

# ON COMPLEMENTED SUBSPACES OF $C(K)$ -SPACES

GRZEGORZ PLEBANEK AND ALBERTO SALGUERO ALARCÓN

ABSTRACT. We prove that there is a compact space  $L$  and a complemented subspace of the Banach space  $C(L)$  which is not isomorphic to a space of continuous functions.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let us say that a Banach space  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space if it is isomorphic to a Banach space of the form  $C(K)$ , of real-valued continuous functions on some compact topological space  $K$ . The classical complemented subspace problem for  $\mathcal{C}$ -spaces reads as follows:

**Problem 1.1.** *Is the class of  $\mathcal{C}$ -spaces closed under taking complemented subspaces?*

Rosenthal's survey [14, section 5] offers nearly everything that is known on the matter. The following are particular examples of  $\mathcal{C}$ -spaces for which a positive answer to 1.1 has been obtained:

- (1) A subspace of  $c_0(\Gamma)$  is complemented if and only if it is isomorphic to some  $c_0(\Gamma')$  for  $|\Gamma'| \leq |\Gamma|$ , see Granero [6].
- (2) Every complemented subspace of  $C(\omega^\omega)$  is isomorphic either to  $c_0$  or to  $C(\omega^\omega)$ , see Benyamini [2].
- (3) Every complemented subspace of  $C[0, 1]$  with a non-separable dual is isomorphic to  $C[0, 1]$ ; this was proved by Rosenthal [13], see also [14, section 4C].
- (4) Every complemented subspace of  $\ell_\infty$  is isomorphic to  $\ell_\infty$ , by a well-known result of Lindenstrauss [10].

It is worth recalling in connection with (1) that Marciszewski [11] gave a characterization of those compact spaces  $K$  for which  $C(K)$  is isomorphic to  $c_0(\Gamma)$  for some  $\Gamma$ . Let us note that even the nature of complemented subspaces of separable  $\mathcal{C}$ -spaces is not fully understood. It is proved in [2] that if  $X$  is isomorphic to a complemented subspace of

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46B03, 46B25, 46E15, 54G12.

The first author was partially supported by the grant 2018/29/B/ST1/00223 from National Science Centre, Poland. The second author has been supported by project PID2019-103961GB-C21 funded by MCIN, project IB20038 funded by Junta de Extremadura and by the grant FPU18/00990 by the Spanish Ministry of Universities.

The authors are grateful to Jesús Castillo for inspiring this research.

$C[0, 1]$  and  $X^*$  is separable then  $X$  is a quotient of  $C(\alpha)$  for a countable ordinal number  $\alpha$ , the space of continuous functions on the ordinal interval  $\{\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\}$ .

One can specify Problem 1.1, in the spirit of Pełczyński's dissertation [12], to the following.

**Problem 1.2.** *Given a surjection  $\theta : L \rightarrow K$  between compact spaces such that  $\theta^\circ[C(K)]$  is a complemented subspace of  $C(L)$ , is the Banach space  $C(L)/\theta^\circ[C(K)]$  a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space?*

Here  $\theta^\circ : C(K) \rightarrow C(L)$  stands for the isometric embedding given by  $\theta^\circ(g) = g \circ \theta$  for  $g \in C(K)$ . The aim of this paper is to present a negative answer to Problem 1.1 by providing the following counterexample to Problem 1.2.

**Theorem 1.3.** *There are two separable scattered compacta  $K$  and  $L$  and a continuous surjection  $\theta : L \rightarrow K$  such that  $C(L) \simeq \theta^\circ[C(K)] \oplus X$  and the Banach space  $X$  is not a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space.*

Let us recall that a compact space  $K$  is *scattered* if every subspace of  $K$  has an isolated point. This is equivalent to saying that every regular finite measure on  $K$  is concentrated on a countable set so that the dual space  $M(K) = C(K)^*$  may be identified with  $\ell_1(K)$ .

Actually, the compact spaces  $K$  and  $L$  mentioned above are the so-called *Aleksandrov-Urysohn spaces* defined by almost disjoint families of subsets of natural numbers. Recall that a family  $\mathcal{A}$  of infinite subsets of  $\omega$  (or any other countably infinite set) is *almost disjoint* if  $A \cap B$  is finite for any distinct  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ . To every almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A}$  one can associate a compact space  $K_{\mathcal{A}}$ , where

$$K_{\mathcal{A}} = \omega \cup \mathcal{A} \cup \{\infty\},$$

is topologized so that the points in  $\omega$  are isolated, basic neighbourhoods of any  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  are of the form  $\{A\} \cup (A \setminus F)$ , where  $F \subseteq \omega$  is finite, and  $K_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a one point compactification of a locally compact space  $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}} = \omega \cup \mathcal{A}$ . This construction was used nearly a hundred years ago by Aleksandrov and Urysohn and became a popular subject in set-theoretic topology, see Hrušák's survey [7]. Spaces of the form  $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$  are often called *Mrówka* or *Mrówka-Isbell spaces*.

Aleksandrov-Urysohn compacta  $K_{\mathcal{A}}$  have found various applications in Banach space theory, see for instance [1, 4, 9]. In [15] we used  $K_{\mathcal{A}}$ -spaces to prove that (consistently) there is a Banach space  $X$  which is not a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space, but it contains a copy of  $c_0$  so that  $X/c_0 = c_0(\mathfrak{c})$ . This illustrates the fact that “to be a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space” is not a three-space property even for the simplest examples of  $\mathcal{C}$ -spaces.

Let us sketch briefly the basic idea that is behind our construction leading to Theorem 1.3. It is well-known that if a Banach space  $X$  is isomorphic to a space of the form  $C(K)$

then  $B_{X^*}$ , the dual unit ball equipped with the *weak\** topology, contains a topological copy of  $K$ . We use this observation and employ the basic technique of [15]. Namely, we carry out an inductive construction of length  $\mathfrak{c}$  that builds the space  $X$  in question and, at the same time, eliminates all the possible candidates inside  $B_{X^*}$  that might arise from an isomorphism between  $X$  and some  $\mathcal{C}$ -space. This inductive process requires no additional set-theoretic axiom thanks to a counting argument that builds on a result of Haydon [8].

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1.  $\mathcal{C}$ -spaces.** The symbol  $K$  always stands for a compact Hausdorff space. As we have already mentioned, a Banach space  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space if it is *isomorphic* to a space of continuous real-valued functions  $C(K)$  for some  $K$ . For a given space  $C(K)$ , we, as usual, identify the dual space  $C(K)^*$  with the space  $M(K)$  of signed Radon measures on  $K$  having finite variation;  $M_1(K)$  stands for the unit ball of  $M(K)$ , equipped with the *weak\** topology inherited from  $C(K)^*$ . For a measure  $\mu \in M(K)$ ,  $|\mu|$  denotes its variation.

