

# $H^\infty + \text{BUC}$ does not have the best approximation property

Carl Sundberg

## § 1. Introduction

Let  $L^\infty$  denote the usual Lebesgue space of functions on the unit circle  $[|z|=1]$  and let  $H^\infty$  denote the bounded analytic functions on the unit disc  $[|z|<1]$ . By identifying functions in  $H^\infty$  with their boundary values we may regard  $H^\infty$  as a closed subalgebra of  $L^\infty$ . The closed algebras between  $H^\infty$  and  $L^\infty$  are called *Douglas algebras* and have been studied extensively ([3], [4], [5], [9], [11], [14], [15]). For background and general information on Douglas algebras see [6] and [13].

Let  $C$  denote the space of continuous functions on the unit circle. It was shown by Sarason [10] that the linear span  $H^\infty + C$  is a Douglas algebra. In fact it is the smallest such algebra properly containing  $H^\infty$ ; see [7]. In [12], Sarason asked whether  $H^\infty + C$  has the *best approximation property*, i.e. whether given any  $f \in L^\infty$  there existed a  $g \in H^\infty + C$  such that

$$\|f - g\|_\infty = d(f, H^\infty + C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf \{\|f - g\|_\infty : g \in H^\infty + C\}.$$

This question was answered affirmatively by Axler, Berg, Jewell, and Shields [1], who then raised the question of whether all Douglas algebras possess this property.

A subsequent paper of Luecking [8] provided a simpler proof of the  $H^\infty + C$  case using the theory of  $M$ -ideals. In an unpublished manuscript, Marshall and Zame give a very simple proof of this case and also give many interesting examples of Douglas algebras possessing the best approximation property. Another such example is given by Younis in [16].

In this paper we answer the question for general Douglas algebras negatively, our counterexample being a certain "natural" Douglas algebra. In order to describe and work with this algebra it is convenient to move over to the real line  $\mathbf{R}$  and the upper half plane  $\Delta = \{z = x + iy : x, y \in \mathbf{R}, y > 0\}$ . Henceforth in this paper  $L^\infty$  and  $H^\infty$  will refer to the corresponding function spaces on  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $\Delta$ . Let  $\text{BUC}$

denote the space of bounded uniformly continuous functions on  $\mathbf{R}$ . It is shown by Sarason [11] that  $H^\infty + \text{BUC}$  is a Douglas algebra, and this is the algebra which we will show fails the best approximation property.

The following definitions and notations will be used. For  $f \in L^\infty$  and  $z = x + iy \in \Delta$  we define the Poisson integral of  $f$  at  $z$  by

$$P[f](z) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{y}{(x-t)^2 + y^2} f(t) dt;$$

then  $P[f]$  is harmonic in  $\Delta$  with boundary value  $f$ , and if  $f \in H^\infty$  then  $P[f](z) = f(z)$ . For  $z, w \in \Delta$  we define the pseudo-hyperbolic distance between  $z$  and  $w$  by  $\varrho(z-w) = \left| \frac{z-w}{z-\bar{w}} \right|$ . For an interval  $I \subset \mathbf{R}$  and a function  $f$  on  $\mathbf{R}$  we define  $\text{Var}_I(f) = \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in I} |f(x_1) - f(x_2)|$  and  $\|f\|_I = \sup_{x \in I} |f(x)|$ . We denote the length of  $I$  by  $|I|$ . Finally we will use the following facts, the first of which is shown by Sarason in [11] and the second of which is an easy exercise with the Poisson integral formula: if  $f, g \in H^\infty + \text{BUC}$  then

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}} |P[fg](x+iy) - P[f](x+iy)P[g](x+iy)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow 0;$$

and if  $f \in \text{BUC}$  and  $0 < \varkappa < 1$  then

$$\sup \{ |P[f](w) - P[f](z)| : \varrho(z, w) \cong \varkappa \} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \text{Im } z \rightarrow 0.$$

Other information about  $H^\infty + \text{BUC}$  is developed in [11] and in Exercise 8, Chapter IX of [6].

It is a pleasure to express my gratitude to the Mittag—Leffler Institute for their hospitality and support during the time this research was conducted.

**§ 2. Theorem.**  $H^\infty + \text{BUC}$  does not have the best approximation property.

*Proof.* First, a bit of motivation for the construction. Returning to the unit circle for a moment, Marshall and Zame pointed out that  $(H^\infty + C)/H^\infty$  has continuous best approximations, i.e. given  $f \in L^\infty$  such that  $d(f, H^\infty) \cong 1 + \varepsilon$  and  $d(f, H^\infty + C) = 1$ , there exists  $h \in C$  such that  $d(f-h, H^\infty) = 1$  and  $\|h\|_\infty \cong \delta(\varepsilon)$ , where  $\delta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . We now will do a preliminary construction whose essential point is that this property fails in  $H^\infty + \text{BUC}$ , and the theorem will then follow easily.

