

## NEAR ISOMETRIES OF BOCHNER $L^1$ AND $L^\infty$ SPACES

MICHAEL CAMBERN

**Let  $(\Omega_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i)$  be  $\sigma$ -finite measure spaces,  $i = 1, 2$ , and let  $E$  be a Hilbert space. If the Bochner spaces  $L^p(\Omega_1, \Sigma_1, \mu_1, E)$  and  $L^p(\Omega_2, \Sigma_2, \mu_2, E)$  are nearly isometric, for either  $p = 1$  or  $p = \infty$ , then  $L^1(\Omega_1, \Sigma_1, \mu_1, E)$  is isometric to  $L^1(\Omega_2, \Sigma_2, \mu_2, E)$  and hence  $L^\infty(\Omega_1, \Sigma_1, \mu_1, E)$  is isometric to  $L^\infty(\Omega_2, \Sigma_2, \mu_2, E)$ .**

Throughout this paper the letter  $E$  will denote a Banach space which will often be taken to be Hilbert space. Interaction between elements of a Banach space and those of its dual will be denoted by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . We will write  $E_1 \cong E_2$  to indicate that the Banach spaces  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are isometric.

Following Banach, [2, p. 242], we will call the Banach spaces  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  nearly isometric if  $1 = \inf\{\|T\|\|T^{-1}\|\}$ , where  $T$  runs through all isomorphisms of  $E_1$  onto  $E_2$ . It is of course equivalent to suppose that  $1 = \inf\{\|T\|\}$ , where  $\|T^{-1}\| = 1$ , and hence  $T$  is a norm-increasing isomorphism of  $E_1$  onto  $E_2$ . For if  $T$  is any continuous isomorphism of one Banach space onto another, we obtain an isomorphism  $\hat{T}$  having the desired properties by defining  $\hat{T}$  to be equal to  $\|T^{-1}\|T$ .

If  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$  is a positive measure space and  $E$  a Banach space, the Bochner spaces  $L^p(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu, E)$  will be denoted by  $L^p(\mu, E)$  when there is no danger of confusing the underlying measurable spaces involved, and by  $L^p(\mu)$  when  $E$  is the scalar field. For the definitions and properties of these spaces we refer to [8].

It has been noted by Benyamini [4] that, as a consequence of known properties of spaces of continuous functions, if two spaces  $L^p(\mu_1)$  and  $L^p(\mu_2)$  are nearly isometric, for either  $p = 1$  or  $p = \infty$ , then they are isometric. What we wish to show is that the same conclusion can be drawn for near isometries of certain Bochner spaces. We will prove the following:

**THEOREM.** *Let  $(\Omega_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i)$  be  $\sigma$ -finite measure spaces,  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $E$  a Hilbert space. If there exists an isomorphism  $T$ , with  $\|T^{-1}\| = 1$  and  $\|T\| < 3/(2\sqrt{2})$ , mapping  $L^p(\Omega_1, \Sigma_1, \mu_1, E)$  onto  $L^p(\Omega_2, \Sigma_2, \mu_2, E)$  for either  $p = 1$  or  $p = \infty$ , then  $L^1(\Omega_1, \Sigma_1, \mu_1, E) \cong L^1(\Omega_2, \Sigma_2, \mu_2, E)$  and  $L^\infty(\Omega_1, \Sigma_1, \mu_1, E) \cong L^\infty(\Omega_2, \Sigma_2, \mu_2, E)$ .*

