Pacific Journal of Mathematics

SUPERHARMONIC INTERPOLATION IN SUBSPACES OF $C_c(X)$

LEONARD ASIMOW

Vol. 83, No. 2 April 1979

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 83, No. 2, 1979

SUPERHARMONIC INTERPOLATION IN SUBSPACES OF $C_c(X)$

L. ASIMOW

Let E be a closed subset of the compact Hausdorff X and let A be a closed separating subspace of $C_C(X)$. Let ρ be a dominator (strictly positive, *l.s.c.*) defined on $X \times T$, T the unit circle in C. Conditions, formulated in terms of boundary measures, are discussed for approximate and exact solutions to the problem of finding ρ-dominated extensions in A of functions $g \in (A|_E)^-$ satisfying re tg $(x) \leqq \rho(x, t)$ on $E \times T$. Various interpolation theorems of Rudin-Carleson type for superharmonic dominators are incorporated into this framework.

We do not assume that A contains the constant functions. We denote $M(X) = C(X)^*$, the space of regular Borel measures on X.

We consider $N = M(E)$ as situated in $M(X)$ as the range of the projection $\pi_1\mu = \mu|_E$ and denote the complementary projection $\pi_2\mu = \mu|_{X\setminus E}$. Thus $(A|_E)^\perp$ is identified with the subspace $A^\perp \cap N$ in $M(X)$.

We call $\mu \in M(X)$ a *boundary measure* if $|\mu|$ is maximal with respect to the Choquet ordering as a measure of X (embedded by evaluation) in the w^* compact unit ball A_1^*. If $1 \in A$ then this is the same as $|\mu|$ being maximal on the state space S_A, as $X \subset S_A$, a w^* closed face of A_1^*.

For brevity we denote the boundary measures by $\partial_A M(X)$, or $\partial M(X)$, if A is understood, and in general, adopt the convention of writing $\partial_A S$ for $S \cap \partial_A M(X)$. Thus, $\partial_A A^\perp$ refers to the boundary measures annihilating A. The space A^* is the quotient space $M(X)/A^\perp$ and images under the quotient map are denoted $\hat{\mu}$ for $\mu \in M(X)$. A subset $S \subset M(X)$ is called *A-stable* if $\hat{S} = (\partial_A S)^\wedge$.

We call E an *interpolation set* if $A|_E$ is closed in $C(E)$. Gamelin [8] shows that E is an interpolation set if and only if there is a k; $0 \leqq k < \infty$, such that for each $m \in A^\perp$,

$$\|\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N\| \leqq k\|\pi_2 m\| . \tag{1}$$

The best value of k is called the *extension constant*, $e(A, E)$.

In [10] Roth introduces a general framework for interpolation problems by means of a *dominator*, ρ, defined as a strictly positive *l.s.c.* extended real-valued function on $X \times T$ (T the unit circle in C). We let

$$U = \{f \in C(X) \colon re \text{ tf } (x)/\rho(x, t) \leqq 1 \text{ for all } (x, t) \in X \times T\}$$

and write

$$||f||_\rho = \sup\{re\, tf(x)/\rho(x, t): (x, t) \in X \times T\}$$

for the Minkowski functional of U. Thus $||f||_\rho \leqq 1$ if and only if $re\, tf(x) \leqq \rho(x, t)$, $(x, t) \in X \times T$. Then $||\mu||_\rho$, $\mu \in M(X)$, refers to the polar functional given by

$$||\mu||_\rho = \sup\{re(f, \mu): f \in U\} .$$

Since ρ is *l.s.c* and positive there is a constant c such that $||f||_\rho \leqq c||f||$ (the uniform norm corresponding to $\rho \equiv 1$) and if ρ is bounded above the two are equivalent.

We say E is an *approximate ρ-interpolation set* for A if E is an interpolation set and for each $g \in (A|_E)^-$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $f \in A$ such that $f|_E = g$ and $||f||_\rho < ||g||_\rho + \varepsilon$. We say E is an *exact ρ-interpolation set* if f can be chosen with $||f||_\rho = ||g||_\rho$. It is shown in [5] that for bounded ρ, E is an approximate ρ-interpolation set for A if and only if for each $m \in A^\perp$,

$$||\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N||_\rho \leqq ||-\pi_2 m||_\rho . \tag{2}$$

If, in addition, the image $\hat{U}$ of U^0 under the quotient map is *decomposable* by $\hat{N}$ then E is an exact ρ-interpolation set. If there is an s, $0 \leqq s < 1$, such that for each $m \in A^\perp$,

$$||\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N||_\rho \leqq s||-\pi_2 m||_\rho \tag{3}$$

then the above holds and E is ρ-exact for A. Gamelin's results [8] can be phrased as follows: Let G be a compact set in $X\backslash E$ and let

$$\rho(G, k)(x, t) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ for } (x, t) \in E \times T \\ k \text{ for } (x, t) \in G \times T \\ 1 \vee k \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then E is an approximate $\rho(G, k)$-interpolation set for all such G if and only if (1) holds and if, in addition, $e(A, E) < 1$ then E is an exact ρ-interpolation set for any continuous T-invariant ρ such that $\rho > e(A, E)$ on $X \times T$. This was obtained in abstract form using polar techniques by Ando [3].