Let  $\varepsilon, R > 8, \eta$  be given positive numbers — we are thinking of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\eta$  as being small and  $R$  as being large. For  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  we pick widely spaced intervals  $I_k \subset \mathbf{R}$ , all of length  $\eta$ . Let  $I_k \subset \check{I}_k \subset \tilde{\check{I}}_k$  where  $I_k, \check{I}_k$ , and  $\tilde{\check{I}}_k$  have the same midpoint,  $|\check{I}_k|/|I_k| \rightarrow \infty$  rapidly as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $|\tilde{\check{I}}_k| - |\check{I}_k|$  is constant. We choose all these intervals so that the  $\tilde{\check{I}}_k$ 's are disjoint. Denote the midpoint of  $I_k$  by  $x_k$ .

Pick  $\varkappa$  very close to 1,  $0 < \varkappa < 1$ , pick  $\delta_k > 0$  to be small numbers such that  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , and define  $I_k = \{x + i\delta_k : x \in I_k\}$ . Let  $\{z_{kn}\}_{n=-N_k, \dots, N_k}$  be a maximal set of points on the line  $I_k$  having pseudohyperbolic separation of adjacent points being equal to  $\varkappa$ , and such that  $z_{k0} = x_k + i\delta_k$ . Thus the points  $\{z_{kn}\}$  are distributed symmetrically with respect to the line  $\text{Re } z = x_k$ . Define the finite Blaschke product  $b_k$  with these points as zeros:  $b_k(z) = \prod_{n=-N_k}^{N_k} \frac{z - z_{kn}}{z - \bar{z}_{kn}}$ . Then from the symmetry of

the  $\{z_{kn}\}$  it follows easily that  $b_k(x_k + iy) > 0$  for all  $y > 0$ . Define  $w_k = x_k + i \frac{\Pi}{320R} \eta$ .

Now set  $b = \prod_{k=1}^\infty b_k$ ,  $S(z) = \prod_{k=1}^\infty \frac{z - w_k}{z - \bar{w}_k}$ . Standard methods easily show that both products converge uniformly on compact subsets of  $\Delta \cup \mathbf{R}$  and define Blaschke products if the intervals are widely enough dispersed. Clearly  $S \in \text{BUC}$ . It is also easy to check that if the  $I_k$ 's are widely dispersed then  $|1 - b(w_k)| < 1 \forall k$ , and if in addition  $|\tilde{I}_k|/|I_k| \rightarrow \infty$  fast enough (where "fast enough" will depend on the choice of the  $\delta_k$ 's), then  $|1 - b(x)| < 1/2 \varepsilon$  for  $x \notin \cup \tilde{I}_k$ .

If  $\varkappa$  is chosen close enough to 1, the  $\delta_k$ 's are all small enough, and the  $I_k$ 's are widely enough dispersed, then the set  $\{w_k\} \cup \{z_{kn}\}$  will be an interpolating sequence with interpolation constant close to 1 (see [2] and [6], Chapter VII); what this means for us is that if complex numbers  $\alpha_k, \beta_{kn}$  are given for  $k \geq 1$  and  $-N_k \leq n \leq N_k$  and  $|\alpha_k| \leq 1, |\beta_{kn}| \leq 1$ , then there exists  $\varphi \in H^\infty$  such that  $\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq 1 + \varepsilon/2$  and  $\varphi(w_k) = \alpha_k, \varphi(z_{kn}) = \beta_{kn}$ .

Because of the conditions imposed on the lengths of the intervals  $I_k, \tilde{I}_k, \tilde{\tilde{I}}_k$ , we can find  $\chi \in \text{BUC}$  such that  $0 \leq \chi \leq 1, \chi \equiv 1$  on  $\cap_k \tilde{I}_k$ , and  $\chi \equiv 0$  off  $\cap_k \tilde{\tilde{I}}_k$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(\chi \bar{S} \bar{b} - \chi \bar{S}, H^\infty) &= d(\chi - \chi b, S b H^\infty) \\ &\leq \|(1 - \chi)(1 - b)\|_\infty + d(1 - b, S b H^\infty). \end{aligned}$$

