{1,n} + \sum_{j=2}^n k_j b_{j,n} \right) e_{n+1,n+1}^{(n+1)}$$

where $0 \leq k_j \leq 1$; $2 \leq j \leq n$. Even $k_j < 1$ holds properly for all $j = 2, \dots, n$; since otherwise there would be two different $s_1, s_2 \in \text{ex } S$ with $x(s_1) = x(s_2) = 1$; which can be inferred from (7) similarly as the proof of (6). Using the same kind of argument shows $0 < k_j$ for all $j = 2, \dots, n$. In view of (6) there is some $b_{i,n} \neq 0$.

(a) Let $\sum_{i=1}^n b_{i,n} < 1$:

Let i_0 be an index with $b_{i_0,n} \neq 0$. Set $k_{i_0} = 1$ and

$$\rho = \min \left(\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^n b_{i,n} \right) |k_{i_0}(n-1) - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i_0}}^n k_j|^{-1}; 1/n \right).$$

Define

$$a_{i_0,n} = \left(1 - 2^{-2n} \rho \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i_0}}^n k_j \right) b_{i_0,n}$$

$$a_{i,n} = b_{i,n} + 2^{-2n} \rho k_{i_0} b_{i_0,n}; \quad i \neq i_0.$$

(b) Assume now $\sum_{i=1}^n b_{i,n} = 1$.

From our assumption $x \in \Lambda(S, s)$ together with (7) it follows similarly as above that there is $i \geq 2$ with $b_{i,n} > 0$. Assume without loss of generality that $b_{n,n} > 0$.

$$\text{Let } \rho = \min \left(\frac{1}{2} (1 - k_n) |k_n(n-1) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j|^{-1}; 1/n \right).$$

Define

$$a_{1,n} = b_{1,n} + 2^{-(2n+1)} k_n (1 + \rho) b_{n,n}$$

$$a_{i,n} = b_{i,n} + 2^{-(2n+1)} k_n \rho b_{n,n}; \quad 2 \leq i \leq n-1 \quad (\text{if } n > 2)$$

$$a_{n,n} = \left(1 - 2^{-(2n+1)} - 2^{-(2n+1)} \rho \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \right) b_{n,n}.$$

Hence in either case $0 < a_{i,n}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n a_{i,n} < 1$. Furthermore

$$(8) \quad |a_{i..n} - b_{i..n}| \leq 2^{-2n} \quad \text{for all } i \leq n.$$

Define

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} e_{i,n}^{(n+1)} &= e_{i,n+1}^{(n+1)} + a_{i,n} e_{n+1,n+1}^{(n+1)} & i \leq n+1 \\ e_{i,n}^{(n+1)} &= e_{i,n}^{(n+1)} + a_{i,n-1} e_{n,n}^{(n+1)} & i \leq n \\ &\vdots \\ e_{1,1}^{(n+1)} &= e_{1,2}^{(n+1)} + a_{1,1} e_{2,2}^{(n+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

From (8) and (9) we derive easily $\|e_{i,k}^{(n+1)} - e_{i,k}^{(n)}\| \leq 2^{-n}$; $k = 1, \dots, n+1$; $i \leq n$. Hence $(2)_{n+1}$ and $(3)_{n+1}$ are established.

Furthermore, because the elements k_j of (7) depend only on $a_{i,k}$; $i \leq k \leq n-1$; we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e_{1,1}^{(n+1)} &= e_{1,n}^{(n+1)} + \sum_{j=2}^n k_j e_{j,n}^{(n+1)} \\ &= e_{1,n+1}^{(n+1)} + \sum_{j=2}^n k_j e_{j,n+1}^{(n+1)} + \left(a_{1,n} + \sum_{j=2}^n k_j a_{j,n} \right) e_{n+1,n+1}^{(n+1)} \\ &= e_{1,n+1}^{(n+1)} + \sum_{j=2}^n k_j e_{j,n+1}^{(n+1)} + \left(b_{1,n} + \sum_{j=2}^n k_j b_{j,n} \right) e_{n+1,n+1}^{(n+1)} \\ &= e_{1,1}^{(n)} = x. \end{aligned}$$

Now, in STEP $(n+2)$, repeat the procedure of STEP $(n+1)$ but replace E_{n+1} by E_{n+2} and $n+1$ by $n+2$. Then turn to STEP $(n+3)$, \dots , STEP (m) . We obtain $(2)_{n+1}, \dots, (2)_m$ and $(3)_{n+1}, \dots, (3)_m$.

Consider now F_n . Find positively generated l_∞^k subspaces $F_n \subset F_{n+1} \subset \dots \subset F_m \subset Y$ and peaked partitions spanning F_k , $\{f_{i,k}^{(m)} \in F_k \mid i \leq k\}$ with

$$f_{i,k}^{(m)} = f_{i,k+1}^{(m)} + a_{i,k} f_{k+1,k+1}^{(m)}; \quad k = n, \dots, m-1$$

where we have set $f_{i,n}^{(m)} = f_{i,n}^{(n)}$; $i = 1, \dots, n$. This is possible by the Corollary after Lemma 4. Define

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i,k}^{(j)} &= f_{i,k}^{(m)}; & i \leq k; & \quad n+1 \leq k \leq m; & \quad n+1 \leq j \leq m \\ f_{i,k}^{(j)} &= f_{i,k}^{(n)}; & i \leq k; & \quad 1 \leq k \leq n; & \quad n+1 \leq j \leq m. \end{aligned}$$

Find positively generated l_∞^k -subspaces F_k of Y with

$F_{k-1} \subset F_k$; $k = m + 1, \dots, r$; such that

$$(10) \quad \inf \{ \|y_j - x\| \mid x \in F_r \} \leq 2^{-m} \|y_j\|; \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Repeat (*) with r instead of m and F_r instead of E_m . This yields $(2')_{m+1}, \dots, (2')_r$ and $(3')_{m+1}, \dots, (3')_r$.