In [6] Briem shows that if E is a subset of the Choquet boundary, $\partial_A X$, then E is an interpolation set if and only if (1) holds only for $m \in \partial_A A^\perp$. Further, if X is metrizable then (1) holds for $\partial_A A^\perp$ if and only if E is an approximate $\rho(G, k)$-interpolation set for each compact $G \subset \partial_A X\backslash E$. The A-stability of the unit ball $M_1(X)$ (Hustad's theorem [9]) and of $N = M(E)$ (since $E \subset \partial_A X$) are essential here. If (1) holds for $\tilde{e}(A, E) < 1$ (again, $\tilde{e}$ is the smallest k such that (1) holds for all $m \in \partial A^{\perp}$) then E is $\rho(G, k)$ exact for any $G \subset \partial_A X \backslash E$ and $k > \tilde{e}$.

If (1) holds for all $m \in \partial_A A^{\perp}$ with $k = 0$ this can be expressed as

$$(4) \qquad m \in \partial_A A^{\perp} \text{ imples } \pi_1 m \in A .$$

The set E is called an M-set if $M(E)$ is A-stable and (4) holds. Roth [10] shows that if E is an M-set and ρ is a bounded A-*superharmonic* (if $1 \in A$ this means $\rho(x, t) \geqq \int \rho(\cdot, t) d\mu$ for any $\mu \in M_1^+(X)$ and $\hat{\mu} = x \in X \subset A_1^*$) dominator then E is an exact ρ-interpolation set for A. This generalizes the Alfsen-Hirsberg theorem [2] which deals with T-invariant ρ and $E \subset \partial_A X$.

In this note we consolidate these results by showing that for E an interpolation set with $M(E)$ A-stable and ρ A-superharmonic then E is an approximate ρ-interpolation set if and only if (2) holds for $m \in \partial_A A^{\perp}$. If in addition $\hat{U}$ is decomposable by $\hat{N}$ in A^* then the interpolation is exact. This is the case if ρ is bounded and (3) holds for $m \in \partial_A A^{\perp}$. (If ρ is bounded and (2) or (3) holds then E is already an interpolation set.) We give a measure theoretic condition for the decomposability of $\hat{U}$ and show by means of simple examples of $A(K)$ spaces that exactness of interpolation can be deduced in this way even though equality holds in (2) which, of course, precludes the use of (3).

1. Hustad-Roth stability theorems. Let A be a closed separating subspace of $C(X)$. Define $\Phi: C(X) \to C(X \times T)$ by $\Phi f(x, t) = tf(x)$. By separating we shall mean that the range of $\Phi|_A$ separates the points of $X \times T$. This assumption can be avoided, as is shown in Fuhr-Phelps [7], but at the expense of additional technicalities. If $\nu \in M(X \times T)$ then the Hustad map is given by

$$\mu = \Phi^* \nu \in M(X); \mu(f) = \int_{X \times T} tf(x) d\nu(x, t) .$$

If $\Phi = \Phi|_A$ has range $B \subset C(X \times T)$ and ν is a maximal probability measure on $X \times T \subset B_1^*$ representing $\tilde{L} \in B_1^*$ then Hustad's theorem says $\mu = \Phi^* \nu$ belongs to $\partial_A M(X)_1$ with $\hat{\mu} = L = \phi^* \tilde{L}$. We combine this with the following observations concerning T-invariant A-superharmonic dominators to obtain a general stability theorem due to Roth [11].

Thus let ρ be a strictly positive *l.s.c.* extended real-valued function on X such that for each $x \in X$ and $\mu \in M_1^+(X)$ with $\hat{\mu} = x \in A^*$, we have $\rho(x) \geqq \int_X \rho d\mu$, that is, ρ is A-superharmonic. If $U = \{f \in C(X): re f/\rho \leqq 1\}$ then U^0 is a w^* compact convex subset of the positive cone $M^+(X)$, and we let $\hat{U}$ be the quotient image in A^*. Take $\bar{R}^+$ to be the one-point-compactification of R^+ and

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &= \{(x, s) \in X \times \bar{R}^+ : \rho(x) \leqq s \leqq +\infty\} , \\ Y_0 &= \{(x, \rho(x)) \in X_0 : \rho(x) < \infty\} , \\ Y_\infty &= \{(x, \rho(x)) \in X_0 : \rho(x) = +\infty\} . \end{aligned}$$

Since ρ is *l.s.c.*, $Y_0 \cup Y_\infty$ and Y_∞ are both G_δ subsets of X_0 so that Y_0 is a Borel set. Define

$$\psi : C(X) \longrightarrow C(X_0);\ \psi f(x, s) = f(x)/s ,$$

and let $\theta = \psi|_A$ with (not necessarily closed) range $B \subset C(X_0)$. Since ρ is strictly positive ψ is bounded and θ^* is one-to-one from B^* into A^*. Let

$$\phi_0 : X_0 \longrightarrow B_1^*$$

be the evaluation map and let $\hat{V} = w^* - \overline{co}\phi_0(X_0)$.