Consider now any Banach space  $X$ . Given any *weak\** compact subset  $K$  of  $B_{X^*}$  and  $0 < c \leq 1$ , we say  $K$  is *c-norming* if  $\sup_{x^* \in K} |x^*(x)| \geq c\|x\|$  for every  $x \in X$ . Note that in such a case the evaluation map

$$T : X \longrightarrow C(K), \quad Tx(f) = f(x),$$

is an isomorphic embedding with  $\|T^{-1}\| \leq 1/c$ .

**Definition 2.1.** We say that  $K \subseteq B_{X^*}$  is *free* if the above operator  $T$  is onto; that is, every continuous function on  $K$  is defined by some  $x \in X$ .

Let us recall the following simple observation from [15] (see Lemma 2.2):

**Lemma 2.2.** *For a Banach space  $X$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space;
- (ii) there is a closed free subset  $K$  of  $B_{X^*}$  which is *c-norming* for some  $0 < c \leq 1$ .

The next result about complementation is well-known; see e.g. [12, Proposition 4.1].

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $\theta : L \rightarrow K$  be a continuous surjection between compact spaces and let  $\theta^\circ$  be the corresponding isometric embedding  $\theta^\circ : C(K) \rightarrow C(L)$  given by  $\theta^\circ(g) = g \circ \theta$ .*

*Then  $\theta^\circ[C(K)]$  is complemented in  $C(L)$  by a projection of norm no bigger than  $r$  if and only if there is a continuous mapping*

$$\varphi : K \longrightarrow (M_r(L), \text{weak}^*),$$

*such that  $\text{supp } \varphi(t) \subseteq \theta^{-1}(t)$  and  $\varphi(t)[\theta^{-1}(t)] = 1$  for every  $t \in K$ .*

Let us note that Lemma 2.3 can be proved by appealing to the natural identification

$$\mathcal{C}(L, M_1(K)) = \mathcal{L}(C(L), C(K)).$$

For instance, given a mapping  $\varphi$  as above we can define an operator  $T : C(L) \rightarrow C(K)$  by  $Tf(t) = \langle f, \varphi(t) \rangle$  and a projection  $P$  from  $C(L)$  onto  $\theta^\circ[C(K)]$  by  $P = \theta^\circ \circ T$ .

**2.2. Boolean algebras.** We shall consider Boolean algebras and their Stone spaces using the classical Stone duality. Given an algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$ , its Stone space (of all ultrafilters on  $\mathfrak{B}$ ) is denoted by  $ult(\mathfrak{B})$ . On the other hand, if  $K$  is a zero-dimensional compact space then  $\text{clop}(K)$  is the algebra of clopen subsets of  $K$ . There is a natural Boolean isomorphism between  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\text{clop}(ult(\mathfrak{B}))$ , as well as a canonical homeomorphism between  $K$  and  $ult(\text{clop}(K))$ . Moreover, every Boolean morphism  $f : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$  induces a continuous mapping  $f^* : ult(\mathfrak{B}) \rightarrow ult(\mathfrak{A})$  by the formula  $f^*(p) = f^{-1}(p)$ , and every continuous mapping  $h : K \rightarrow L$  between Stone spaces defines a Boolean morphism  $h^* : \text{clop}(L) \rightarrow \text{clop}(K)$  by  $h^*(C) = h^{-1}(C)$ .

Let us note that, in the language of Stone duality, an Aleksandrov-Urysohn compactum  $K_{\mathcal{A}}$  associated to an almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A}$  (defined in the introduction) may be seen as  $ult(\mathfrak{A})$ , where  $\mathfrak{A}$  the subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$  generated by  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\text{fin}(\omega)$ , the ideal of all finite subsets of  $\omega$ .

We write  $M(\mathfrak{B})$  for the space of all signed *finitely* additive functions on an algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$ . Likewise, for any  $r > 0$ ,  $M_r(\mathfrak{B})$  denotes the family of  $\mu \in M(\mathfrak{B})$  for which  $\|\mu\| \leq r$ . Here, as usual,  $\|\mu\| = |\mu|(1_{\mathfrak{B}})$ , where the variation  $|\mu|$  is given by

$$|\mu|(A) = \sup_{B \in \mathfrak{B}, B \subseteq A} \{|\mu(B)| + |\mu(A \setminus B)|\}.$$

Recall that the space  $M(\mathfrak{B})$  may be identified with  $M(ult(\mathfrak{B}))$  since every  $\mu \in M(\mathfrak{B})$  defines — via the natural Stone isomorphism — an additive function on  $\text{clop}(ult(\mathfrak{B}))$  and such a function extends uniquely to a Radon measure. Assuming this identification, it is clear that the *weak\** topology on  $M(\mathfrak{B})$  becomes the topology of convergence on elements of  $\mathfrak{B}$ .

In connection with Lemma 2.2, we record the following observation.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be an algebra of subsets of some set  $\Delta$ . If a set of measures  $M \subseteq M_1(\mathfrak{B})$  is contained in a free set lying in the dual unit ball of  $C(ult(\mathfrak{B}))$  then for every  $Z \in \mathfrak{B}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a simple  $\mathfrak{B}$ -measurable function  $g : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that for every  $\mu \in M$  we have*

$$|\langle \mu, g \rangle - |\mu(Z)|| < \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* Simply, the function  $M \ni \mu \mapsto |\mu(Z)|$  is *weak\** continuous so, as  $M$  lies inside a free set, there is a continuous  $f : \text{ult}(\mathfrak{B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|\mu(Z)| = \langle \mu, f \rangle$ . To finish the proof it is enough to take a simple continuous function  $g$  on  $\text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$  with  $\|f - g\| < \varepsilon$ . Then  $g$  may be seen as a simple  $\mathfrak{B}$ -measurable function on  $\Delta$ .  $\square$

Below we consider Boolean algebras contained in  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$  (later  $\omega$  will be replaced by another countable set). The symbol  $M^{\ell_1}(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$  will denote the subspace of  $M(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$  consisting of the measures  $\mu$  which are defined by an element  $x \in \ell_1$ , that is

$$\mu(B) = \sum_{n \in B} x(n),$$

for  $B \subseteq \omega$ . In the sequel it will be customary to take some  $\mu \in M^{\ell_1}(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$  and consider the restriction of  $\mu$  to some subalgebras  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ , denoting such an intention by  $\mu \in M^{\ell_1}(\mathfrak{B})$ . Regarding measures on subalgebras of  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ , the following standard fact will be needed:

**Lemma 2.5.** *If  $\mathfrak{B}$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$  containing  $\text{fin}(\omega)$  then every  $\nu \in M(\mathfrak{B})$  can be written as  $\nu = \mu + \nu'$ , where  $\mu \in M^{\ell_1}(\mathfrak{B})$  and  $\nu' \in M(\mathfrak{B})$  is a measure vanishing on finite sets.*

Consider an algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  generated by an almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $\omega$  and  $\text{fin}(\omega)$ . Note that if we take  $\nu \in M(\mathfrak{B})$  and a decomposition  $\nu = \mu + \nu'$  as in 2.5 then  $\nu'(A) \neq 0$  for at most countably many  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Moreover, for any  $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  if we consider the corresponding algebra  $\mathfrak{A}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$  generated by  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and finite sets then any  $\nu_1 \in M(\mathfrak{A}_1)$  has an obvious extension to  $\nu \in M(\mathfrak{A})$ . Namely, write  $\nu_1 = \mu_1 + \nu'_1$  where  $\mu_1$  is the  $\ell_1$ -part of  $\nu_1$  and extend  $\nu'_1$  to  $\nu' \in M(\mathfrak{A})$  simply declaring that  $\nu'(A) = 0$  for every  $A \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_1$ . Then  $\nu = \mu_1 + \nu' \in M(\mathfrak{A})$ .

**Definition 2.6.** In the setting as above, the measure  $\nu$  will be called the natural extension of  $\nu_1$ .

*Remark 2.7.* Suppose we have an almost disjoint family of subsets of  $\omega$  and let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be the algebra in  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$  generated by  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$  and  $\text{fin}(\omega)$ . By the above remarks, every  $\mu \in M(\mathfrak{A})$  can be identified with the restriction of  $\mu$  to some intermediate algebra, the one generated by finite sets and the family  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \xi\}$  for some  $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ .

Finally, we recall the well-known Rosenthal lemma which will be used in the following form, see e.g. [5, p.18].

**Theorem 2.8.** *Let  $(\mu_n)_n$  be a uniformly bounded sequence of measures in  $M^{\ell_1}(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$ . For every sequence of pairwise disjoint sets  $E_n \subseteq \omega$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is an infinite set  $N \subseteq \omega$*

such that

$$|\mu_k| \left( \bigcup_{j \in N \setminus \{k\}} E_j \right) < \varepsilon,$$

whenever  $k \in N$ .

### 3. SEPARATING SETS OF MEASURES

We describe here a useful trick that can be used during an inductive construction of length  $\mathfrak{c}$ ; its essence was invented by Haydon [8]. Throughout the section let us fix a Boolean algebra  $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\omega)$  containing all finite subsets of  $\omega$  and such that  $|\mathfrak{B}| < \mathfrak{c}$ . We are concerned with pairs of sets of measures of  $M_1(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$  – or any other countably infinite set – which are “separated with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$ ” in the sense of the following definition.

**Definition 3.1.** Consider two sets of measures  $M, M' \subseteq M_1(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$ . We say that the pair  $(M, M')$  is  $\mathfrak{B}$ -separated if there are  $n \in \omega$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $B_1, \dots, B_n \in \mathfrak{B}$  such that for every  $(\mu, \mu') \in M \times M'$  there is  $i \leq n$  such that  $|\mu(B_i) - \mu'(B_i)| \geq \varepsilon$ .

Our main result on  $\mathfrak{B}$ -separation is Proposition 3.5 given below; it will become crucial in the next sections, when it will be used to destroy a possible freeness of some norming sets of measures.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose that for given  $M, M' \subseteq M_1(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$  there is a simple  $\mathfrak{B}$ -measurable function  $g : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that*

$$|\langle \mu, g \rangle - \langle \mu', g \rangle| \geq \varepsilon \text{ whenever } \mu \in M \text{ and } \mu' \in M'.$$

*Then the pair  $(M, M')$  is  $\mathfrak{B}$ -separated.*

*Proof.* It follows by straightforward calculations that, if we write  $g = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \cdot \chi_{B_i}$  for some  $r_i \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $B_i \in \mathfrak{B}$ , then the pair  $(M, M')$  is  $\mathfrak{B}$ -separated by the sets  $B_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , with a constant  $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon / (\sum_{i=1}^n |r_i|)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *For every infinite subset  $M \subseteq M_1(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$  there is an infinite  $M' \subseteq M$  such that  $M'$  and  $M \setminus M'$  are not  $\mathfrak{B}$ -separated.*

*Proof.* The crux is that, as the algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  is of size smaller than  $\mathfrak{c}$ , it can separate  $M'$  and  $M \setminus M'$  for less than  $\mathfrak{c}$  sets  $M'$ . Indeed, suppose that  $M'$  and  $M \setminus M'$  are separated by some sets  $B_1, \dots, B_n$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Choose a rational number  $\delta < \varepsilon/2$  and for any  $q \in [-1, 1]^n \cap \mathbb{Q}^n$  consider the set

$$M(q) = \{\mu \in M_1(\mathcal{P}(\omega)) : |\mu(B_i) - q_i| < \delta \text{ for every } i \leq n\}.$$

Note that, by separation, if  $M(q) \cap M' \neq \emptyset$  then  $M(q) \cap (M \setminus M') = \emptyset$ . Appealing to the compactness of  $[-1, 1]^n$  we infer the existence of  $m \in \omega$  and  $q_1, \dots, q_m \in [-1, 1]^n \cap \mathbb{Q}^n$  so that

$$M' \subseteq \bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq m} M(q_k) \quad \text{and} \quad (M \setminus M') \cap \bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq m} M(q_k) = \emptyset.$$

In other words,  $M'$  and  $M \setminus M'$  can be “physically separated” by some finite union of sets of the form  $M(q)$ . Finally, it is clear that there are less than  $\mathfrak{c}$  such unions, and any of them cannot separate more than one pair  $(M', M \setminus M')$ , so we are done.  $\square$

Given any  $Z \subseteq \omega$ , we shall write  $\mathfrak{B}[Z]$  for the algebra generated by  $\mathfrak{B} \cup \{Z\}$ . Note that every element of  $\mathfrak{B}[Z]$  is of the form  $(A \cap Z) \cup (B \cap Z^c)$  for some  $A, B \in \mathfrak{B}$ . The next technical lemma provides a method of enlarging the algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  and preserving non-separation of a given pair  $(M, M')$  at the same time.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Suppose that for given  $M, M' \subseteq M_1(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$  there are*

