

THE EXTREME POINTS OF THE UNIT BALL OF THE JAMES SPACE J AND ITS DUAL SPACES

SPIROS A. ARGYROS AND MANUEL GONZÁLEZ

ABSTRACT. We provide a new proof of S. Bellenot's characterization of the extreme points of the unit ball B_J of James quasi-reflexive space J . We also provide an explicit description of the norm of J^{**} which yields an analogous characterization for the extreme points of $B_{J^{**}}$. In the last part of the paper we describe the set of all extreme points of B_{J^*} and its norm closure. It is remarkable that the descriptions of the extreme points of B_J and B_{J^*} are closely connected.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. Some properties of J and J^*	3
2.2. Notations	4
3. A characterization of the extreme points of B_J	4
3.1. The existence of norming partitions	4
3.2. Properties of x -norming partitions	6
3.3. On the extreme points of B_J	9
3.4. Further properties of $Ext(B_J)$	10
3.5. The finest x -norming partition	11
4. The norm of J^{**} and the extreme points of $B_{J^{**}}$	12
4.1. A norming set for J^{**}	12
4.2. The norm of J^{**}	13
4.3. The extreme points of $B_{J^{**}}$	15
5. The extreme points of B_{J^*}	15
6. Vectors with multiple x -norming partitions	22
References	26

1. INTRODUCTION

The James space, constructed by R.C. James ([13]) more than seventy years ago, showed the existence of a non-reflexive Banach space isomorphic to its second dual, and a quasi-reflexive, non-reflexive Banach space. This space played a central role in the development of Banach space theory and was extensively studied by many authors. We mention James' paper [14] and also the works of A. Andrew ([2], [3]), S. Bellenot ([4], [5], [6]) and P.G. Casazza et al. ([8], [9]). A comprehensive presentation of the

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 46B03, 46B20.

The second author was supported in part by MICINN (Spain), Grant PID2019-103961GB-C22.

properties of James' space and its dual space can be found in the monograph ([11]) by H. Fetter and B. Gamboa de Buen.

In ([13]), James' space was constructed using the squared variation norm (Equation 2.1) which makes the unit vector basis $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a shrinking (Schauder) basis. We denote this space by J_s . In this paper we consider a space J isometric to J_s for which $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a boundedly complete basis. It is defined as follows:

A sequence of real numbers $x = (x(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is in J when

$$(1.1) \quad \|x\|_J = \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{k \in I_i} x(k) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} : \{I_i\}_{i=1}^n \text{ disjoint intervals of } \mathbb{N} \right\} < \infty.$$

This norm appeared later in the literature, and R.C. James ([14]) attributed its definition to J. Lindenstrauss ([15]). Since $\|x\|_2 = (\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |x(k)|^2)^{1/2} \leq \|x\|_J$, the space J is a dense linear subspace of ℓ_2 .

In this paper we characterize the extreme points of the unit balls of J , J^* and J^{**} .

In Section 2 we present some properties of J and J_s , and we introduce some notation.

Section 3 is devoted to prove the following characterization of the set of extreme points of the unit ball of J , denoted $Ext(B_J)$, first proved by S. Bellenot ([5]):

Theorem 3.13. A vector $x \in J$ is in $Ext(B_J)$ if and only if $\|x\|_J = \|x\|_2 = 1$.

As a consequence of this characterization, $Ext(B_J)$ is norm-closed (Corollary 3.16). Theorem 3.13 is not explicitly stated in [5], where the set of the extreme points of the unit ball of J_s was characterized (see Corollary 3.22). For doing this, Bellenot developed a maximum path algorithm for graphs using a language vaguely related to that of Banach space theory. Here we follow a different approach using the concept of *x-norming partition* for $x \in J$, which is a (finite or infinite) family $\{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ of disjoint intervals of \mathbb{N} on which x achieves its norm, in the sense that

$$\|x\|_J = \left(\sum_{i \in F} \left| \sum_{n \in I_i} x(n) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Note that we can assume that $\{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ is a partition of \mathbb{N} . We show that every $x \in J$ admits at least one *x-norming partition* (Corollary 3.4), although a vector x can have more than one *x-norming partition* (see Section 6).

When we discovered our first proof of Theorem 3.13, we were unaware of the fact that Bellenot had already proved it. Our proof was based on some properties of the *x-norming partitions* (Proposition 3.6). Bellenot's concept of "maximal cost paths" helped us reveal some deeper regularity properties. The key result (Corollary 3.9) shows that given $x \in J$ and two *x-norming partitions* \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{L} , if $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $L \in \mathcal{L}$, then either $I \subset L$ or $L \subset I$ or $I \cap L = \emptyset$. As a consequence, there exists another *x-norming partition* that refines both \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{L} (Corollary 3.10), and there exists an *x-norming partition* \mathcal{M} which refines any other *x-norming partition* (Proposition 3.24). We call \mathcal{M} the *finest x-norming partition*. It corresponds to Bellenot's maximal cost path and its existence is the main result of [5]. Our proof of Theorem 3.13 is based on these regularity properties.

Given a norm-one vector $x \in J$, every *x-norming partition* $\{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ generates a extreme point of B_J as follows. If $b_i = \sum_{n \in I_i} x(n)$ for $i \in F$, then $\sum_{i \in F} b_i e_{k_i} \in Ext(B_J)$ for every strictly increasing sequence $(k_i)_{i \in F}$ in \mathbb{N} (Corollary 3.18).

We also describe $Ext(B_J)$ without explicitly using the norm of J . Given $x \in \ell_2$ with $\|x\|_2 = 1$, $x \in Ext(B_J)$ if and only if $|\sum_{n \in I} x(n)|^2 \leq \sum_{n \in I} |x(n)|^2$ for every interval I of \mathbb{N} (Corollary 3.20).

In Section 4 we consider the set $\mathcal{D} \subset B_{J^*}$ (see Equation 2.2) and we define \mathcal{D}_1 as the w^* -closure of \mathcal{D} in J^* . We show that \mathcal{D}_1 norms J^{**} . This fact allows us to give an explicit description of the norm of J^{**} , which is a natural extension of the norm of J . Denoting $e_\omega = w^*\text{-lim}_n e_n \in J^{**}$, the space J^{**} is generated by the transfinite $(e_p)_{p \in \omega+1}$ with the following norm:

$$\|x^{**}\|_{**} = \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{i \in F} \left| \sum_{n \in I_i} x^{**}(n) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} : \{I_i\}_{i \in F} \text{ disjoint intervals of } \omega + 1 \right\}.$$

In a similar way, we can define the norm of the transfinite even dual spaces of J . Moreover, the points of $Ext(B_{J^{**}})$ are described similarly to those of $Ext(B_J)$.

Section 5 is devoted to the study of $Ext(B_{J^*})$. Note that for an interval I of \mathbb{N} , $I^*(x) = \sum_{n \in I} x(n)$ defines $I^* \in J^*$ with $\|I^*\|_* = 1$. We consider the set

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \left\{ \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* : \{I_i\}_{i \in F} \text{ disjoint intervals of } \mathbb{N}, \left(\sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 1 \right\},$$

which is a w^* -closed subset of B_{J^*} that norms J ([14]). Hence $Ext(B_{J^*}) \subset \mathcal{D}_1$ ([12]).

As we have mentioned, the characterization of $Ext(B_{J^*})$ is closely related to that of $Ext(B_J)$. The following result indicates this fact.

Proposition 5.3. Let $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$. Then $\|x^*\|_* = 1$ if and only if $\sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i$ is an extreme point of B_J .

Therefore every $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* \in Ext(B_{J^*})$ must satisfy the above condition. Furthermore we show that such an x^* with $\alpha_i I_i^* \neq 0$ must also satisfy the property that $\cup_{i \in F} I_i$ is an interval (Proposition 5.4). These two requirements characterize the extreme points of B_{J^*} .

Theorem 5.10. A vector $x^* \in J^*$ is in $Ext(B_{J^*})$ if and only if it satisfies

- (i) $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^*$ with $\alpha_i I_i^* \neq 0$ for every $i \in F$, and
- (ii) $x = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i \in Ext(B_J)$ and $\cup_{i \in F} I_i$ is an interval of N .

In contrast to $Ext(B_J)$, $Ext(B_{J^*})$ is not norm closed. In Proposition 5.13 we characterize the elements of the norm-closure of $Ext(B_{J^*})$.

In Section 6 we show examples of vectors $x \in J$ such that the cardinal of the set of x -norming partitions takes all possible values: any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, \aleph_0 or \mathfrak{c} (Proposition 6.1).

Acknowledgments. We thank I. Gasparis for his help in this research. In particular, his suggestion to use Choquet's theorem in Section 5 made it more clear. We also thank W.B. Johnson and P. Motakis for their comments.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Some properties of J and J^* . James space [13] can be described using two norms. The first norm is the original one in [13]. It is called the *square variational*

norm, and it is defined as follows. For $x \in c_{00}$ we set

$$(2.1) \quad \|x\|_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \max \left\{ \left(\sum_{k=1}^m |x(n_k) - x(n_{k-1})|^2 \right)^{1/2} : 1 \leq n_1 < \dots < n_m \right\},$$

where we assume $n_0 = 0$ and $x(0) = 0$.

We denote by J_s the completion of $(c_{00}, \|\cdot\|_s)$, where c_{00} is the space of finitely non-zero real sequences. The unit vector basis $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a shrinking basis for J_s .

The second norm $\|\cdot\|_J$ (Equation 1.1) appeared for the first time in ([14]). James attributed its definition to J. Lindenstrauss ([15]). The unit vector basis $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a boundedly complete basis for J .

A vector $x = \sum_n a_n e_n \in J$ will often be denoted as a scalar sequence $x: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $x(n) = a_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The spaces J and J_s are isometric. Indeed, it is easy to check that the linear map $T: J \rightarrow J_s$ defined by $T(x) = (\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} x(k))_n$ is an onto isometry. The inverse T^{-1} maps $(a_n)_n \in J_s$ to $(a_n - a_{n+1})_n \in J$.

James [14] showed that J^* is not isomorphic to any subspace of J_s , and Andrew [2] showed that no non-reflexive subspace of J_s is isomorphic to a subspace of J^* . We also mention two important results concerning the local structure of J and J^* : James [14] proved that ℓ_∞ is finitely representable in J , and G. Pisier [16] showed that J^* has cotype 2, hence ℓ_∞ is not finitely representable in J^* .

2.2. Notations. For a Banach space X , B_X and S_X are the closed unit ball and the unit sphere of X . The unit vector basis of J is denoted (e_n) .

The *support* of $x \in J$ is the set $\text{supp}(x) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : x(n) \neq 0\}$. The range of x , denoted by $\text{ran}(x)$, is the minimal interval (finite or infinite) containing $\text{supp}(x)$. Given $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we denote by $x|_A$ the sequence which coincides with x for $n \in A$ and it is 0 otherwise.

In the sequel, any (finite, or infinite) sequence $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ of disjoint intervals of \mathbb{N} is indexed so that $\max I_i < \min I_{i+1}$ for $i \in F$. If $x \in J$ and $\mathcal{I} = (I_i)_{i \in F}$ is a sequence of disjoint intervals of \mathbb{N} , we denote $\|x\|_{\mathcal{I}} = \left(\sum_{i \in F} \left| \sum_{n \in I_i} x(n) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}$.

We write $(J^*, \|\cdot\|_*)$ for the dual of J . Since (e_n) is a boundedly complete basis for J , the sequence of biorthogonal functionals $(e_n^*)_n \subset J^*$ is a shrinking basis for its closed linear span in J^* . We denote this subspace of J^* by J_* because it is a predual of J .

For I an interval of \mathbb{N} we set $I^* = \sum_{n \in I} e_n^* \in J^*$. Moreover,

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{D} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i I_i^* : \{I_i\}_i \text{ disjoint finite intervals of } \mathbb{N}, \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 1 \right\}$$

is a subset of B_{J^*} that norms J [14], hence $B_{J^*} = \overline{\text{co}}^{w^*}(\mathcal{D})$.

We denote by $\#A$ the cardinal of a set A .