The first term is bounded by  $1/2 \varepsilon$  since if  $x \in \mathbf{R}, 1 - \chi(x) \neq 0$ , then  $x \notin \cap_k \tilde{I}_k$ , hence  $|1 - b(x)| < \varepsilon/2$ . To estimate the second term we write

$$\begin{aligned} d(1 - b, S b H^\infty) &= \inf_{g \in H^\infty} \|1 - b - S b g\|_\infty \\ &= \inf \{ \|\varphi\|_\infty : \varphi(w_k) = 1 - b(w_k), \varphi(z_{kn}) = 1 - b(z_{kn}) = 1 \} \leq 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \end{aligned}$$

by the above comments and the fact that  $|1 - b(w_k)| < 1$ . Hence  $d(\chi \bar{S} \bar{b} - \chi \bar{S}, H^\infty) < 1 + \varepsilon$ .

What we have done so far has been to start with a function having distance 1 from  $H^\infty$ , namely  $\chi \bar{S} \bar{b}$ , and then to change it by the large BUC function  $\chi \bar{S}$  to get a function whose distance from  $H^\infty$  is only slightly greater than 1. The point of what we will do next is that it is impossible to get back to a function having

distance 1 from  $H^\infty$  by adding a small BUC function. Actually we need a local version of this fact.

Assume, to get a contradiction, that there is a function  $h \in \text{BUC}$  and a  $g \in H^\infty$  such that  $\|h\|_\infty \leq R$ ,  $\|g\|_\infty \leq R$ ,  $\text{Var}_{I_k}(h) < 1/2$  for all  $k$ , and  $\|\chi \bar{S} \bar{b} - \chi \bar{S} - h - g\|_{I_k} \leq 1$  for all  $k$ . Define  $h_k = h - h(x_k)$ ,  $g_k = g + h(x_k)$ . Then  $\|h_k\|_\infty \leq 2R$ ,  $\|g_k\|_\infty \leq 2R$ ,  $\|h_k\|_{I_k} \leq 1/2$ , and

$$\|\chi \bar{S} \bar{b} - \chi \bar{S} - h - g\|_{I_k} = \|\bar{S} \bar{b} - \bar{S} - h_k - g_k\|_{I_k} = \|1 - b - S b h_k - S b g_k\|_{I_k},$$

so that  $\|1 - b - S b h_k - S b g_k\|_{I_k} \leq 1$ . Fixing attention on a point  $z_{kn}$  we write

$$1 - b - S b h_k - S b g_k = 1 - b - P[h_k](z_{kn}) S b - g_k S b - [h_k - P[h_k](z_{kn})] S b.$$

Now  $h_k - P[h_k](z_{kn}) = h - P[h](z_{kn})$ , and since  $h \in \text{BUC}$  and  $\text{Im } z_{kn} = \delta_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  we have for  $z$  satisfying  $\varrho(z, z_{kn}) \leq \varkappa$  that

$$\begin{aligned} |P[(h_k - P[h_k](z_{kn})) S b](z)| &= |P[(h - P[h](z_{kn})) S b](z)| \\ &= |P[h S b](z) - P[h](z_{kn}) S(z) b(z)| \leq |P[h S b](z) - P[h](z) P[S b](z)| \\ &\quad + |P[h](z) - P[h](z_{kn})| |S(z)| |b(z)| < \lambda_k \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

Also since  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$  and  $|I_k|/|I_k| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we have by the Poisson integral formula that  $\|1 - b - S b h_k - S b g_k\|_{I_k} \leq 1$  implies that

$$\sup \{ |P[1 - b - S b h_k - S b g_k](z)| : \varrho(z, z_{kn}) \leq \varkappa \} \leq 1 + \lambda'_k$$

where  $\lambda'_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup \{ |1 - b(z) - P[h_k](z_{kn}) S(z) b(z) - g_k(z) S(z) b(z)| : \varrho(z, z_{kn}) \leq \varkappa \} \\ &= \sup \{ |P[1 - b - P[h_k](z_{kn}) S b - g_k S b](z)| : \varrho(z, z_{kn}) \leq \varkappa \} \leq 1 + \lambda_k + \lambda'_k \rightarrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

Writing  $x_{kn} = \text{Re } z_{kn}$ , define

$$B_{kn}(z) = b(z \delta_k + x_{kn}), G_{kn}(z) = 1 + P[h_k](z_{kn}) S(z \delta_k + x_{kn}) - g_k(z \delta_k + x_{kn}) S(z \delta_k + x_{kn}).$$