- $n \in \omega$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $k > 12n/\varepsilon$ ;
- almost disjoint sets  $Z_1, \dots, Z_k \subseteq \omega$ ;
- $A_i, B_i \in \mathfrak{B}$ ;

*such that, for every  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , the pair  $(M, M')$  is  $\mathfrak{B}[Z_j]$ -separated, with  $\varepsilon$  as a constant, by sets*

$$Y_{j,i} = (A_i \cap Z_j) \cup (B_i \cap Z_j^c), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n$$

*Then  $(M, M')$  is  $\mathfrak{B}$ -separated.*

*Proof.* Consider a fixed pair  $(\mu, \mu') \in M \times M'$ . For every  $j \leq k$  there is  $i(j) \leq n$  such that  $|\mu(Y_{j,i(j)}) - \mu'(Y_{j,i(j)})| \geq \varepsilon$  and, since  $k > 12n/\varepsilon$ , we can choose  $m \leq n$  such that the set of indices  $J = \{j \leq k : i(j) = m\}$  verifies  $|J| > 12/\varepsilon$ . Now set

$$F = \bigcup \{Z_j \cap Z_l : j, l \in J, j \neq l\};$$

It is clear that, since  $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$  are almost disjoint,  $F$  is finite and  $Z_j \setminus F$  are disjoint for  $j \in J$ .

Note that there is a privileged  $j \in J$  such that

$$(3.1) \quad |\mu|(Z_j \setminus F) < \varepsilon/6 \quad , \quad |\mu'|(Z_j \setminus F) < \varepsilon/6$$

Indeed, since  $\|\mu\| \leq 1$ , writing  $J_1$  for the set of those  $j \in J$  for which  $|\mu|(Z_j \setminus F) \geq \varepsilon/6$  we have

$$1 \geq \|\mu\| \geq \sum_{j \in J_1} |\mu|(Z_j \setminus F) \geq \varepsilon/6 |J_1|,$$

so  $|J_1| \leq 6/\varepsilon < |J|/2$ . Of course, the same argument applies to  $\mu'$ , and this shows that some  $j \in J$  satisfies 3.1.

Now, taking  $m$  as above and  $j$  satisfying 3.1 and writing

$$Y = Y_{j,m} = (A_m \cap Z_j) \cup (B_m \cap Z_j^c)$$

we have  $|\mu(Y) - \mu'(Y)| \geq \varepsilon$ . If we define

$$(3.2) \quad B = (A_m \cap Z_j \cap F) \cup (B_m \cap (Z_j \cap F)^c)$$

then  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$  as  $F$  is finite, and both  $B \setminus Y$  and  $Y \setminus B$  are contained in  $Z_j \setminus F$ . Therefore, straightforward calculations using 3.1 yield

$$|\mu(Y) - \mu(B)| < \varepsilon/3, \quad |\mu'(Y) - \mu'(B)| < \varepsilon/3,$$

hence  $|\mu(B) - \mu'(B)| \geq \varepsilon/3$ .

To finish the proof, it is enough to realise there are finitely many sets  $B$  defined as in 3.2, and therefore the pair  $(M, M')$  is  $\mathfrak{B}$ -separated by all of them with  $\varepsilon/3$  as the separating constant.  $\square$

We are finally ready for the main result of the section, the following measure-theoretic version of Haydon's Lemma 1D from [8].

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\omega)$  be an algebra containing all finite sets and such that  $|\mathfrak{B}| < \mathfrak{c}$ . Suppose that we are given  $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$  and a list of pairs  $\{(M_\alpha, M'_\alpha) : \alpha < \xi\}$  inside  $M_1(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$  that are not  $\mathfrak{B}$ -separated.*

*For every almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\omega)$  with  $|\mathcal{Z}| = \mathfrak{c}$  there is  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$  such that for every  $\alpha < \xi$ , the pair  $(M_\alpha, M'_\alpha)$  is not  $\mathfrak{B}[Z]$ -separated.*

*Proof.* Our previous lemma shows that, given any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , any  $\alpha < \xi$ , any  $n \in \omega$  and any collection  $A_i, B_i \in \mathfrak{B}$  for  $i \leq n$ , the pair  $(M_\alpha, M'_\alpha)$  can be  $\mathfrak{B}[Z]$ -separated using the collection of sets  $\{(A_i \cap Z) \cup (B_i \cap Z^c), 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  only for finitely many  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ . Since both  $|\mathfrak{B}|$  and  $\xi$  are smaller than  $\mathfrak{c}$ , this gives the assertion by counting.  $\square$

#### 4. COMPLEMENTATION AND FREENESS

We deal in this section with the most technical points of the main construction. It will be convenient to work in the countable set

$$(4.1) \quad \Delta = \{(n, k) \in \omega^2 : k \leq n\}$$

rather than in  $\omega$ . For any set  $C \subseteq \omega$ , we write  $\widehat{C}$  for the ‘‘cylinder’’ of base  $C$ ; namely,

$$\widehat{C} = \{(n, k) \in \Delta : n \in C\}.$$



Moreover, for every  $n \in \omega$ , we write

$$S_n = \widehat{\{n\}} = \{(n, k) : k \leq n\}, \quad \varphi_n = \frac{1}{n+1} \cdot \sum_{k \leq n} \delta_{(n,k)},$$

so that  $\varphi_n$  is the uniform probability distribution on “the stick”  $S_n$ .

**4.1. Two algebras.** Suppose we have an almost disjoint family  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$  of subsets of  $\omega$  and  $\{B_\alpha^0, B_\alpha^1 : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$  an almost disjoint family of subsets of  $\Delta$  which are related by the conditions  $B_\alpha^0 \cup B_\alpha^1 = \widehat{A}_\alpha$  and  $B_\alpha^0 \cap B_\alpha^1 = \emptyset$ . Let

- (i)  $\mathfrak{A}$  be the algebra in  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$  generated by  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$  and  $\text{fin}(\omega)$ ,
- (ii)  $\mathfrak{B}$  be the algebra in  $\mathcal{P}(\Delta)$  generated by  $\{B_\alpha^0, B_\alpha^1 : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$  and  $\text{fin}(\Delta)$ ,

and write  $K = \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$ ,  $L = \text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$ . Then there is a natural surjection  $\theta : L \rightarrow K$  arising from the fact that  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}} = \{\widehat{A} : A \in \mathfrak{A}\}$  is a Boolean subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{B}$  isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{A}$  (see Section 2.2).