PROPOSITION 1.1. *Let ρ be a T-invariant A-superharmonic dominator on X as above.*

(1) *ϕ_0 is one-to-one on $X_0 \backslash (X \times \{\infty\})$, $X \times \{\infty\} = \phi_0^{-1}(0)$, and $\theta^* \hat{V} = \hat{U}$.*

(2) *If ν is a maximal probability measure on $\hat{V}$ then $\nu[\phi_0(Y_0) \cup \{0\}] = 1$ and ν may be identified with the measure on Y_0 given by $\nu \circ \phi_0$.*

(3) If *ν is as in (2) and $\mu = \psi^* \nu$ then for any bounded Borel function h on X*

$$\int_X h d\mu = \int_{Y_0} (h(x)/\rho(x) d\nu(x, \rho(x)) .$$

In particular, $\mu \in U^0$.

(4) *Let $\mu_0 \in M_1^+(X)$ with $\hat{\mu}_0 = x_0 \in X \subset A_1^*$ and define $\tilde{\mu}_0 \in M(X_0)$ by*

$$\tilde{\mu}_0(F) = (1/\rho(x_0)) \int_X F(x, \rho(x)) \rho(x) d\mu_0(x) .$$

Then for any bounded Borel function h on X

$$\int_{X_0} (h(x)/s) d\tilde{\mu}_0(x, s) = (1/\rho(x_0)) \int_X h d\mu_0 .$$

In particular $\tilde{\mu}_0 \geqq 0$, $\tilde{\mu}_0(X_0) = \tilde{\mu}_0(Y_0) \leqq 1$, and $\tilde{\mu}_0$ represents $(x_0, \rho(x_0)) \in \hat{V}$.

(5) *If ν is maximal on $\hat{V}$ then $\mu = \psi^* \nu$ is maximal on $K = \overline{co} X \subset A^*$.*

Proof. (1) The separation theorem shows $\hat{U} = w^*\overline{co}\{x/s: (x, s) \in X_0\}$. Now

$$\theta^* \circ \phi_0(x, s) = x/s \in A^*$$

so the rest of (1) follows from the fact that A separates points in X. For (2) let $p = 1 - \chi_{\{0\}}$ on $\hat{V}$ and note that the lower envelope $\check{p}$ is the Minkowski functional of $\hat{V}$. Since ν is maximal,

$$1 = \nu[\{x: p(x) = \check{p}(x)\}] = \nu[\{x: \check{p}(x) = 1 \text{ or } 0\}] .$$

Now $\lambda \geqq 1$ implies $\phi_0(x, \lambda s) = (1/\lambda)\phi_0(x, s)$, so that

$$\nu[\phi_0(Y_0) \cup \{0\}] = 1 .$$

If $f \in C(X)$ then $\psi^*\nu(f) = \int_{X_0}(f(x)/s)d\nu(x, s) = \int_{Y_0}(f(x)/\rho(x))d\nu(x, \rho(x))$ and so (3) holds.

(4): If $F \in C(X_0)$ and $0 \leqq F \leqq 1$ then

$$0 \leqq \tilde{\mu}_0(F) \leqq (1/\rho(x_0))\int_X \rho d\mu_0 \leqq 1 .$$

Thus $\tilde{\mu}_0 \geqq 0$, $\tilde{\mu}_0(X_0) \leqq 1$ and $\mu_0[\{x: \rho(x) = +\infty\}] = 0$. For $F = \psi h$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu}_0(F) &= \int_{X_0}(h(x)/s)d\tilde{\mu}_0(x, s)\\ &= (1/\rho(x_0))\int_X h d\mu_0 .\end{aligned}$$

(5): Let f be a continuous convex function of K and denote the upper envelope of f by $\hat{f}(K)$, where [1, I. 3.6]

$$\hat{f}(K)(x_0) = \sup\{\mu(f): \mu \in M_1^+(X) \text{ and } \hat{\mu} = x_0 \in A^*\} .$$