In the scalar case, Banyamini's theorem follows from an analogous result for spaces of continuous functions obtained independently by D. Amir [1] and the author [5], [6]. And we note that if  $E$  is finite-dimensional with orthonormal basis  $\{e_n: n = 1, \dots, N\}$ , and  $X_i$  denotes the maximal ideal space of  $L^\infty(\mu_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , then it can be shown that  $L^\infty(\mu_i, E)$  is isometrically isomorphic to  $C(X_i, E)$ , the space of continuous functions on  $X_i$  to  $E$ , under the map  $\sum_{n=1}^N f_n e_n \rightarrow \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{f}_n e_n$ , where  $f \rightarrow \hat{f}$  is the Gelfand representation of  $L^\infty(\mu_i)$ . In this case the theorem of this article can be obtained from what is known about isomorphisms of continuous vector-valued functions [7], the result for vectorial  $L^\infty$  following directly from [7] and that for  $L^1$  then following by arguments analogous to those given here in the proof of Lemma 8. However when  $E$  is infinite dimensional, the continuity on  $X_i$  of the coordinate functions  $\hat{f}_n$  no longer implies continuity for  $\sum_n \hat{f}_n e_n$ , even in the presence of separability, and thus the problem requires different methods of approach.

Consequently, in what follows,  $E$  will represent an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. Although the proofs presented here require only that the dimension of  $E$  be greater than two, for all finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces  $E$  not only does our theorem follow from [7], but it follows with the bound  $3/(2\sqrt{2})$  replaced by the better bound  $\sqrt{2}$ .

Our approach here will be to replace the measure spaces  $(\Omega_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i)$  by measure spaces in which we have a topology, and on which measurable vector-valued functions are very close to being continuous. For this we will require the notion of a perfect measure. Thus, following [3], if  $X$  is an extremally disconnected compact Hausdorff space we will call a nonnegative, extended real-valued measure  $\mu$  defined on the Borel sets  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  of  $X$  *perfect* if

- (i) every nonempty clopen set has positive measure,
- (ii) every nowhere dense Borel set has measure zero, and
- (iii) every nonempty clopen set contains another nonempty clopen set with finite measure.

The proof of our theorem is now completed by means of a sequence of lemmas.

**LEMMA 1.** *Let  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure space, and let  $X$  be the Stonean space of the measure algebra  $\Sigma/\mu$ . (Equivalently,  $X$  is the maximal ideal space of  $L^\infty(\mu)$ .) For  $A \in \Sigma$  let  $\hat{A}$  denote the clopen subset of  $X$  which represents the equivalence class of  $A$ . Then the measure  $\hat{\mu}$  defined on the algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of clopen subsets of  $X$  by  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{A}) = \mu(A)$ ,  $A \in \Sigma$ , can be extended to a perfect measure, also denoted by  $\hat{\mu}$ , on  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  such that  $L^1(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu, E) \cong L^1(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \hat{\mu}, E)$ , and hence  $L^\infty(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu, E) \cong L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \hat{\mu}, E)$ .*

*Proof.* The set function  $\hat{\mu}$  defined above is, indeed, countably additive on  $\mathcal{A}$ , [8, p. 11]. Thus, by the Carathéodory extension theorem,  $\hat{\mu}$  has a unique extension to the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{A}$ . This  $\sigma$ -algebra clearly contains the Baire sets of  $X$ .

First suppose that  $\mu$  is finite. Then, [9, p. 351],  $\hat{\mu}$  can be further extended to a regular measure on  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ , which is clearly perfect. (The proof that every nowhere dense Borel set has measure zero is contained in [10, p. 18, Lemma 9.4].)

If  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite but not finite, let  $\Omega$  be the disjoint union  $\Omega = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ , where  $A_n \in \Sigma$  and  $0 < \mu(A_n) < \infty$  for all  $n$ . Then define the finite measure  $\mu_0$  on  $\Sigma$  by  $\mu_0(A) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A \cap A_n) / (2^n \cdot \mu(A_n))$ . Since the  $\mu_0$ -null and  $\mu$ -null sets of  $\Sigma$  coincide, the measure algebras  $\Sigma/\mu$  and  $\Sigma/\mu_0$  have the same Stonean space  $X$ . The measure  $\hat{\mu}_0$  defined as above on  $\mathcal{A}$  extends to a perfect regular Borel measure on  $X$ . And since for sets  $A \in \Sigma$  we have

$$\mu(A) = \sum_n \mu(A \cap A_n) = \sum_n 2^n \cdot \mu(A_n) \mu_0(A \cap A_n),$$

it follows that for  $\hat{A} \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\hat{\mu}(\hat{A}) = \sum_n \hat{\mu}(\hat{A} \cap \hat{A}_n) = \sum_n 2^n \cdot \hat{\mu}(\hat{A}_n) \hat{\mu}_0(\hat{A} \cap \hat{A}_n).$$

Thus if we define, for  $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ ,  $\hat{\mu}(B) = \sum_n 2^n \cdot \hat{\mu}(\hat{A}_n) \hat{\mu}_0(B \cap \hat{A}_n)$ , the set function so defined is an extension of  $\hat{\mu}$  to a perfect measure on  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ .

Finally, the map  $\sum_{j=1}^n e_j \chi_{A_j} \rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^n e_j \chi_{\hat{A}_j}$  carries the dense subspace of  $L^1(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu, E)$  consisting of simple functions isometrically into the corresponding subspace of  $L^1(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \hat{\mu}, E)$ . Since every  $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  differs from a clopen set by a set of  $\hat{\mu}$ -measure zero [3, p. 1], the map is actually onto the subspace of simple functions in  $L^1(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \hat{\mu}, E)$  and thus extends to an isometry of  $L^1(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu, E)$  onto  $L^1(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \hat{\mu}, E)$ .

**LEMMA 2.** *Let  $X$  and  $\hat{\mu}$  be as in Lemma 1. Then given a measurable  $E$ -valued function  $F$  on  $X$  there exists an open dense subset  $U_F$  of  $X$  such that  $F|_{U_F}$  is continuous, and  $\hat{\mu}(X - U_F) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* First assume that  $\hat{\mu}$  is finite. Here we follow the argument given by Peter Greim in [11, p. 124]. Take a sequence  $\{F_n\}$  of simple functions converging a.e. to  $F$ . Again using the fact that each set in  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  differs from a clopen set by a set of measure zero, we may suppose that each  $F_n$  is continuous. Then Egoroff's theorem shows that  $F$  is the almost uniform limit of continuous functions. Hence for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a

measurable set  $U_\varepsilon$  such that the restriction of  $F$  to  $U_\varepsilon$  is continuous and  $\hat{\mu}(X - U_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$ . Using the facts that  $\hat{\mu}$  is regular and that an open set and its closure have the same measure, we may assume that  $U_\varepsilon$  is clopen. If then  $U_F$  is the union of all the  $U_\varepsilon$ 's it has the required properties, for its complement is closed and has measure zero, and thus can contain no non-void open set.

If  $\hat{\mu}$  is  $\sigma$ -finite but not finite let  $\hat{\mu}_0$  be the finite measure that appears in the proof of Lemma 1. The argument of the preceding paragraph with  $\hat{\mu}$  replaced by  $\hat{\mu}_0$  then shows that  $F$  is continuous on a dense open set  $U_F$  with  $\hat{\mu}_0(X - U_F) = 0$ . Since  $\hat{\mu}$  and  $\hat{\mu}_0$  have the same null sets, the proof is complete.

As a consequence of Lemma 1 it suffices to prove our theorem for two  $\sigma$ -finite perfect Borel measures defined on extremally disconnected compact Hausdorff spaces. Accordingly, we shall henceforth assume that  $X$  and  $Y$  are extremally disconnected compact Hausdorff spaces and that  $\mu$  (resp.  $\nu$ ) is a  $\sigma$ -finite perfect measure on  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$ ). Until further notice,  $T$  will denote a norm-increasing isomorphism of  $L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \mu, E)$  onto  $L^\infty(Y, \mathcal{B}(Y), \nu, E)$  with  $\|T\| < 3/(2\sqrt{2})$  and  $\|T^{-1}\| = 1$ .

