Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae

Persephone Kiriakouli

Characterizations of spreading models of l^1

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 41 (2000), No. 1, 79--95

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/119142

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 2000

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.

This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://project.dml.cz

Characterizations of spreading models of l^1

P. Kiriakouli

Abstract. Rosenthal in [11] proved that if (f_k) is a uniformly bounded sequence of real-valued functions which has no pointwise converging subsequence then (f_k) has a subsequence which is equivalent to the unit basis of l^1 in the supremum norm.

Kechris and Louveau in [6] classified the pointwise convergent sequences of continuous real-valued functions, which are defined on a compact metric space, by the aid of a countable ordinal index "γ". In this paper we prove some local analogues of the above Rosenthal 's theorem (spreading models of l^1) for a uniformly bounded and pointwise convergent sequence (f_k) of continuous real-valued functions on a compact metric space for which there exists a countable ordinal ξ such that $\gamma((f_{n_k})) > \omega^\xi$ for every strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers. Also we obtain a characterization of some subclasses of Baire-1 functions by the aid of spreading models of l^1.

Keywords: uniformly bounded sequences of continuous real-valued functions, convergence index, spreading models of l^1, Baire-1 functions

Classification: 46B20, 46E99

1. Introduction

By $\mathbb{N}$ we mean the set of all natural numbers (i.e., $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$), by ω we mean the first infinite ordinal (i.e., $\omega = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$) and by ω_1 we mean the first uncountable ordinal. If X is a set then: $|X|$ denotes the cardinal number of X, $[X]^{<\omega}$ the set of all finite subsets of X and $[X]$ the set of all infinite subsets of X. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the Schreier family (i.e., $\mathcal{S} = \{\emptyset\} \cup \{A \subset \mathbb{N} : A \neq \emptyset, |A| \leq \min A\}$). Alspach and Argyros in [1] defined the generalized Schreier families $\mathcal{F}_\xi$, $\xi < \omega_1$, where $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset\} \cup \{\{n\} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{S}$.

A real-valued function f defined on a set X is bounded if $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)| < +\infty$. A sequence (f_k) of real-valued functions defined on a set X is uniformly bounded if $\sup_k \|f_k\|_\infty < +\infty$.

Rosenthal in [11] proved that if (f_k) is a uniformly bounded sequence of real-valued functions which has no pointwise converging subsequence then (f_k) has a subsequence which is equivalent to the unit basis of l^1 in the supremum norm.

If (f_k) is a sequence of real-valued functions and $1 \leq \xi < \omega_1$ an ordinal we say that (f_k) is l^1_ξ-spreading model (or spreading model of l^1 of order ξ) if there are positive real numbers C and M such that

$$C \sum_{i=1}^m |c_i| \leq \| \sum_{i=1}^m c_i f_{k_i} \|_\infty \leq M \sum_{i=1}^m |c_i|$$

for every $F = \{k_1 < \ldots < k_m\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$ and for every real numbers $c_1, \ldots, c_m$.

Kechris and Louveau in [6] defined the convergence index "γ" of a sequence of continuous real-valued functions defined on a compact metric space and proved that $\gamma((f_k)) < \omega_1$ iff (f_k) is pointwise converging.

This paper is a continuation of the paper [8]. By using some results of [1], [3] and [8] and using few combinatorial lemmas we prove the following basic results:

If K is a compact metric space, (f_k) a uniformly bounded and pointwise converging sequence of continuous real-valued functions on K and $1 \leq \xi < \omega_1$ then the following hold: (a) If $\gamma((f_{n_k})) > \omega^\xi$ for every strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers then there exists a strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers such that the sequence (f_{n_k}) is l^1_ξ-spreading model (cf. Theorem 3.1). (b) If (n_k) is a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers and (n'_k) a subsequence of (n_k) such that the sequence $(f_{n'_{2k+1}} - f_{n'_{2k}})$ is l^1_ξ-spreading model then $\gamma((f_{n_k})) > \omega^\xi$ (cf. Theorem 3.2).

By using (b) we prove that: If the sequence (f_k) is l^1_ξ-spreading model then $\gamma((f_{n_k})) > \omega^\xi$ for every strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers (cf. Theorem 3.3). Combining these results and [8] we obtain some criteria (characterizations) for l^1_ξ-spreading models (cf. Theorem 3.4).

Also Kechris and Louveau in [6] classified the bounded Baire-1 functions, which are defined on a compact metric space K, to the subclasses $\mathcal{B}^\xi_1(K)$, $\xi < \omega_1$. Professor S. Negrepontis and the author ([7] or [10; Theorem 3.8]) proved the following: If K is compact metric space, $1 \leq \xi < \omega_1$, f a Baire-1 function on K with $f \notin \mathcal{B}^\xi_1(K)$ and (f_k) a uniformly bounded sequence of continuous real-valued functions on K pointwise converging to f, then (f_k) has a subsequence which is l^1_ξ-spreading model (cf. Theorem 3.5 (i)). In this paper we obtain this result as consequence of Theorem 3.1. Also using Theorem 3.3 we obtain the following result:

If K is a compact metric space, $1 \leq \xi < \omega_1$, f a bounded real-valued function on K and (f_k) a uniformly bounded sequence of continuous real-valued functions defined on K and pointwise converging to f such that for every sequence (g_k) of convex blocks of (f_k) (i.e., $g_k \in conv((f_p)_{p\geq k})$ for all k) there exists a subsequence of (g_k) which is l^1_ξ-spreading model then $f \notin \mathcal{B}^\xi_1(K)$ (cf. Theorem 3.5 (ii)). (Here $conv((h_k))$ denotes the set of convex combinations of the h_k's.) For $\xi = 1$, the above result has been proved by Haydon, Odell and Rosenthal in [5].

By using the above results we prove the following: (i) If every uniformly bounded and pointwise converging to zero sequence (f_k) of continuous real-valued functions on a compact metric space K with $\inf_k \|f_k\|_\infty > 0$ has a subsequence which is l^1_ξ-spreading model then all bounded and non-continuous Baire-1 functions on K do not belong to $\mathcal{B}^\xi_1(K)$. (ii) If every uniformly bounded and pointwise converging to zero sequence of continuous real-valued functions on a compact metric space K does not have a subsequence which is l^1_ξ-spreading model, then all bounded Baire-1 functions on K belong to $\mathcal{B}_1^\xi(K)$ (cf. Theorem 3.6).

2. Preliminaries

Let K be a compact metric space and $C(K)$ the set of continuous real-valued functions on K. By $\mathbb{R}$ we mean the set of all real numbers. A function $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$ is Baire-1 if there exists a sequence (f_k) in C(K) that converges pointwise to f. Let $\mathcal{B}_1(K)$ be the set of all bounded Baire-1 real-valued functions on K. Haydon, Odell and Rosenthal in [5], Kechris and Louveau in [6] defined the oscillation index $\beta(f)$ of a general function $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$ and proved that f is Baire-1 iff $\beta(f) < \omega_1$.

Definition 2.1 (cf. [5], [6]). Let K be a compact metric space, $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$, $P \subseteq K$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $P^0_{\epsilon,f} = P$ and for any ordinal α let $P^{\alpha+1}_{\epsilon,f}$ be the set of those $x \in P^\alpha_{\epsilon,f}$ such that for every open set U around x there are two points x_1 and x_2 in $P^\alpha_{\epsilon,f} \cap U$ such that $|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \geq \epsilon$.