If $g = \psi(f|_X)$ then $g \in C(X_0)$ with $g \equiv 0$ on $X \times \{\infty\}$. If $\tilde{\mu}_0 = x_0$ and $\tilde{\mu}_0$ is as in (4) then $\tilde{\mu}_0$ represents $(x_0, \rho(x_0)) \in \hat{V}$ and the upper envelope, $\hat{g}(\hat{V})$, satisfies

$$\hat{g}(\hat{V})(x_0, \rho(x_0)) \geqq \sup\{\tilde{\mu}_0(g): \hat{\mu}_0 = x_0\} = (1/\rho(x_0))\hat{f}(K)(x_0)$$

by part (4). Thus, using part (3), and [1, I. 4.5],

$$\int_X [\hat{f}(K) - f]d\mu = \int_{Y_0}[\hat{f}(K) - f]/\rho d\nu \leqq \int_{Y_0}[\hat{g}(\hat{V}) - g]d\nu = 0$$

since ν is maximal. Hence, μ is maximal on K.

We now consider the case where ρ is defined on $X \times T$. We say such a ρ is *A-superharmonic* if for each $(x, t) \in X \times T$ and $\mu \in M(X \times T)_1^+$ with

$$\int_{X\times T} sf(y)d\mu(y, s) = tf(x) \text{ for all } f \in A$$

we have $\rho(x, t) \geqq \int_{X\times T} \rho d\mu$.

THEOREM 1.2 (Hustad-Roth). *If ρ is an A-superharmonic dominator then U^0 is A-stable.*

Proof. Let $\Phi: C(X) \to C(X \times T)$; $\Phi f(x, t) = tf(x)$ and let

$$U^1 = \{F \in C(X \times T): reF(x, t)/\rho(x, t) \leqq 1\}$$

and $\phi = \Phi|_A$ with range B.

Let $\Psi: C(X \times T) \to C(X_0)$; $\Psi F(x, t, s) = F(x, t)/s$, where X_0 is the closed epigraph of ρ in $(X\times T)\times \bar{R}^+$. Now $\Phi U \subset U^1$ and $\phi(A \cap U) = B \cap U^1$. Given $L \in \hat{U}$, let $\tilde{L} \in (U^1)^\wedge \subset B^*$ and $L' \in \hat{V}$ (as in Proposition 1.1) with $\theta^* L' = \tilde{L}$ and $\phi^* \tilde{L} = L$. We have $B_1^* = w^*\overline{co}(X \times T)$ and the hypothesis says ρ on $X \times T$ is B-superharmonic. Hence the results of Proposition 1.1 apply. Thus if ν' is maximal on $\hat{V}$ representing L' then 1.1 (3) and (5) show $\nu = \Psi^*\nu'$ is maximal on B_1^* representing $\tilde{L} \in (U^1)^\wedge$. Then $\mu = \phi^*\nu \in U^0$ and $\hat{\mu} = L \in \hat{U}$. Furthermore, Hustad's theorem shows μ is a boundary measure.

If $1 \in A$ then the condition for A-superharmonicity is somewhat simpler.

PROPOSITION 1.3. *If $1 \in A$ then ρ is A-superharmonic if and only if for each $\mu \in M_1^+(X)$ with $\hat{\mu} = x$,*

$$\rho(x, t) \geqq \int_X \rho(\cdot, t) d\mu .$$

Proof. If ρ is A-superharmonic and $\mu \in M_1^+(X)$ with $\hat{\mu} = x$ we can embed X as $X \times \{t\} \subset X \times T$ so that the measure μ satisfies

$$\int_{X\times T} sf(y)d\mu = tf(x)$$

and hence

$$\rho(x, t) \geqq \int_{X\times\{t\}} \rho(x, t)d\mu = \int_X \rho(\cdot, t)d\mu .$$

Conversely, if $\mu \in M_1^+(X \times T)$ and represents tx then, since $1 \in A$, we have $t\overline{co}X = tS_A$(S_A the state space of A) is a face of A_1^*. Hence $\text{supp}\mu \subset X \times \{t\}$ and the measure $\mu_1(f) = \int_{X\times T} f(x)d\mu$ represents x so that

$$\rho(x, t) \geqq \int_X \rho(\cdot, t) d\mu_1 = \int_{X\times T} \rho d\mu .$$

2. **Dominated interpolation.** If E is a compact subset of X we let

$$M = \{f \in C(X): f|_E = 0\}$$

and denote $M \cap A$ by $E^\perp$. It is well known that E is an interpolation set for A if and only if $A + M$ is closed in $C(X)$ and this in turn is equivalent to $\hat{N}$ being w^* (or norm) closed in A^*. The following characterization of approximate ρ-interpolation sets follows from results in [5; 4.2]. We denote $N = M(E) \subset M(X)$.