**LEMMA 3.** *If  $F \in L^\infty(\mu, E)$  and  $\|F(x)\| = 1$  for almost all  $x \in X$ , then, for almost all  $y \in Y$ ,  $(63/64)^{1/2} \leq \|T(F)(y)\|$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose, to the contrary, that there exists a set  $A \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$  with  $\nu(A) > 0$  such that  $\|T(F)(y)\| < (63/64)^{1/2}$  for  $y \in A$ . Again using [3, p. 1],  $A = B \Delta C$  with  $B$  clopen and  $C$  of first category. We may assume that  $T(F) = 0$  on the  $\nu$ -null set  $B \cap C$  and hence that  $\|T(F)(y)\| < (63/64)^{1/2}$  on the clopen set  $B$  with  $\nu(B) = \nu(A) > 0$ . Let  $U_{T(F)}$  be an open dense subset of  $Y$  on which  $T(F)$  is continuous, and whose complement has  $\nu$ -measure zero. Then  $\nu(B \cap U_{T(F)}) = \nu(B) > 0$ ,  $B \cap U_{T(F)}$  is open and  $T(F)$  is continuous on this set.

Let  $k = \|T(F)\|_\infty$ . Choose  $y_0 \in B \cap U_{T(F)}$  and take  $e \in E$  with  $\|e\| = 1$  perpendicular to  $T(F)(y_0)$ . Then for all scalars  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T(F)(y) + \alpha(k^2 - 63/64)^{1/2} \cdot e \right\|^2 \\ & \leq \|T(F)(y)\|^2 + 2(k^2 - 63/64)^{1/2} |\langle e, T(F)(y) \rangle| \\ & \quad + k^2 - (63/64). \end{aligned}$$

For  $y = y_0$  the expression on the right is less than  $k^2$ , and since it is continuous on  $B \cap U_{T(F)}$ , there exists a clopen set  $D$  containing  $y_0$  such that for all  $y \in D$  we have  $\|T(F)(y) + \alpha(k^2 - 63/64)^{1/2} \cdot e\|^2 < k^2$ .

Thus if we define  $G \in L^\infty(\nu, E)$  by  $G = (k^2 - 63/64)^{1/2} \cdot e \cdot \chi_D$ , then  $G$  is a nonzero element of  $L^\infty(\nu, E)$  such that for all scalars  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| = 1$   $\|T(F) + \alpha G\|_\infty = k$ .

We can suppose that  $\|F(x)\| = 1$  for all  $x \in X$ . We must have

$$\|T^{-1}(G)\|_\infty \geq (1/\|T\|)(k^2 - 63/64)^{1/2} > ((2\sqrt{2})/3)(k^2 - 63/64)^{1/2}.$$

And since the complement of  $U_F \cap U_{T^{-1}(G)}$  has  $\mu$ -measure zero, we can choose  $x_0 \in U_F \cap U_{T^{-1}(G)}$  with

$$\|T^{-1}(G)(x_0)\| > ((2\sqrt{2})/3)(k^2 - 63/64)^{1/2}.$$

Next note that if  $\alpha$  is a scalar with  $|\alpha| = 1$  such that  $\operatorname{Re} \alpha \langle T^{-1}(G)(x_0), F(x_0) \rangle \geq 0$ , then

$$\|F(x_0) + \alpha T^{-1}(G)(x_0)\|^2 > 1 + (8/9)(k^2 - 63/64).$$

Since  $\|F(x) + \alpha T^{-1}(G)(x)\|$  is continuous on  $U_F \cap U_{T^{-1}(G)}$ , there is a clopen set  $W$  containing  $x_0$  such that

$$\|F(x) + \alpha T^{-1}(G)(x)\|^2 > 1 + (8/9)(k^2 - 63/64) \quad \text{on } W.$$

Thus

$$\|F + \alpha T^{-1}(G)\|_\infty^2 > 1 + (8/9)(k^2 - 63/64),$$

and we will have obtained a contradiction to the fact that  $T^{-1}$  is norm-decreasing if the quantity on the right is greater than  $k^2$ -equivalently if  $63/64 < (9 - k^2)/8$ . But since  $k^2 \leq \|T\|^2 < 9/8$ , we indeed have  $63/64 < (9 - k^2)/8$  and this contradiction completes the proof of the lemma.