At a limit ordinal α we set $P^\alpha_{\epsilon,f} = \bigcap_{\beta<\alpha} P^\beta_{\epsilon,f}$.

Let $\beta(f,\epsilon)$ be the least α with $K^\alpha_{\epsilon,f} = \emptyset$ if such an α exists, and $\beta(f,\epsilon) = \omega_1$, otherwise. Define the oscillation index $\beta(f)$ of f by

$$\beta(f) = \sup\{\beta(f,\epsilon) : \epsilon > 0\}.$$

For every $\xi < \omega_1$ we define $\mathcal{B}_1^\xi(K) = \{f \in \mathcal{B}_1(K) : \ \beta(f) \leq \omega^\xi\}$.

The complexity of pointwise convergent sequences of continuous real-valued functions defined on a compact metric space is described by a countable ordinal index "γ" which is defined in the following way.

Definition 2.2 (cf. [6]). Let K be a compact metric space, (f_k) a sequence of continuous real-valued functions defined on K, $P \subseteq K$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $P^0_{\epsilon,(f_k)} = P$ and for any ordinal α let $P^{\alpha+1}_{\epsilon,(f_k)}$ be the set of those $x \in P^\alpha_{\epsilon,(f_k)}$ such that for every open set U around x and for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there are $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m > n > p$ and a point x' in $P^\alpha_{\epsilon,(f_k)} \cap U$ such that $|f_m(x') - f_n(x')| \geq \epsilon$.

At a limit ordinal α we set $P^\alpha_{\epsilon,(f_k)} = \bigcap_{\beta<\alpha} P^\beta_{\epsilon,(f_k)}$. (It can be noticed that $P^\alpha_{\epsilon,(f_k)}$ is a closed subset of P in the relative topology of P.) Let $\gamma((f_k),\epsilon)$ be the least α with $K^\alpha_{\epsilon,(f_k)} = \emptyset$ if such an α exists, and $\gamma((f_k),\epsilon) = \omega_1$, otherwise. (Notice that if $\gamma((f_k),\epsilon) < \omega_1$ then it is a successor ordinal.) Define the convergence index $\gamma((f_k))$ of (f_k) by

$$\gamma((f_k)) = \sup\{\gamma((f_k),\epsilon) : \epsilon > 0\}.$$

Also in [6] it is proved that, $\gamma((f_k)) < \omega_1$ iff (f_k) is pointwise converging.

Generalized Schreier families.

Definition 2.3 (cf. [1])**.** If F and H are finite non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then we define $F < H$ iff $\max F < \min H$, $n \leq F$ iff $n \leq \min F$. Let $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}_0^{'} = \{\{n\} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_1^{'}$ be the usual Schreier family, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_1^{'} = \{\emptyset\} \cup \{A \subset \mathbb{N} : A \neq \emptyset, |A| \leq \min A\}$. If $\mathcal{F}_\xi$, $\mathcal{F}_\xi^{'}$ have been defined then we set

$$\mathcal{F}_{\xi+1} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Big\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} F_i : F_1, \dots , F_k \in \mathcal{F}_\xi \ \text{ with } \ k \leq F_1 < \dots < F_k \Big\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_{\xi+1}^{'} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Big\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} F_i : F_1, \dots , F_k \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^{'} \ \text{ with } \ k \leq F_1 < \dots < F_k \Big\}.$$

If ξ is a limit ordinal with $\mathcal{F}_\zeta$, $\mathcal{F}_\zeta^{'}$ defined for each $\zeta < \xi$, choose and fix a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals (ξ_k) and a strictly increasing sequence of successor ordinals $(\xi_k^{'})$ with $\xi = \sup_k \xi_k = \sup_k \xi_k^{'}$ and let

$$\mathcal{F}_\xi = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{F \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_k} : \min F \geq k\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_\xi^{'} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{F \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_k^{'}}^{'} : \min F \geq k\}.$$

It can be noticed that the families $\mathcal{F}_m$, $1 \leq m < \omega$, appeared for the first time in an example constructed by Alspach and Odell [2]. (Also it is obvious that $\mathcal{F}_m = \mathcal{F}_m^{'}$ for every $m < \omega$.)

Lemma 2.4. (a) *For every $\zeta < \xi < \omega_1$ there exists $n \equiv n(\zeta, \xi) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $n \leq F \in \mathcal{F}_\zeta$ then $F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$ and, if $n \leq F \in \mathcal{F}_\zeta^{'}$ then $F \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^{'}$* (see also [3; Lemma 2.1.8 (a)]).

(b) *For every $\xi < \omega_1$, whenever $F = \{n_1 < \dots < n_k\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$ (resp. $F = \{n_1 < \dots < n_k\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^{'}$) and $m_i \geq n_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ then we have $\{m_1, \dots , m_k\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$ (resp. $\{m_1, \dots , m_k\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^{'}$)* (see also [3; Lemma 2.1.8 (b)]).

(c) *If $\zeta \leq \xi < \omega_1$ then there exists a strictly increasing sequence (λ_k) of natural numbers such that if $F \in \mathcal{F}_\zeta^{'}$ then $\{\lambda_j : j \in F\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$.*

(d) *If $\zeta \leq \xi < \omega_1$ then there exists a strictly increasing sequence (μ_k) of natural numbers such that if $F \in \mathcal{F}_\zeta$ then $\{\mu_j : j \in F\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi^{'}$.*

Proof: (a) and (b) are proved easily by induction on $\xi < \omega_1$. We shall prove (c) by induction on $\xi < \omega_1$. For $\xi = 0$ it is obvious by Definition 2.3. Suppose that $\xi \geq 1$ and that the conclusion holds for every $\eta < \xi$. Assume that $\xi = \eta + 1$, where $\eta < \omega_1$. If $\zeta \leq \eta$ then there exists a strictly increasing sequence (λ_k) of natural numbers such that if $F \in \mathcal{F}'_\zeta$ then $\{\lambda_j : j \in F\} \in \mathcal{F}_\eta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\eta+1} = \mathcal{F}_\xi$. Let $\zeta = \xi = \eta + 1$. By the induction assumption, there exists a strictly increasing sequence (λ_k) of natural numbers such that if $F \in \mathcal{F}'_\eta$ then $\{\lambda_j : j \in F\} \in \mathcal{F}_\eta$. Then we easily see that if $F \in \mathcal{F}'_\zeta = \mathcal{F}'_{\eta+1}$ then $\{\lambda_j : j \in F\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\eta+1} = \mathcal{F}_\xi$.

Assume ξ is a limit ordinal and let (ξ_k) be the strictly increasing sequence of ordinals with $\sup_k \xi_k = \xi$ that defines the family $\mathcal{F}_\xi$. If $\zeta < \xi$ then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\zeta < \xi_n$ for all $n \geq n_0$. We set $\lambda_k^{n_0} = k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By induction on $n > n_0$, there exists a subsequence (λ_k^n) of (λ_k^{n-1}) such that if $F \in \mathcal{F}'_\zeta$ then $\{\lambda_j^n : j \in F\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_n}$. Consider the sequence $(\lambda_{n_0+k}^{n_0+k})$. By using the assumption and (b) we have that if $F \in \mathcal{F}'_\zeta$ and $k = \min F$ then $F' = \{\lambda_{n_0+j}^{n_0+j} : j \in F\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_{n_0+k}}$ and $F' \geq \lambda_{n_0+k}^{n_0+k} \geq n_0 + k$. Therefore $F' \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$.