**Proposition 4.1.** *In the above setting, let us further assume that*

$$\lim_{n \in A_\alpha} \varphi_n(B_\alpha^0)$$

*exists for every  $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$ . Then  $\theta^\circ[C(K)]$  is a complemented subspace of  $C(L)$ .*

*Proof.* Our plan is to define a *weak\** continuous mapping  $\varphi : K \rightarrow M_1(\mathfrak{B})$  so that  $\varphi(n) = \varphi_n$  for every  $n \in \omega$  and for every  $x \in K$ ,  $\varphi(x)$  is concentrated on  $\theta^{-1}(x)$  and  $\varphi(x)[\theta^{-1}(x)] = 1$ . Then the assertion will follow from Lemma 2.3.

For this purpose, write  $p_\alpha$  for the ultrafilter on  $\mathfrak{A}$  containing  $A_\alpha$  and no finite set. Then  $\theta^{-1}(p_\alpha)$  consists of exactly two ultrafilters  $q_\alpha^0, q_\alpha^1 \in \text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$  containing  $B_\alpha^0$  and  $B_\alpha^1$ , respectively, but no finite sets. Denoting  $t_\alpha = \lim_{n \in A_\alpha} \varphi_n(B_\alpha^0)$ , we define

$$\varphi(p_\alpha) = t_\alpha \cdot \delta_{p_\alpha^0} + (1 - t_\alpha) \cdot \delta_{p_\alpha^1}.$$

Finally, if  $p \in \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  is the “point at infinity”, the unique ultrafilter containing neither finite sets nor  $A_\alpha$ ’s, then we set  $\varphi(p) = \delta_q$ , where  $q$  is the corresponding ultrafilter on  $\mathfrak{B}$ .

It is routine to check that  $\varphi$  is *weak\** continuous at every  $p_\alpha \in \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  as well as at  $p$ . For example, to check the latter: if  $\varphi(p)(B) = 1$  then  $B \in q$ , which means that  $B$  contains an element of the form  $\Delta \setminus \widehat{A}$ , where

$$A = \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_{\alpha_i} \cup F \text{ and } F \subseteq \omega \text{ is finite.}$$

Then  $\varphi(x)(B) = 1$  for every  $x \in \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfying  $A \notin x$ . Note the other two conditions needed to apply Lemma 2.3 are trivially satisfied.  $\square$

**4.2. Two lemmata.** Following the previous setting, we fix  $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$  and consider here two partial algebras:

- $\mathfrak{A}_\xi$ , the algebra in  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$  generated by  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \xi\}$  and  $\text{fin}(\omega)$ ;
- $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$ , the algebra in  $\mathcal{P}(\Delta)$  generated by  $\{B_\alpha^0, B_\alpha^1 : \alpha < \xi\}$  and  $\text{fin}(\Delta)$ .

We also fix an infinite set  $C \subseteq \omega$  which is almost disjoint from  $A_\alpha$  for every  $\alpha < \xi$ . Let us now describe how to define  $A_\xi \subseteq C$  and how to split  $\widehat{A}_\xi$  into  $B_\xi^0$  and  $B_\xi^1$  so that the final spaces possess the additional feature that  $C(L)/\theta^\circ[C(K)]$  is not a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space. First, let us introduce the following working definition:

**Definition 4.2.** Given  $0 < c \leq 1$ , we shall say that a sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \omega}$  in the unit ball of  $M^{\ell_1}(\mathcal{P}(\Delta))$  is *c-admissible* if

- $\mu_n(S_k) = 0$  for every  $k, n \in \omega$ ;
- $|\mu_n(\{n, 0\})| \geq c$  for every  $n \in \omega$ .

We also say  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \omega}$  is *admissible* if it is *c-admissible* for some  $0 < c \leq 1$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Given a c-admissible sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \omega}$ , there is an infinite set  $C' \subseteq C$  and subsets  $P_n \subseteq S_n$  for  $n \in C'$  such that*

- $(\varphi_n(P_n))_{n \in C'}$  and  $(\varphi_n(S_n \setminus P_n))_{n \in C'}$  are both convergent to  $1/2$ ;
- $(\mu_n(P_n))_{n \in C'}$  converges to some  $a \geq c/2$  (and therefore  $(\mu_n(S_n \setminus P_n))_{n \in C'}$  converges to  $-a$ ).

*Proof.* It is clear that we can assume  $\mu_n(\{n, 0\}) \geq c$  without any serious loss of generality. Since  $\mu_n(S_n) = 0$ , there is a set  $Q_n \subseteq S_n \setminus \{(n, 0)\}$  with cardinality between  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  and  $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$  such that  $\mu_n(Q_n) \leq \frac{c}{2}$ . If we put  $P_n = S_n \setminus Q_n$  then  $(\varphi_n(P_n))_{n \in \omega}$  and  $(\varphi_n(S_n \setminus P_n))_{n \in \omega}$  are both convergent to  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Therefore, we only need to consider an infinite  $C' \subseteq C$  such that  $(\mu_n(P_n))_{n \in C'}$  is convergent in order to conclude.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  be a c-admissible sequence in the unit ball of  $M^{\ell_1}(\mathcal{P}(\Delta))$ . There are three infinite sets  $J_3 \subseteq J_2 \subseteq J_1 \subseteq C$  and  $Z \subseteq \widehat{J}_2$  such that*

- (i) *the following pairs of sets of measures*
  - $\{\mu_n : n \in J_3\}$  and  $\{\mu_n : n \in J_2 \setminus J_3\}$ ,
  - $\{\mu_n : n \in J_2\}$  and  $\{\mu_n : n \in J_1 \setminus J_2\}$ ,*are not  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$ -separated;*

- (ii) *if we consider  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \omega}$  as measures in  $M_1(\mathfrak{B}_\xi[Z])$ , then the family  $(\mu_n)_{n \in J_1}$  cannot be inside a c-norming free set.*

*Proof.* Set  $0 < \delta < c/16$ . First, note that by virtue of Rosenthal's Lemma (see 2.8), shrinking  $C$  if necessary we can assume that

$$(4.2) \quad |\mu_n|(\widehat{C} \setminus S_n) < \delta \text{ for every } n \in C.$$

Then we apply Lemma 4.3 to find an infinite subset  $J_1 \subseteq C$  and sets  $P_n \subseteq S_n$  so that  $\mu_n(P_n)$  is convergent to some  $a \geq c/2$  for  $n \in J_1$ . By eliminating a finite number of terms from  $J_1$ , we can also assume that

$$(4.3) \quad |\mu_n(P_n) - a| < \delta \text{ for every } n \in J_1.$$

Finally, applying Lemma 3.3 twice, we find infinite subsets  $J_3 \subseteq J_2 \subseteq J_1$  such that (i) is granted. Then we put

$$Z = \left( \bigcup_{n \in J_3} P_n \right) \cup \left( \bigcup_{n \in J_2 \setminus J_3} (S_n \setminus P_n) \right).$$

In what follows, given  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , it will be convenient to write  $r \approx_\varepsilon s$  rather than  $|r - s| < \varepsilon$ . Note first that to demonstrate that a given set of measures  $M \subseteq M_1(\mathfrak{B}_\xi[Z])$  cannot lie inside a free set, by Lemma 2.4 it is enough to consider the function  $\mu \mapsto |\mu(Z)|$  and check that there is no  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi[Z]$ -measurable simple function  $h$  such that

$$|\mu(Z)| \approx_\delta \langle \mu, h \rangle,$$

for  $\mu \in M$ .