THEOREM 2.1. *Let ρ be a (strictly positive l.s.c) dominator on X such that either ρ is bounded or E is an interpolation set. The following are equivalent*:

(i) *E is an approximate ρ-interpolation set for A,*

(ii) *$A + M$ is closed in $C(X)$ and*

$$(A + M) \cap (U + M) = (A \cap U + M)^- ,$$

(iii) $\hat{U} \cap \hat{N} = (U^0 \cap N)^\wedge$,

(iv) $\|\mu + A^\perp \cap N\|_\rho = \|\mu + A^\perp\|_\rho$ *for all* $\mu \in N$,

(v) $\|\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N\|_\rho \leqq \|-\pi_2 m\|_\rho$ *for all* $m \in A^\perp$.

For $x \in A^*$ we write $\|x\|_\rho$ for the Minkowski functional of $\hat{U}$ so that if $\hat{\mu} = x$

$$\|x\|_\rho = \|\mu + A^\perp\|_\rho .$$

The set U^0 is *split*, that is, $\|\mu\|_\rho = \|\pi_1\mu\|_\rho + \|\pi_2\mu\|_\rho$ [10, 5].

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Let N and U^0 be A-stable sets in $M(X)$. Then for $\mu \in \partial_A M(X)$,*

(1) $\|\mu + A^\perp\|_\rho = \|\mu + \partial A^\perp\|_\rho = \|\hat{\mu}\|_\rho$,

(2) $\|\mu + N + A^\perp\|_\rho = \|\pi_2\mu + \pi_2\partial A^\perp\|_\rho$ $(\pi_2\mu = \mu|_{X\setminus E})$,

(3) If $\|\mu\|_\rho = \|\hat{\mu}\|_\rho$ *then*

$$\|\pi_i\mu\|_\rho = \|(\pi_i\mu)^\wedge\|_\rho \quad (i = 1, 2) .$$

Proof. If $\mu \in \partial M(X)$ and $\|\hat{\mu}\|_\rho \leqq r$ then $\mu = r\nu + m$ with $\nu \in U^0$ and $m \in A^\perp$. The stability of U^0 shows we can assume $\nu \in \partial U^0$, so that $m \in \partial A^\perp$. Then (1) follows. If $\mu = r\nu + \eta + \zeta$ with $\nu \in \partial U^0$, $\eta \in \partial N$, $\zeta \in A^\perp$, then $\zeta \in \partial A^\perp$ and $\pi_2\mu = r\pi_2\nu + \pi_2\zeta \in r\pi_2 U^0 + \pi_2\partial A^\perp$. Conversely, if $\pi_2\mu = r\nu + \pi_2\zeta$, $\nu \in \partial U^0$, $\zeta \in \partial A^\perp$ then

$$\mu = r\nu + (\pi_1\mu - \pi_1\zeta) + \zeta \in rU^0 + \partial N + \partial A^\perp .$$

For (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}||\pi_1\mu||_\rho &\geqq ||(\pi_1\mu)^\wedge||_\rho = ||\pi_1\mu + A^\perp||_\rho = ||\mu - \pi_2\mu + A^\perp||_\rho \\ &\geqq ||\mu||_\rho - ||\pi_2\mu + A^\perp||_\rho \geqq ||\mu||_\rho - ||\pi_2\mu||_\rho = ||\pi_1\mu||_\rho .\end{aligned}$$

Since we do not assume $1 \in A$, we take the *Choquet boundary*, $\partial_A X$, to be $X \cap ext A_1^*$. There are two main instances where the A-stability of N can be deduced.

PROPOSITION 2.3. *Let E be a closed subset of X such that either*

(a) $E \subset \partial_A X$ *or*

(b) $E = F \cap X$, *F a w^* closed face of A_1^*.*

Then N is A-stable.

Proof. In the case (a) each probability measure on E is maximal and so the result follows since $\overline{co}E$ spans $\hat{N}$. In case (b) each maximal probability measure μ with $\hat{\mu} \in \overline{co}E$ has its support on $(ext\ F)^- \subset E$.

THEOREM 2.4. *Let E be a closed subset of X such that either*

(a) $E \subset \partial_A X$, *or*

(b) $E = F \cap X$, *F a closed face of A_1^*.*

Let ρ be an A-superharmonic dominator such that either ρ is bounded or E is an interpolation set. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) *E is an approximate ρ-interpolation set,*

(ii) $||\mu + A^\perp \cap N||_\rho = ||\mu + \partial A^\perp||_\rho$ *for all* $\mu \in \partial N$,

(iii) $||\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N||_\rho \leqq ||-\pi_2 m||_\rho$ *for all* $m \in \partial A^\perp$.