Now suppose that $\zeta = \xi$ and let (ζ'_k) be the strictly increasing sequence of successor ordinals with $\sup_k \zeta'_k = \zeta$ that defines the family $\mathcal{F}'_\zeta$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $j_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $j_n \geq n$ and $\zeta'_n < \xi_{j_n}$. We set $\lambda_k^0 = k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By induction on $n \geq 1$, there exists a subsequence (λ_k^n) of (λ_k^{n-1}) such that if $F \in \mathcal{F}'_{\zeta'_n}$ then $\{\lambda_j^n : j \in F\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_{j_n}}$. The proof can be finished by taking the sequence $(\lambda_{j_k}^k)$ and using (b) and Definition 2.3. Similarly, we prove the condition (d). □

Repeated Averages.

S. Argyros, S. Mercourakis and A. Tsarpalias [3] defined a family $\{(M, \xi) : M \in [\mathbb{N}], \xi < \omega_1\}$ called Repeated Averages Hierarchy. The definition of this family follows.

Definition 2.5 (cf. [3])**.** Let $S_{l^1}^+$ be the positive part of the unit sphere of l^1. For $A = (a_k)$ in $S_{l^1}^+$ and $F = (x_k)$ bounded sequence in a Banach space X we denote by $A \cdot F$ the usual matrices product, that is:

$$A \cdot F = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k x_k.$$

For an $A = (a_k)$ in $S_{l^1}^+$ we set $\operatorname{supp} A = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : a_k \neq 0\}$. A sequence $(A_k) \subseteq S_{l^1}^+$ is said to be *block sequence* if $\operatorname{supp} A_k < \operatorname{supp} A_{k+1}$ for every $k = 1, 2, \ldots$.

For an $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ an *M-summability method* is a block sequence (A_k) with $A_k \in S_{l^1}^+$ and $M = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{supp} A_k$.

For every $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and $\xi < \omega_1$, an M-summability method (ξ_k^M) is defined inductively in the following way. (The notation (M, ξ) is also used for the same method.)

(i) For $\xi = 0$, $M = (m_k)$ we set $\xi_k^M = e_{m_k}$, where (e_k) is the unit basis of l^1 (i.e., $e_k = (0, 0, \dots, 1, 0, \dots)$, the 1 occurring in the k^{th} place).

(ii) If $\xi = \zeta + 1$, $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and (ζ_k^M) has been defined then we define (ξ_k^M) inductively as follows. We set $k_1 = 0$, $s_1 = \min \operatorname{supp} \zeta_1^M$, and

$$\xi_1^M = \frac{\zeta_1^M + \ldots + \zeta_{s_1}^M}{s_1} .$$

Suppose that for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, k_j, s_j have been defined and

$$\xi_j^M = \frac{\zeta_{k_j+1}^M + \ldots + \zeta_{k_j+s_j}^M}{s_j} .$$

Then we set $k_n = k_{n-1} + s_{n-1}$, $s_n = \min \operatorname{supp} \zeta_{k_n}^M$ and

$$\xi_n^M = \frac{\zeta_{k_n+1}^M + \ldots + \zeta_{k_n+s_n}^M}{s_n} .$$

This completes the definition for successor ordinals.

(iii) If ξ is a limit ordinal and if we suppose that for every $\zeta < \xi$, $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ the sequence (ζ_k^M) has been defined, then we define (ξ_k^M) as follows: We denote by (ζ_k) the strictly increasing sequence of successor ordinals with $\sup_k \zeta_k = \xi$ that defines the family $\mathcal{F}_\xi^{'}$.

For $M = (m_j)$ we define inductively $M_1 = M$, $n_1 = m_1$, $M_2 = \{m_j : m_j \notin \operatorname{supp} [\zeta_{n_1}]_1^{M_1}\}$, $n_2 = \min M_2$, $M_3 = \{m_j : m_j \notin \operatorname{supp} [\zeta_{n_2}]_1^{M_2}\}$ and $n_3 = \min M_3$, and so on.

We set $\xi_1^M = [\zeta_{n_1}]_1^{M_1}, \xi_2^M = [\zeta_{n_2}]_1^{M_2}, \dots, \xi_k^M = [\zeta_{n_k}]_1^{M_k}, \dots$. Hence (ξ_k^M) has been defined. This completes the definition of Repeated Averages Hierarchy.

Remark 2.6 (cf. [3])**.** By induction on $\xi < \omega_1$ it is easy to show that for every $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and $\xi < \omega_1$ we have $\{\operatorname{supp} \xi_k^L : L \in [M], k = 1, 2, \dots\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\xi^{'}$.

Notation 2.7 (cf. [3])**.** For $F \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$ and $A = (a_k)$ in l^1 we denote by $\langle A, F\rangle$ the quantity $\sum_{k \in F} a_k$.

Definition 2.8. A family $\mathcal{F}$ of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ is said to be *hereditary* if $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $G \subseteq F$ implies $G \in \mathcal{F}$. A family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$ is said to be *compact* if the set of all characteristic functions χ_F, where $F \in \mathcal{F}$, is a compact subspace of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the product topology. The family $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be *adequate* if $\mathcal{F}$ is hereditary and compact.

By Proposition 2.3.2 of [3], Theorem 2.2.6 of [3] and Lemma 2.4(d) we have the following theorem:

Theorem 2.9. *Let $\xi < \omega_1$ be an ordinal, $\mathcal{F}$ an adequate family of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and δ a positive real number such that for every $N \in [M]$ and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $\sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \langle \xi_n^N, F \rangle > \delta$.*

Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence (m_k) of members of M such that $\{m_j : j \in E\} \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $E \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$.

Trees.

Definition 2.10 (cf. [4]). Let X be a set. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $X^n := \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) : x_1, \dots, x_n \in X\}$.

(i) A *tree* T on X will be a subset of $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty X^n$ with the property that $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in T$ whenever $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}) \in T$.

(ii) Proceeding by induction we associate to each ordinal α a new tree T^α as follows: We set $T^0 = T$. If T^α is obtained, let

$$T^{\alpha+1} = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in T^\alpha : (x_1, \dots, x_n, x) \in T^\alpha \text{ for some } x \in X\}.$$

If β is a limit ordinal we set $T^\beta = \bigcap_{\alpha < \beta} T^\alpha$.

