

## THE TRANSLATION INVARIANT UNIFORM APPROXIMATION PROPERTY FOR COMPACT GROUPS

GIANCARLO TRAVAGLINI

ABSTRACT. We show that, unlike the abelian case, the translation invariant uniform approximation property fails in a strong way for  $L^1$  of a compact connected semisimple Lie group.

1. We recall (see [5, 4 and 1]) that a Banach space  $X$  is said to have the uniform approximation property if there are  $k \geq 1$  and a sequence  $q(n)$  of positive numbers such that for any  $m$ -dimensional subspace  $E \subset X$  there exists an operator  $T: X \rightarrow X$  for which  $Tx = x$  for  $x \in E$ ,  $\|T\| \leq k$ ,  $\dim TX \leq q(m)$ .

As an important example we recall (see [4]) that the reflexive Orlicz spaces have the uniform approximation property. The purpose of this paper is to show that the situation is strongly different when we consider a Banach function space on a compact group and the translation invariant analogue of the uniform approximation property, i.e. if we modify the above definition assuming that  $X$ ,  $E$  and  $T$  are translation invariant. This notion was introduced by Bożejko and Pełczyński in [1], where the case of a compact abelian group was considered; they proved the theorem below and they obtained, as a consequence, a general result on the translation invariant analogue of the uniform approximation property for translation invariant function Banach spaces on  $G$ .

**THEOREM 1 (BOŻEJKO AND PEŁCZYŃSKI).** *Let  $G$  be a compact abelian group with dual group  $\Gamma$ . For every  $k > 1$  there exists a positive sequence  $q_k(n)$  such that for every finite set  $M \subset \Gamma$  there exists a trigonometric polynomial  $g$  such that  $\hat{g}|_M = 1$ ,  $\|g\|_1 \leq k$ ,  $\text{card}(\text{supp}(\hat{g})) \leq q_k(\text{card } M)$ .*

The above theorem is no longer true for arbitrary compact groups. We shall prove the following

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $G$  be a compact connected semisimple Lie group with dual object  $\hat{G}$  (a maximal set of pairwise inequivalent unitary irreducible representations of  $G$ ). Let  $m \geq 1$ , let  $\{M_h\}_{h=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of pairwise disjoint subsets of  $\hat{G}$  of cardinality at most  $m$  and let  $\{P_h\}_{h=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of trigonometric polynomials such that  $\hat{P}_h(\sigma) = I_\sigma$  for all  $\sigma \in M_h$  and  $\text{card}(\text{supp}(\hat{P}_h)) \leq \text{const}_m$ , then  $\|P_h\|_1 \rightarrow \infty$  (as  $h \rightarrow \infty$ ).*

The author wishes to thank P. M. Soardi for raising the question considered here. In the next section we shall fix the notation.

---

Received by the editors August 4, 1981.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 43A15; Secondary 22E46.

©1982 American Mathematical Society  
0002-9939/82/0000-0223/\$01.75

2. Let  $G$  denote a compact connected semisimple Lie group with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $T$  a maximal torus with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{t}$ . The complexification  $\mathfrak{t}_\mathbb{C}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{C}$  and we denote by  $\Delta$  the set of roots of  $(\mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{C}, \mathfrak{t}_\mathbb{C})$ . We choose in  $\Delta$  a system  $P$  of positive roots and the associated system of simple roots. We set  $\beta = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in P} \alpha$ . The weights of  $G$  are ordered by letting  $\lambda_1 \preccurlyeq \lambda_2$  if  $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1$  is a sum (possibly empty) of simple roots [6, p. 314]. We write  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$  if  $\lambda_1 \preccurlyeq \lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ . If  $E$  is a set of weights of  $G$ , we say that  $\lambda$  is a minimal (maximal) weight in  $E$  if no weight  $\gamma$  in  $E$  satisfies  $\gamma < \lambda$  ( $\gamma > \lambda$ ). For every weight  $\lambda$  the symmetric sum  $S(\lambda)$  is defined on  $T$  by  $S(\lambda)(t) = \sum_{\mu} \exp \mu(u)$ , where  $t = \exp u$  ( $u \in \mathfrak{t}$ ) and the summation runs over all  $\mu$  in the orbit of  $\lambda$  under the action of the Weyl group  $W$ ; we denote by  $\tilde{S}(\lambda)$  the unique central continuous extension of  $S(\lambda)$  to the whole of  $G$ . We recall that the dual object  $\hat{G}$  may be identified with the semilattice  $\Sigma$  of the dominant weights of  $G$ ; throughout this paper we shall use the same symbol to denote a representation in  $\hat{G}$  and his highest weight in  $\Sigma$ . Finally, for every  $\lambda$  in  $\hat{G}$ ,  $\chi_\lambda$  and  $d_\lambda$  denote the character and the dimension of  $\lambda$  respectively, while  $I_\lambda$  is the identity operator on the Hilbert space  $H_{d_\lambda}$ .

