

Norming M-bases and C(K) spaces

Tommaso Russo tommaso.russo.math@gmail.com

j./w. P. Hájek, J. Somaglia, and S. Todorčević

51th Winter School in Abstract Analysis Vlachovice, Czech Republic January 13–20, 2024

Some basis stuff

A sequence $(e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a **Schauder basis** if for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there are unique scalars $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with

$$x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n e_n$$
 (the series converges in \mathcal{X}).

- ► Two drawbacks:
 - Schauder bases can only exist in separable spaces.
 - ▶ Enflo ('73). Not every separable Banach space has a Schauder basis.
- A system $\{e_n; \varphi_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}^*$ is a Markushevich basis (M-basis) if:
 - (i) $\langle \varphi_k, e_n \rangle = \delta_{k,n}$,
 - (ii) $\overline{\operatorname{span}}\{e_n\} = \mathcal{X}$,
 - (iii) $\overline{\operatorname{span}}^{w^*} \{ \varphi_n \} = \mathcal{X}^*.$
- Advantages:
 - Markushevich ('43). Every separable Banach space has an M-basis.
 - ▶ The definition extends to all Banach spaces (just change label!).
- ▶ Drawback: $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle \varphi_n, x \rangle e_n$ might not converge!

Let us welcome the main character



Example: The trigonometric system $\{t \mapsto e^{ikt}\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is not a Schauder basis of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T})$ (or $L^1(\mathbb{T})$), but it is an M-basis.

▶ **Johnson ('70).** ℓ_{∞} has no M-basis.

We actually have more:

- ▶ If \mathcal{X}^* is separable, \mathcal{X} admits an M-basis with $\overline{\operatorname{span}}\{\varphi_\alpha\} = \mathcal{X}^*$.
- Every separable Banach space, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, admits an M-basis $\{e_n; \varphi_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $\|e_n\| \cdot \|\varphi_n\| \leqslant 1 + \varepsilon$.
- Every separable Banach space admits a 1-norming M-basis.

Definition. An M-basis $\{e_{\alpha}; \varphi_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ is λ -norming $(0 < \lambda \leqslant 1)$ if $\operatorname{span}\{\varphi_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \Gamma}$ is a λ -norming subspace, namely if

$$\lambda \|x\| \leq \sup\{|\langle \varphi, x \rangle| : \varphi \in \operatorname{span}\{\varphi_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \Gamma}, \|\varphi\| \leq 1\}.$$

ightharpoonup pprox there is a finitely supported Hahn–Banach theorem.



- ▶ John–Zizler ('74). Every Banach space with norming M-basis has a PRI and a LUR norm.
- ▶ Amir–Lindenstrauss ('68). A Banach space \mathcal{X} is WCG if it contains a weakly compact subset with dense linear span.
 - Amir-Lindenstrauss ('68). WCG spaces have a PRI.
 - ► Troyanski ('71). WCG spaces have a LUR norm.
- ▶ Perhaps WCG ←→ norming M-basis?
 - ▶ The canonical basis of $\ell_1(\Gamma)$ is 1-norming.
 - ▶ John–Zizler ('74). Does every WCG space have a norming M-basis?
- ► More recent results: WCG spaces, or spaces with norming M-basis, are Plichko. And Plichko spaces have a PRI and a LUR norm.

Theorem (Hájek, Advances '19)

There exists a WCG space with no norming M-basis.

ightharpoonup Actually, the example is a $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K})$ space.

Asplund entered the chat



- **John–Zizler ('74).** If a Banach space $(\mathcal{X}, \|\cdot\|)$ has a 1-norming M-basis and $\|\cdot\|$ is Fréchet differentiable, then \mathcal{X} is WCG.
- ► Fabian ('87). WCD + Asplund implies WCG.
 - $ightharpoonup \mathcal{X}$ is Asplund if...
- **Codefroy** (\sim '90). Let \mathcal{X} be an Asplund space with norming M-basis. Is \mathcal{X} WCG?

Theorem (Hájek, R., Somaglia, Todorčević, Advances '21)

There exists an Asplund space $\mathcal X$ with a 1-norming M-basis such that $\mathcal X$ is not WCG.

- **Problem.** Is there a C(K) counterexample?
 - **The same) Problem.** Let $\mathcal K$ be a scattered compact space such that $\mathcal C(\mathcal K)$ has a norming M-basis. Is $\mathcal K$ Eberlein?

How could I give a talk with no ω_1 ?



- ▶ **Deville–Godefroy ('93).** A Valdivia compact space K is Corson iff it does not contain $[0, \omega_1]$.
- ▶ Alster ('79). A scattered Corson compact is Eberlein.
- lackbox Well, maybe you should consider the case $\mathcal{K} = [0, \omega_1]...$
- ▶ Alexandrov–Plichko ('06). $C[0, \omega_1]$ admits no norming M-basis.

Theorem (R. and Somaglia, '23)

 ${\it C}[0,\omega_1]$ embeds in no Banach space with a norming M-basis.

- ▶ So if $[0, \omega_1]$ is continuous image of K, C(K) has no norming M-basis.
- If K = T is a tree (with the coarse wedge topology), then: T scattered and C(T) with norming M-basis implies T Eberlein.

Hold on, did we do something?



- ▶ Alexandrov–Plichko ('06). $C[0, \omega_1]$ admits no norming M-basis.
- ▶ **R.–Somaglia ('23).** $C[0, \omega_1]$ does not embed in a Banach space with norming M-basis.
- ► Are they actually different results?

Problem

Let $\mathcal X$ be a Banach space with norming M-basis and $\mathcal Y$ be a subspace of $\mathcal X$. Must $\mathcal Y$ have a norming M-basis?

- **Vanderwerff–Whitfield–Zizler ('94).** Yes, if \mathcal{Y} is WCG (WLD).
- ho does not embed in a space with norming M-basis (no LUR).
- ▶ Kubiś ('07). The analogue for Plichko spaces has negative answer.
- **Problem**, **Kalenda ('00)**. Do all subspaces of $\ell_1(\Gamma)$ have a norming M-bases? Are they Plichko?

- **Problem.** Assume that a $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K})$ space has a norming M-basis. Must \mathcal{K} be Valdivia?
- **Problem.** Let \mathcal{K} be a scattered Valdivia compact such that $[0, \omega_1] \subseteq \mathcal{K}$. Is there a linear extension operator E: $\mathcal{C}([0, \omega_1]) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K})$?
 - Actually, what we really want is: does $C([0, \omega_1])$ embed in C(K)?
- If both answers are YES, there is no $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K})$ counterexample to Godefroy's problem.

(A few, recent) References



P. Hájek Hilbert generated Banach spaces need not have a norming Markushevich basis Adv. Math. **351** (2019), 702–717.



P. Hájek, T. Russo, J. Somaglia, and S. Todorčević An Asplund space with norming Markuševič basis that is not weakly compactly generated Adv. Math. 392 (2021), 108041.



T. Russo and J. Somaglia Banach spaces of continuous functions without norming Markushevich bases Mathematika **69** (2023), 992–1010.

Thank you for your attention!