Notation 2.11. If T is a tree on a set X and $Y \subseteq X$ then we set:

$$T_{|Y} := T \cap \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty Y^n.$$

In the proofs of the main results (Theorems 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4) we shall use some results from [8] which are contained in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.12. *Let K be a compact metric space, $1 \leq \xi < \omega_1$ and (f_k) a sequence of continuous real-valued functions on K. The following hold:*

(i) *If $\gamma((f_{n_k})) > \omega^\xi$ for every strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers then there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers such that for every subsequence (n_k') of (n_k) and for every $E = \{k_1 < \dots < k_\lambda\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$, $(\lambda \in \mathbb{N})$, there exists $x_E \in K$ with $|f_{n'_{2k_j+1}}(x_E) - f_{n'_{2k_j}}(x_E)| > \epsilon$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \lambda$.*

(ii) *If $\epsilon > 0$, (n_k) a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers and (n_k') a subsequence of (n_k) such that for every $E = \{k_1 < \dots < k_\lambda\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$, $(\lambda \in \mathbb{N})$, there exists $x_E \in K$ with $|f_{n'_{2k_j+1}}(x_E) - f_{n'_{2k_j}}(x_E)| > \epsilon$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \lambda$, then $\gamma((f_{n_k}), \epsilon) > \omega^\xi$.*

Proof: (i) We start with the next claim.

Claim. There exist a strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\gamma((f_{n_k'}), \epsilon) > \omega^\xi$ for every subsequence (n_k') of (n_k).

[*Proof of Claim.* Assume the contrary. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$ and (n_k) strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers there exists a subsequence $(n_k^{'})$ of (n_k) such that $\gamma((f_{n_k^{'}}), \epsilon) \leq \omega^{\xi}$. We set $n_k^0 = k$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By induction on $i \geq 1$, there exists a subsequence (n_k^i) of (n_k^{i-1}) such that $\gamma((f_{n_k^i}), \frac{1}{i}) \leq \omega^{\xi}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\gamma((f_{n_k^k})) \leq \omega^{\xi}$, a contradiction.]

Therefore, by Claim and [8; Theorem 3.3 (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii)], there are $\epsilon > 0$ and a strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers such that for every subsequence $(n_k^{'})$ of (n_k) and for every $E = \{k_1 < \ldots, k_\lambda\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$, $(\lambda \in \mathbb{N})$, there is $x_E \in K$ with $|f_{n'_{2k_j+1}}(x_E) - f_{n'_{2k_j}}(x_E)| > \epsilon$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \lambda$.

(ii) By [8; Lemma 3.1.3, Definition 3.1.1], $\gamma((f_{n_k^{'}}), \epsilon) > \omega^{\xi}$ and hence $\gamma((f_{n_k}), \epsilon) > \omega^{\xi}$. □

3. Main results

In this section the complexity of pointwise convergent sequences of continuous real-valued functions defined on a compact metric space as described by the convergence index "γ" produces some local analogues (spreading models) of Rosenthal' s theorem (cf. Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3). By using these results and [8] we obtain a characterization of l_ξ^1-spreading models (cf. Theorem 3.4) and a characterization of those bounded Baire-1 functions which have the oscillation index greater than ω^{ξ}, where $1 \leq \xi < \omega_1$ (cf. Theorem 3.5). We start with the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let K be a compact metric space, $1 \leq \xi < \omega_1$ and (f_k) a uniformly bounded and pointwise converging sequence of continuous real-valued functions on K such that $\gamma((f_{n_k})) > \omega^{\xi}$ for every strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers.*

Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers such that the sequence (f_{n_k}) is l_ξ^1-spreading model.

For the proof of this theorem we need Lemmas 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.7, 3.1.8 which are proved by using a method, developed by Professor S. Negrepontis and the author (cf. [7] or [10; Definition 3.6, Lemma 3.7]). We start the next definition.

Definition 3.1.1 (cf. [1])**.** Let K be a compact metric space and $(f_k) \subseteq C(K)$ pointwise converging on K. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and let

$$A_{n,m}^{+} = \{x \in K : f_n(x) - f_m(x) > \epsilon\}, \quad A_{n,m}^{-} = \{x \in K : f_n(x) - f_m(x) < -\epsilon\}.$$

For each countable ordinal α we define inductively a subset of K by $O^0(\epsilon, (f_k), K) = K$,

$$O^{\alpha+1}(\epsilon, (f_k), K) = \{x \in O^{\alpha}(\epsilon, (f_k), K) : \quad \text{for every neighborhood } U \text{ of } x$$

there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$ there exists $m_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\bigcap_{m \geq m_n} A^+_{n,m} \cap O^\alpha(\epsilon, (f_k), K) \cap U \neq \emptyset \text{ or } \bigcap_{m \geq m_n} A^-_{n,m} \cap O^\alpha(\epsilon, (f_k), K) \cap U \neq \emptyset\}.$$

If β is a limit ordinal, $O^\beta(\epsilon, (f_k), K) = \bigcap_{\alpha<\beta} O^\alpha(\epsilon, (f_k), K)$.

Remark 3.1.2. It is easy to show that if (n_k) is a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers and $x \in O^\alpha(\epsilon, (f_{n_k}), K)$ for some $\alpha < \omega_1$, then for every strictly increasing sequence (m_k) of natural numbers and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m_j \in \{n_k : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$ for all $j \geq l$ we have $x \in O^\alpha(\epsilon, (f_{m_k}), K)$.

Definition 3.1.3. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n < \omega_1$ we say that the n-tuple $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has **property** (A) if whenever K is a compact metric space, $(f_k) \subseteq C(K)$ pointwise converging to f, (n_k) a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every subsequence (n'_k) of (n_k) and for every $E_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_1}, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_n}$ with $m \leq E_1 < \dots < E_n$ there exists $x \in K$ such that $|f_{n'_{2j+1}}(x) - f_{n'_{2j}}(x)| > \epsilon$ for all $j \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$, then there exists a subsequence (n'_k) of (n_k) such that $O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\dots+\omega^{\xi_1}}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n'_k}), K) \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 3.1.4. *For every $\xi < \omega_1$, whenever $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (A) then $(\xi, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (A).*

Proof: We proceed by induction on $\xi < \omega_1$.

Case 1. $(\xi = 0)$. Assume that $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ have property (A) and we shall show that $(0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (A). Indeed, let K be a compact metric space, $(f_k) \subseteq C(K)$ pointwise converging to f, $\epsilon > 0$, (n_k) a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every subsequence (n'_k) of (n_k) and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $E_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_1}, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_n}$ with $m \leq k < E_1 < \dots < E_n$ there exists $x \in K$ with $|f_{n'_{2j+1}}(x) - f_{n'_{2j}}(x)| > \epsilon$ for all $j \in \{k\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$. We shall prove that there exists a subsequence (n'_k) of (n_k) such that $O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\dots+\omega^{\xi_1}+1}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n'_k}), K) \neq \emptyset$.

We set $P_1 := \{x \in K : |f_{n_{2m+1}}(x) - f_{n_{2m}}(x)| \geq \epsilon\}$. By the continuity of $f_{n_{2m}}, f_{n_{2m+1}}$, P_1 is a closed subset of K and hence it is a compact subspace of K. Also we set $n^0_k = n_{2m+k+1}$ for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Then for every subsequence (n'_k) of (n^0_k) we consider the subsequence (n''_k) of (n_k) with $n''_k = n_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq 2m+1$ and $n''_k = n'_k$ for $k \geq 2m+2$. By applying the assumption we have that for every $E_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_1}, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_n}$ with $m+1 \leq E_1 < \dots < E_n$ there exists $x \in P_1$ such that $|f_{n'_{2j+1}}(x) - f_{n'_{2j}}(x)| > \epsilon$ for all $j \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$. Since $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (A), there exists a subsequence (n^1_k) of (n^0_k) and $x_1 \in O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\dots+\omega^{\xi_1}}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n^1_k}), P_1)$. Then clearly $|f_{n_{2m+1}}(x_1) - f_{n_{2m}}(x_1)| \geq \epsilon$.