3. A CHARACTERIZATION OF THE EXTREME POINTS OF B_J

3.1. The existence of norming partitions. We can always extend a (finite or infinite) sequence $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ of disjoint intervals of \mathbb{N} to a partition of \mathbb{N} into intervals. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_I(\mathbb{N})$ the set of all partitions of \mathbb{N} into intervals.

Observe that $\|x\|_J = \sup \{ \|x\|_{\mathcal{I}} : \mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_I(\mathbb{N}) \}$ for every $x \in J$.

Definition 3.1. Let $x \in J$. A sequence $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ of disjoint intervals of \mathbb{N} is said to be x -norming if $\|x\|_J = \|x\|_{\mathcal{I}}$.

Our first task is to show that every $x \in J$ admits an x -norming partition.

Definition 3.2. We set $m_0 = 0$, and for every subset F of \mathbb{N} we define a partition $\mathcal{P}_F \in \mathcal{P}_I(\mathbb{N})$ as follows:

- (1) If $F = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{P}_F = \{\mathbb{N}\}$.
- (2) If $F = \{m_1 < \dots < m_k\}$ is non-empty and finite, then

$$\mathcal{P}_F = \{[m_j + 1, m_{j+1}] : j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1\} \cup \{[m_k + 1, \infty)\}.$$

- (3) If $F = \{m_1 < m_2 < \dots\}$ is infinite, then

$$\mathcal{P}_F = \{[m_j + 1, m_{j+1}] : j \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Moreover, we denote $\|x\|_F = \|x\|_{\mathcal{P}_F}$ for $x \in J$.

Observe that $\|x\|_J = \sup_{F \subset \mathbb{N}} \|x\|_F$ for every $x \in J$.

In our next result, by identifying sets with their indicator functions, we endow the powerset of \mathbb{N} with the topology of pointwise convergence.

Proposition 3.3. Let (F_n) be a sequence of non-empty, finite subsets of \mathbb{N} pointwise convergent to $F \subset \mathbb{N}$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x\|_{F_n} = \|x\|_F$ for every $x \in J$.

Proof. Let $x \in J$. Let P_m, Q_m denote the natural projections onto the closed subspaces generated by $\{e_i : i \leq m\}$, $\{e_i : i > m\}$ respectively. Then $\|x\|_F \leq \|x\|_J$ hence $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|Q_m x\|_F = 0$ for every $F \subset \mathbb{N}$.

We consider three cases:

$F = \emptyset$. In this case $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \min F_k = \infty$. Hence

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x\|_{F_k} = \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x(n) \right| = \|x\|_F.$$

F finite nonempty. Denoting $m_0 = \max F$, we may assume that $F = F_k \cap [1, m_0]$ for each k . Then $\|x\|_F^2 = \|P_{m_0}(x)\|_F^2 + \|Q_{m_0}(x)\|_F^2$ and

$$\|x\|_{F_k}^2 = \|P_{m_0}(x)\|_{F_k}^2 + \|Q_{m_0}(x)\|_{F_k}^2 = \|P_{m_0}(x)\|_F^2 + \|Q_{m_0}(x)\|_{F_k \setminus F}^2.$$

Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \min F_k \setminus F = \infty$ we get $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|Q_{m_0}(x)\|_{F_k \setminus F} = \|Q_{m_0}(x)\|_F$. Hence

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x\|_{F_k} = \|x\|_F.$$

F infinite. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists k_m such that $F_k \cap [1, m] = F \cap [1, m]$ for $k > k_m$. Hence $\|P_m(x)\|_{F_k} = \|P_m(x)\|_F$ for $k > k_m$.

Given $\varepsilon > 0$ we choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|Q_m(x)\|_J < \varepsilon$. Then, for $k > k_m$,

$$\|x\|_F < \|P_m(x)\|_{F_k} + \varepsilon \leq \|x\|_{F_k} + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|x\|_{F_k} < \|P_m(x)\|_F + \varepsilon \leq \|x\|_F + \varepsilon,$$

which yields $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x\|_{F_k} = \|x\|_F$. □

Corollary 3.4. For every $x \in J$ there exists $F \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|x\|_F = \|x\|_J$. Hence \mathcal{P}_F is an x -norming partition.

Proof. By the definition of the norm of J there exists a sequence (F_n) of finite, non-empty, subsets of \mathbb{N} such that $\lim_n \|x\|_{F_n} = \|x\|_J$. By compactness, there is no loss of generality in assuming that (F_n) is pointwise convergent to some $F \subset \mathbb{N}$. The assertion is now derived from Proposition 3.3. \square

Remark 3.5. *It follows from the arguments that prove Corollary 3.4 that for each $x \in J$ the x -norming partitions define a closed subset of $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. In Section 6 we will see that there exists a non-zero $x \in J$ with uncountably many x -norming partitions.*

3.2. Properties of x -norming partitions.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $x \in J$ and let $\{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ be an x -norming partition such that for all $i \in F$ we have $\text{supp}(x) \cap I_i \neq \emptyset$. Then the following assertions hold:*

- (1) $\text{supp}(x) \subset \cup_i I_i$.
- (2) For every G subinterval of F we have $\sum_{i \in G} |\sum_{n \in I_i} x(n)|^2 = \|x|_{\cup_{i \in G} I_i}\|_J^2$.
- (3) For every $i \in F$ and every $n \in I_i \cap \text{supp}(x)$, the scalars

$$\sum_{m \in I_i} x(m), \quad \sum_{m \in I_i, m \leq n} x(m), \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{m \in I_i, m \geq n} x(m)$$

are all non-zero and have the same sign.

- (4) For every $i \in F$, $\sum_{m \in I_i} x(m)$ and $\sum_{m \in I_{i+1}} x(m)$ have alternate signs.
- (5) Let $i \in F$. If $n_1 < n_2$ are consecutive in $\text{supp}(x)$ with $x(n_1)x(n_2) > 0$, then either $\{n_1, n_2\} \subset I_i$, or $\{n_1, n_2\} \cap I_i = \emptyset$.

Proof. (1) If not, then there exists $n \in \text{supp}(x) \setminus \cup_{i \in F} I_i$ which yields that $\{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ is not x -norming.

(2) If not, then Corollary 3.4 allows us to choose a partition $\{L_m\}$ of $\cup_{i \in G} I_i$ which is $(x|_{\cup_{i \in G} I_i})$ norming. This yields that the partition $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is not x -norming.

(3) Indeed, if $\sum_{m \in I_i, m \leq n} x(m) = 0$, then $|\sum_{m \in I_i, m > n} x(m)| = \|x|_{I_i}\|_J$, a contradiction, since

$$x(n) \neq 0 \text{ and } \|x|_{I_i}\|_J^2 \geq \left| \sum_{m \in I_i, m > n} x(m) \right|^2 + |x(n)|^2.$$

Similar arguments show that all three scalars above have the same sign.

(4) Observe that since for all $i \in F$ we have $\text{supp}(x) \cap I_i \neq \emptyset$, then $\sum_{m \in I_i} x(m) \neq 0$. If the conclusion fails, then

$$\left| \sum_{m \in I_i \cup I_{i+1}} x(m) \right|^2 > \left| \sum_{m \in I_i} x(m) \right|^2 + \left| \sum_{m \in I_{i+1}} x(m) \right|^2$$

which yields that the partition $\{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ is not x -norming.

(5) Indeed, otherwise we would have that $n_1 \in I_i$ and $n_2 \in I_{i+1}$, for some interval I_i of an x -norming partition. Moreover, we may assume that n_1 is the maximum of I_i , while n_2 is the minimum of I_{i+1} . Properties (3) and (4) now yield a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let ρ, γ and ε be scalars with $\varepsilon \neq 0$. Assume that*

$$\rho + \gamma^2 \leq (\gamma + \varepsilon)^2.$$

Then $\rho + (\gamma + \delta)^2 < (\gamma + \delta + \varepsilon)^2$ for every scalar δ such that $\delta\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Observe that the function $f(x) = (x + \varepsilon)^2 - x^2 - \rho$, defined on \mathbb{R} , is strictly increasing for $\varepsilon > 0$, and strictly decreasing for $\varepsilon < 0$. Therefore

$$\rho + \gamma^2 \leq (\gamma + \varepsilon)^2 \implies \rho + x^2 < (x + \varepsilon)^2, \forall x > \gamma, \text{ for } \varepsilon > 0$$

while

$$\rho + \gamma^2 \leq (\gamma + \varepsilon)^2 \implies \rho + x^2 < (x + \varepsilon)^2, \forall x < \gamma, \text{ for } \varepsilon < 0,$$

and the assertion of the lemma is proved. \square

In the remaining of this subsection we assume, with no loss of generality, that every x -norming partition $\{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ satisfies the following condition:

$\forall i \in F, \{\min I_i, \max I_i\} \subset \text{supp}(x)$ if I_i is finite, and $\min I_i \in \text{supp}(x)$ otherwise.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n e_n \in J$, $x \neq 0$, and let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{L_j\}_{j \in G}$ be x -norming partitions. Assume that there exist $i \in F$ and $j \in G$ such that*

$$I_i \subset L_j, \text{ and } \min I_i = \min L_j.$$

Then for every $i' \in F$, $i' \neq i$, either $I_{i'} \subset L_j$, or $I_{i'} \cap L_j = \emptyset$.

Therefore, there exists a subinterval F_j of F such that

$$L_j \cap \text{supp}(x) = \cup_{i \in F_j} [I_i \cap \text{supp}(x)].$$

Proof. Assume that the conclusion fails. We prove the case where $j = 1$, since the general case is proved with exactly the same arguments.

(i) Since $j = 1$, we conclude that $i = 1$.

(ii) Let I_k be the unique element of $\{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ which is separated by L_1 . Since

$$L_1 \cap \text{supp}(x) = [(\cup_{m < k} I_m) \cup (L_1 \cap I_k)] \cap \text{supp}(x),$$

we obtain

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{n \in L_1} \lambda_n = \sum_{p < k} \sum_{n \in I_p} \lambda_n + \sum_{n \in L_1 \cap I_k} \lambda_n.$$

(iii) Equation 3.1 combined with part (3) of Proposition 3.6 yield that the scalars

$$\sum_{m < k} \sum_{n \in I_m} \lambda_n, \quad \sum_{n \in L_1 \cap I_k} \lambda_n, \quad \sum_{n \in I_k \setminus L_1} \lambda_n \text{ and } \sum_{n \in I_k} \lambda_n$$

are all non-zero and have the same signs. Moreover, k must be an odd integer by part (4) of Proposition 3.6.

(iv) By the previous part, the scalars:

$$\varepsilon = \sum_{m < k} \sum_{n \in I_m} \lambda_n \quad \gamma = \sum_{n \in L_1 \cap I_k} \lambda_n \text{ and } \delta = \sum_{n \in I_k \setminus L_1} \lambda_n$$

are all non-zero and have the same sign.

(v) Since $L_1 \in \mathcal{L}$, (ii) and part (2) of Proposition 3.6 yield

$$\sum_{m < k} \left| \sum_{n \in I_m} \lambda_n \right|^2 + \gamma^2 \leq \|x|_{L_1}\|_J^2 = \left| \sum_{n \in L_1} \lambda_n \right|^2 = (\gamma + \varepsilon)^2.$$

Setting $\rho = \sum_{m < k} |\sum_{j \in I_m} \lambda_j|^2$, (iv) implies that $\rho + \gamma^2 \leq (\gamma + \varepsilon)^2$ and, by Lemma 3.7, $\varepsilon\delta > 0$. From that we infer $\rho + (\gamma + \delta)^2 < (\gamma + \delta + \varepsilon)^2$. Hence

$$\sum_{m=1}^k |\sum_{n \in I_m} \lambda_n|^2 < |\sum_{n \in \cup_{m=1}^k I_m} \lambda_n|^2.$$

We get that $\{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ is not an x -norming partition, because the partition

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{\cup_{m \leq k} I_m\} \cup \{I_m\}_{m > k}$$

gives an estimate on x strictly greater than that of $\{I_i\}_{i \in F}$. This is a contradiction that completes the proof. \square

The x -norming partitions are not necessarily unique, but they have some regularity properties that we describe in the following corollaries.

