

## A CHARACTERIZATION OF HILBERT SPACE

RONALD E. BRUCK, JR.

**ABSTRACT.** A real Banach space  $E$  of dimension  $\geq 3$  is an inner product space iff there exists a bounded smooth convex subset of  $E$  which is the range of a nonexpansive retraction.

De Figueiredo and Karlovitz [3] have shown that if  $E$  is a strictly convex real finite-dimensional Banach space and  $\dim E \geq 3$  then there can exist no bounded smooth nonexpansive retract of  $E$  unless  $E$  is a Hilbert space. (A subset  $F$  of  $E$  is a nonexpansive retract of  $E$  if it is the range of a nonexpansive retraction  $r: E \rightarrow F$ .) This is a consequence of their more general result that if  $E$  is reflexive and a convex nonexpansive retract of  $E$  has at a boundary point  $x_0$  a unique supporting hyperplane  $x_0 + H$  then  $H$  is the range of a projection of norm 1. As they have pointed out, the latter theorem fails in nonreflexive spaces (the unit ball of  $C[0, 1]$  furnishes a counterexample). Nevertheless, their first result is true in general:

**THEOREM.** *Suppose  $E$  is a real Banach space with  $\dim E \geq 3$ . Then  $E$  is an inner product space iff there exists a bounded smooth nonexpansive retract of  $E$  with nonempty interior.*

We separate out of the proof of the theorem a lemma, valid in all real Banach spaces:

**LEMMA.** *Suppose  $F$  is a bounded smooth closed convex subset of a real Banach space  $E$  and  $F$  has nonempty interior. Then given disjoint bounded closed convex sets  $M$  and  $K$  in  $E$  with  $K$  compact, there exist  $p \in E$  and  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $K \subset p + \lambda F$  and  $(p + \lambda F) \cap M = \emptyset$ .*

**PROOF OF LEMMA.** Clearly the hypotheses and conclusions of the lemma are invariant if  $K$  and  $M$  are translated by the same vector; thus without loss of generality we may assume  $0 \in K$ . Similarly, we may also assume  $0 \in \text{int } F$ . Since  $K$  is compact and  $M$  is closed, a basic separation theorem for convex sets assures the existence of a closed hyperplane  $H$  which strictly separates  $M$  and  $K$ ; that is, there exist  $w \in E^*$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}^1$

---

Received by the editors June 26, 1972 and, in revised form, August 21, 1973.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 46C05.

Key words and phrases. Nonexpansive retract.

© American Mathematical Society 1974

such that  $H = \{x \in E : w(x) = c\}$  and

$$(1) \quad 0 \leq \sup\{w(y) : y \in K\} < c < \inf\{w(y) : y \in M\}.$$

Since  $K$  and  $M$  are bounded, (1) also holds for functionals sufficiently close to  $w$  (in the norm of  $E^*$ ). By the Bishop-Phelps theorem [1] the support functionals of  $F$  are dense in  $E^*$ ; thus we may assume without loss of generality that the functional  $w$  in (1) is a support functional of  $F$ .

If  $w$  supports  $F$  at  $x_0$ , then  $H = \{x : w(x) = c\}$  is the tangent hyperplane to  $\mu F$  at  $\mu x_0$ , where  $\mu = c/w(x_0) > 0$ . Let  $F_t = (1-t)\mu x_0 + t \cdot \text{int}(\mu F)$  for  $t > 0$ . Since  $\text{int} \mu F$  is convex and  $\mu x_0$  is a boundary point of  $\mu F$ , it is easily seen that  $F_s \subset F_t$  if  $s < t$ .

The family  $\{F_t : t > 0\}$  is an open cover of  $K$ . (In fact, since  $\mu F$  is smooth at  $\mu x_0$ , it is easily verified that  $\bigcup_{t>0} F_t$  is the open half-space  $\{x : w(x) < c\}$  with boundary  $H$  which includes  $\text{int}(\mu F)$ . By (1),  $K$  is a subset of this open half-space.)

Since the cover  $\{F_t : t > 0\}$  is linearly ordered by inclusion and  $K$  is compact, there exists  $t > 0$  such that  $K \subset F_t \subset \text{Cl}(F_t)$ . On the other hand,  $M \cap \text{Cl}(F_t) = \emptyset$  because  $M$  is a subset of the opposite open half-space  $\{x : w(x) > c\}$ . Since  $\text{Cl}(F_t) = (1-t)\mu x_0 + \mu t F$ , we may take  $p = (1-t)\mu x_0$ ,  $\lambda = \mu t$  to reach the conclusion of the lemma. Q.E.D.