By induction on $j \geq 1$ and using that $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (A), there exists a strictly increasing sequence (n^{j+1}_k) of elements of $\{n^j_{2m+k+1} : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$ and

$x_{j+1} \in K$ with $x_{j+1} \in O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\ldots+\omega^{\xi_1}}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n_k^{j+1}}), P_{j+1})$, where $P_{j+1} := \{x \in K : |f_{n^j_{2m+1}}(x) - f_{n^j_{2m}}(x)| \geq \epsilon\}$.

Since K is compact metric space, there exists a subsequence (x_{λ_j}) of (x_j) and $x \in K$ such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} x_{\lambda_j} = x$. Then $|f_{n^{\lambda_j - 1}_{2m+1}}(x_{\lambda_j}) - f_{n^{\lambda_j-1}_{2m}}(x_{\lambda_j})| \geq \epsilon$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Then it is easy to choose a subsequence (λ_{μ_j}) of (λ_j) and $n^{'}_j \in \{n^{\lambda_{\mu_j}-1}_{2m}, n^{\lambda_{\mu_j}-1}_{2m+1}\}$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that one of the following holds:

(1) $f_{n^{'}_j}(x_{\lambda_{\mu_j}}) - f(x_{\lambda_{\mu_j}}) > \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots$,

(2) $f_{n^{'}_j}(x_{\lambda_{\mu_j}}) - f(x_{\lambda_{\mu_j}}) < -\frac{\epsilon}{3}$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots$.

We shall prove that $x \in O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\ldots+\omega^{\xi_1}+1}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n^{'}_k}), K)$. Indeed, let U be a neighborhood of x. Since $\lim_{j\to\infty} x_{\lambda_{\mu_j}} = x$, there exists $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{\lambda_{\mu_j}} \in U$ for all $j \geq j_0$.

Suppose that (1) holds. Since (f_k) converges pointwise to f for every $j \geq j_0$ there exists $m_j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$f_{n^{'}_j}(x_{\lambda_{\mu_j}}) - f_{n^{'}_m}(x_{\lambda_{\mu_j}}) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{3} > \frac{\epsilon}{4} \quad \text{for all} \quad m \geq m_j.$$

So, by using Remark 3.1.2, $x_{\lambda_{\mu_j}} \in \bigcap_{m\geq m_j} A^{+}_{j,m} \cap O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\ldots+\omega^{\xi_1}}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n^{'}_k}), K) \cap U$ for all $j \geq j_0$. Therefore $x \in O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\ldots+\omega^{\xi_1}+1}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n^{'}_k}), K)$. A similar argument shows that $x \in O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\ldots+\omega^{\xi_1}+1}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n^{'}_k}), K)$ if (2) holds.

Case 2. ($\xi \geq 1$). Suppose that the conclusion holds for every $\zeta < \xi$ and we shall show it for ξ. Assume that $(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n)$ has property (A) and we shall show that $(\xi, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n)$ has property (A). Indeed, let K be a compact metric space, $(f_k) \subseteq C(K)$ pointwise converging to f, $\epsilon > 0$, (n_k) a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every subsequence $(n^{'}_k)$ of (n_k) and $E \in \mathcal{F}_\xi, E_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_1}, \ldots, E_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_n}$ with $m \leq E < E_1 < \ldots < E_n$ there exists $x \in K$ with $|f_{n^{'}_{2j+1}}(x) - f_{n^{'}_{2j}}(x)| > \epsilon$ for all $j \in E \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$. We set $n^m_k = n_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider these two subcases:

(a) $\xi = \zeta + 1$. Then for every subsequence $(n^{'}_k)$ of (n_k), $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j \geq m$ and $F_1, \ldots, F_j \in \mathcal{F}_\zeta, E_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_1}, \ldots, E_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_n}$ with $j \leq F_1 < \ldots < F_j < E_1 < \ldots < E_n$ there exists $x \in K$ such that $|f_{n^{'}_{2k+1}}(x) - f_{n^{'}_{2k}}(x)| > \epsilon$ for all $k \in \bigcup_{l=1}^j F_l \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$. By the induction hypothesis, $(\underbrace{\zeta, \ldots, \zeta}_{j-times}, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n)$ has property (A) for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. So, by induction on $j > m$, there exists a subsequence (n^j_k) of (n^{j-1}_k) such that $O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\ldots+\omega^{\xi_1}+j\omega^\zeta}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n^j_k}), K) \neq \emptyset$. We set $n^{'}_k = n^{m+k}_{m+k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, by the compactness of K and using Definition 3.1.1 and Remark 3.1.2, we get that the set $O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\ldots+\omega^{\xi_1}+\omega^\xi}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n^{'}_k}), K)$ is non-empty.

(b) ξ is a limit ordinal. Let (ζ_k) be the strictly increasing sequence of ordinals with $\sup_k \zeta_k = \xi$ that defines the family $\mathcal{F}_\xi$. Then for every subsequence (n'_k) of (n_k), $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j \geq m$ and $E \in \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_j}, E_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_1}, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_n}$ with $j \leq E < E_1 < \dots < E_n$ there exists $x \in K$ such that $|f_{n'_{2k+1}}(x) - f_{n'_{2k}}(x)| > \epsilon$ for all $k \in E \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$. By the induction hypothesis, $(\zeta_j, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (A) for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. So, by induction on $j > m$, there exists a subsequence (n_k^j) of (n_k^{j-1}) such that $O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\dots+\omega^{\xi_1}+\omega^{\zeta_j}}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n_k^j}), K)$ is non-empty. We set $n'_k = n_{m+k}^{m+k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By the compactness of K and using Definition 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, we get $O^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\dots+\omega^{\xi_1}+\omega^{\xi}}(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n'_k}), K) \neq \emptyset$. □

Lemma 3.1.5. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n < \omega_1$ the n-tuple $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (A).*

Proof: By Lemma 3.1.4, it is enough to show that the 1-tuple (ξ) has property (A) for every $\xi < \omega_1$. We shall prove it by induction on $\xi < \omega_1$. For $\xi = 0$, let K be a compact metric space, $(f_k) \subseteq C(K)$ pointwise convergent to f, (n_k) a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every subsequence (n'_k) of (n_k) and for every $E = \{k\} \in \mathcal{F}_0$ there exists $x \in K$ such that $|f_{n'_{2k+1}}(x) - f_{n'_{2k}}(x)| > \epsilon$. Then working as in the proof of the case 1 of Lemma 3.1.4 we prove that there exists a subsequence (n'_k) of (n_k) such that $O^1(\frac{\epsilon}{4}, (f_{n'_k}), K) \neq \emptyset$.