Corollary 3.9. *Let $x \in J$ and let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{L_j\}_{j \in G}$ be x -norming partitions. Then given $i \in F$ and $j \in G$, either $I_i \subset L_j$ or $L_j \subset I_i$ or $I_i \cap L_j = \emptyset$.*

Proof. The sets

$$F_1 = \{i \in F : \exists j \in G, \min I_i = \min L_j\}, \quad G_1 = \{j \in G : \exists i \in F, \min I_i = \min L_j\}.$$

are non-empty since both contain 1. Let $i_0 \in F_1$. Then there exists a unique $j_0 \in G_1$ such that $\min I_{i_0} = \min L_{j_0}$. Hence, by Proposition 3.8,

$$\text{either } I_{i_0} \subset L_{j_0} \quad \text{or} \quad I_{i_0} \cap \text{supp}(x) = \cup_{j \in Q} [L_j \cap \text{supp}(x)].$$

In the first alternative i_0 and every $j \in G$ fulfill the conclusion, while in the second one for every $j \in Q$ we have $L_j \subset I_{i_0}$ and any other L_k is disjoint from I_{i_0} (Proposition 3.8). The same holds for $j_0 \in G_1$.

Assume that $i_0 \in G \setminus G_1$ and let $i_1 = \max\{i \in G_1 : i < i_0\}$ and $j_1 \in G_1$ such that $\min I_{i_1} = \min L_{j_1}$. Then Proposition 3.8 yields

$$L_{j_1} \cap \text{supp}(x) = \cup_{i \in Q} [I_i \cap \text{supp}(x)] \quad \text{and} \quad i_0 \in Q.$$

Therefore I_{i_0} is disjoint to each L_j with $j \neq j_0$, and the result is proved. Similar arguments work in the case $j_0 \in G \setminus G_1$. \square

Let us see that there exists a joint refinement of any two x -norming partitions.

Corollary 3.10. *Let $x \in J$ and let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{L_j\}_{j \in G}$ be x -norming partitions. Then there exists an x -norming partition $\mathcal{M} = \{M_p\}_{p \in H}$ such that*

(1) $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{L}$.

(2) For every $i \in F$ and $j \in G$ there exist subintervals H_i and H_j of H such that

$$I_i \cap \text{supp}(x) = \cup_{p \in H_i} [M_p \cap \text{supp}(x)] \quad \text{and} \quad L_j \cap \text{supp}(x) = \cup_{p \in H_j} [M_p \cap \text{supp}(x)].$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M} = \{I_i : \exists j \in G, I_i \subset L_j\} \cup \{L_j : \exists i \in F, L_j \subset I_i\}$ and write $\mathcal{M} = \{M_p\}_{p \in H}$. Clearly \mathcal{M} satisfies (2). Let us see that \mathcal{M} is an x -norming partition.

For $i \in F$, either $I_i \in \mathcal{M}$ or $I_i \cap \text{supp}(x) = \cup_{p \in H_i} [M_p \cap \text{supp}(x)]$. In the second case, for each $p \in H_i$ there exists $j_p \in G$ such that $M_p = L_{j_p}$. Since both \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{L} are x -norming partitions, we have

$$\left| \sum_{n \in I_i} x(n) \right|^2 = \sum_{p \in H_i} \left| \sum_{n \in M_p} x(n) \right|^2.$$

Hence $\sum_{p \in H} \left| \sum_{n \in M_p} x(n) \right|^2 = \sum_{i \in F} \left| \sum_{n \in I_i} x(n) \right|^2$, proving that \mathcal{M} is x -norming. \square

In Proposition 3.24 we will show the existence of a finest x -norming partition for each non-zero $x \in J$.

Definition 3.11. A vector $x \in J$ is said to be separated by partitions if, given $n_1 < n_2$ consecutive elements of $\text{supp}(x)$, there exists an x -norming partition $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ such that n_1 and n_2 belong to different intervals of \mathcal{I} .

The next proposition is a consequence of Corollary 3.10 and it is the basic ingredient for proving the characterization of the extreme points of B_J .

Proposition 3.12. Let $x \in J$ with $x \neq 0$ which is separated by partitions. Then the partition $\{\{n\}\}_{n \in \text{supp}(x)}$ is an x -norming partition. Hence $\|x\|_J = \|x\|_2$.

Proof. Let $\text{supp}(x) = (m_k)_{k \in F}$. We show by induction that for every $k \in F$ there exists an x -norming partition \mathcal{I}_k such that

$$\mathcal{I}_k = \{\{n\} : n \leq k\} \cup \{I_{k,i} : i \in G_k, k < i\}.$$

Any x -norming partition separating m_1, m_2 can be taken as \mathcal{I}_1 . Assume that $k+1 < \text{sup}F$ and \mathcal{I}_k exists. Then we choose an x norming partition \mathcal{L}_{k+1} which separates m_{k+1}, m_{k+2} . Corollary 3.10 yields that there exists a joint refinement \mathcal{I}_{k+1} of $\mathcal{L}_{k+1}, \mathcal{I}_k$ which can easily be checked that it satisfies the inductive conclusion. If $k+1 = \text{sup}F$ then \mathcal{I}_k is an x -norming partition consisting from singletons. This completes the inductive proof.

If F is a finite initial interval of \mathbb{N} the result has been proved. If $F = \mathbb{N}$ then we set \mathcal{I} to be the pointwise limit of $(\mathcal{I}_k)_k$, which, from Proposition 3.3, is an x -norming partition and clearly satisfies the conclusion. \square

3.3. On the extreme points of B_J . The main result of this subsection is the following characterization of the extreme points of B_J , denoted $\text{Ext}(B_J)$.

Theorem 3.13. Let $x \in J$. Then $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ if and only if $\|x\|_J = \|x\|_2 = 1$.

We postpone the proof of Theorem 3.13. First we collect some facts about the extreme points of B_J .

Proposition 3.14. Let $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$. Then any pair $n_1 < n_2$ of consecutive elements of $\text{supp}(x)$ is separated by partitions.

Proof. Suppose that $x = \sum_n a_n e_n \in S_J$ and $n_1 < n_2$ are consecutive elements of $\text{supp}(x)$ not separated by partitions. Corollary 3.4 yields

$$\left\| \sum_{n \leq n_1} a_n e_n \right\|_J^2 + \left\| \sum_{n \geq n_2} a_n e_n \right\|_J^2 < 1.$$

Thus, by the continuity of the norm, there exists $t > 0$ small enough so that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{n < n_1} a_n e_n + (a_{n_1} + t)e_{n_1} \right\|_J^2 + \left\| (a_{n_2} - t)e_{n_2} + \sum_{n > n_2} a_n e_n \right\|_J^2 < 1 \text{ and} \\ \left\| \sum_{n < n_1} a_n e_n + (a_{n_1} - t)e_{n_1} \right\|_J^2 + \left\| (a_{n_2} + t)e_{n_2} + \sum_{n > n_2} a_n e_n \right\|_J^2 < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Now it is clear that

$$\left\| \sum_{n < n_1} a_n e_n + (a_{n_1} + t)e_{n_1} + (a_{n_2} - t)e_{n_2} + \sum_{n > n_2} a_n e_n \right\|_J^2 \leq 1 \text{ and}$$

$$\left\| \sum_{n < n_1} a_n e_n + (a_{n_1} - t)e_{n_1} + (a_{n_2} + t)e_{n_2} + \sum_{n > n_2} a_n e_n \right\|_J^2 \leq 1.$$

Hence x is the average of two different vectors in B_J , and thus $x \notin \text{Ext}(B_J)$. \square

Corollary 3.15. *If $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ and $n_1 < n_2$ are consecutive members of $\text{supp}(x)$, then n_1 and n_2 are separated by partitions. Moreover, $x(n_1)x(n_2) < 0$.*

Proof. The separation between n_1 and n_2 by an x -norming partition is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.14. We may thus choose an x -norming partition \mathcal{I} and successive intervals $I_1 < I_2$ of \mathcal{I} so that $n_k \in I_k$ for $k = 1, 2$. Since n_1 and n_2 are consecutive members of the support of x , there is no loss of generality in assuming that $n_1 = \max I_1$, $n_2 = \min I_2$ and no interval of \mathcal{I} lies between I_1 and I_2 . By applying properties (3) and (4) of Proposition 3.6, we conclude that $x(n_1)x(n_2) < 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.13. Suppose that $x = (y + z)/2$, where $\|y\|_J \leq 1$ and $\|z\|_J \leq 1$. Since $\|u\|_2 \leq \|u\|_J$ for all $u \in J$, both y and z lie in B_{ℓ_2} . By our hypothesis, x is in the unit sphere of ℓ_2 . Then $x \in \text{Ext}(B_{\ell_2})$, hence $x = y = z$, and thus $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$.

Conversely, for $x = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j e_j \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$, we will show that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |a_j|^2 = 1$. Indeed, Corollary 3.15 yields that any $n_1 < n_2$ in $\text{supp}(x)$ are separated by an x -norming partition. Hence Proposition 3.12 provides the result. \square

3.4. Further properties of $\text{Ext}(B_J)$. In this subsection we point out a few direct corollaries of Theorem 3.13. We start with the following result stated in [5].

Corollary 3.16. *The set $\text{Ext}(B_J)$ is norm-closed.*

Proof. Since $\|x\|_2 \leq \|x\|_J$, there is a continuous natural inclusion $i : J \rightarrow \ell_2$, and $\text{Ext}(B_J) = S_J \cap i^{-1}(S_{\ell_2})$. \square

Given $x \in J$ with $\text{supp}(x) = \{m_1 < \dots < m_k < \dots\}$ and a set $F = \{n_1 < \dots < n_k < \dots\} \subset \mathbb{N}$, we denote by x^F the element of J satisfying $x(m_k) = x^F(n_k)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\text{supp}x^F = F$. Similarly, we define x^F when $\text{supp}(x)$ and F are finite sets.

Corollary 3.17. *For x and F as above, x is in $\text{Ext}(B_J)$ if and only if so is x^F .*

Proof. The definition of $\|\cdot\|_J$ implies that the map $e_{m_k} \rightarrow e_{n_k}$ induces an isometry between $\overline{\langle (e_{m_k})_k \rangle}$ and $\overline{\langle (e_{n_k})_k \rangle}$. Hence $\|x\|_J = \|x^F\|_J$. And clearly $\|x\|_2 = \|x^F\|_2$. \square

Corollary 3.18. *Let $x \in S_J$.*

- (1) *If $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ then $\|x|I\|_J = \|x|I\|_2$ for every interval I .*
- (2) *If $(I_i)_{i \in F}$ is an x -norming partition and we set $b_i = \sum_{n \in I_i} x(n)$ for every $i \in F$, then $\sum_{i \in F} b_i e_{k_i} \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ for every strictly increasing sequence $(k_i)_{i \in F} \subset \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. (1) is a consequence of Proposition 3.6.

(2) It is enough to consider the case $k_i = i$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the general case follows from Theorem 3.13 and the fact that (e_n) is a spreading basis for J .

By part (2) of Proposition 3.6, $\sum_{i \in F} |b_i|^2 = 1$. Let $(E_i)_{i=1}^d$ be a finite sequence of bounded disjoint intervals of \mathbb{N} . Since the $\cup_{i \in F} I_i \supset \text{supp}(x)$,

$$\sum_{r=1}^d \left| \sum_{i \in E_r} b_i \right|^2 = \sum_{r=1}^d \left| \sum_{i \in E_r} \sum_{j \in I_i} x(j) \right|^2 \leq \|x\|_J^2.$$

Then $y = \sum_{i \in F} b_i e_{k_i} \in J$ with $\|y\|_J \leq 1$, hence $\|y\|_J = \|y\|_2 = 1$, and by Theorem 3.13 we conclude that $y \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$. \square

Definition 3.19. A vector $x \in J$ has non-positive remainder, denoted NPR, provided that $\left| \sum_n x(n) \right|^2 \leq \sum_n |x(n)|^2$.

The vector x has NPR hereditarily if $x|_I$ has NPR for every interval I of \mathbb{N} .