**LEMMA 4.** *Let  $F \in L^\infty(\mu, E)$  with  $(63/64)^{1/2} \leq \|F(x)\| \leq \|T\|$  a.e. For  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  define  $\phi(A) \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$  by  $\phi(A) = \{y \in Y: \|T(\chi_A F)(y)\| \geq 31/32\}$ .*

(i) *If  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint measurable subsets of  $X$  then  $\phi(A) \cap \phi(B)$  is a  $\nu$ -null set and, modulo a  $\nu$ -null set,  $\phi(A') = [\phi(A)]'$  (where for any set  $A$ ,  $A'$  denotes its complement).*

(ii) *If we furthermore assume that  $\|F\|_\infty \leq 1$  then  $\|T(\chi_A F)(y)\| < .44$  a.e. on  $\phi(A')$ .*

*Proof.* (i). If  $\phi(A) \cap \phi(B)$  had positive measure then, proceeding as in the proof of the previous lemma we could find a nonempty clopen set  $C \subseteq Y$  on which  $\|T(\chi_A F)(y)\| > 15/16$  and  $\|T(\chi_B F)(y)\| > 15/16$ , and

on which both  $T(\chi_A F)$  and  $T(\chi_B F)$  are continuous. By choosing first a point  $y_0 \in C$  and then a scalar  $\alpha$  such that

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle T(\chi_B F)(y_0), T(\chi_A F)(y_0) \rangle \geq 0,$$

it would then follow that  $\|T(\chi_A F) + \alpha T(\chi_B F)\|_\infty > (15\sqrt{2})/16 > 1.3$ . But since for all scalars  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| = 1$  we have  $\|\chi_A F + \alpha \chi_B F\|_\infty \leq \|T\|$ ,  $\|T(\chi_A F) + \alpha T(\chi_B F)\|_\infty$  must be less than  $\|T\|^2 < 1.2$ , and thus  $\phi(A)$  and  $\phi(B)$  must be a.e. disjoint.

We wish next to show that the union of  $\phi(A)$  and  $\phi(A')$  is almost all of  $Y$ . Suppose, to the contrary, that on some Borel set  $D \subseteq Y$  with  $\nu(D) > 0$  we had  $\|T(\chi_A F)(y)\| < 31/32$  and  $\|T(\chi_{A'} F)(y)\| < 31/32$ . We may suppose that  $D$  is clopen and that both  $T(\chi_A F)$  and  $T(\chi_{A'} F)$  are continuous on  $D$ . Let  $k_1 = \|T(\chi_A F)\|_\infty$ ,  $k_2 = \|T(\chi_{A'} F)\|_\infty$  and  $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$ . Then arguing as in the second paragraph of the proof of Lemma 3, we could find a  $G \in L^\infty(\nu, E)$  with  $\|G\|_\infty = (k^2 - (31/32)^2)^{1/2}$  and such that  $\|T(\chi_A F) + \alpha G\|_\infty \leq k$  and  $\|T(\chi_{A'} F) + \alpha G\|_\infty \leq k$  for all scalars  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| = 1$ .

Then  $\|T^{-1}(G)\|_\infty > ((2\sqrt{2})/3)(k^2 - (31/32)^2)^{1/2}$  so that by an argument analogous to that given in the third paragraph of the proof of Lemma 3, we can find a scalar  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| = 1$  such that

$$\|F + \alpha T^{-1}(G)\|_\infty^2 > 63/64 + (8/9)(k^2 - (31/32)^2).$$

This latter quantity will be greater than  $k^2$  iff  $(9 \cdot 63 - 64 \cdot k^2)/8 \cdot 64 > (31/32)^2$  an inequality which in fact holds since here  $\|F\|_\infty \leq \|T\|$  gives  $k \leq \|T\|^2$  and hence  $k^2 \leq \|T\|^4 < 81/64$ . Thus  $\|F + \alpha T^{-1}(G)\|_\infty > k$ .