3. We need a lemma, whose proof is contained in [2].

LEMMA. For any  $\lambda$  in  $\Sigma$  the function  $\tilde{S}(\lambda + 2\beta)$  has the following Fourier expansion (on  $G$ ):  $\tilde{S}(\lambda + 2\beta) = \chi_{\lambda+2\beta} + \sum m_\gamma \chi_\gamma + \tau \chi_\lambda$ , where  $\tau = \pm 1$ , the  $m_\gamma$  are relative integers and  $\lambda < \gamma < \lambda + 2\beta$  for any  $\gamma$  in the above summation.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. We choose a maximal weight  $\lambda_h$  in  $M_h$  and we write  $F_1 = \text{supp}(\hat{S}(\lambda_h + 2\beta)) \cap \text{supp}(\hat{P}_h)$ ; we have two cases:

- (a')  $F_1 = \{\lambda_h\}$ ,
- (b')  $F_1 = \{\lambda_h, \gamma_1^1, \dots, \gamma_r^1\}$  ( $r \geq 1$ ).

In the first case we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_h\|_1 &\geq \frac{1}{\|\tilde{S}(\lambda_h + 2\beta)\|_\infty} \cdot \|P_h * \tilde{S}(\lambda_h + 2\beta)\|_\infty \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\text{card } W} \cdot \|\chi_{\lambda_h}\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty \quad (\text{as } h \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

In the case (b') we first observe that (by the lemma and the maximality of  $\lambda_h$ ) we have  $M_h \cap \{\gamma_1^1, \dots, \gamma_r^1\} = \emptyset$ . Then we choose a minimal weight  $\bar{\gamma}_1^1$  in  $\{\gamma_1^1, \dots, \gamma_r^1\}$  and an integer  $n_1$  such that the polynomial  $T_1^1 = \tau \tilde{S}(\lambda_h + 2\beta) + n_1 \tilde{S}(\bar{\gamma}_1^1 + 2\beta)$  satisfies  $\hat{T}_1^1(\bar{\gamma}_1^1) = 0$ ; observe that  $\hat{T}_1^1(\lambda_h) = d_{\lambda_h}^{-1} I_{\lambda_h}$ , otherwise, by the lemma, we should have  $\lambda_h < \bar{\gamma}_1^1$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_1^1 < \lambda_h$ ; in the same way one verifies that  $\hat{T}_1^1(\lambda) = 0$  for any  $\lambda \neq \lambda_h$  in  $M_h$ . Then we choose a minimal weight  $\bar{\gamma}_2^1$  in  $\{\gamma_1^1, \dots, \gamma_r^1\} \setminus \{\bar{\gamma}_1^1\}$  and an integer  $n_2$  such that  $T_2^1 = T_1^1 + n_2 \tilde{S}(\bar{\gamma}_2^1 + 2\beta)$  satisfies  $\hat{T}_2^1(\bar{\gamma}_2^1) = 0$ ; observe that  $\hat{T}_2^1(\lambda_h) = d_{\lambda_h}^{-1} I_{\lambda_h}$ , while  $\hat{T}_2^1(\bar{\gamma}_1^1) = 0$  (we cannot have  $\bar{\gamma}_2^1 \preccurlyeq \bar{\gamma}_1^1$ , hence, by the lemma,

$$\bar{\gamma}_1^1 \notin \text{supp}(\hat{S}(\bar{\gamma}_2^1 + 2\beta));$$

moreover, as above,  $\hat{T}_2^1(\lambda) = 0$  for any  $\lambda \neq \lambda_h$  in  $M_h$ . Now we choose a minimal weight  $\bar{\gamma}_3^1$  in  $\{\bar{\gamma}_1^1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_r^1\} \setminus \{\bar{\gamma}_1^1, \bar{\gamma}_2^1\}$  and an integer  $n_3$  such that  $T_3^1 = T_2^1 + n_3 \tilde{S}(\bar{\gamma}_3^1 + 2\beta)$  satisfies  $\hat{T}_3^1(\bar{\gamma}_3^1) = 0$ ; arguing as above we observe that  $\hat{T}_3^1(\lambda_h) = d_{\lambda_h}^{-1} I_{\lambda_h}$ ,  $\hat{T}_3^1(\gamma_i) = 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ),  $\hat{T}_3^1(\lambda) = 0$  for any  $\lambda \neq \lambda_h$  in  $M_h$ . We go on until we