Our next corollary is an immediate consequence of the first part of Corollary 3.18.

Corollary 3.20. Let $x \in J$. Then $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ if and only if x has NPR hereditarily and $\|x\|_2 = 1$.

We derive a characterization of the norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ which does not involve $\|\cdot\|_J$.

Corollary 3.21. Let $x^* \in J^*$. Then,

$$\|x^*\|_* = \sup\{x^*(x) : x \text{ has NPR hereditarily and } \|x\|_2 = 1\}.$$

We close this subsection with a characterisation of the extreme points of B_{J_s} . We recall that J_s is the James space defined with the square variational norm.

Corollary 3.22. Let $x = \sum_n a_n e_n \in J_s$ with $\|x\|_s = 1$. Then $x \in \text{Ext}(B_{J_s})$ if and only if the sequence $(a_n - a_{n+1})_n$ is NPR hereditarily.

Proof. As we have mentioned the map $(c_n)_n \rightarrow (c_n - c_{n+1})_n$ is an onto isometry from J_s to J . Hence $(c_n)_n$ is an extreme point of B_{J_s} if and only if $(c_n - c_{n+1})_n$ is an extreme point of B_J . The result follows from Corollary 3.20. \square

3.5. The finest x -norming partition. Here we show that for every non-zero $x \in J$ there exists a finest x -norming partition which corresponds to the maximal cost path in [5]. In this subsection every x -norming partition $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ satisfies

$$\forall i \in F, \{\min I_i, \max I_i, \} \subset \text{supp}(x) \text{ if } \#I_i < \infty \text{ and } \min I_i \in \text{supp}(x) \text{ otherwise.}$$

Definition 3.23. (1) Let $x \in J$ and let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{L_j\}_{j \in G}$ be x -norming partitions. We say that \mathcal{I} refines \mathcal{L} if for every $j \in G$ there exists a F_j subinterval of F such that $L_j \cap \text{supp}(x) = \cup_{i \in F_j} [I_i \cap \text{supp}(x)]$.

(2) Let $x \in J$. An x -norming partition \mathcal{I} is said to be the finest x -norming partition if it refines any other x -norming partition.

If $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{L_j\}_{j \in G}$ are x -norming partitions and \mathcal{I} refines \mathcal{L} then for every $i \in F$ and $j \in G$ either $I_i \subset L_j$ or $I_i \cap L_j = \emptyset$.

Proposition 3.24. Every non-zero $x \in J$ admits a finest x -norming partition.

Proof. Let $x \in J$. We denote by \mathcal{P} the set of all x -norming partitions, and equip \mathcal{P} with a partial order defined as follows: $\mathcal{L} \prec \mathcal{I}$ if \mathcal{I} refines \mathcal{L} .

As in Definition 3.2, we identify each $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\hat{\mathcal{I}} \subset \mathbb{N}$, where

$$\hat{\mathcal{I}} = \{\min I_i, \max I_i : \#I_i < \infty\} \cup \{\min I_i : \#I_i = \infty\}.$$

So we view \mathcal{P} as a closed subset of $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, by Corollary 3.4 and Remark 3.5. Also Corollary 3.10 implies that (\mathcal{P}, \prec) is a directed net. Therefore there exists a subnet $\{\mathcal{I}_q\}_q$ converging to $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$, an x -norming partition, in the sense that $\{\hat{\mathcal{I}}_q\}_q$ pointwise converges to $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$. We claim that \mathcal{I} is a finest x -norming partition.

Indeed, if $\mathcal{L} = \{L_j\}_{j \in G}$ is an x -norming partition and L_j is a finite interval of \mathbb{N} , then there exists another $\mathcal{M} = \{M_p\}_{p \in H} \in \mathcal{P}$ that refines \mathcal{L} and $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ coincides with $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ on $\{1, \dots, \max L_j\}$. Hence there exists a subinterval F_j of F such that

$$L_j \cap \text{supp}(x) = \cup_{i \in F_j} [I_i \cap \text{supp}(x)].$$

If L_j is an infinite interval, then any $\mathcal{M} = \{M_p\}_{p \in H} \in \mathcal{P}$ that refines \mathcal{L} contains a unique M_{p_0} such that $\min L_j = \min M_{p_0}$. Therefore if \mathcal{M} refines \mathcal{L} and $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ coincides with $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ on $\{1, \dots, \min L_j\}$, then there exists I_{i_0} with $\min L_j = \min I_{i_0}$ which yields

$$L_j \cap \text{supp}(x) = \cup_{i_0 \leq i} [I_i \cap \text{supp}(x)],$$

and the proof is complete. \square

Remark 3.25. *The existence of the finest x -norming partition and Proposition 3.14 easily imply that for every $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ we have $\|x\|_J = \|x\|_2$. Indeed, x is an extreme point if and only if its finest x -norming partition consists of singletons.*

4. THE NORM OF J^{**} AND THE EXTREME POINTS OF $B_{J^{**}}$

Here we give an expression for the norm of J^{**} and we present a characterisation of the extreme points of the unit ball of J^{**} .

4.1. A norming set for J^{} .** In the sequel, I_∞^* and $I_{[k, \infty)}^*$ denote the functionals in J^* that correspond to the set \mathbb{N} and to the final segment of \mathbb{N} starting from $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The next result will be necessary later. It is well-known ([3], [9]), and it is also a consequence of the main result of [1].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $(x_n)_n$ be a normalized block sequence in J such that $I_\infty^*(x_n) \rightarrow 0$. Then (x_n) has a subsequence equivalent to l_2 basis.*

The following result is also well-known. We prove it for the sake of completeness. Here $(e_n^*)_n$ is the sequence of biorthogonal functionals of basis of J .

- Lemma 4.2.**
- (1) $\{e_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{I_\infty^*\}$ generates a norm-dense subspace of J^* .
 - (2) $J^* = J_* \oplus \langle I_\infty^* \rangle$, where J_* is the closed subspace of J^* generated by $(e_n^*)_n$, which is a predual of J .
 - (3) The canonical copy of J in J^{**} has codimension one.

Proof. (1) If not, there exists $x^{**} \in S_{J^{**}}$ such that $\{e_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{I_\infty^*\} \subset \text{Ker } x^{**}$. Since J is separable and contains no copy of l_1 there exists a normalized sequence $(x_k)_k$ such that $x_k \xrightarrow{w^*} x^{**}$. Observe that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_k(n) \rightarrow 0$. Hence we may assume that $(x_k)_k$ is a block sequence and $I_\infty^*(x_k) \rightarrow 0$. So Lemma 4.1 yields that $(x_k)_k$ has a subsequence equivalent to the l^2 basis, a contradiction.

(2) Since the natural basis $(e_n)_n$ is boundedly complete the sequence $(e_n^*)_n$ generates the canonical embedding in J^* of the predual J_* of J . Clearly, $I_\infty^* \notin J_*$ and the first part of the proof yields the result.

(3) It is clear that $J^{**} = (J_* \oplus \langle I_\infty^* \rangle)^* = J \oplus \mathbb{R}$. Since J_* is the canonical copy of the predual of J in J^* , it follows that in the above equality J denotes the canonical copy of J in J^{**} . \square

Recall from Section 2 the definition of the set $\mathcal{D} \subset J_*$ which norms the space J :

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ x^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i I_i^* : \{I_i\}_i \text{ disjoint finite intervals and } \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

The following fact is a consequence of a Theorem of Bessaga and Pelczynski ([7]) and for the shake of completeness we present a proof of it.

Lemma 4.3. *The set $\mathcal{D}_1 = \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{w^*} \subset J^*$ norms J^{**} .*

Proof. We denote by $\|\cdot\|_{**}$ the norm of J^{**} and we will show that

$$\|x^{**}\|_{**} = \sup_{x^* \in \mathcal{D}_1} |x^{**}(x^*)|, \forall x^{**} \in J^{**}.$$

Let $x^* \in J^*$. Using Choquet's theorem ([10]), we choose a probability measure μ on the w^* -Borel subsets of B_{X^*} , supported on \mathcal{D}_1 , such that

$$x^*(x) = \int_{\mathcal{D}_1} x d\mu, \forall x \in X.$$

Let $x^{**} \in J^{**}$. Since J^* is separable, Goldstine's theorem yields a sequence (x_n) in X such that $\|x_n\|_J \leq \|x^{**}\|_{**}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x^{**} = w^*$ - $\lim_n x_n$. By the dominated convergence theorem

$$x^{**}(x^*) = \int_{\mathcal{D}_1} x^{**} d\mu,$$

which yields $|x^{**}(x^*)| \leq \sup\{|x^{**}(y^*)| : y^* \in \mathcal{D}_1\}$, which proves our assertion and the lemma clearly follows. \square

We denote by $\omega + 1$ the set $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\omega\}$ with the order that extends the usual one in \mathbb{N} .

Remark 4.4. (1) *Since $I_\infty^*(e_n) = 1$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (e_n) is a weakly Cauchy, non-weakly convergent sequence in J . Therefore, there exists $e_\omega \in J^{**}$ such that $e_n \xrightarrow{w^*} e_\omega$.*

(2) *For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $I_{[k, \infty)}^*(e_\omega) = 1$. Thus $I_{[k, \infty)}^*(x^{**}) = \sum_{k \geq n} x^{**}(n) + x^{**}(\omega)$ for all $x^{**} \in J^{**}$.*

4.2. The norm of J^{} .** Here we consider \mathcal{D}_1 as a subset of J^{***} , w^* is the weak*-topology on J^{***} , and for an interval I of $\omega + 1$, $I^* \in J^{***}$ is the associated functional.

Lemma 4.5. (1) *For every interval I in of $\omega + 1$ there exists a sequence of intervals*

$$(I_n)_n \subset \mathcal{D}_1 \text{ such that } I_n \rightarrow I \text{ pointwise. Hence } I_n^* \xrightarrow{w^*} I^*.$$

(2) $\overline{\mathcal{D}_1}^{w^*} = \left\{ \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* : \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i^2 \leq 1, (I_i)_{i \in F} \text{ disjoint intervals of } \omega + 1 \right\}$, where F is either a finite initial interval of \mathbb{N} or \mathbb{N} or $\omega + 1$.

Proof. (1) As we have said before, $I_{[k,\infty)}^*$ acting on J^{**} coincides with I^* where $I = [k, \infty) \cup \{\omega + 1\}$. Therefore, the only intervals I of $\omega + 1$ such that $I^* \notin \mathcal{D}_1$ are $I_0 = \{\omega + 1\}$ and $I_k = [k, \infty)$. For the first case we set $I_n = [n, \infty) \cup \{\omega + 1\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and it easily follows that $I_n^* \xrightarrow{w^*} I_0^*$. In the second case we set $I_n = [k, n]$, $k < n$ and we have that $I_n^* \xrightarrow{w^*} I_k^*$.

(2) Consider the functional $x^{***} = \sum_{p \in \omega+1} \alpha_p I_p^*$, where $\sum_{p \in \omega+1} \alpha_p^2 \leq 1$ and $\{I_p\}_p$ are non-empty disjoint finite intervals. Clearly, $I_\omega = \{\omega\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$x_n^{***} = \sum_{p=1}^n \alpha_p I_p^* + \alpha_\omega I_{[k,\infty)}^*.$$

It is easy to check that $x_n^{***} \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and $x_n^{***} \xrightarrow{w^*} x^{***}$.

The remaining cases can be proved in a similar manner. \square

For $x^{**} \in J^{**}$ and a disjoint family of intervals $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ of $\omega + 1$ we denote

$$\|x^{**}\|_{\mathcal{I}} = \left(\sum_{i \in F} \left(\sum_{p \in I_i} x^{**}(p) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

The proof of the following result is easy.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i \in F}$ be a disjoint family of intervals of $\omega + 1$. Then*

$$\|x^{**}\|_{\mathcal{I}} = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^*(x^{**}) : \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i^2 \leq 1 \right\} \text{ for each } x^{**} \in J^{**}.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}_1 \subset \overline{\mathcal{D}_1}^{w^*} \subset B_{J^{***}}$ and \mathcal{D}_1 norms J^{**} (Lemma 4.3), Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 yield the next description of the norm of J^{**} :

Proposition 4.7. *For $x^{**} \in J^{**}$*

$$\|x^{**}\|_{**} = \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{i \in F} \left| \sum_{n \in I_i} x^{**}(n) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} : \{I_i\}_{i \in F} \text{ disjoint intervals of } \omega + 1 \right\},$$

where F is either a finite initial interval of \mathbb{N} , or \mathbb{N} , or $\omega + 1$.