But since  $\|T(\chi_A F) + \alpha G\|_\infty \leq k$  and  $\|T(\chi_{A'} F) + \alpha G\|_\infty \leq k$  and  $T^{-1}$  is norm-decreasing, we must have  $\|\chi_A F + \alpha T^{-1}(G)\|_\infty \leq k$  and  $\|\chi_{A'} F + \alpha T^{-1}(G)\|_\infty \leq k$ . Since, for any  $x \in X$ ,  $F(x) + \alpha T^{-1}(G)(x)$  is equal either to  $\chi_A(x)F(x) + \alpha T^{-1}(G)(x)$  or to  $\chi_{A'}(x)F(x) + \alpha T^{-1}(G)(x)$  we have a contradiction and thus, modulo a null set,  $\phi(A') = [\phi(A)]'$ .

(ii): We know that  $\|T(\chi_{A'} F)(x)\| \geq 31/32$  on  $\phi(A')$  and thus on this set we must have  $\|T(\chi_A F)(x)\|^2 < 9/8 - (31/32)^2 < .19$  so that  $\|T(\chi_A F)(x)\| < .44$  a.e. on  $\phi(A')$ . Otherwise an argument analogous to that of the first paragraph of this proof would provide a contradiction. This concludes the proof of the lemma.

Now fix an  $F \in L^\infty(\mu, E)$  with  $\|F(x)\| = 1$  a.e.  $[\mu]$ . Then by Lemma 4(i) we obtain a map  $\phi$ , defined modulo null sets, from  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  to  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$  determined, for  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ , by  $\phi(A) = \{y \in Y: \|T(\chi_A F)(y)\| \geq 31/32\}$

and satisfying  $\phi(A') = [\phi(A)]'$ . Next note that  $R = \|T\|T^{-1}$  is a norm-increasing isomorphism of  $L^\infty(\nu, E)$  onto  $L^\infty(\mu, E)$  satisfying  $\|R\| < 3/(2\sqrt{2})$  and  $\|R^{-1}\| = 1$ , and that by Lemma 3,

$$(63/64)^{1/2} \leq \|T(F)(y)\| \leq \|T\| = \|R\| \quad \text{a.e. } [\nu].$$

Thus, interchanging the roles of  $T$  and  $R$ , of  $F$  and  $T(F)$ , and those of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$ , by Lemma 4(i) we obtain a map  $\psi$  from  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$  to  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  satisfying  $\psi(B') = [\psi(B)]'$ , modulo null sets, for  $B \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$  and determined by  $\psi(B) = \{x \in X: \|R(\chi_B \cdot T(F))(x)\| \geq 31/32\}$ .

LEMMA 5.  $\|T^{-1}(\chi_{B'} \cdot T(F))(x)\| < .44$  a.e. on  $\psi(B)$ .

*Proof.* For  $B \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$  we have  $\|R(\chi_B \cdot T(F))(x)\| \geq 31/32$  on  $\psi(B)$  and thus

$$\|T^{-1}(\chi_B \cdot T(F))(x)\| = \|R(\chi_B \cdot T(F))(x)\|/\|T\| \geq .9 \quad \text{on } \psi(B).$$

If we let

$$P = \text{ess sup}_{x \in \psi(B)} \|T^{-1}(\chi_{B'} \cdot T(F))(x)\|$$

then since  $F = T^{-1}(\chi_B \cdot T(F)) + T^{-1}(\chi_{B'} \cdot T(F))$  we must have  $(.9)^2 + P^2 \leq 1 = \|F\|_\infty^2$  and hence  $P < .44$  as claimed.

LEMMA 6. If  $B \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$  then, modulo a  $\nu$ -null set,  $\phi(\psi(B)) = B$ . Hence  $\phi$  is a mapping, defined modulo null sets, of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  onto  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$ .