PROOF OF THEOREM. Necessity is trivial, since it is well known that the closed unit ball of a Hilbert space  $E$  is a smooth nonexpansive retract of  $E$ . (In fact, every closed convex subset of  $E$  is a nonexpansive retract of  $E$ —the proximity mapping is a nonexpansive retraction.)

To prove sufficiency, let  $E_1$  be any three-dimensional subspace of  $E$ ,  $E_0$  any two-dimensional subspace of  $E_1$ , and  $x_0$  any point of  $E_1 \setminus E_0$ . Fix  $R > 0$  and define

$$K = \{x \in E_0 : \|x\| \leq R\},$$

$$M = \{x \in E : \|x - y\| \leq \|x_0 - y\| \text{ for all } y \in K\}.$$

Then  $K$  and  $M$  are bounded closed convex sets with  $K$  compact. We claim that  $K \cap M \neq \emptyset$ .

Otherwise, by the lemma there exist  $p \in E$  and  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $K \subset p + \lambda F$  and  $(p + \lambda F) \cap M = \emptyset$ . If  $f$  is a nonexpansive retraction of  $E$  onto  $F$ , it is easily verified that  $g : x \mapsto \lambda f(\lambda^{-1}(x - p)) + p$  is a nonexpansive retraction of  $E$  onto  $p + \lambda F$ . In particular, for any  $y \in K \subset p + \lambda F$  we have  $g(y) = y$  so

$$\|g(x_0) - y\| = \|g(x_0) - g(y)\| \leq \|x_0 - y\|;$$

by definition,  $g(x_0)$  therefore belongs to  $M$ . But  $g(x_0) \in p + \lambda F$  since  $g$  retracts  $E$  onto  $p + \lambda F$ . This is a contradiction since  $(p + \lambda F) \cap M = \emptyset$ .

We have shown that  $K \cap M \neq \emptyset$  so that for each  $R > 0$  there exists  $x_R \in E_0$  with

$$(2) \quad \|x_R - y\| \leq \|x_0 - y\|$$

for all  $y$  in  $E_0$  with  $\|y\| \leq R$ . Since (2) holds for  $y=0$  in particular, the set  $\{x_R: R > 0\}$  is bounded and (since  $\dim E_0 = 2$ ) therefore relatively compact. Hence there exists a sequence  $R_n \rightarrow \infty$  such that  $x_{R_n} \rightarrow x_\infty$  for some  $x_\infty$  in  $E_0$ . It follows from (2) that

$$(3) \quad \|x_\infty - y\| \leq \|x_0 - y\| \quad \text{for all } y \in E_0.$$

As in Kakutani [4], (3) implies the existence of a linear projection  $P$  of  $E_1$  onto  $E_0$  with  $\|P\| = 1$ .

To summarize: Whenever  $E_1$  is a three-dimensional subspace of  $E$  and  $E_0$  is a two-dimensional subspace of  $E_1$ , then there exists a projection  $P$  of  $E_1$  onto  $E_0$  with  $\|P\| = 1$ . By Kakutani [4],  $E_1$  must be an inner product space. Finally, since every three-dimensional subspace of  $E$  is an inner product space,  $E$  itself must be an inner product space. Q.E.D.

REMARK. The same technique can be used to prove the following variant of Kakutani's theorem: If  $E$  is a real Banach space of dimension  $\geq 3$  and every closed linear subspace of  $E$  of codimension 1 is the range of a projection of norm 1, then  $E$  is an inner product space. It is only necessary to show that every closed half-space in  $E$  is a nonexpansive retract of  $E$ ; and this can be done as in Bruck [2, Theorem 5].

#### REFERENCES

1. E. Bishop and R. R. Phelps, *The support functionals of convex sets*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 7, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1963, pp. 27-35. MR 27 #4051.
2. R. E. Bruck, Jr., *Nonexpansive projections on subsets of Banach spaces*, Pacific J. Math. 47 (1973), 341-356.
3. D. G. de Figueiredo and L. A. Karlovitz, *On the extension of contractions on normed spaces*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 18, Part 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1970, pp. 95-104. MR 43 #877.
4. S. Kakutani, *Some characterizations of Euclidean space*, Japan J. Math. 16 (1939), 93-97. MR 1, 146.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007