Remark 4.8. *As in the case of J , for every $x^{**} \in J^{**}$ there exists an x^{**} -norming partition satisfying the properties of Propositions 3.6 and 3.8.*

Proposition 4.9. *The family $(e_p)_{p \in \omega+1}$ is a bimonotone transfinite basis for J^{**} .*

Proof. For $x = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e_i + \alpha_\omega e_\omega$ and $y = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e_i$ we have $\|y\|_{**} \leq \|x\|_{**}$.

Indeed, since $y \in \langle (e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rangle$, its norm is determined by a finite sequence of disjoint finite intervals of \mathbb{N} . This family gives the same evaluation on x . The remaining cases are treated in a similar manner. We conclude that the basis $(e_p)_{p \in \omega+1}$ is bimonotone for $\langle (e_p)_{p \in \omega+1} \rangle$, and this property is extended to J^{**} . \square

Remark 4.10. *In the case of J we first defined the norm and then we found the norming set $\mathcal{D} \subset J^*$. For J^{**} we followed a reverse way. First we proved that the set \mathcal{D}_1 norms J^{**} , and then we used $\overline{\mathcal{D}_1}^{w^*} \subset J^{***}$ to define the norm of J^{**} .*

The dual spaces of quasireflexive spaces were studied by Bellenot in [4].

Remark 4.11. (1) In the fourth dual of J , denoted by $J^{2(**)}$, the basis $(e_n)_n$ of J is not w^* -converging to e_ω since $I_{\{\omega\}}^* \in J^{***}$ separates $(e_n)_n$ from e_ω , but $(e_n)_n$ remains being non trivial weak Cauchy. Hence $J^{2(**)}$ is generated by $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, e_ω and $e_{\omega+1}$ in the natural order, where $e_{\omega+1}$ is the image of $e_\omega \in J^{**}$ by the canonical embedding into $J^{2(**)}$, and the w^* -limit of $(e_n)_n$ is the new e_ω . Therefore $\{e_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{e_{\omega+1}\}$ generates the canonical copy of J^{**} in $J^{2(**)}$.

The norm of $J^{2(**)}$ is defined using the intervals of $\omega + 2$ as we did for J^{**} . This argument can be repeated for all the spaces $J^{n(**)}$.

(2) The higher even duals of J are more easily described if we view them as subspaces of $J\mathbb{Q}$, where \mathbb{Q} is the set of rational numbers. Namely, $J\mathbb{Q}$ is the completion of $c_{00}(\mathbb{Q})$ endowed with a James type norm defined as follows:

For $x = (x(p))_{p \in \mathbb{Q}} \in c_{00}(\mathbb{Q})$ we set

$$\|x\|_{J\mathbb{Q}} = \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{p \in I_i} x(p) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} : \{I_i\}_i \text{ disjoint intervals of } \mathbb{Q} \right\}.$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the space $J^{n(**)}$ is isometric to any subspace of $J\mathbb{Q}$ generated by $(e_{t_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \cup (e_{s_m})_{m=1}^n$ with $(t_k)_k \subset \mathbb{Q}$ strictly increasing and $(s_m)_{m=1}^n \subset \mathbb{Q}$ strictly decreasing with $\lim_k t_k < s_n$. Moreover the subspace generated by $(e_{t_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \cup (e_{s_m})_{m=1}^l$, $1 \leq l < n$ is isometric to the natural embedding of $J^{l(**)}$ into $J^{n(**)}$.

The space $J^{\omega(**)}$ is the limit of $J^{n(**)}$. It is isometric to any subspace of $J\mathbb{Q}$ generated by two sequences $(e_{t_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(e_{s_m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $(t_k)_k \subset \mathbb{Q}$ strictly increasing, $(s_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Q}$ strictly decreasing and $\lim_k t_k < \lim_m s_m$.

These arguments can be extended inductively to $J^{\alpha(**)}$ for $\alpha \leq \omega^2$.

4.3. The extreme points of $B_{J^{}}$.** The proof of the following result is similar to the one we did for $Ext(B_J)$. So it is left to the interested reader.

Theorem 4.12. Let $x^{**} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j e_j + a_\omega e_\omega \in S_{J^{**}}$. Then $x^{**} \in Ext(B_{J^{**}})$ if and only if $\|x^{**}\|_{**} = \|x^{**}\|_2$.

The properties of the extreme points of B_J described in Subsection 3.3, remain valid for the extreme points of $B_{J^{**}}$. In particular the following analogue of Corollary 3.18 is proved with similar arguments.

Corollary 4.13. Let $x^{**} \in S_{J^{**}}$.

- (1) If $x^{**} \in Ext(B_{J^{**}})$ then $\|x^{**}|I\|_{**} = \|x^{**}|I\|_2$ for every interval I .
- (2) If $(I_i)_{i \in F}$ is an x^{**} -norming partition and $b_i = \sum_{n \in I_i} x^{**}(n)$ for each $i \in F$, then $\sum_{i \in F} b_i e_{k_i} \in Ext(B_{J^{**}})$ for every strictly increasing sequence $(k_i)_{i \in F}$ in \mathbb{N} .

5. THE EXTREME POINTS OF B_{J^*}

Here we provide a complete description of the extreme points of B_{J^*} . As in the previous section, every interval I of \mathbb{N} has associated $I^* \in J^*$, we write $I_{[k, \infty)}^*$ when $I = [k, \infty)$, the set \mathcal{D} norms J , and we denote $\mathcal{D}_1 = \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{w^*} \subset J^*$.

Standard arguments yield the next result.

Lemma 5.1. *The set \mathcal{D}_1 is the union of the sets*

$$\left\{ \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* : \{I_i\}_i \text{ are disjoint finite intervals and } \left(\sum_{i \in F} |\alpha_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 1 \right\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i I_i^* + \alpha_{n+1} I_{[k, \infty)}^* : \{I_i\}_i \text{ are disjoint finite intervals and } \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} |\alpha_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 1 \right\},$$

where F is either an initial segment of \mathbb{N} or is equal to \mathbb{N} , and in the second set we assume that $\max I_n < k$.

In the sequel, F denotes either a finite initial segment of \mathbb{N} , or \mathbb{N} .

Remark 5.2. (1) *Since for $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ we have $\|x^*\|_* \leq (\sum_{i \in F} |\alpha_i|^2)^{1/2}$, when all the segments I_i are finite we have $x^* = \sum_F \alpha_i I_i^* \in J_*$, the predual of J .*

(2) *For every $x^* \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap J_*$ there exists $x \in S_J$ such that $x^*(x) = 1$.*

(3) *The only elements of \mathcal{D}_1 that could not be normed by B_J are those of the form $x^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i I_i^* + \alpha_{n+1} I_{[k, \infty)}^*$.*

We do not know if there exist any $x^ \in \mathcal{D}_1$ which does not attain its norm on B_J .*

Our next result connects the set \mathcal{D}_1 with $\text{Ext}(B_J)$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $x^* = \sum_F \alpha_i I_i^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$. Then $\|x^*\|_* = 1$ if and only if $\sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i$ is an extreme point of B_J .*

Proof. Suppose $\|x^*\|_* = 1$ and take $x^{**} \in S_{J^{**}}$ such that $x^{**}(x^*) = 1$ and set $\beta_i = I_i^*(x^{**})$ for $i \in F$. Since $\sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i \beta_i = 1$, $\sum_{i \in F} |\alpha_i|^2 \leq 1$ and $\sum_{i \in F} |\beta_i|^2 \leq 1$ we conclude $\sum_{i \in F} |\beta_i|^2 = 1$. So $\{I_i\}_i$ is an x^{**} -norming partition with $\alpha_i = \beta_i$ for all $i \in F$, and Corollary 4.13 (2) yields that $\sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$.

Conversely, assume that $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and $x = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$. We define $y = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_{n_i}$ where $n_i = \min I_i \forall i \in F$. Then

$$\|y\|_J = \left(\sum_{i \in F} |\alpha_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad x^*(y) = 1.$$

Hence $\|x^*\|_* = 1$. □

Proposition 5.3 (2) shows that the extreme points of B_{J^*} are among the $x^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ whose coefficients form an extreme point of B_J . The next result shows that not all these $x^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ are in $\text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $x = \sum_{n \in F} \alpha_n e_n \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ and let $\{I_n\}_{n \in F}$ be a nonempty disjoint family of intervals of \mathbb{N} . If $\cup_{n \in \text{supp}(x)} I_n$ is not an interval of \mathbb{N} , then $x^* = \sum_{n \in F} \alpha_n I_n^*$ is not an extreme point of B_{J^*} .*

Proof. By our assumption there are $k < m$ successive elements of $\text{supp}(x)$ such that $\max I_k + 1 < \min I_m$. Setting $I_{k,m} = (\max I_k, \min I_m)$, we have

$$I_{k,m} \cap (\cup_{n \in \text{supp}(x)} I_n) = \emptyset.$$

We set $J_k = I_k \cup I_{k,m}$, $J_m = I_m \cup I_{k,m}$ which are intervals of \mathbb{N} . Notice that if there exists $n \in F$ such that $I_{k,m} \cap I_n \neq \emptyset$ then the corresponding $\alpha_n = 0$. We define

$$y^* = \sum_{n \in F, n \neq k} \alpha_n I_n^* + \alpha_k J_k^* \quad \text{and} \quad z^* = \sum_{n \in F, n \neq m} \alpha_n I_n^* + \alpha_m J_m^*.$$

From our assumptions, $\alpha_k, \alpha_m \neq 0$. Since $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ and k, m are successive in $\text{supp}(x)$, they must have alternate signs. Assuming $\alpha_m > 0$ we get $0 \in (\alpha_k, \alpha_m)$. Hence there exists $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that $\lambda\alpha_k + (1 - \lambda)\alpha_m = 0$. It is easy to check that $x^* = \lambda y^* + (1 - \lambda)z^*$ with $y^* \neq z^*$. \square

Propositions 5.3 and 5.4 yield the following result.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $x^* \in \text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$. Then $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^*$ with $\alpha_i I_i^* \neq 0$ for each $i \in F$, $x = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ and $\cup_{n \in \text{supp}(x)} I_n$ is an interval of \mathbb{N} .*

It is natural to ask if the conclusions (1), (2) determine a characterization of the extreme points of B_{J^*} . Next we give a positive answer of this question.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $x^*, y^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ satisfying the following conditions:*

(a) $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ with $\alpha_i I_i^* \neq 0$ for every $i \in F$ and

$$w = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i \in \text{Ext}(B_J).$$

(b) $y^* = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j L_j^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ such that $\beta_j L_j^* \neq 0$ for every $j \in G$ and for every $z = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_{k_i}$ with $k_i \in I_i$ we have $y^*(z) = 1$.

Then the following assertions hold:

(1) For $i \in F$ setting $n_i = \min I_i$ and $x = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_{n_i}$, we have that $\{L_j\}_{j \in G}$ is an x -norming partition.

(2) For $j \in G$ setting $H_j = \{i : n_i \in L_j\}$ and $k_j = \min H_j$, we have that

$$\beta_j = \text{sign}(\alpha_{k_j}) \left(\sum_{i \in H_j} |\alpha_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \text{ for every } j \in G.$$

(3) For every $j \in G$ we have $\cup_{i \in H_j} I_i \subset L_j$.

(4) If, additionally, $\cup_{i \in \text{supp}(w)} I_i$ is an interval of \mathbb{N} then $\cup_{j \in G} L_j$ is also an interval and for every $j \in G$, $1 < j < \sup G$, we have $L_j = \cup_{i \in H_j} I_i$.