To verify (ii), we argue by contradiction: let us suppose that the sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in J_1}$  lies inside a  $c$ -norming free set in  $M_1(\mathfrak{B}_\xi[Z])$  so, in particular by Lemma 2.4, there is a  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi[Z]$ -measurable simple function  $h$  such that

$$|\mu_n(Z)| \approx_\delta \langle \mu_n, h \rangle \text{ for } n \in J_1.$$

We can assume without loss of generality that  $h = r \cdot \chi_Z + g$ , where  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $g$  is  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$ -measurable just by taking into account that  $\mu_n(S_k) = 0$  for every  $n, k \in \omega$  and the fact that for every  $B \in \mathfrak{B}_\xi$ , either  $B \cap Z$  or  $B \cap Z^c$  is finite. Let us further suppose that  $r \geq 0$  (otherwise, we can consider the function  $\mu \rightarrow -|\mu(Z)|$ ). Then we have

$$|\mu_n(Z)| \approx_\delta r \cdot \mu_n(Z) + \langle \mu_n, g \rangle$$

whenever  $n \in J_1$ . Using 4.2 and 4.3 we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} a &\approx_{2\delta(r+1)} r \cdot a + \langle \mu_n, g \rangle && \text{for } n \in J_3 \\ a &\approx_{2\delta(r+1)} -r \cdot a + \langle \mu_k, g \rangle && \text{for } k \in J_2 \setminus J_3 \\ 0 &\approx_{2\delta(r+1)} \langle \mu_l, g \rangle && \text{for } l \in J_1 \setminus J_2 \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that  $r$  is small, say  $0 \leq r < 1/2$ . Then the first two relations above give

$$\langle \mu_n, g \rangle \geq \varepsilon_1 = a/2 - 2\delta(r+1) \geq a/2 - 3\delta \text{ for all } n \in J_2,$$

while the third one gives

$$\langle \mu_l, g \rangle \leq \varepsilon_2 = 2\delta(r+1) \leq 3\delta \text{ for } l \in J_1 \setminus J_2.$$

Since  $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2$  (recall that  $a \geq c/2$  and  $\delta < c/16$ ), Lemma 3.2 implies that  $\{\mu_n : n \in J_2\}$  and  $\{\mu_n : n \in J_1 \setminus J_2\}$  are separated, which is a contradiction.

On the other hand, if  $r \geq 1/2$  then for  $n \in J_3$  and  $k \in J_2 \setminus J_3$  the first two approximate relations above yield

$$\langle \mu_k, g \rangle - \langle \mu_n, g \rangle \geq 2ra - 4\delta(r+1) = 2r(a-2\delta) - 4\delta \geq a - 8\delta > 0,$$

so this time  $\{\mu_n : n \in J_3\}$  and  $\{\mu_n : n \in J_2 \setminus J_3\}$  would be separated by Lemma 3.2.  $\square$

*Notation 4.5.* In the setting of 4.4, we put  $A_\xi = J_2$ ,  $B_\xi^0 = Z$ ,  $B_\xi^1 = \widehat{A}_\xi \setminus Z$ .

For the purpose of the final construction below, we need to consider the following augmented variant of the previous lemma.

**Lemma 4.6.** *Consider a sequence of measures  $\nu_n \in M_1(\mathfrak{B}_\xi)$  such that, if we write  $\nu_n = \mu_n + \nu'_n$  as in 2.5, then the sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is  $c$ -admissible and  $|\nu'|(\widehat{C}) = 0$  for every  $n$ .*

*There are three infinite sets  $J_3 \subseteq J_2 \subseteq J_1 \subseteq C$  and  $Z \subseteq \widehat{J}_2$  such that*

(i) *the following pairs of sets of measures*

- $\{\nu_n : n \in J_3\}$  and  $\{\nu_n : n \in J_2 \setminus J_3\}$ ,
- $\{\nu_n : n \in J_2\}$  and  $\{\nu_n : n \in J_1 \setminus J_2\}$ ,

*are not  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$ -separated;*

(ii) *if we consider the natural extensions of  $\nu_n$ 's to measures in  $M_1(\mathfrak{B}_\xi[Z])$  (see 2.6) then the family  $(\nu_n)_{n \in J_1}$  cannot be inside a  $c$ -norming free set.*

*Proof.* Actually, this follows by the same argument as above: note that all the considerations inside  $\widehat{C}$  do not affect the measures  $\nu'_n$ .  $\square$

## 5. THE FINAL CONSTRUCTION

We are ready to describe an inductive construction of two algebras  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  introduced in Section 4.1. Thus our aim is to

- (1) find an almost disjoint family  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$  is of subsets of  $\omega$ ;
- (2) define a partition  $\widehat{A}_\alpha = B_\alpha^0 \cup B_\alpha^1$  for every  $\alpha$  so that, in particular, the assumption of Proposition 4.1 is fulfilled;
- (3) let  $\mathfrak{A}_\xi$  be the algebra in  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$  generated by  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \xi\}$  and  $\text{fin}(\omega)$ ;
- (4) let  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$  be the algebra in  $\mathcal{P}(\Delta)$  generated by  $\{B_\alpha^0, B_\alpha^1 : \alpha < \xi\}$  and  $\text{fin}(\Delta)$ ;
- (5) finally, define  $\mathfrak{A} = \bigcup_{\xi < \mathfrak{c}} \mathfrak{A}_\xi$  and  $\mathfrak{B} = \bigcup_{\xi < \mathfrak{c}} \mathfrak{B}_\xi$ ;

in such a way that, for  $K = \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  and  $L = \text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$ , the space  $C(L)/\theta^\circ[C(K)]$  is not a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space.