Proof. The hypotheses imply that U^0 and N are A-stable and so 2.2. (1) shows for $\mu \in \partial M$,

$$||\mu + A^\perp||_\rho = ||\mu + \partial A^\perp||_\rho .$$

Thus (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) follows from 2.1. If (ii) holds and $x \in \hat{U} \cap \hat{N}$ then choose $\mu \in \partial N$ with $\hat{\mu} = x$ and $\mu \in U^0 + A^\perp$. Then

$$||\mu + A^\perp \cap N||_\rho = ||\mu + \partial A^\perp||_\rho = ||\mu + A^\perp||_\rho \leqq 1$$

so that $\mu = \nu + m$; $\nu \in U^0$, $m \in A^\perp \cap N$. Hence $\nu \in N$ and $\hat{\mu} = x = \hat{\nu} \in (U^0 \cap N)^\wedge$. Thus 2.1 (iii) holds and hence (i) is shown.

The exactness of ρ-interpolation is characterized by the sum

$A \cap U + E^{\perp}(E^{\perp}$ the ideal of functions in $C(X)$ vanishing on E) being closed in A, a condition which is implied by the decomposability of $\hat{U}$ by $\hat{N}$ in A^* [5; Theorem 3.2]. If E is an interpolation set (so that $\hat{N}$ if w^* closed in A^*) then $\hat{U}$ is said to be *decomposable* by $\hat{N}$ if there is an $\alpha \geqq 1$ such that each $x \in \hat{U}$ is a convex combination of elements y, z with $y \in \hat{U} \cap \hat{N}, z \in \hat{U}$ and $||z|| \leqq \alpha ||z + \hat{N}||$ (dual uniform norm).

The condition for decomposability, and hence exact interpolation, can be formulated in terms of representing measures in $M(X)$. We illustrate this for boundary measures in the case where ρ is superharmonic.

THEOREM 2.5. *Let E be a closed subset of X and A a closed separating subspace such that either*

(a) $E \subset \partial_A X$, *or*

(b) $E = F \cap X, F$ *a closed face of* A_1^*,

and let ρ be an A-superharmonic dominator such that either ρ is bounded or E is an interpolation set.

If for each $x \in \hat{U}$ there is a $\mu \in \partial_A U^0$ with $\hat{\mu} = x$ and

$$||\pi_2\mu + \partial A^{\perp}|| \leqq \alpha ||\pi_2\mu + \pi_2\partial A^{\perp}||$$

(α a constant independent of μ) then E is an exact ρ-interpolation set.)

Proof. Given $x \in \hat{U}$ choose a boundary measure μ satisfying $\hat{\mu} = x$, $||\hat{\mu}||_\rho = ||\mu||_\rho$ and $||\pi_2\mu + \partial A^{\perp}|| \leqq \alpha ||\pi_2\mu + \pi_2\partial A^{\perp}||$. Now $||\mu||_\rho = ||\pi_1\mu||_\rho + ||\pi_2\mu||_\rho$ shows that μ is a convex combination of $\mu_1 \in U^0 \cap N$ and $\mu_2 \in U^0$, scalar multiples of $\pi_1\mu, \pi_2\mu$ respectively. Thus, $||\mu_2 + \partial A^{\perp}|| \leqq \alpha ||\mu_2 + \pi_2\partial A^{\perp}||$ and x is a convex combination of $y \in (U^0 \cap N)^\wedge$ and $z \in \hat{U}$ with (using 2.2 (1) and (2))

$$\begin{aligned}||z|| &= ||\mu_2 + \partial A^{\perp}|| \leqq \alpha ||\mu_2 + \pi_2\partial A^{\perp}|| = \alpha ||\mu + N + A^{\perp}|| \\ &= \alpha ||z + \hat{N}|| .\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $(U^0 \cap N)^\wedge = \hat{U} \cap \hat{N}$ and that $\hat{U}$ is decomposable by $\hat{N}$. Therefore E is an exact ρ-interpolation set.

If E is an M-set then $\pi_2\partial A^{\perp} \subset \partial A^{\perp}$ so that

$$||\pi_2\mu + \pi_2\partial A^{\perp}|| \geqq ||\pi_2\mu + \partial A^{\perp}||$$

and the condition of 2.5 is automatically satisfied (for A-stable U^0). More generally, if U^0 and N are A- stable and, for some $s < 1$

$$||\pi_1 m + A^{\perp} \cap N||_\rho \leqq s || -\pi_2 m||_\rho \text{ for all } m \in \partial A^{\perp}$$

then a computation based on [5; 4.8] shows the condition of Theorem 2.5 holds, so that E is an exact ρ-interpolation set.

COROLLARY 2.6. *If E is an M-set for the closed separating subspace $A \subset C(X)$ then E is an exact ρ-interpolation set for A for any A-superharmonic dominator ρ.*

Proof. If E is an M-set then $\hat{N}$ is the range of a projection in A^* so that E is an interpolation set for A. The conclusion then follows from 2.5.