Moreover, if there exists $m \in \text{supp}(y^*)$ with $\max \text{supp}(x^*) < m$, then we have $\text{sign}(y^*(m)) = \text{sign}(\alpha_d)$ for $d = \max \text{supp}(w)$.

Proof. (1) For $x = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_{n_i}$ our assumptions yield $x^*(x) = y^*(x) = 1$. Therefore

$$y^*(x) = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j \sum_{i \in H_j} \alpha_i = 1, \quad \sum_j |\beta_j|^2 \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_j \left| \sum_{i \in H_j} \alpha_i \right|^2 \leq 1,$$

which implies $\sum_j \left| \sum_{i \in H_j} \alpha_i \right|^2 = 1$; hence $\{L_j\}_j$ is an x -norming partition.

(2) From the previous we conclude that $\beta_j = \sum_{i \in H_j} \alpha_i$ for all $j \in G$. Furthermore, since x is an extreme point and $\{L_j\}_{j \in G}$ is an x -norming partition,

$$\left| \sum_{i \in H_j} \alpha_i \right|^2 = \sum_{i \in H_j} |\alpha_i|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{sign} \left(\sum_{i \in H_j} \alpha_i \right) = \text{sign}(\alpha_{k_j}).$$

By part (3) of Proposition 3.6, $\beta_j = \text{sign}(\alpha_{k_j}) \left(\sum_{i \in H_j} |\alpha_i|^2 \right)^{1/2}$ for every $j \in G$.

(3) Assume that there exists a $j_0 \in G$ and $i_0 \in H_{j_0}$ such that $I_{i_0} \setminus L_{j_0} \neq \emptyset$, and set

$$E_{j_0} = \{i \in H_{j_0} : I_i \setminus L_{j_0} \neq \emptyset\} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{j_0} = H_{j_0} \setminus E_{j_0}.$$

Clearly $E_{j_0} \neq \emptyset$ and, for $i \in E_{j_0}$, we choose $m_i \in I_i \setminus L_{j_0}$. We set

$$z = \sum_{i \notin H_{j_0}} \alpha_i e_{n_i} + \sum_{i \in Q_{j_0}} \alpha_i e_{n_i} + \sum_{i \in E_{j_0}} \alpha_i e_{m_i}.$$

From our assumptions $y^*(z) = 1$. On the other hand

$$\beta_{j_0} L_{j_0}^*(z) = \beta_{j_0} \sum_{i \in Q_{j_0}} \alpha_i \text{ and } \sum_{i \in H_{j_0}} \alpha_i \neq \sum_{i \in Q_{j_0}} \alpha_i,$$

which yields a contradiction, completing the proof of (3).

(4) The first part is a direct consequence of (3) and the fact that $\cup_{i \in \text{supp}(w)} I_i$ is an interval. For the second part, since $\{L_j\}_{j \in G}$ is an x -norming partition, part (3) of Proposition 3.6 yields that for every $j \in G$ and $p_j = \max L_j \cap \text{supp}(x)$

$$\text{sign}\left(\sum_{i \in L_j} \alpha_i\right) = \text{sign} \alpha_{p_j},$$

and by (2), $\text{sign}(\beta_j) = \text{sign}(\alpha_{p_j})$. To finish the argument, observe that $m \in L_{j_0}$ with $j_0 = \max G$. Hence $\text{sign}(y^*(m)) = \text{sign}(\beta_{j_0}) = \text{sign}(\alpha_d)$. \square

Remark 5.7. Assume that $x^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ with $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^*$ where $x = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i$ is an extreme point of B_J and $\cup_{i \in \text{supp}(x)} I_i$ is an interval of \mathbb{N} . Then for $n \notin \text{supp}(x)$ such that $I_n \neq \emptyset$ it follows that $n < \min \text{supp}(x)$, or $\max \text{supp}(x) < n$. Thus, in the sequel, we may assume that $\text{supp}(x) = F$ with F an initial segment of \mathbb{N} or equal to \mathbb{N} .

In our next lemma we adopt the notation used in the statement of Lemma 5.6.

Lemma 5.8. Let $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ with $\alpha_i I_i^* \neq 0$ for every $i \in F$ and satisfying

$$w = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i \in \text{Ext}(B_J) \text{ and } \cup_{i \in \text{supp}(x)} I_i \text{ is an interval of } \mathbb{N}.$$

Then there exists a w^* -closed face E of B_{J^*} such that $x^* \in E$ and every $y^* = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j L_j^* \in E \cap \mathcal{D}_1$ with $\beta_j L_j^* \neq 0$, $j \in G$, satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) $\{L_j\}_{j \in G}$ is an x -norming partition for $x = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_{n_i}$ and $n_i = \min I_i$.
- (2) For every $j \in G$, if $H_j = \{i : n_i \in L_j\}$ and $k_j = \min H_j$ then

$$\beta_j = \text{sign}(\alpha_{k_j}) \left(\sum_{i \in H_j} |\alpha_i|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

- (3) $\cup_{j \in G} L_j$ is an interval of \mathbb{N} , $\cup_{i \in H_j} I_i \subset L_j$ for each $j \in G$ and $\cup_{i \in H_j} I_i = L_j$ for each $1 < j < \sup G$. Moreover, if $\max \text{supp}(x^*) < \max \text{supp}(y^*)$ then $\text{sign}(y^*(m)) = \text{sign}(\alpha_d)$ for $d = \max \text{supp}(w)$.

Proof. We set $S = \{\sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_{m_i} : m_i \in I_i\}$, and for each $s \in S$ we define

$$E_s = \{x^* \in B_{J^*} : x^*(s) = 1\}.$$

Then E_s is a w^* -closed face of B_{J^*} and $x^* \in E_s$. Hence $E = \cap_{s \in S} E_s$ is a non empty w^* -closed face and $x^* \in E$.

Let $y^* \in E \cap \mathcal{D}_1$ and $s \in S$ then $x^*(s) = 1, y^*(s) = 1$. Therefore for every $y^* \in E \cap \mathcal{D}_1$ the pair x^*, y^* satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 5.6, which yields the desired properties for y^* . \square

Proposition 5.9. *Let $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ such that $x = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e_i \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ and $\cup_{i \in \text{supp}(x)} I_i$ is an interval of \mathbb{N} . Then $x^* \in \text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$.*

Proof. For $i \in F$ we can assume $\alpha_i I_i^* \neq 0$. Let E be the face of B_{J^*} defined in Lemma 5.8. Then $\text{Ext}(E) \subset \text{Ext}(B_{J^*}) \subset \mathcal{D}_1$, hence $\overline{\text{co}}^{w^*}(\mathcal{D}_1 \cap E) = E$.

Since $\mathcal{D}_1 \cap E$ is w^* compact, the easy version of Choquet's theorem ([10], [12]) yields that for $z^* \in E$ there exists a (not necessarily unique) probability measure μ_{z^*} with $\text{supp}(\mu_{z^*}) \subset \mathcal{D}_1 \cap E$ which represents z^* . Namely, for every $w \in J$

$$z^*(w) = \int_E y^*(w) d\mu_{z^*}(y^*).$$

We denote by μ_{x^*} a probability measure with $\text{supp}(\mu_{x^*}) \subset \mathcal{D}_1 \cap E$ representing x^* . We will prove that $\mu_{x^*} = \delta_{x^*}$, hence $x^* \in \text{Ext}(E)$. Otherwise $x^* = (z^* + w^*)/2$ with $z^* \neq w^*$ and if μ_{z^*}, μ_{w^*} represent z^*, w^* then $\mu_{x^*} = (\mu_{z^*} + \mu_{w^*})/2 \neq \delta_{x^*}$.

Let $y^* = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j L_j^* \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap E$ with $\beta_j I_j \neq 0$ for all $j \in G$. Part (3) of Lemma 5.8 yields $\min L_1 \leq \min I_1$. We set

$$W_0 = \left\{ y^* \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap E : y^* = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j L_j^* \text{ and } \min L_1 < \min I_1 \right\} \text{ and}$$

$$V_0 = \left\{ y^* \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap E : y^* = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j L_j^* \text{ and } \min L_1 = \min I_1 \right\}.$$

Since for $y^* = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j L_j^* \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap E$ we have $\min L_1 \leq \min I_1$, we conclude

$$W_0 \cup V_0 = \mathcal{D}_1 \cap E.$$

Let us show that $\mu_{x^*}(W_0) = 0$. Indeed, assume that $W_0 \neq \emptyset$ and set $m = \min I_1 - 1$. Then for $y^* = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j L_j^* \in W_0$, Lemma 5.8 yields

$$y^*(e_m) = \beta_1, \text{ sign}(\beta_1) = \text{sign}(\alpha_1), |\beta_1| \geq |\alpha_1|.$$

Assuming that $\mu_{x^*}(W_0) > 0$, since $y^*(e_m) = 0$ for $y^* \in V_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \left| \int_{W_0} y^*(e_m) d\mu_{x^*} \right| &= \left| \int_{W_0} y^*(e_m) d\mu_{x^*} + \int_{V_0} y^*(e_m) d\mu_{x^*} \right| = \\ & \left| \int_{\mathcal{D}_1 \cap E} y^*(e_m) d\mu_{x^*} \right| = \left| \int_E y^*(e_m) d\mu_{x^*} \right| = |x^*(e_m)| = 0, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Hence $\mu_{x^*}(W_0) = 0$, and $\mu_{x^*}(V_0) = 1$ because $\mathcal{D}_1 \cap E \setminus W_0 = V_0$.

For $k \in F$ with $k < \text{sup}F$ we set

$$V_k = \left\{ y^* \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap E : y^* = \sum_{i \leq k} \alpha_i I_i^* + \sum_{j \in G, k < j} \beta_j L_j^* \right\},$$

where G is an initial interval of \mathbb{N} that depends on y^* , and we inductively show that $\mu_{x^*}(V_k) = 1$. We first prove the inductive assumption for $k = 1$ and $1 < \text{sup}F$.

Observe that $V_1 \subset V_0$. If $y^* = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j L_j^* \in V_0$ with $|H_1| = 1$ (see Lemma 5.6 for the definition of H_1) then, since $1 < \text{sup}F$, we have $L_1 = I_1$. Indeed, $I_2 \subset L_2$, $I_1 \cup I_2$

is an interval and $\min L_1 = \min I_1$. This yields that $y^* \in V_1$, hence

$$V_0 \setminus V_1 = W_1 = \left\{ y^* \in V_0 : y^* = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j L_j^* \text{ and } |H_1| > 1 \right\}.$$

We will show that $\mu_{x^*}(W_1) = 0$. We fix $m \in I_1$. Then $y^* = \sum_{j \in G} \beta_j L_j^* \in W_1$ satisfies

$$y^*(e_m) = \beta_1, \quad \text{sign}(\beta_1) = \text{sign}(\alpha_1), \quad |\beta_1| \geq (|\alpha_1|^2 + |\alpha_2|^2)^{1/2}$$

by Lemma 5.8 (2). Also for $y^* \in V_1$ we have that $y^*(e_m) = \alpha_1$. Therefore, assuming that $\mu_{x^*}(W_1) > 0$ we have

$$\int_{W_1} y^*(e_m) d\mu_{x^*} = \gamma \mu_{x^*}(W_1), \quad \text{sign}(\gamma) = \text{sign}(\alpha_1) \text{ and } |\gamma| > |\alpha_1|.$$

Hence

$$|x^*(e_m)| = \left| \int_{W_1} y^*(e_m) d\mu_{x^*} + \int_{V_1} y^*(e_m) d\mu_{x^*} \right| = |\gamma \mu_{x^*}(W_1) + \alpha_1 \mu_{x^*}(V_1)| > |\alpha_1|,$$

which gives a contradiction since $x^*(e_m) = \alpha_1$. Thus $\mu_{x^*}(V_1) = \mu_{x^*}(V_0) = 1$ and the proof for $k = 1$ is complete.

Let $k \in F$, $1 < k < \sup F$ and assume that $\mu_{x^*}(V_{k-1}) = 1$. To show that $\mu_{x^*}(V_k) = 1$ we follow the same steps as in the case $k = 1$ with V_{k-1} in the place of V_0 . This completes the inductive proof.