*Proof.* Recall that  $\phi(\psi(B))$  is the set on which  $\|T(\chi_{\psi(B)} \cdot F)(y)\| \geq 31/32$ . We have

$$\chi_{\psi(B)} \cdot F = \chi_{\psi(B)} \cdot T^{-1}(\chi_B \cdot T(F)) + \chi_{\psi(B)} \cdot T^{-1}(\chi_{B'} \cdot T(F)).$$

Thus for  $x \in \psi(B)$ ,  $\chi_{\psi(B)}(x) \cdot F(x)$  differs from  $T^{-1}(\chi_B \cdot T(F))(x)$  by  $\chi_{\psi(B)}(x) \cdot T^{-1}(\chi_{B'} \cdot T(F))(x)$  which, by Lemma 5, has norm  $< .44$  for almost all  $x$ . And for  $x \in \psi(B')$ ,  $\chi_{\psi(B)}(x) \cdot F(x) = 0$  and so can differ from  $T^{-1}(\chi_B \cdot T(F))(x)$  by this latter function itself which, again by Lemma 5, has norm a.e.  $< .44$  on  $\psi(B')$ . Hence

$$\|\chi_{\psi(B)} \cdot F - T^{-1}(\chi_B \cdot T(F))\|_\infty \leq .44$$

and thus

$$(*) \quad \|T(\chi_{\psi(B)} \cdot F) - \chi_B \cdot T(F)\|_\infty \leq .44\|T\| < .47.$$

If we suppose that  $\phi(\psi(B)) - B$  has positive  $\nu$ -measure, we have, for  $x \in \phi(\psi(B)) - B$ ,  $\|T(\chi_{\psi(B)} \cdot F)(x)\| \geq 31/32$  and  $\chi_B(x)T(F)(x) = 0$ , which contradicts  $(*)$  above. And if we suppose that  $B - \phi(\psi(B))$  has

positive  $\nu$ -measure then, by Lemma 3,  $\chi_B(x) \cdot T(F)(x)$  has norm  $\geq (63/64)^{1/2} > .99$  a.e. on this set, while by Lemma 4(ii)  $T(\chi_{\psi(B)} \cdot F)(x)$  has norm  $< .44$  a.e. on  $B - \phi(\psi(B)) \subseteq \phi(\psi(B'))$ . This again contradicts (\*) and so completes the proof of the lemma.

Recall that a mapping  $\phi$ , defined modulo null sets, of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  onto  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$  is called a *regular set isomorphism* if it satisfies the properties

$$\phi(A') = [\phi(A)]'$$

$$\phi\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(A_n)$$

and

$$\nu[\phi(A)] = 0 \quad \text{if, and only if, } \mu(A) = 0,$$

for all sets  $A, A_n$  in  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ , [12].

LEMMA 7.  $\phi$  is a regular set isomorphism of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  onto  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$ .

*Proof.* We have seen that  $\phi$  is a mapping, defined modulo null sets, of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  onto  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$  satisfying

$$\phi(A') = [\phi(A)]', \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(X).$$

Note that for  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ ,  $\mu(A) \neq 0$  iff  $\chi_A \cdot F \neq 0$  in  $L^\infty(\mu, E)$  which is true iff  $T(\chi_A \cdot F) \neq 0$  in  $L^\infty(\nu, E)$  which holds (since  $T$  is norm-increasing) iff  $\nu[\phi(A)] = \nu(\{y \in Y: \|T(\chi_A \cdot F)(y)\| \geq 31/32\}) > 0$ . Thus

$$\nu[\psi(A)] = 0 \quad \text{if } \mu(A) = 0.$$

Now suppose that  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint set in  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ . Then by Lemma 4(i)  $\phi(A)$  and  $\phi(B)$  are a.e. disjoint. Thus if  $B$  is a measurable subset of the measurable set  $A$ , then  $B$  and  $A'$  are disjoint so that  $\phi(B)$  and  $\phi(A')$  are disjoint. Hence  $B \subseteq A$  implies that  $\phi(B) \subseteq \phi(A)$ . The sentence before last also implies that  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint iff  $\phi(A)$  and  $\phi(B)$  are disjoint.

Next assume that  $\{A_1, A_2, \dots\}$  is a sequence of measurable subsets of  $X$  and let  $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ . Then since  $A_n \subseteq A$  for all  $n$  we have  $\phi(A_n) \subseteq \phi(A)$  for all  $n$  so that  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(A_n) \subseteq \phi(A)$ . Set  $B = \phi(A) - \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(A_n)$ . We would like to show that  $\nu(B) = 0$ .