construct a trigonometric polynomial  $T^1 = T_r^1$  with the following properties:  $\hat{T}^1(\lambda_h) = d_{\lambda_h}^{-1} I_{\lambda_h}$ ;  $\hat{T}^1(\gamma_j) = 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, r$ ;  $\hat{T}^1(\lambda) = 0$  for any  $\lambda \neq \lambda_h$  in  $M_h$ ;  $\|T^1\|_\infty \leq \text{const}_w$  (in particular  $\|T^1\|_\infty$  does not depend upon  $h$ ).

Now we write  $F_2 = \text{supp}(\hat{T}^1) \cap \text{supp}(\hat{P}_h)$ ; we have two cases:

$$(a^2) F_2 = \{\lambda_h\},$$

$$(b^2) F_2 = \{\lambda_h, \gamma_1^2, \dots, \gamma_s^2\} \quad (s \geq 1)$$

(observe that, by construction,  $\{\gamma_1^1, \dots, \gamma_r^1\} \cap \{\gamma_1^2, \dots, \gamma_s^2\} = \emptyset$ ; observe also that for any  $\gamma_j^2$  we have  $\lambda_h < \gamma_j^2$ , hence we cannot have  $\gamma_j^2 \leq \lambda$  for any  $\lambda$  in  $M_h$ ). In the case (a<sup>2</sup>) we obtain, as above,

$$\|P_h\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{\|T^1\|_\infty} \cdot \|P_h * T^1\|_\infty \geq \text{const}_w^{-1} \cdot d_{\lambda_h} \rightarrow \infty \quad (\text{as } h \rightarrow \infty).$$

In the case (b<sup>2</sup>) we argue exactly as above (taking the set  $\{\gamma_1^1, \dots, \gamma_r^1, \gamma_1^2, \dots, \gamma_s^2\}$  in place of  $\{\gamma_1^1, \dots, \gamma_r^1\}$ ) until we construct a trigonometric polynomial  $T^2$  which has the following properties:  $\hat{T}^2(\lambda_h) = d_{\lambda_h}^{-1} I_{\lambda_h}$ ;  $\hat{T}^2(\gamma_j^1) = 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, r$ ;  $\hat{T}^2(\gamma_j^2) = 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, s$ ;  $\|T^2\|_\infty \leq \text{const}_w$ .

Then we write  $F_3 = \text{supp}(\hat{T}^2) \cap \text{supp}(\hat{P}_h)$ ; again we have two cases (a<sup>3</sup>) and (b<sup>3</sup>) and we go on. To complete the proof we recall that  $\text{card}(\text{supp}(\hat{P}_h)) \leq \text{const}_m$ , hence we cannot be in the second case for more than  $\text{const}_m$  steps.

REMARK. In [3] it was shown that  $\|\chi_\sigma\|_3 \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\sigma$  runs in  $\Sigma$ . Hence the technique of the above proof shows that not only  $\|P_h\|_1 \rightarrow \infty$ , but also the  $(L^p, L^p)$  convolutor norm of  $P_h$  diverges for  $1 \leq p \leq \frac{3}{2}$  or  $p \geq 3$ . We omit the details.

#### REFERENCES

1. M. Bożejko and A. Pelczyński, *An analogue in commutative harmonic analysis of the uniform approximation property of Banach spaces*, Séminaire d'Analyse Fonctionnelle (1978–1979), Exp. No. 9, École Polytech. Palaiseau, 1979.
2. S. Giulini, P. M. Soardi and G. Travaglini, *A Cohen type inequality for compact Lie groups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **77** (1979), 359–364.
3. ———, *Norms of characters and Fourier series on compact Lie groups*, J. Funct. Anal. **46** (1982), 88–101.
4. J. Linderstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *The uniform approximation property in Orlicz spaces*, Israel J. Math. **23** (1976), 142–155.
5. A. Pelczyński and H. P. Rosenthal, *Localization techniques in  $L_p$  spaces*, Studia Math. **52** (1975), 263–289.
6. V. S. Varadarajan, *Lie groups, Lie algebras and their representations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1974.

ISTITUTO MATEMATICO DELL'UNIVERSITÀ, VIA SALDINI 50, 20133 MILANO, ITALY

Current address: Department of Mathematics, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 63130