If $x^* = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i I_i^*$ then $\mu_{x^*} = \delta_{x^*}$ since $\cap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} V_k = \{x^*\}$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu_{x^*}(V_k) = 1$. For $x^* = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i I_i^*$ with I_d an infinite subinterval of \mathbb{N} , then we have proved by induction that $\mu_{x^*}(V_{d-1}) = 1$ and

$$V_{d-1} = \left\{ y^* \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap E : y^* = \sum_{i \leq d-1} \alpha_i I_i^* + \beta_d L_d \right\}.$$

It follows from part (3) of Lemma 5.8 that $I_d \subset L_d$. Since $\cup_{i \in F} I_i$ is an interval, we have $\min I_d = \min L_d$, $I_d = L_d$ and $\beta_d = \alpha_d$. Hence $V_{d-1} = \{x^*\}$, and thus $\mu_{x^*} = \delta_{x^*}$.

It remains the case when $x^* = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i I_i^*$ and I_d is a finite interval. In this case $V_{d-1} = \{x^*\} \cup W_d$, where

$$W_d = \left\{ y^* \in V_{d-1} : y^* = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \alpha_i I_i^* + \alpha_d L_d \quad \max I_d < \max L_d \right\}.$$

Inductively we have shown that $\mu_{x^*}(V_{d-1}) = 1$. Finally, we prove that $\mu_{x^*}(W_d) = 0$. Indeed, set $m = \max I_d + 1$ and observe that for $y^* \in W_d$, $y^*(e_m) = \alpha_d \neq 0$, while $x^*(e_m) = 0$. Therefore,

$$0 = x^*(e_m) = \int_{V_{d-1}} y^*(e_m) d\mu_{x^*} = \int_{W_d} y^*(e_m) d\mu_{x^*} = \alpha_d \mu_{x^*}(W_d),$$

which yields $\mu_{x^*}(W_d) = 0$. Hence $\mu_{x^*}(\{x^*\}) = \mu_{x^*}(V_{d-1}) = 1$, implying $\mu_{x^*} = \delta_{x^*}$. \square

Corollary 5.5 and Proposition 5.9 imply the main characterization of $\text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$:

Theorem 5.10. *A vector $x^* \in J^*$ is in $\text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$ if and only if $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^*$ and the following properties are satisfied:*

- (1) $x = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i$ is an extreme point of B_J

(2) $\cup_{i \in \text{supp}(x)} I_i$ is an interval of \mathbb{N} .

In contrast to $\text{Ext}(B_J)$ (see Corollary 3.16), $\text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$ is not norm closed as the next example shows.

Example 1. We set

$$x^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1^* - e_4^*) \quad \text{and} \quad x_m^* = \frac{m}{\sqrt{2(m^2 + 1)}}(e_1^* - \frac{1}{m}e_2^* + \frac{1}{m}e_3^* - e_4^*) \quad \text{for } m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It is easy to check that x^* , $(x_m^*)_m$ are norm-one vectors such that

$$x^* \notin \text{Ext}(B_{J^*}), \quad (x_m^*)_m \subset \text{Ext}(B_{J^*}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|x_m^* - x^*\|_* \rightarrow 0.$$

This example raises the question whether $\overline{\text{Ext}(B_{J^*})}^{\|\cdot\|_*} = \mathcal{D}_1 \cap S_{J^*}$. Next we show that this is not the case.

Definition 5.11. Let $x^* \in \mathcal{D}_1$ with $x^* = \sum_F \alpha_i I_i^*$ where F is an initial interval of \mathbb{N} and $\alpha_i \neq 0$ for each $i \in F$. The gap function $g_{x^*} : F \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of x^* is defined as follows:

$$g_{x^*}(i) = \min I_{i+1} - \max I_i - 1, \quad \text{if } i < \text{sup}F, \quad \text{and} \quad g_{x^*}(i) = 0 \quad \text{if } i = \text{sup}F$$

Lemma 5.12. Let $x^* \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap S_{J^*}$. Suppose that $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^*$ and $\alpha_i I_i^* \neq 0$ for all $i \in F$. If $1 \in g_{x^*}[F]$ then $x^* \notin \text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$.

Proof. Since $\|x^*\|_* = 1$, Proposition 5.3 yields that $x = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i e_i \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$. Therefore, for every $i < \text{sup}F$ we have that $\alpha_i \alpha_{i+1} < 0$ (Corollary 3.15).

Assume, on the contrary, that there exists a sequence $(x_m^*)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$ such that $x_m^* \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|_*} x^*$. Choose $i_0 \in F$ such that $g_{x^*}(i_0) = 1$ and set $n_0 = \max I_{i_0}$. Then $n_0 + 2 = \min I_{i_0+1}$ and since $x_m^* \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|_*} x^*$ we conclude that

$$x_m^*(e_{n_0}) \rightarrow \alpha_{i_0}, \quad x_m^*(e_{n_0+2}) \rightarrow \alpha_{i_0+1} \quad \text{and} \quad x_m^*(e_{n_0+1}) \rightarrow 0.$$

We set $x_m^* = \sum_{i \in F_m} \alpha_{i,m} I_{i,m}^*$. Theorem 5.10 yields that $\cup_{i \in F_m} I_{i,m}$ is an interval and $x_m = \sum_{i \in F_m} \alpha_{i,m} e_i \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$. Thus, for large $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_m^*(e_{n_0}) x_m^*(e_{n_0+2}) < 0$ and either $x_m^*(e_{n_0+1}) = x_m^*(e_{n_0})$, or $x_m^*(e_{n_0+1}) = x_m^*(e_{n_0+2})$. We get a contradiction, since $x_m^*(e_{n_0+1}) \rightarrow 0$ and $\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1} \neq 0$. \square

Now we complete the description of $\overline{\text{Ext}(B_{J^*})}^{\|\cdot\|_*}$.

Proposition 5.13. Let $x^* = \sum_{i \in F} \alpha_i I_i^* \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap S_{J^*}$ with $\alpha_i I_i^* \neq 0$ for all $i \in F$. Then $x^* \in \overline{\text{Ext}(B_{J^*})}^{\|\cdot\|_*}$ if and only if $1 \notin g_{x^*}[F]$.

Proof. The direct implication is a consequence of Lemma 5.12.

For the converse, assume that $1 \notin g_{x^*}[F]$, and set $G = \{i \in F : g_{x^*}(i) > 0\}$. If $G = \emptyset$ then $x^* \in \text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$ (Proposition 5.3, Theorem 5.10). Thus we assume that $G \neq \emptyset$.

We define a sequence $(x_m^*)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$ such that $x_m^* \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|_*} x^*$, and we proceed as in Example 1. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we choose positive scalars $(\beta_i)_{i \in G}$ with $\sum_{i \in G} \beta_i^2 < 1/(2m^2)$, we decompose the interval $(\max I_i, \min I_{i+1})$ into two nonempty subintervals $L_i < M_i$ for each $i \in G$, and we define $z_m^* = \sum_{i \in G} (-\text{sign}(\alpha_i) \beta_i L_i^* + \text{sign}(\alpha_i) \beta_i M_i^*)$.

Note that $\|z_m^*\|_* < 1/(\sqrt{2}m)$. So, setting $y_m^* = x^* + z_m^*$ and $x_m^* = \frac{1}{\|y_m^*\|_*} y_m^*$, it is easy to check that $(x_m^*)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{Ext}(B_{J^*})$ and $\|x_m^* - x^*\|_* \rightarrow 0$, completing the proof. \square

6. VECTORS WITH MULTIPLE x -NORMING PARTITIONS

This is an appendix to Section 3. We provide examples of $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ admitting multiple x -norming partitions, as it is stated in the following result.

Proposition 6.1. *Let α be either $k \in \mathbb{N}$ or \aleph_0 or \mathfrak{c} . Then there exists $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ admitting exactly α x -norming partitions. These values of α are the only possible cardinalities of a set of x -norming partitions.*

We will give the proof at the end of this section.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $x = a_1e_1 + a_2e_2 + a_3 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $a_1 > 0$, $a_2 < 0$ and $a_3 > 0$. Then the only possible x -norming partitions are $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$.*

Proof. Since $a_1a_2 < 0$, $\{1, 2\}$ is not an interval of an x -norming partition and the same happens for $\{a_2, a_3\}$. \square

Lemma 6.3. *The set*

$$E = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i e_i \in \mathbb{R}^3 : a_1, a_3 > 0, a_2 < 0, \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i = 1 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i^2 = 1 \right\}$$

satisfies the following properties:

- (1) E is uncountable.
- (2) For every $0 < a_1 < 1$ there exists a unique pair a_2, a_3 in \mathbb{R} such that

$$a_1e_1 + a_2e_2 + a_3e_3 \in E.$$

- (3) For every $a_1e_1 + a_2e_2 + a_3e_3 \in E$ we have $|a_2| < \min\{a_1, a_3\}$. If additionally $a_1 \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$ then $a_1 > a_3$.

Proof. (1) We consider the hyperplane $H = \{a_1e_1 + a_2e_2 + a_3e_3 \in \mathbb{R}^3 : a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = 1\}$ and we set $C = H \cap B_{\mathbb{R}^3}$. Then C is the circumcircle of the triangle with vertices $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$. We claim that E is the set of points of the circumference of C lying strictly between e_1 and e_3 .

Indeed, the center of C is $x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{3}e_i$, and for $x \in C$ lying strictly between e_1 and e_2 , the segments $[x_0, x]$ and $[e_1, e_2]$ satisfy $[x_0, x] \cap [e_1, e_2] = \{z\}$. Then

$$z = sx_0 + (1-s)x = te_1 + (1-t)e_2,$$

hence $z(2) = s\frac{1}{3} + (1-s)x(2) = 0$. This yields that $x(2) < 0$. Moreover $x(1)$ and $x(3)$ are positive because $x(1) + x(2) + x(3) = 1$ and $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$.

The same arguments show that any other vector in C does not belong to E .

(2) Observe that E is connected and, if P_1 is the projection onto the first coordinate, then $P_1(E) = (0, 1)$, showing the existence of a_2, a_3 . Moreover the hyperplane $P_1^{-1}(a_1)$ meets E in exactly one point. This fact implies the uniqueness of the pair a_2, a_3 .

(3) It follows from the properties of E . Namely, $\sum_{i=1}^3 a_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^3 a_i^2 = 1$. \square

Clearly, if $x \in E$ then $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ and admits two different x -norming partitions.

Lemma 6.4. *Let G be an initial interval of \mathbb{N} and let $(a_i)_{i \in G} \subset \mathbb{R}$ satisfying*

$$a_1 > 0, \quad \sum_{i \in G \setminus \{1\}} a_i > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \sum_{i \in G} a_i \right|^2 = \sum_{i \in G} a_i^2.$$

Then for $0 < b_1 < a_1$ we have $|b_1 + \sum_{i \in G \setminus \{1\}} a_i|^2 < b_1^2 + \sum_{i \in G \setminus \{1\}} a_i^2$.

Proof. From $|\sum_{i \in G} a_i|^2 = \sum_{i \in G} a_i^2$ we obtain

$$a_1 \left(\sum_{i \in G \setminus \{1\}} a_i \right) + \sum_{i, j \neq 1, i \neq j} a_i a_j = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad a_1 \left(\sum_{i \in G \setminus \{1\}} a_i \right) > 0.$$

These facts and $0 < b_1 < a_1$ yield

$$b_1 \left(\sum_{i \in G \setminus \{1\}} a_i \right) + \sum_{i, j \neq 1, i \neq j} a_i a_j < 0,$$

which implies $|b_1 + \sum_{i \in G \setminus \{1\}} a_i|^2 < b_1^2 + \sum_{i \in G \setminus \{1\}} a_i^2$. \square

Our next result is the key to construct vectors $x \in J$ with multiple x -norming partitions.