We let  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  be the algebra generated by  $\text{fin}(\omega)$  and  $\mathfrak{B}_0$  be the algebra generated by  $\text{fin}(\Delta)$ . We also fix  $\mathcal{R} = \{R_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\}$ , an almost disjoint family of subsets of  $\omega$ . The role of  $R_\xi$  is

to make room to perform step  $\xi$ ; in particular, we shall construct  $A_\xi$  as a subset of  $R_\xi$  for every  $\xi$ .

To handle the induction in a diagonal manner, let us fix a bijection  $\rho : \mathfrak{c} \times \mathfrak{c} \rightarrow \mathfrak{c}$  such that  $\rho(\alpha, \beta) = \xi$  implies  $\alpha < \xi$ .

For every algebra  $\mathfrak{B}_\alpha$  we fix an enumeration

$$\{(c_{\alpha,\beta}, (\nu_n^{\alpha,\beta})_{n \in \omega}) : \beta < \mathfrak{c}\},$$

of pairs of constants  $c > 0$  and sequences of measures in  $M_1(\mathfrak{A}_\alpha)$  such that their  $\ell_1$ -parts form a  $c$ -admissible sequences in the sense of Definition 4.2. Moreover, for every such a sequence  $(\nu_n^{\alpha,\beta})_n$  we organize bookkeeping of three sets  $J_3^{\alpha,\beta} \subseteq J_2^{\alpha,\beta} \subseteq J_1^{\alpha,\beta}$  of indices with the following in mind:

**Inductive assumption 5.1.** The pairs

- $\{\nu_n^{\alpha,\beta} : n \in J_3^{\alpha,\beta}\}$  and  $\{\nu_n^{\alpha,\beta} : n \in J_2^{\alpha,\beta} \setminus J_3^{\alpha,\beta}\}$ ,
- $\{\nu_n^{\alpha,\beta} : n \in J_2^{\alpha,\beta}\}$  and  $\{\nu_n^{\alpha,\beta} : n \in J_1^{\alpha,\beta} \setminus J_2^{\alpha,\beta}\}$ ,

are not  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$ -separated whenever  $\rho(\alpha, \beta) < \xi$ .

The role of the step  $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$  is to consider  $\alpha, \beta$  such that  $\rho(\alpha, \beta) = \xi$  and kill possible freeness of the sequence  $(\nu_n^{\alpha,\beta})_{n=1}^\infty$ ; we work inside  $R_\xi$  and do the following. First we find an almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $R_\xi$  with  $|\mathcal{C}| = \mathfrak{c}$  and apply Lemma 4.4  $\mathfrak{c}$ -many times, for every  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . Hence for each  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ , 4.4 provides us with a set  $Z(C) \subseteq \widehat{C}$  which, when added to the algebra  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$ , prevents measures  $(\nu_n^{\alpha,\beta})_{n \in C}$  from being inside a free set. We now refer to Proposition 3.5 to pick  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that adding  $Z = Z(C)$  enables us to have 5.1 granted for all  $\alpha', \beta'$  satisfying  $\rho(\alpha', \beta') < \xi$ . This  $Z$  comes with suitable  $J_3 \subseteq J_2 \subseteq J_1 \subseteq C$  as in 4.4 and we conclude the step by declaring

$$(J_3^{\alpha,\beta}, J_2^{\alpha,\beta}, J_1^\alpha) = (J_3, J_2, J_1) \text{ and } A_\xi = J_2, B_\xi^0 = Z, B_\xi^1 = \widehat{A}_\xi \setminus Z.$$

It remains to show that the algebras  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  we have just constructed give rise to the compacta  $K = \text{ult}(\mathfrak{A})$  and  $L = \text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$  providing the desired counterexample for the complemented subspace problem.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* First, we recall that there is a surjection  $\theta : L \rightarrow K$  arising from the fact that  $\mathfrak{B}$  contains an isomorphic copy  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}} = \{\widehat{A} : A \in \mathfrak{A}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . In turn,  $\theta^\circ[C(K)]$  is complemented in  $C(L)$  by Proposition 4.1 so we have  $C(L) = \theta^\circ[C(K)] \oplus X$  for a closed subspace  $X \subseteq C(L)$ .

To prove that  $X$  is not a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space, we appeal to Lemma 2.2. It is clear that every continuous functional on  $X$  may be seen as a finitely additive signed measure on  $\mathfrak{B}$  vanishing on all the sticks  $S_n$ . Therefore, any  $c$ -norming set of such measures lying inside the unit ball of  $M(\mathfrak{B})$  must contain a sequence of measures  $\nu_n = \mu_n + \nu'_n$  — decomposed as indicated

in Lemma 2.5 — such that the  $\ell_1$ -parts  $\mu_n$  form a  $c$ -admissible sequence in the sense of Definition 4.2. For every  $n$ , we have  $|\nu'_n|(A_\alpha) > 0$  for at most countably many  $\alpha$ 's. Hence there is  $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$  such that  $|\nu'_n|(A_\xi) = 0$  for every  $n$  and  $\xi \geq \alpha$  (recall here Remark 2.7). This means that the restrictions of measures  $\nu_n$  to  $\mathfrak{A}_\alpha$  were listed (together with the constant  $c$ ) as  $(c_{\alpha,\beta}, (\nu_n^{\alpha,\beta})_{n \in \omega})$  for some  $\beta < \mathfrak{c}$ . That pair was treated at step  $\xi = \rho(\alpha, \beta)$  when we added a witness to the algebra  $\mathfrak{B}_\xi$  showing that  $\nu_n$ 's cannot be inside a free set when we think that  $\mu_n \in M(\mathfrak{B}_\xi)$ . Note that the same will hold if we treat  $\mu_n$ 's as elements of  $M(\mathfrak{B}_\eta)$  for  $\eta > \xi$  (via their natural extensions), and this is the role of the inductive assumption 5.1.

Finally, we have killed all the possible candidates inside the unit ball of  $X^*$  for norming free sets, and the proof is complete.  $\square$

*Remark 5.2.* Let us remark that, in Theorem 1.3 we have  $C(L) \simeq \theta^\circ[C(K)] \oplus X$ , where  $\theta^\circ[C(K)]$  is an image of a projection  $P : C(L) \rightarrow C(L)$  of norm 1, which follows from Lemma 2.3 and the fact that  $\varphi : K \rightarrow M(L)$  defined in Proposition 4.1 takes values in probability measures from  $M(L)$ . Consequently, the space  $X$ , which is not a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space, is an image of  $C(L)$  under a projection of norm 2.