3. Examples. We illustrate the results of § 2 with various choices of ρ. First, let X be a compact *metric* space with E a closed subset and $M(E)$ A-stable for the closed separating subspace $A \subset C(X)$. Let G be the collection of compact subsets $G \subset \partial_A X \backslash E$ and let $\rho = \rho(G, k)$ be the dominator mentioned in the introduction. Then (for $k < \infty$)

$$(1) \qquad \|\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N\| \leqq k\|\pi_2 m\| \text{ for all } m \in \partial A^\perp$$

if and only if E is an approximate $\rho(G, k)$-interpolation set for all $G \in \mathscr{G}$. To see this we note that since $G \subset \partial_A X$, U^0 is A-stable so that the second property holds if and only if

$$(2) \qquad \|\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N\|_\rho \leqq \|-\pi_2 m\|_\rho \text{ for all } m \in \partial A^\perp, G \subset \mathscr{G} .$$

It follows easily from [5; 4.1] that if $Y = X \backslash (E \cap G)$ then

$$\|\mu\|_\rho = \|\mu|_E\| + k\|\mu|_G\| + (1 \vee k)\|\mu|_Y\|$$

so that

$$\|\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N\| = \|\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N\|_\rho$$

and, since for boundary measures μ, the metrizability of X gives

$$|\mu|(X \backslash E) = |\mu|(\partial_A X \backslash E) = \sup\{|\mu|(G): G \in \mathscr{G}\} ,$$

we have

$$k\|\pi_2 m\| = \sup\{\|\pi_2 m\|_\rho: \rho = \rho(G, k),\ G \in \mathscr{G}\} .$$

The equivalence of (1) and (2) is now immediate. If (1) holds for $k_0 < 1$ and $k_0 < k \leqq 1$ then for $\rho = \rho(G, k)$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cup N\|_\rho &= \|\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N\| \leqq k_0(\|m|_G\| + \|m|_Y\|) \\ &\leqq (k_0/k)(k\|m|_G\| + \|m|_Y\|) = (k_0/k)\|\pi_2 m\|_\rho\end{aligned}$$

so that E is an exact $\rho(G, k)$-interpolation set for A.

The study of sufficient conditions for the A-convex hull of E to be a generalized peak set (we now assume $1 \in A$) has been shown [4] to be related to an ordering on $C_c(X)$ and $M(X)$ induced by choosing P to be a closed proper convex cone with nonempty interior in C. Let α, β be the generators (of modulus one) of the dual cone $P^* = \{z: re\,az \geqq 0 \text{ for all } a \in P\}$. We denote by e the element of P such that $re\,e\gamma = 1$ $(\gamma = \alpha, \beta)$. If $f \in C_c(X)$ we say $f \geqq 0(P)$ if $f(X) \subset P$ and $\mu \geqq 0(P^*)$ means $\mu(B) \in P^*$ for all Borel sets $B \subset X$. Then the function $e \equiv e$ becomes an order unit for $C(X)$ in which the order unit norm $\|\cdot\|_e$ (equivalent to the uniform norm) is given by

$$\rho(x, t) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ for } t = \pm\gamma \\ 1/c \text{ for } t \neq \pm\gamma\,, \end{cases} \quad \gamma = \alpha, \beta$$

where c is a constant such that

$$cz| \leqq |re\alpha z| \vee |re\beta z|\,.$$

This provides an example of a ρ which is not T-invariant.

Let ρ^+ and ρ^- be strictly positive $l.s.c.$ functions on X and take

$$\rho(x, t) = \begin{cases} \rho^+(x) \text{ on } X \times \{1\} \\ \rho^-(x) \text{ on } X \times \{-1\} \\ +\infty \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $U = \{f \in C(X): -\rho^- \leqq re f \leqq \rho^+\}$. If $\mu \in U^0$ and f is real then $\lambda\, if \in U$ for all real λ so that

$$1 \geqq re\mu(\lambda\, if) = -\lambda im\mu(f)$$

and hence $im\mu(f) = 0$. Thus μ is a real measure and $U^0 \subset reM(X)$.

If A_0 is a real subspace of $C(X)$ then we can apply the results of §2 to the self-adjoint space $A_0 + iA_0 = A$. Then $\|f\|_\rho = \|re f\|_\rho$ and $m \in A^\perp$ if and only if $m = m_1 + im_2$ with m_1, m_2 real measures in $A^\perp$. Also m is a boundary measure if and only if m_1, m_2 are boundary. Hence E is an approximate (exact) ρ-interpolation set for A if and only if it is for $A_0 = reA$, and the measure conditions of §2 need only involve real measures in $M(X)$. If X is a compact convex subset of a locally convex space and $A_0 = A(X)$ (real affine continuous functions) then ρ is A-superharmonic if and only if $\rho^+ = (\rho^+)\hat{}$ and $\rho^- = (\rho^-)\hat{}$, that is, if and only if ρ^+ and ρ^- are concave on X.

