

XI. Continuous operators are not always bounded

Objektyp: **Chapter**

Zeitschrift: **L'Enseignement Mathématique**

Band (Jahr): **31 (1985)**

Heft 1-2: **L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE**

PDF erstellt am: **25.09.2024**

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

COROLLARY 38. Assume that the definite space $(\mathfrak{E}; \langle , \rangle)$ is complete and that the system of types (Corollary 26) is linearly independent in $\Gamma/2\Gamma$ (considered as a \mathbf{Z}_2 -vector space) then the conclusions (i), (ii), (iii) of Theorem 37 hold.

$C(\mathfrak{E})$ in Theorem 37 is not complete (unless finite dimensional). Its quadratic form \langle , \rangle can be extended to the completion \tilde{C} . By using Theorem 28 one can see that this completion has $L_{\perp\perp}(\tilde{C}) = L_c(\tilde{C})$ if and only if E has $L_{\perp\perp}(E) = L_c(E)$.

XI. CONTINUOUS OPERATORS ARE NOT ALWAYS BOUNDED

XI.1. INTRODUCTION. Let \mathfrak{E} be an infinite dimensional definite space in the sense of Definition 15. A linear map (operator) $h: \mathfrak{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ is called *bounded* iff there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that for all $x \in \mathfrak{E}$ we have $\varphi\langle hx \rangle \geq \gamma + \varphi\langle x \rangle$.

In [6] A. Fässler gave an explicit example of a continuous operator h on an orthomodular space \mathfrak{E} that is not bounded; she also proved a criterion for boundness which is very useful in the study of the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{E})$ of bounded operators $h: \mathfrak{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ when \mathfrak{E} is an orthomodular definite space of a certain kind. We shall prove this criterion anew here as its original proof can be shortened considerably.

We shall consider definite spaces that satisfy

(19) $(\mathfrak{E}; \langle , \rangle)$ contains a maximal orthogonal family $(e_i)_{\mathbf{N}}$ such that the groups $\Theta(\varphi\langle e_i \rangle)$ are different.

By (14) we see that (19) is a property of \mathfrak{E} , not of $(e_i)_{\mathbf{N}}$; Keller's original example of an orthomodular space satisfies (19).

XI.2. FÄSSLER'S CRITERION. In this subsection let $(\mathfrak{E}; \langle , \rangle)$ be an infinite dimensional orthomodular space that has (19). Fix a maximal orthogonal family $(e_i)_{\mathbf{N}}$ that enjoys (19). If $f: \mathfrak{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ is given, expand (Lemma 27)

$$(20) \quad f e_i = \sum_{j \in \mathbf{N}} \alpha_{ij} e_j \quad (i \in \mathbf{N})$$

THEOREM 39 ([6]). The linear map f is bounded iff it is continuous and satisfies

$$(21) \quad \{\varphi\alpha_{ii} \mid T\varphi\langle fe_i \rangle = T\varphi\langle e_i \rangle\} \quad \text{is bounded below.}$$

The heart of the proof of Theorem 39 is the following consequence of assumption (19).

LEMMA 40 [6]. *If f is continuous then (19) implies that the set $I := \{i \in \mathbf{N} \mid \varphi\langle fe_i \rangle < \varphi\langle e_i \rangle \ \& \ \varphi\langle fe_i \rangle \not\equiv \varphi\langle e_i \rangle \pmod{2\Gamma}\}$ is finite.*

Proof. We renumber the e_i such that $\Theta(\varphi\langle e_i \rangle) \subset \Theta(\varphi\langle e_{i+1} \rangle)$. If we replace e_i by a multiple then its group does not change; therefore we may assume without loss of generality that for all $r, s \in \mathbf{N}$ we have

$$(22) \quad r < s \Rightarrow \varphi\langle e_r \rangle \in \Theta(\varphi\langle e_s \rangle), \quad \varphi\langle e_r \rangle \geq 0$$

From (22) we obtain that for all $r, s \in \mathbf{N}$

$$(23) \quad r < s \Rightarrow \forall \delta \in \Gamma: \varphi\langle e_r \rangle < |\varphi\langle e_s \rangle + 2\delta|$$

If $i \in I$ then $\varphi\langle fe_i \rangle \equiv \varphi\langle e_j \rangle$ for some $j \neq i$. Let $I_0 \subset I$ be the subset of those i for which the j is smaller than i . Thus, if $i \in I \setminus I_0$ then $\varphi\langle fe_i \rangle = \varphi\langle e_j \rangle + 2\varphi\alpha_{ij} < \varphi\langle e_i \rangle$; so by (23) we must actually have $\varphi\langle fe_i \rangle \leq -\varphi\langle e_i \rangle \leq 0$. Since (e_i) is a null sequence we see that $I \setminus I_0$ has to be finite (because $\{fe_i \mid i \in I \setminus I_0\}$ must also be a null sequence if $I \setminus I_0$ is infinite). Thus, in order to prove Lemma 40 we have to show that I_0 is finite.

The idea in [6] is to show that for each $i \in I_0$ there is $\lambda_i \in k$ such that $\varphi\langle f(\lambda_i e_i) \rangle \leq 0$ and $\varphi\langle \lambda_i e_i \rangle \geq 0$ so that by the same token I_0 must be finite. This is accomplished by choosing, in turn, $\lambda = 1$, $\lambda = \langle fe_i \rangle^{-1}$, according as to whether $\varphi\langle fe_i \rangle$ is ≤ 0 , > 0 respectively.

Proof of Theorem 39. Assume that f is bounded. Continuity is obvious. Let $\gamma \in \Gamma$ be a bound for f and let $\gamma_0 = \min\{0, \gamma\}$. Now $\varphi\langle fe_i \rangle = \varphi\langle \alpha_{ii} e_i \rangle$ for all i occurring in (21), i.e., for all $i \in \mathbf{N} \setminus I$ (by assumption (19) we have $T\varphi\langle e_i \rangle \neq T\varphi\langle e_j \rangle$ for all $i \neq j$). Thus, if $\varphi\alpha_{ii} > 0$ then trivially $\varphi\alpha_{ii} \geq \gamma_0$; if $\varphi\alpha_{ii} < 0$ then $\varphi(\alpha_{ii}) > 2\varphi\alpha_{ii} \geq \gamma \geq \gamma_0$.

Assume conversely that f is continuous and has (21). We show that there is $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$ with $\varphi\langle fe_i \rangle \geq \gamma_0 + \varphi\langle e_i \rangle$ ($i \in \mathbf{N}$). Let γ be a lower bound for the set in (21) and set $\gamma_0 := \min\{0, 2\gamma, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}$ where $\gamma_v := \varphi\langle fe_v \rangle - \varphi\langle e_v \rangle$, $v \in I$. To finish the proof we conclude $\varphi\langle f\mathbf{x} \rangle > \varphi\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle + \gamma_0$ ($\forall \mathbf{x}$) by continuity of f :

$$\varphi\langle f \sum_1^\infty \xi_i e_i \rangle = \varphi\langle f(\xi_{i_0} e_{i_0}) \rangle \geq \gamma_0 + \varphi\langle \xi_{i_0} e_{i_0} \rangle = \gamma_0 + \varphi\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle.$$