Proposition 6.5. (a) Let $(r_i)_{i=1}^k$ be a finite strictly increasing sequence with $r_1 \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $r_k = 1$. Then there exists a unique finite sequence $(a_j)_{j=1}^{2k+1}$ satisfying

(1) $a_1 = r_1$, and for $1 < m < k$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2m+1} a_j = r_{m+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \sum_{j=1}^{2m+1} a_j \right|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{2m+1} a_j^2.$$

(2) For every subinterval I of $\{1, \dots, 2k+1\}$ with $\#I > 1$ and either $1 < \min I$ or $\min I = 1$ and $\max I = 2n$, we have $|\sum_{j \in I} a_j|^2 < \sum_{j \in I} a_j^2$.

(b) If $(r_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is strictly increasing with $r_1 \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\lim r_k = 1$ then there exists a sequence $(a_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the analogous to the previous conditions (1), (2) in (a).

Proof. (a) We define $(a_j)_{j=1}^{2k+1}$ as follows. For $j = 1$ we set $a_1 = r_1$. For $m = 2, \dots, k$, by part (2) of Lemma 6.3, there are unique numbers a_{2m}, a_{2m+1} satisfying

$$r_m + a_{2m} + a_{2m+1} = r_{m+1} \quad \text{and} \quad r_m^2 + a_{2m}^2 + a_{2m+1}^2 = r_{m+1}^2.$$

This completes the definition of $(a_j)_{j=1}^{2k+1}$. It is easy to check that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2m+1} a_j = r_{m+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \sum_{j=1}^{2m+1} a_j \right|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{2m+1} a_j^2,$$

and part (2) of Lemma 6.3 implies that the sequence $(a_j)_{j=1}^{2k+1}$ is unique. So the proof of (1) is complete.

To prove (2), note that for $1 \leq m \leq k-1$ the vector $x_m = r_m e_1 + a_{2m-2} e_2 + a_{2m-1} e_3$ belongs to the set

$$E_m = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i e_i \in \mathbb{R}^3 : a_1, a_3 > 0, a_2 < 0, \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i = r_{m+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i^2 = r_{m+1}^2 \right\}.$$

Hence $a_{2m} < 0$ and $a_{2m+1} > 0$. Since $r_m \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, fact (3) in Lemma 6.3 yields

$$0 < a_{2m+1} < r_m, \quad a_{2m} < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |a_{2m}| < a_{2m+1}.$$

Let I be a subinterval of $\{1, \dots, 2k-1\}$ with $\#I > 1$. First we assume that $1 < 2m+1 = \min I$ and $\max I = 2l+1$. Then

$$\sum_{j=2m+1}^{2l+1} a_j = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{2l+1} a_j - \sum_{j=1}^{2m+1} a_j \right) + a_{2m+1} = (r_{l+1} - r_{m+1}) + a_{2m+1} > 0$$

and $\sum_{j=2m+2}^{2l+1} a_j = r_{l+1} - r_{m+1} > 0$. Therefore

$$\left| r_{m+1} + \sum_{j=2m+2}^{2l-1} a_j \right|^2 = r_{m+1}^2 + \sum_{j=2m+2}^{2l+1} a_j^2 \quad \text{and} \quad r_{m+1} > a_{2m+1}.$$

The last inequality holds since $r_{m+1} > r_m > a_{2m+1}$. Thus the assumptions of Lemma 6.4 are fulfilled, and we get $\left| \sum_{j \in I} a_j \right|^2 < \sum_{j \in I} a_j^2$.

This completes the proof for subintervals of $\{1, \dots, 2k-1\}$ with odd ends. The other cases can be reduced to this one.

Indeed, assume first that $\min I = 2m+1$ and $\max I = 2l$. Then from the previous case we get $\sum_{j=2m+1}^{2l-1} a_j > 0$ and $a_{2l} < 0$. Hence

$$\left| \sum_{j=2m+1}^{2l} a_j \right|^2 < \left| \sum_{j=2m+1}^{2l-1} a_j \right|^2 + a_{2l}^2 \leq \sum_{j=2m+1}^{2l} a_j^2.$$

With the same arguments we treat the case $\min I = 2m$ and $\max I = 2l+1$. The remaining case is $\min I = 2m$ and $\max I = 2l$.

Again, as in the previous cases, we have $\sum_{j=2m}^{2l-1} a_j > 0$ and $a_{2l} < 0$. And similarly we conclude that

$$\left| \sum_{j=2m}^{2l} a_j \right|^2 < \left| \sum_{j=2m}^{2l-1} a_j \right|^2 + a_{2l}^2 < \sum_{j=2m}^{2l} a_j^2.$$

To finish the proof of (2) of part (a) we examine the case $\min I = 1$ and $\max I = 2n$, in which we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2n} a_j = \sum_{j=1}^{2n-1} a_j + a_{2n} = r_n + a_{2n}$$

with $r_n > 0$, $a_{2n} < 0$ and $|a_{2n}| < r_n$. Hence

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^{2n} a_j \right|^2 = |r_n + a_{2n}|^2 < |r_n|^2 < \sum_{j=1}^{2n} a_j^2.$$

To prove (b), let $(r_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ as in the statement. We define the sequence $(a_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the same way as in the finite case, and it satisfies

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{2k+1} a_j = r_{k+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \sum_{j=1}^{2k+1} a_j \right|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{2k+1} a_j^2 = r_{k+1}^2.$$

Clearly $a_j \rightarrow 0$. Hence $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j = 1$ and $\left| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \right|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^2 = 1$.

The uniqueness of $(a_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be proved as in the finite case. Thus part (1) of (b) is proved. To prove (2), we shall show that for every interval I of \mathbb{N} with $\#I > 1$ and either $\min I > 1$ or $\min I = 1$ and $\max I = 2n$, we have $\left| \sum_{j \in I} a_j \right|^2 < \sum_{j \in I} a_j^2$.

If I is finite and satisfies one of the above two conditions then the proof is identical with the corresponding one in part (a). Thus we assume that I is infinite and $\min I > 1$.

If $\min I = 2m + 1$, then

$$\sum_{j=2m+1}^{\infty} a_j = \sum_{j=2m+2}^{\infty} a_j + a_{2m+1} = 1 - r_{m+1} + a_{2m+1} > 0 \text{ and}$$

$$\sum_{j=2m}^{\infty} a_j = 1 - r_m > 0 \text{ and } r_m > a_{2m+1}.$$

Hence Lemma 6.4 yields the result.

If $\min I = 2m$ then $a_{2m} < 0$ and $\sum_{j=2m+1}^{\infty} a_j > 0$. Hence

$$\left| \sum_{j=2m}^{\infty} a_j \right|^2 < a_{2m}^2 + \left| \sum_{j=2m+1}^{\infty} a_j \right|^2 < \sum_{j=2m}^{\infty} a_j^2,$$

part (2) in (b) is proved and the proof is complete. \square

For $x \in J$, we denote $\mathcal{N}(x) = \{\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{I} \text{ } x\text{-norming partition}\}$.

Corollary 6.6. (a) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $x_k \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ such that $\#\mathcal{N}(x_k) = k$.

(b) There exists $x_{\infty} \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ such that $\#\mathcal{N}(x_{\infty}) = \aleph_0$.

Proof. (a) Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k = 1$ then every e_n satisfies the conclusion. If $k > 1$ we choose $(r_i)_{i=1}^k$ and set $x_k = \sum_{j=1}^{2k-1} a_j e_j$, where $(a_j)_{j=1}^{2k-1}$ is the sequence associated to $(r_i)_{i=1}^k$ in Proposition 6.5.

Let $\{I_p\}_{p \in G}$ be an x_k -norming partition. Then Proposition 6.5 yields that there is at most one I_p with $\#I_p > 1$ and, if it exists, then $\min I_p = 1, \max I_p = 2l - 1$. Therefore $x_k \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ and $\#\mathcal{N}(x_k) = k$.

(b) The vector x_{∞} is defined in a similar way. \square

Proposition 6.7. The set of all $x \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ for which $\#\mathcal{N}(x_k) > \aleph_0$ is uncountable.

Proof. We take $x = a_1 e_1 + a_2 e_2 + a_3 e_3 \in E$ and we set $y = -a_3 e_4 - a_2 e_5 - a_1 e_6$. Then we decompose \mathbb{N} into $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ disjoint intervals with $\#F_n = 6 \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. We also denote $x_n + y_n$ the shift of $x + y$ into the interval F_n , and $z = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n}(x_n + y_n)$.

Let $\{I_i\}_{i \in G}$ be a z -norming partition. Then

(1) For every $i \in G$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\text{either } I_i \subset \text{supp}(x_n) \text{ or } I_i \subset \text{supp}(y_n).$$

(2) For every $i \in G$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\text{either } I_i = \text{supp}(x_n) \text{ or } I_i = \text{supp}(y_n) \text{ or } \exists k \in F_n \text{ with } I_i = \{k\}.$$

Both assertions are easily established. Therefore, if we denote

$$\mathcal{I}_{x_n} = \{\{k\} : k \in \text{supp}(x_n)\}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{x_n} = \text{supp}(x_n)$$

and we define

$$P = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\mathcal{I}_{x_n}, \mathcal{L}_{x_n}\} \times \{\mathcal{I}_{y_n}, \mathcal{L}_{y_n}\},$$

then every $\mathcal{I} \in P$ defines a z -norming partition, showing that $(\|z\|_J)^{-1}z \in \text{Ext}(B_J)$ and admits uncountable many z -norming partitions. Since z is different for different vectors in E , the result is proved. \square

Remark 6.8. *If for some $x \in J$ the set of x -norming partitions is uncountable, then this set has the cardinality of the continuum. Indeed, we showed in Remark 3.6 that this set is in correspondence one-to-one with a closed subset of $\{0, 1\}^N$.*

Proof of Proposition 6.1. It is a direct consequence of Corollary 6.6, Proposition 6.7 and Remark 6.8. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Amemiya and I. Ito, *Weakly null sequences in James spaces on trees*, Kodai Math. J. **4** (1981), 418–425.
- [2] A. Andrew, *James's quasi-reflexive space is not isomorphic to any subspace of its dual*, Israel J. Math. **38** (1981), 276–282.
- [3] A. Andrew, *Spreading basic sequences and subspaces of James' quasi-reflexive space*, Math. Scand. **48** (1981), 109–118.
- [4] S. Bellenot, *Transfinite duals of quasireflexive Banach spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **273** (1982), 551–577.
- [5] S. Bellenot, *The maximum path theorem and extreme points of James's space*, Studia Math. **94** (1989), 1–15.
- [6] S. Bellenot *Isometries of James spaces*, Contemp. Math. A.M.S. **85** (1989), 1–18.
- [7] C. Bessaga and A. Pełczyński, *On extreme points in separable conjugate space*, Israel J. Math. **4** (1966), 262–264.
- [8] P.G. Casazza, *James' quasi-reflexive space is primary*, Israel J. Math **26** (1977), 294–305.
- [9] P.G. Casazza, B.L. Lin, and R. H. Lohman, *On James' quasi-reflexive Banach space*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **67** (1977), 265–271.
- [10] G. Choquet, *Theory of Capacities*, Annales de l'Institut Fourier, **5** (1954), 131–295.
- [11] H. Fetter and B. Gamboa de Buen, *The James Forest* Lecture Note Series London Math. Soc. **236**, 1997.
- [12] V.P. Fonf, J. Lindenstrauss and R.R. Phelps *Infinite Dimensional Convexity*, Handbook of the Geometry of Banach spaces. North Holland vol. I (2001), 599–670.
- [13] R.C. James, *A non-reflexive Banach space isometric with its second conjugate space*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **37** (1951), 174–177.
- [14] R.C. James, *Banach spaces quasi-reflexive of order one*, Studia Math. **60** (1977), 157–177.
- [15] J. Lindenstrauss, *On James's paper "Separable conjugate spaces"*, Israel J. Math. **9** (1971), 279–284.
- [16] G. Pisier, *The dual J^* of the James space has cotype 2 and the Gordon-Lewis property*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **103** (1988), 323–331.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS, FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ZOGRAFOU CAMPUS, 157 80, ATHENS, GREECE.

Email address: sargyros@math.ntua.gr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CANTABRIA, AVENIDA DE LOS CASTROS S/N, 39071 SANTANDER, SPAIN.

Email address: manuel.gonzalez@unican.es