Let X be a square in R^2 with vertices denoted $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with

$E = \{1, 2\}$ diagonally opposite and $A_0 = A(X)$, ρ^+, $\rho^- \equiv 1$. Then $\partial A^\perp$ is a one-dimensional subspace of the four-dimensional space $\partial M(X)$ spanned by the point-masses $\{\delta_i\}_{i=1}^4$. A generator for $\partial A^\perp$ is $m = \delta_1 + \delta_2 - \delta_3 - \delta_4$. Clearly $A^\perp \cap N = \{0\}$ since coE is a simplex and so

$$||\pi_1 m + A^\perp \cap N|| = ||\pi_1 m|| = ||\pi_2 m|| .$$

This shows E is an approximate ρ-interpolation set for $A(X)$. Obviously E is in fact an exact interpolation set, but this cannot be concluded from a condition such as (3) in the introduction. Nevertheless, the condition of 2.5 holds, since if

$$\mu = \Sigma \lambda_i \delta_i$$

then

$$||\mu|| = \Sigma |\lambda_i|$$

and

$$||\pi_2\mu + \pi_2\partial A^\perp|| = inf\{|\lambda_3 - \lambda| + |\lambda_4 - \lambda| : \lambda \in R\} = |\lambda_4 - \lambda_3| .$$

If λ_3 and λ_4 are opposite in sign then

$$||\pi_2\mu + \partial A^\perp|| \leqq ||\pi_2\mu|| = |\lambda_3| + |\lambda_4| = |\lambda_4 - \lambda_3| = ||\pi_2\mu + \pi_2\partial A^\perp|| .$$

If, say $0 \leqq \lambda_3 \leqq \lambda_4$, consider $\nu = \mu + \lambda_3 m$. Then $\hat{\nu} = \hat{\mu}$ and

$$||\nu|| = \Sigma|\lambda_i - \lambda_3| \leqq (|\lambda_1| + |\lambda_2| + 2|\lambda_3|) + |\lambda_4| - |\lambda_3| = ||\mu||$$

and

$$||\pi_2\nu + \partial A^\perp|| \leqq ||\pi_2\nu|| = \lambda_4 - \lambda_3 = ||\pi_2\mu + \pi_2\partial A^\perp|| .$$

We conclude with an example of an approximate interpolation set which is not exact. Let X be the unit ball of the sequence space l^1(w^* topology) and let $\rho \equiv 1$. Then take $A = c_0$, the pre-dual of l^1, so that $||a||_\rho = ||a||_\infty = sup\{|a_n|\}$. Let E be the singleton $\{x^0\}$, $x_n^0 = 1/2^n$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$. If $(a, x^0) = 1$ then $\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n/2^n = 1$ so that some a_n must be greater than one. Clearly we can find such an a with $||a|| \leqq 1 + \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Thus E is an approximate, but not exact, ρ-interpolation set.

REFERENCES

1. E. M. Alfsen, *Compact convex sets and boundary integrals*, Ergebnisse der Math, 57, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971.
2. E. M. Alfsen and B. Hirsberg, *On dominated extensions in linear subspaces in* $C_C(X)$, Pacific J. Math., **36** (1971), 567-584.
3. T. Ando, *Closed range theorems for convex sets and linear liftings*, Pacific J. Math., **44** (1973), 393-409.

4. L. Asimow, *Exposed faces of dual cones and peak-set criteria for function spaces*, J. Funct. Anal., **12**(4), (1973), 456–474.

5. ———, *Interpolation in Banach spaces*, Rocky Mtn. J. Math., to appear.

6. E. Briem, *Interpolation in subspaces of* $C(X)$, J. Funct. Anal., **12** (1973), 1–12.

7. R. Fuhr and R. R. Phelps, *Uniqueness of complex representing measures on the Choquet boundary*, J. Funct. Anal., **14** (1973), 1–27.

8. T. W. Gamelin, *Restrictions of subspaces of* $C(X)$, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **112** (1964), 278–286.

9. O. Hustad, *A norm-preserving complex Choquet theorem*, Math. Scand., **29** (1971), 271–278.

10. W. Roth, *A general Rudin-Carleson theorem in Banach spaces*, Pacific J. Math., **73** (1), (1977), 197–213.

11. ———, *A stability theorem for the Choquet ordering in* $C_{\mathbf{C}}(X)$, Math. Scand., to appear.

Received December 27, 1978.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
SYRACUSE, NY 13210

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of the manuscript. However, you may use them in the displayed equations. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Please propose a heading for the odd numbered pages of less than 35 characters. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. **39**. Supply name and address of author to whom proofs should be sent. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints to each author are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: $84.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: $42.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for numbers issued in the last three calendar years, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924, U.S.A. Older back numbers obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION
Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.).
8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Vol. 83, No. 2 April, 1979