We then have that  $B_{kn}$  is a Blaschke product for which  $|B'_{kn}(i)| = |b'(z_{kn})| \delta_k$  is bounded below by some positive constant not depending on  $k, n$  (since  $\{z_{kn}\}$  is an interpolating sequence, see Chapter VII of [6]),  $G_{kn} \in H^\infty$ ,  $\|G_{kn}\|_\infty \leq 1 + 4R$ , and

$$\sup \{ |1 - B_{kn}(z) G_{kn}(z)| : \varrho(z, i) \leq \varkappa \} \leq 1 + \lambda_k + \lambda'_k.$$

A simple argument based on normal families and the open mapping theorem now yields  $\lambda''_k \rightarrow 0$  such that  $\sup \{ |G_{kn}(z)| : \varrho(z, i) \leq \varkappa \} \leq \lambda''_k$ . Hence

$$|1 + P[h_k](z_{kn}) S(z) - g_k(z) S(z)| < \lambda''_k \quad \text{if } \varrho(z, z_{kn}) < \varkappa.$$

Then for such  $z$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &P[1 + h_k S + g_k S](z) \leq |1 + P[h_k](z_{kn}) S(z) + g_k(z) S(z)| \\ &+ |P[h_k S](z) - P[h_k](z) S(z)| + |P[h_k](z) - P[h_k](z_{kn})| |S(z)|. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is bounded by  $\lambda_k''$ , and the arguments we have used show that the second and third terms are bounded by numbers  $\lambda_k''', \lambda_k''''$  which go to 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , since  $h \in \text{BUC}$ . Hence for  $k$  large enough,  $|P[1+h_k S+g_k S](z)| < 1/16$  for  $z \in I_k$ . The Poisson integral formula (on the line  $\text{Im } z = \delta_k$ ) together with the choice of  $w_k$  and the facts that  $\|1+h_k S+g_k S\|_\infty < 5R$ ,  $\|h_k\|_\infty < 2R$ , and  $\|h_k\|_{I_k} \leq 1/2$  now implies that

$$|P[1+h_k S+g_k S](w_k)| < \frac{1}{8} \text{ and } |P[h_k S](w_k)| < \frac{9}{16}.$$

This leads to a contradiction since

$$P[1+h_k S+g_k S](w_k) = 1 + P[h_k S](w_k).$$

(It is of interest to note the similarity at this point to the example at the end of Section 3 of [15].)

We have thus shown that if  $g \in H^\infty$ ,  $h \in \text{BUC}$ ,  $\|g\|_\infty \leq R$ ,  $\|h\|_\infty \leq R$ , and

$$\|\chi \bar{S} \bar{b} - \chi \bar{S} - h - g\|_{I_k} \leq 1 \text{ for all } k,$$

then

$$\text{Var}_{I_k}(h) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{ for some } k.$$

Now find  $g \in H^\infty$  such that  $\|\chi \bar{S} \bar{b} - \chi \bar{S} - g\|_\infty \leq 1 + \varepsilon$  and define  $f = \chi^2 \bar{S} \bar{b} - \chi^2 \bar{S} - \chi g$ , so that  $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ . Clearly  $\|g\|_\infty \leq 4 < 1/2 R$ . Then  $f$  is supported in  $\bigcup_k \tilde{I}_k$  and if  $F = -\chi^2 \bar{S} - \chi g$  we have that  $F \in H^\infty + \text{BUC}$  and  $\|f - F\|_\infty = 1$ . If, however,  $\varphi \in H^\infty$ ,  $h \in \text{BUC}$  with  $\|\varphi\|_\infty < 1/2 R$ ,  $\|h\|_\infty < R$ , and  $\|f - (\varphi + h)\|_{I_k} \leq 1$  for all  $k$ , then

$$1 \geq \|\chi^2 \bar{S} \bar{b} - \chi^2 \bar{S} - \chi g - \varphi - h\|_{I_k} = \|\bar{S} \bar{b} - \bar{S} - h - (\varphi + g)\|_{I_k} \text{ for all } k,$$

so  $\text{Var}_{I_k}(h) \geq 1/2$  for some  $k$  since  $g + \varphi \in H^\infty$  and  $\|g + \varphi\|_\infty \leq R$ .