By Lemma 6 there exists  $C \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  with  $\phi(C) = B$ . By what we established in the paragraph before last, we must have  $C \subseteq A$  in this instance. Thus if we suppose that  $B$ , hence  $C$ , has positive measure then,



for some  $n$ ,  $C$  meets  $A_n$  in a set of positive measure. But  $\phi(A_n)$  and  $\phi(C)$  are disjoint, and this contradiction shows that we must have  $\nu(B) = 0$ . Thus

$$\phi\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(A_n),$$

completing the proof of the lemma.

The proof of our Theorem is now completed by the following:

**LEMMA 8.** *If there exists an isomorphism  $T$  of  $L^p(\mu, E)$  onto  $L^p(\nu, E)$  with  $\|T^{-1}\| = 1$  and  $\|T\| < 3/(2\sqrt{2})$  for  $p = 1$  or  $p = \infty$  then  $L^1(\mu, E) \cong L^1(\nu, E)$  and  $L^\infty(\mu, E) \cong L^\infty(\nu, E)$ .*

*Proof.* First suppose that  $T$  is such a mapping of  $L^\infty(\mu, E)$  onto  $L^\infty(\nu, E)$ . We have seen that there then exists a regular set isomorphism  $\phi$  of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  onto  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$ . Then for  $B \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$  define  $\lambda(B) = \mu[\phi^{-1}(B)]$ . If  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  we have  $\mu(A) = \lambda[\phi(A)] = \int_{\phi(A)} d\lambda$  so that the map  $\sum_{j=1}^n e_j \chi_{A_j} \rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^n e_j \chi_{\phi(A_j)}$  carries the dense subspace of simple functions in  $L^1(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \mu, E)$  isometrically onto the corresponding subspace of  $L^1(Y, \mathcal{B}(Y), \lambda, E)$  and can thus be extended to an isometry of  $L^1(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \mu, E)$  onto  $L^1(Y, \mathcal{B}(Y), \lambda, E)$ . Then multiplication by the scalar function  $d\lambda/d\nu$  carries this latter space isometrically onto  $L^1(Y, \mathcal{B}(Y), \nu, E)$ . Hence  $L^1(\mu, E) \cong L^1(\nu, E)$  and consequently  $L^\infty(\mu, E) \cong L^\infty(\nu, E)$ .

If we start with a map  $T$  of  $L^1(\mu, E)$  onto  $L^1(\nu, E)$  satisfying the conditions of the lemma, then  $T^*$  is an isomorphism of  $L^\infty(\nu, E)$  onto  $L^\infty(\mu, E)$  with  $\|T^{*-1}\| = 1$  and  $\|T^*\| < 3/(2\sqrt{2})$ , and the proof then follows as above.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] D. Amir, *On isomorphisms of continuous function spaces*, Israel J. Math., **3** (1965), 205–210.
- [2] S. Banach, *Théorie des opérations linéaires*, Monografie Matematyczne, Warsaw, 1932.
- [3] E. Behrends et al.,  *$L^p$ -Structure in Real Banach Spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 613, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1977.
- [4] Y. Benyamini, *Near isometries in the class of  $L^1$ -preduals*, Israel J. Math., **20** (1975), 275–281.
- [5] M. Cambern, *A generalized Banach-Stone theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **17** (1966), 396–400.
- [6] ———, *On isomorphisms with small bound*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **18** (1967), 1062–1066.

- [7] \_\_\_\_\_, *Isomorphisms of spaces of continuous vector-valued functions*, Illinois J. Math., **20** (1976), 1–11.
- [8] J. Diestel and J. J. Uhl, Jr., *Vector Measures*, Math. Surveys, no. 15, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., 1977.
- [9] N. Dinculeanu, *Vector Measures*, Pergamon Press, New York, 1967.
- [10] T. Gamelin, *Uniform Algebras*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1969.
- [11] P. Greim, *Hilbert spaces have the Banach-Stone property for Bochner spaces*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc., **27** (1983), 121–128.
- [12] J. Lamperti, *On the isometries of certain function spaces*, Pacific J. Math., **8** (1958), 459–466.

Received August 28, 1984.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106