Then go back to E_m and find positively generated l_∞^k -subspaces $E_{m+1} \subset \dots \subset E_r$ of X with $E_m \subset E_{m+1}$ and peaked partitions $\{e_{i,k}^{(r)} \mid i \leq k\}$ of E_k with

$$e_{i,k}^{(r)} = e_{i,k+1}^{(r)} + a_{i,k} e_{k+1,k+1}^{(r)}; \quad k = m, \dots, r - 1.$$

(We have set $e_{i,m}^{(r)} = e_{i,m}^{(m)}$).

Define

$$\begin{aligned} e_{i,k}^{(j)} &= e_{i,k}^{(r)}; & i \leq k; & \quad m + 1 \leq k \leq r; & \quad m + 1 \leq j \leq r; \\ e_{i,k}^{(j)} &= e_{i,k}^{(m)}; & i \leq k; & \quad 1 \leq k \leq m; & \quad m + 1 \leq j \leq r. \end{aligned}$$

Finally go back to (*) and repeat everything with E_r and F_r instead of E_n and F_n , respectively. By (3) and (3') we obtain

$$e_{i,n} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} e_{i,n}^{(j)}; \quad f_{i,n} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f_{i,n}^{(j)}; \quad i \leq n, \quad n \in \mathbf{N};$$

which are elements of peaked partitions with

$$e_{i,n} = e_{i,n+1} + a_{i,n} e_{n+1,n+1}; \quad f_{i,n} = f_{i,n+1} + a_{i,n} f_{n+1,n+1} \\ i \leq n; \quad n \in \mathbf{N}; \quad f_{1,1} = y; \quad e_{1,1} = x \quad ((2) \text{ and } (2')). \text{ From (4), (10)}$$

and (3), (3') we infer that

$$\text{closed span } \{f_{i,n} \mid i \leq n; \quad n \in \mathbf{N}\} = Y$$

and

$$\text{closed span } \{e_{i,n} \mid i \leq n; \quad n \in \mathbf{N}\} = X.$$

We define an isometric isomorphism $T : A_0(S; s) \rightarrow A_0(S; \tilde{s})$ by $T(e_{i,n}) = f_{i,n}$; $i \leq n$; $n \in \mathbf{N}$. \square

Proposition 6 establishes the assertion (a) of the Theorem if we extend T isometrically on $A(S)$ by defining $T(1) = 1$.

Proof of (b):

Let $u, v \in \text{ex } S$ so that $g(u) > 0$ and $g(v) < 0$. If there were an isometric isomorphism (onto) then in view of Lemma 5 there would be $\tilde{g} \in \partial B(A_0(S; s_1))$ with $\tilde{g}(u) > 0$ and $\tilde{g}(v) < 0$ so that $\tilde{g}(s) \neq 0$ for all $s \in S$; $s \neq s_1$. But

then $s_1 = \lambda u + (1 - \lambda)v$ for suitable λ ; $0 < \lambda < 1$. Hence $u = v = s_1$, a contradiction.

(c) has been proved already by Lemma 5.

Concluding remarks. — The assertion (a) of the Theorem cannot be extended on any dense subset of $\partial B(A(S))_+$ since otherwise any element of $\partial B(A(S))_+$ would be extreme point of $B(A(S))$ which is certainly not true. This follows from the fact that for any $e \in \text{ex } B(A(S))$,

$$\max (\|x + e\|, \|x - e\|) = 1 + \|x\|$$

holds for all $x \in A(S)$. (cf. [4] Theorem 4.7. and 4.8.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] E. M. ALFSEN, Compact, convex sets and boundary integrals, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, Springer 1971.
- [2] B. FUCHSSTEINER, Sandwich theorems and lattice semigroups, *J. Functional Analysis*, 16 (1974), 1-14.
- [3] A. J. LAZAR and J. LINDENSTRAUSS, Banach spaces whose duals are L_1 -spaces and their representing matrices, *Acta Math.*, 126 (1971), 165-194.
- [4] J. LINDENSTRAUSS, Extension of compact operators, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 48 (1964).
- [5] J. LINDENSTRAUSS, G. OLSEN and Y. STERNFELD, The Poulsen simplex, to appear in *Anal. Inst. Fourier*.
- [6] W. LUSKY, On separable Lindenstrauss spaces, *J. Functional Analysis*, 26 (1977), 103-120.
- [7] W. LUSKY, The Gurarij spaces are unique, *Arch. Math.*, 27 (1976), 627-635.
- [8] E. T. POULSEN, A simplex with dense extreme points, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 11 (1961), 83-87.
- [9] P. WOJTASZCZYK, Some remarks on the Gurarij space, *Studia Math.*, 41 (1972), 207-210.

Manuscrit reçu le 22 décembre 1976

Proposé par G. Choquet.

Wolfgang Lusky,

Gesamthochschule Paderborn
 Fachbereich 17 - Mathematik - Informatik
 Arbeitsstelle Mathematik
 Pohlweg 55
 Postfach 1621
 479 Paderborn (R.F.A.).