Now suppose that $\xi \geq 1$, the 1-tuple (ζ) has property (A) for every $\zeta < \xi$ and we shall prove that (ξ) has property (A). If $\xi = \zeta + 1$, then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the k-tuple $(\underbrace{\zeta, \dots, \zeta}_{k-times})$ has property (A) by Lemma 3.1.4. If ξ is a limit ordinal and (ξ_k) the strictly increasing sequence of ordinals with $\sup_k \xi_k = \xi$ that defines $\mathcal{F}_\xi$ then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the 1-tuple (ξ_k) has property (A) by the induction assumption. Therefore, by using the definition of the property (A) and using a diagonal argument we get the desired conclusion (as in the case 2 of Lemma 3.1.4). □

Definition 3.1.6. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n < \omega_1$ we say that the n-tuple $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has **property** (B) if whenever T is a tree on ω such that $0 < m_1 < \dots < m_k$ for every $(0, m_1, \dots, m_k) \in T$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that $(0) \in (T_{|N \cup \{0\}})^{\omega^{\xi_n}+\dots+\omega^{\xi_1}}$ for every $N \in [M]$, then there exists a strictly increasing sequence (m_k) of elements of M such that for every $E_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_1}, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_n}$ with $E_1 < \dots < E_n$ and $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = \{k_1 < \dots < k_\lambda\}$, (where $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$), we have $(0, m_{k_1}, \dots, m_{k_\lambda}) \in T$.

Lemma 3.1.7. *For every $\xi < \omega_1$, whenever $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (B) then $(\xi, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (B).*

Proof: We proceed by induction on $\xi < \omega_1$.

Case 1. ($\xi = 0$). Let $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ have property (B), let T be a tree on ω such that $0 < m_1 < \dots < m_k$ for every $(0, m_1, \dots, m_k) \in T$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that $(0) \in (T_{|N \cup \{0\}})^{\omega^{\xi_n} + \dots + \omega^{\xi_1} + 1}$ for every $N \in [M]$.

Claim. There exists $M_0 \in [M]$ such that for every $M' \in [M_0]$ there is $m \in M'$ such that $(0, m) \in (T_{|L \cup \{0\}})^{\omega^{\xi_n} + \dots + \omega^{\xi_1}}$ for all $L \in [M']$ with $\min L > m$.

[*Proof of Claim.* Assume the contrary. Then there exists a decreasing sequence (M_λ) of infinite subsets of M such that if $m_\lambda = \min M_\lambda$ then $m_\lambda < m_{\lambda+1}$ and $(0, m_\lambda) \notin (T_{|\{0, m_\lambda\} \cup M_{\lambda+1}})^{\omega^{\xi_n} + \dots + \omega^{\xi_1}}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the set $L = \{m_\lambda : \lambda = 1, 2, \dots\}$. Then from the assumption we have that $(0) \in (T_{|L \cup \{0\}})^{\omega^{\xi_n} + \dots + \omega^{\xi_1} + 1}$. Hence there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(0, m_\lambda) \in (T_{|L \cup \{0\}})^{\omega^{\xi_n} + \dots + \omega^{\xi_1}}$. Then $(0, m_\lambda) \in (T_{|\{0, m_\lambda\} \cup M_{\lambda+1}})^{\omega^{\xi_n} + \dots + \omega^{\xi_1}}$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of the claim.]

For every $m \in M$ we define the tree

$T_m = \{(0)\} \cup \{(0, n_1, \dots, n_j) : j \in \mathbb{N}, (0, m, n_1, \dots, n_j) \in T\}$.

By induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$, it is easy to show that $(0, m, n_1, \dots, n_j) \in (T_{|N \cup \{0\}})^\alpha$ iff $(0, n_1, \dots, n_j) \in (T_{m|N \cup \{0\}})^\alpha$ and $(0, m) \in (T_{|N \cup \{0\}})^\alpha$ iff $(0) \in (T_{m|N \cup \{0\}})^\alpha$ for every $N \in [M]$.

By repeated application of Claim and using that $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (B), we find strictly increasing sequences $M_\lambda = (m_k^\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ of elements of M and a strictly increasing sequence (m_λ) of elements of M such that for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds $m_\lambda \in M_\lambda$, $m_\lambda^\lambda \leq m_\lambda < \min M_{\lambda+1}$ and for every $E_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_1}, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_n}$ with $E_1 < \dots < E_n$ and $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = \{k_1 < \dots < k_\mu\}$, (where $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$), we have $(0, m_{k_1}^{\lambda+1}, \dots, m_{k_\mu}^{\lambda+1}) \in T_{m_\lambda}$. The proof can be finished by taking the sequence (m_λ) and using Lemma 2.4(b).

Case 2. ($\xi \geq 1$). Assume that the conclusion of our Lemma is true for every $\zeta < \xi$ and we shall show that it is true for ξ. Suppose that $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (B) and we shall show that $(\xi, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (B). Let T be a tree on ω such that $0 < m_1 < \dots < m_k$ for every $(0, m_1, \dots, m_k) \in T$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that $(0) \in (T_{|N \cup \{0\}})^{\omega^{\xi_n} + \dots + \omega^{\xi_1} + \omega^\xi}$ for all $N \in [M]$. Consider these two subcases:

(a) $\xi = \zeta + 1$. Then $(0) \in (T_{|N \cup \{0\}})^{\omega^{\xi_n} + \dots + \omega^{\xi_1} + \lambda\omega^\zeta}$ for all $N \in [M]$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ and by the induction hypothesis, $(\underbrace{\zeta, \dots, \zeta}_{\lambda-times}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (B) for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$.

(b) ξ is a limit ordinal. Let (ζ_k) be the strictly increasing sequence of ordinals with $\sup_k \zeta_k = \xi$ that defines the family $\mathcal{F}_\xi$. Then $(0) \in (T_{|N \cup \{0\}})^{\omega^{\xi_n} + \dots + \omega^{\xi_1} + \omega^{\zeta_\lambda}}$ for every $N \in [M]$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ and by the induction assumption, $(\zeta_\lambda, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (B) for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$.

By using the definition of the property (B) and using a diagonal argument we get the desired conclusion in the two subcases. $\square$

Lemma 3.1.8. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n < \omega_1$, the n-tuple $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ has property (B).*

Proof: By Lemma 3.1.7, it is enough to show that (ξ) has property (B) for every $\xi < \omega_1$. We shall use induction on ξ. Let $\xi = 0$, T be a tree on ω such that $0 < m_1 < \dots < m_k$ for every $(0, m_1, \dots, m_k) \in T$ and $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that $(0) \in (T_{|N\cup\{0\}})^1$ for every $N \in [M]$. Then there exist a strictly decreasing sequence $M_1 \supset M_2 \supset \dots \supset M_k \supset \dots$ of infinite subsets of M and a strictly increasing sequence (m_k) such that $m_k \in M_k$ and $(0, m_k) \in T$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore the sequence (m_k) is the desired sequence.