## 6. TWISTED SUMS OF $c_0$ AND $\mathcal{C}$ -SPACES

Let us recall that an exact sequence of Banach spaces is a diagram of Banach spaces and operators

$$0 \longrightarrow Y \xrightarrow{i} Z \xrightarrow{q} X \longrightarrow 0$$

in which the kernel of every arrow coincides with the image of the preceding one. The middle space  $Z$  is usually called a twisted sum of  $Y$  and  $X$ . By the open mapping theorem,  $i(Y)$  is a closed subspace of  $Z$  so that  $Z/i(Y)$  is isomorphic to  $X$ . We refer the reader to [3] for a fully detailed exposition on the topic and to [1] for a discussion of twisted sums of  $c_0$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ -spaces.

There are two natural ways of constructing twisted sums of  $\mathcal{C}$ -spaces: one is to consider a surjection  $\theta : L \rightarrow K$  between compact spaces which produces the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow C(K) \xrightarrow{\theta^\circ} C(L) \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0.$$

The other is the “dual” situation: we consider an embedding  $\iota : K \rightarrow L$ , which gives

$$0 \longrightarrow \ker \iota^\circ \longrightarrow C(L) \xrightarrow{\iota^\circ} C(K) \longrightarrow 0.$$

In this setting,  $\ker \iota^\circ$  is always a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space, since it is isomorphic to the space of continuous functions on the quotient space  $L/\iota(K)$  obtained by identifying the subspace  $\iota(K) \subseteq L$  to a point.

In [15] we showed, using some set-theoretic assumption, that there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow c_0 \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow C(K) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $X$  is not a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space. Now we can sketch the following analogous result.

**Theorem 6.1.** *There is a compact space  $L$  and a short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow c_0 \longrightarrow C(L) \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0,$$

*in which  $X$  is not a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be the subalgebra of  $P(\Delta)$  constructed in Section 5 and write again  $L = \text{ult}(\mathfrak{B})$ . Consider the subalgebra  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  of  $\mathfrak{B}$  generated by all the sticks  $S_n$ . Of course,  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  is isomorphic to the algebra generated by all finite sets in  $\omega$ ; therefore  $C(\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A}_0))$  is the classical Banach space  $c$  (of all converging sequences), which is isomorphic to its hyperplane  $c_0$ . If we write  $p : \text{ult}(\mathfrak{B}) \rightarrow \text{ult}(\mathfrak{C})$  for the canonical quotient map then a very similar argument to the one from the proof of our main theorem shows that the quotient space  $X$  in the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow C(\text{ult}(\mathfrak{A}_0)) \xrightarrow{p^\circ} C(L) \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0,$$

is not a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space.

Indeed, the crucial point is that it is still true that every functional over  $X$  can be identified with a finitely additive measure on  $\mathfrak{B}$  vanishing on all the sticks  $S_n$ . Therefore, if  $F$  is a  $c$ -norming set in  $B_{X^*}$  then it must contain a sequence of measures in  $M(\mathfrak{B})$  so that their respective  $\ell_1$ -parts form a  $c$ -admissible sequence. We now proceed exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1.3 to deduce that  $F$  cannot be free, and so  $X$  cannot be a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space.  $\square$

It seems, however, that the quotient space  $X$  in Theorem 6.1 is not isomorphic to a complemented subspace of  $C(L)$ .<sup>1</sup> Namely, one can find a complemented copy of  $c_0$  inside  $X$ . Then  $X = c_0 \oplus Y$  for some closed subspace  $Y$  of  $X$ , and assuming  $C(L) \simeq c_0 \oplus X$ , we would have isomorphic relations

$$X \simeq c_0 \oplus Y \simeq c_0 \oplus (c_0 \oplus Y) \simeq c_0 \simeq X \simeq C(L),$$

so  $X$  would be a  $\mathcal{C}$ -space.

---

<sup>1</sup>We thank Antonio Avilés for that remark.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Avilés, W. Marciszewski, G. Plebanek, *Twisted sums of  $c_0$  and  $C(K)$ -spaces: a solution to the CCKY problem*, Adv. Math. 369 (2020), 107168.
- [2] Y. Benyamini, *An extension theorem for separable Banach spaces*, Israel J. Math. 29 (1978), no. 1, 24–30.
- [3] F. Cabello Sánchez, J.M.F. Castillo, *Homological Methods in Banach Space Theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advances Mathematics, Cambridge Univ. Press, to appear.
- [4] F. Cabello Sánchez, J.M.F. Castillo, W. Marciszewski, G. Plebanek, A. Salguero-Alarcón, *Sailing over three problems of Koszmider*, J. Funct. Anal. 279 (2020), 108571.
- [5] D. Diestel, J.J. Uhl, *Vector measures*, Math. Surveys 15, AMS (1977).
- [6] A. S. Granero, *On the complemented subspaces of  $c_0(I)$* , Atti Sem. Mat. Fis. Univ. Módena 46 (1998), no. 1, 35–36.
- [7] M. Hrušák, *Almost disjoint families and topology*, Recent progress in general topology III, Atlantis Press, Paris (2014), 601–638.
- [8] R. Haydon, *A non-reflexive Grothendieck space that does not contain  $l_\infty$* , Israel J. Math. 40 (1981), 65–73.
- [9] P. Koszmider, N.J. Laustsen, *A Banach space induced by an almost disjoint family, admitting only few operators and decompositions*, Adv. Math. 381 (2021), 107613, 39 pp.
- [10] J. Lindenstrauss, *On complemented subspaces of  $m$* , Israel J. Math 5 (1967), 153–156.
- [11] W. Marciszewski, *On Banach spaces  $C(K)$  isomorphic to  $c_0(\Gamma)$* , Studia Math. 156 (2003), 295–302.
- [12] A. Pełczyński, *Linear extensions, linear averagings, and their applications to linear topological classification of spaces of continuous functions*, Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.) 58 (1968), 92 pp.
- [13] H. P. Rosenthal, *On factors of  $C[0, 1]$  with non-separable dual*, Israel J. Math. 13 (1972), 361–378.
- [14] H. P. Rosenthal, *The Banach spaces  $C(K)$* , Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol. 2, 1547–1602, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2003.
- [15] G. Plebanek, A. Salguero Alarcón, *On the three space property for  $C(K)$ -spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. 281 (2021), 109193.

INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY, UNIwersYTET WROCLAWSKI, PL. GRUNWALDZKI 2/4, 50-384 WROCLAW, POLAND

*Email address:* grzes@math.uni.wroc.pl

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE EXTREMADURA, AVENIDA DE ELVAS, 06071-BADAJOS, SPAIN

*Email address:* salgueroalarcon@unex.es