It is now easy to find a function with no best approximant in  $H^\infty + \text{BUC}$ . For  $j = 1, 2, \dots$  pick positive  $\varepsilon_j, R_j > 8, \eta_j$  such that  $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0, R_j \rightarrow \infty, \eta_j \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Carry out the above construction to get intervals  $I_k^j \subset \tilde{I}_k^j \subset \tilde{\tilde{I}}_k^j$  such that  $|I_k^j| = \eta_j$ , functions  $f_j$  supported in  $\bigcup_k \tilde{\tilde{I}}_k^j$  with  $\|f_j\|_\infty \leq 1 + \varepsilon_j$ , and functions  $F_j$  supported in  $\bigcup_k \tilde{\tilde{I}}_k^j$  such that  $F_j \in H^\infty + \text{BUC}$  and  $\|f_j - F_j\|_\infty = 1$ , and such that if  $\varphi \in H^\infty$ ,  $h \in \text{BUC}$  with  $\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq 1/2 R_j, \|h\|_\infty \leq R_j$  and  $\|f_j - (\varphi + h)\|_{I_k^j} \leq 1$  for all  $k$  then  $\text{Var}_{I_k^j}(h) \geq 1/2$  for some  $k$ . This can be done so that  $\bigcup_k \tilde{\tilde{I}}_k^{j_1} \cap \bigcup_k \tilde{\tilde{I}}_k^{j_2} = \emptyset$  if  $j_1 \neq j_2$ , so that the supports of the various  $f_j$ 's are disjoint. Let  $f = \sum_{j=1}^\infty f_j$ . Since  $\sum_{j=1}^N F_j \in H^\infty + \text{BUC}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - \sum_{j=1}^N F_j\|_\infty &= \|\sum_{j=1}^N (f_j - F_j) + \sum_{j=N+1}^\infty f_j\|_\infty \\ &\geq \sup_{j \geq N+1} 1 + \varepsilon_j \rightarrow 1, \text{ we have that} \end{aligned}$$

$d(f, H^\infty + \text{BUC}) \leq 1$ . However say we could find  $\varphi \in H^\infty, h \in \text{BUC}$  such that  $\|f - (\varphi + h)\|_\infty \leq 1$ . If  $j$  is high enough then  $\|\varphi\|_\infty < 1/2 R_j$  and  $\|h\|_\infty < R_j$ . Then  $\|f - (\varphi + h)\|_\infty \leq 1$  implies that  $\|f_j - (\varphi + h)\|_{T_k^j} \leq 1$  for all  $k$ , which then implies that  $\text{Var}_{T_k^j}(h) \geq 1/2$  for some  $k$ . Since  $|\tilde{I}_k^j| = \eta_j \rightarrow 0$  this would violate the uniform continuity of  $h$ . This completes our proof.

### References

1. AXLER, S., BERG, I. D., JEWELL, N. and SHIELDS, A., Approximation by compact operators and the space  $H^\infty + C$ , *Ann. of Math.* **109** (1979), 601—612.
2. CARLESON, L., An interpolation problem for bounded analytic functions, *Amer. J. Math.* **80** (1958), 921—930.
3. CHANG, S.-Y., A characterization of Douglas subalgebras, *Acta Math.* **137** (1976), 81—89.
4. CHANG, S.-Y., Structure of subalgebras between  $L^\infty$  and  $H^\infty$ , *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **227** (1977), 319—332.
5. CHANG, S.-Y. and GARNETT, J. B., Analyticity of functions and subalgebras of  $L^\infty$  containing  $H^\infty$ , *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **72** (1978), 41—46.
6. GARNETT, J. B., *Bounded analytic functions*, Academic Press, New York and London, 1981.
7. HOFFMAN, K. and SINGER, I. M., Maximal subalgebras of  $C(I)$ , *Amer. J. Math.* **79** (1957), 295—305.
8. LUECKING, D., The compact Hankel operators form an  $M$ -ideal in the space of Hankel operators, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **79** (1980), 222—224.
9. MARSHALL, D. E., Subalgebras of  $L^\infty$  containing  $H^\infty$ , *Acta Math.* **137** (1976), 91—98.
10. SARASON, D., Generalized interpolation in  $H^\infty$ , *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **127** (1976), 191—203.
11. SARASON, D., Functions of vanishing mean oscillation, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **207** (1975), 391—405.
12. SARASON, D., in *Spaces of Analytic Functions* (Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. **512** pp. 117—129). Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1976.
13. SARASON, D., *Function theory on the unit circle*, Lecture notes, Virginia Poly. Inst. and State Univ., Blacksburg, Virginia, 1979.
14. SUNDBERG, C., A constructive proof of the Chang—Marshall theorem, *J. Functional Anal.* **46** (1982), 239—245.
15. SUNDBERG, C. and WOLFF, T., Interpolating sequences for  $QA_B$ , to appear in *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*
16. YOUNIS, R., Best approximation in certain Douglas algebras, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **80** (1980), 639—642.

Received June 14, 1983

Department of Mathematics  
University of Tennessee  
KNOXVILLE, Tennessee 37916