Now let $1 \le \xi < \omega_1$ such that (ζ) has property (B) for every $\zeta < \xi$. If $\xi = \zeta + 1$ then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\underbrace{\zeta, \dots, \zeta}_{k-times})$ has property (B) by Lemma 3.1.7. If ξ is a limit ordinal and (ζ_k) is the strictly increasing sequence with $\sup_k \zeta_k = \xi$ that defines the family $\mathcal{F}_\xi$ then the 1-tuple (ζ_k) has property (B) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

By using the definition of the property (B) and using a diagonal argument we prove that (ξ) has property (B). □

Proof of Theorem 3.1: By Lemma 3.1.5, the 1-tuple (ξ) has property (A). So, by Theorem 2.12(i) and by the definition of the property (A), there exist $\delta > 0$ and a subsequence $(n_k^{'})$ of (n_k) such that $O^{\omega^\xi}(\delta, (f_{n_k^{'}}), K) \neq \emptyset$. By Remark 3.1.2, $O^{\omega^\xi}(\delta, (f_{n_k^{"}}), K) \neq \emptyset$ for every subsequence $(n_k^{"})$ of $(n_k^{'})$. Consider the next tree on ω:

$$T := \{(0)\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{(0, m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \omega^{n+1} : m_1 < \dots < m_n \text{ and } \|\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_{m_i}\|_\infty \ge \delta \sum_{i=1}^n |c_i| \text{ for all } c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

We set $M := \{n_k^{'} : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$. By using a result of Alspach and Argyros ([1; Theorem 3.1]), it is easy to see that $(T_{|N\cup\{0\}})^{\omega^\xi} \neq \emptyset$ for every $N \in [M]$. By Lemma 3.1.8, (ξ) has property (B). Therefore, by the definition of the property (B) there exists a subsequence $(n_k^{"})$ of $(n_k^{'})$ such that for every $E = \{k_1 < \dots < k_\lambda\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$, (where $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$), the finite sequence $(0, n_{k_1}^{"}, \dots, n_{k_\lambda}^{"})$ belongs to T and since (f_k) is uniformly bounded we get that the sequence $(f_{n_k^{"}})$ is l_ξ^1-spreading model. □

Combining some results of [3] and [8] we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Let K be a compact metric space, $1 \le \xi < \omega_1$, (f_k) a uniformly bounded and pointwise converging sequence of continuous real-valued functions on K, (n_k) a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers and $(n_k^{'})$ a subsequence of (n_k) such that the sequence $(f_{n_{2k+1}^{'}} - f_{n_{2k}^{'}})$ is l_ξ^1-spreading model. Then $\gamma((f_{n_k})) > \omega^\xi$.*

Proof: By using Lemma 2.4(c) (for $\zeta = \xi$) and the definition of l_ξ^1-spreading model for the sequence $(f_{n_{2k+1}^{'}} - f_{n_{2k}^{'}})$ there exist a strictly increasing sequence

(λ_k) of natural numbers and $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(*) \qquad \delta \sum_{i=1}^{m} |c_i| \leq \| \sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i (f_{n'_{2\lambda_{k_i}+1}} - f_{n'_{2\lambda_{k_i}}}) \|_\infty \leq 2(\sup_k \|f_k\|_\infty) \sum_{i=1}^{m} |c_i|$$

for every $\{k_1 < \ldots < k_m\} \in \mathcal{F}'_\xi$, $c_1, \ldots, c_m \in \mathbb{R}$. For every $x \in K$ let $F_x = \{l \in \mathbb{N} : |f_{n'_{2\lambda_l+1}}(x) - f_{n'_{2\lambda_l}}(x)| \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\}$. Since (f_k) is pointwise converging the sequence $(f_{n'_{2\lambda_k+1}} - f_{n'_{2\lambda_k}})$ converges pointwise to zero and so F_x is finite for every $x \in K$. We set $\mathcal{F} = \{F \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega} : \ F \subseteq F_x \ \text{ for some } \ x \in K\}$. We shall prove that $\mathcal{F}$ is adequate. By Definition 2.8 and the definition of $\mathcal{F}$ it is enough to show that the set $\{\chi_F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is closed subspace of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the product topology. Indeed, If $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, $A = (a_n)$, with $\chi_A \in cl_{\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}}(\{\chi_F : F \in \mathcal{F}\})$ then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $x_n \in K$ such that $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subseteq F_{x_n}$. Then $a_k \in F_{x_n}$ for every $n \geq k$. Since K is a compact metric space there exist a subsequence (x_{k_n}) of (x_n) and $x \in K$ with $\lim_n x_{k_n} = x$. By the continuity of f_k's we have $A \subseteq F_x$ and so A is finite and $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence $\{\chi_F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is closed.

By $(*)$ it is easy to see that $\|\xi_n^L \cdot ((f_{n'_{2\lambda_k+1}} - f_{n'_{2\lambda_k}}))\|_\infty \geq \delta$ for every $L \in [\mathbb{N}]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for every $L \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $x \in K$ such that $|(\xi_n^L \cdot ((f_{n'_{2\lambda_k+1}} - f_{n'_{2\lambda_k}})))(x)| \geq \delta$. Also

$$\delta \leq |(\xi_n^L \cdot ((f_{n'_{2\lambda_k+1}} - f_{n'_{2\lambda_k}})))(x)| \leq \langle \xi_n^L, F_x \rangle \cdot 2 \sup_k \|f_k\|_\infty + \frac{\delta}{2}\,.$$

Then $\langle \xi_n^L, F_x \rangle \geq \frac{\delta}{4 \sup_k \|f_k\|_\infty}$. So, by Theorem 2.9, there exists a strictly increasing sequence (j_k) of natural numbers such that $\{j_l : l \in E\} \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $E \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$. We set $n''_1 = n'_1$, $n''_{2k+1} = n'_{2\lambda_{j_k}+1}$ and $n''_{2k} = n'_{2\lambda_{j_k}}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the sequence (n''_k) is a subsequence of (n_k) and for every $E = \{k_1 < \ldots < k_m\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$ there is $x_E \in K$ such that $|f_{n''_{2k_j+1}}(x_E) - f_{n''_{2k_j}}(x_E)| > \frac{\delta}{2}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.12 (ii), $\gamma((f_{n_k}), \frac{\delta}{2}) > \omega^\xi$. Hence $\gamma((f_{n_k})) > \omega^\xi$. □

Theorem 3.3. *Let K be a compact metric space, $1 \leq \xi < \omega_1$ and (f_k) a uniformly bounded and pointwise converging sequence of continuous real-valued functions on K which is l^1_ξ-spreading model. Then $\gamma((f_{n_k})) > \omega^\xi$ for every strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers.*

Proof: By induction on $1 \leq \xi < \omega_1$, it is easy to show that if $E = \{k_1 < \ldots < k_\lambda\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$ then $F = \{2k_1 < 2k_1 + 1 < \ldots < 2k_\lambda < 2k_\lambda + 1\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$. By using this fact, it is easy to see that if (f_k) is l^1_ξ-spreading model then for every strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers the sequence $(f_{n_{2k+1}} - f_{n_{2k}})$ is also l^1_ξ-spreading model and so, by Theorem 3.2, $\gamma((f_{n_k})) > \omega^\xi$. □

Combining Theorems 3.1, 3.3, 2.12 and Theorem 3.3 of [8] we get the following criteria (characterizations) for the l^1_ξ-spreading model.

Theorem 3.4. *Let K be a compact metric space, $1 \le \xi < \omega_1$ and (f_k) a uniformly bounded and pointwise converging sequence of continuous real-valued functions on K. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) *there exists a subsequence $(f_k^{'})$ of (f_k) which is l^1_ξ-spreading model;*

(ii) *there are $\epsilon > 0$ and a strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers such that for every subsequence $(n_k^{'})$ of (n_k) and for every $E = \{k_1 < \ldots < k_\lambda\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$ (where $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$) there is $x_E \in K$ with $|f_{n^{'}_{2k_j+1}}(x_E) - f_{n^{'}_{2k_j}}(x_E)| > \epsilon$ for all $1 \le j \le \lambda$;*

(iii) *there are $\epsilon > 0$ and a strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers such that for every $E = \{k_1 < \ldots < k_\lambda\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$ (where $\lambda \ge 2$) there is $x_E \in K$ with $|f_{n_{k_{j+1}}}(x_E) - f_{n_{k_j}}(x_E)| > \epsilon$ for all $1 \le j \le \lambda - 1$.*

Theorem 3.5. *Let K be a compact metric space, f a bounded real-valued function on K and $1 \le \xi < \omega_1$. Then the following hold:*

(i) *If $f \notin \mathcal{B}_1^\xi(K)$ and $(f_k) \subseteq C(K)$ a uniformly bounded sequence pointwise converging to f, then (f_k) has a subsequence which is l^1_ξ-spreading model* (cf. [7] or [10; Theorem 3.8]).

(ii) *If $(f_k) \subseteq C(K)$ is a uniformly bounded sequence pointwise converging to f such that for every sequence (g_k) of convex blocks of (f_k) (i.e., $g_k \in conv((f_p)_{p \ge k})$) there exists a subsequence of (g_k) which is l^1_ξ-spreading model, then $f \notin \mathcal{B}_1^\xi(K)$. (Here $conv((h_k))$ denotes the set of convex combinations of the $h_k^{\prime}s$.)*

Proof: The condition (i) is obvious by Theorem 3.1 and using that $\beta(f) \le \gamma((f_k))$ (cf. [6; Proposition 1.1]).

(ii) By [6; Theorem 1.3] there exists a sequence (g_k) of convex blocks of (f_k) such that $\beta(f) = \gamma((g_k))$. By the hypothesis, let $(g_k^{'})$ a subsequence of (g_k) which is l^1_ξ-spreading model. By Theorem 3.3 we have $\gamma((g_k^{'})) > \omega^\xi$. Also $\gamma((g_k^{'})) \le \gamma((g_k)) = \beta(f)$. Hence $\beta(f) > \omega^\xi$ i.e., $f \notin \mathcal{B}_1^\xi(K)$. □

It can be noticed that Theorems 3.3 and 3.5 have been proved for the first time in the preprint [9], but for completeness we gave new proofs. Also for $\xi = 1$, Theorem 3.5 has been proved by Haydon, Odell and Rosenthal in [5].

Theorem 3.6. *Let K be a compact metric space and $1 \le \xi < \omega_1$. Then the following hold:*

(i) *If every uniformly bounded and pointwise converging to zero sequence $(f_k) \subseteq C(K)$ with $\inf_k \|f_k\|_\infty > 0$ has a subsequence which is l^1_ξ-spreading model, then $\mathcal{B}_1(K) \setminus C(K) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_1(K) \setminus \mathcal{B}_1^\xi(K)$.*

(ii) *If no uniformly bounded and pointwise converging to zero sequence* $(f_k) \subseteq C(K)$ *has a subsequence which is* l^1_ξ*-spreading model then* $\mathcal{B}_1(K) \subseteq \mathcal{B}^\xi_1(K)$.

Proof: (i) Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_1(K) \setminus C(K)$. By [6; Theorem 1.3] there exists a uniformly bounded sequence $(g_k) \subseteq C(K)$ pointwise converging to f such that $\gamma((g_k)) = \beta(f)$. Then for every strictly increasing sequence (n_k) of natural numbers the sequence $(g_{n_{2k+1}} - g_{n_{2k}})$ is pointwise converging to zero and $\inf_k \|g_{n_{2k+1}} - g_{n_{2k}}\|_\infty > 0$ because f is not continuous. Hence there exists a subsequence (h_k) of $(g_{n_{2k+1}} - g_{n_{2k}})$ which is l^1_ξ-spreading model. Choose a strictly increasing sequence (j_k) of natural numbers such that $h_k = g_{n_{2j_k+1}} - g_{n_{2j_k}}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We set $n'_1 = n_1$, $n'_{2k} = n_{2j_k}$ and $n'_{2k+1} = n_{2j_k+1}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. So, $h_k = g_{n'_{2k+1}} - g_{n'_{2k}}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.2, $\gamma((g_k)) > \omega^\xi$. Hence $\beta(f) > \omega^\xi$, i.e., $f \notin \mathcal{B}^\xi_1(K)$. This completes the proof of (i).

(ii) Assume the contrary. Then there exists $f \in \mathcal{B}_1(K) \setminus \mathcal{B}^\xi_1(K)$. Let $(f_k) \subseteq C(K)$ be a uniformly bounded sequence which converges pointwise to f. By Theorem 3.5(i), there exists a subsequence (f'_k) of (f_k) which is l^ξ_1-spreading model. Then the sequence $(f'_{2k+1} - f'_{2k})$ converges pointwise to zero. Also, by using that if $F = \{k_1 < \ldots < k_\lambda\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$ then $F' = \{2k_1 < 2k_1 + 1 < \ldots < 2k_\lambda < 2k_\lambda + 1\} \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$, it is easy to show that the sequence $(f'_{2k+1} - f'_{2k})$ is l^1_ξ-spreading model, a contradiction. $\square$

Acknowledgment. I am grateful to referee for his (her) useful corrections.

References

[1] Alspach D., Argyros S., *Complexity of weakly null sequences*, Dissertations Mathematicae **CCCXXI** (1992), 1–44.

[2] Alspach D., Odell E., *Averaging null sequences*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1332, Springer, Berlin, 1988.

[3] Argyros S.A., Mercourakis S., Tsarpalias A., *Convex unconditionality and summability of weakly null sequences*, Israel J. Math. **107** (1998), 157–193.

[4] Bourgain J., *On convergent sequences of continuous functions*, Bull. Soc. Math. Belg. Ser. B **32** (1980), 235–249.

[5] Haydon R., Odell E., Rosenthal H., *On certain classes of Baire-1 functions with applications to Banach space theory*, Longhorn Notes, The University of Texas at Austin, Funct. Anal. Sem. 1987–89.

[6] Kechris A.S., Louveau A., *A classification of Baire class 1 functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **318** (1990), 209–236.

[7] Kiriakouli P., *Namioka spaces, Baire-1 functions, Combinatorial principles of the type of Ramsey and their applications in Banach spaces theory* (in Greek), Doctoral Dissertation, Athens Univ., 1994.

[8] Kiriakouli P., *Classifications and characterizations of Baire-1 functions*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **39.4** (1998), 733–748.

[9] Kiriakouli P., *On combinatorial theorems with applications to Banach spaces theory*, preprint, 1994.

[10] Mercourakis S., Negrepontis S., *Banach spaces and topology II*, Recent Progress in General Topology, M. Hušek and J. van Mill, eds., Elsevier Science Publishers B.V., 1992, pp. 495–536.

[11] Rosenthal H.P., *A characterization of Banach spaces containing l^1*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **71** (1974), 2411–2413.

Sogdianis 6 Ano Ilissia, 15771 Athens, Greece

(*Received* August 20, 1998)