## COMPRESSIONS TO FINITE-DIMENSIONAL SUBSPACES

CHANDLER DAVIS ${ }^{1}$

Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be hilbert space (any dimensionality, real or complex scalars). Let $P$ be a hermitian projection. Let $A$ be any hermitian operator. The compression of $A$ to $P \mathscr{E}[3]$ is $P A P$, considered as an operator on $P \mathscr{H}$. Compressions of completely continuous positive operators are of interest in connection with estimating eigenvalues: the Fischer-Courant minimax theorem [5, p. 235] says the $k$ th highest eigenvalue of $P A P$ is not greater than that of $A$. Compressions enter in the study of more general mappings of operators, often via Nailmark's theorem [6].

Especially in the first connection, the case where $P \mathscr{F}$ is finitedimensional is interesting. But in some problems a finite-dimensional subspace may be known, not via the operator $P$, but via an arbitrary set of vectors which span it; if they are not orthonormal, one would rather not have to find $P$. This suggests that the following elementary formulas may be worth pointing out. I suppose that at least Formula 1 must be known already, but not, apparently, very widely.

Notation. $x_{1}, \cdots, x_{n}$ form a linear basis of PFe. $G$ denotes the determinant of their Gramian ( $n \times n$ matrix with $i, j$ entry $\left(x_{i}, x_{j}\right)$ ). If the kth row of the Gramian is replaced by $\left(z, x_{1}\right), \cdots,\left(z, x_{n}\right)$, all other rows being left unchanged, the determinant of the resulting matrix will be denoted $G\left(x_{k} ; z\right)$.

Evident properties: $G\left(x_{k} ; z\right)=0$ if $z=(1-P) z$ or $z=x_{i}(i \neq k)$, while $G\left(x_{k} ; x_{k}\right)=G$; also $G\left(x_{k} ; z\right)$ is linear in $z$. These may be summed up by saying that $G\left(x_{k} ; z\right)=\left(z, x_{k}^{*}\right) G$, where $\left\{x_{1}^{*}, \cdots, x_{n}^{*}\right\}$ is the basis of $P \mathfrak{C}$ biorthonormal with $\left\{x_{1}, \cdots, x_{n}\right\}$.

Formula 1. $P z=G^{-1} \sum_{k} G\left(x_{k} ; z\right) x_{k}$. (This notation here and below means summation over all available values of the index.)

Proof. Uniquely $z=\sum_{i} a_{i} x_{i}+(1-P) z$. Substitute this on both sides, and use the evident properties of $G\left(x_{k} ; z\right)$.

Formula 2. $\operatorname{tr}(P A P)=G^{-1} \sum_{k} G\left(x_{k} ; A x_{k}\right)$.
Proof. Let $\xi_{1}, \cdots, \xi_{n}$ be orthonormal eigenvectors of $P A P$, and $\lambda_{1}, \cdots, \lambda_{n}$ their respective eigenvalues; then $x_{i}=\sum_{\rho} T_{i \rho} \xi_{\rho}$, where $T$ is some nonsingular matrix. Recall that

$$
\left(x_{i}, x_{j}\right)=\sum_{\rho \sigma} T_{i \rho} \bar{T}_{j \sigma}\left(\xi_{\rho}, \xi_{\sigma}\right)=\sum_{\rho} T_{i \rho} \bar{T}_{j \rho}=\left(T T^{*}\right)_{i j}
$$
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gives $G=|\operatorname{det} T|^{2}$. (* denotes conjugate transpose.) It remains to prove that, analogously, $\sum_{k} G\left(x_{k} ; A x_{k}\right)=|\operatorname{det} T|^{2} \operatorname{tr}(P A P)$. Now $\left(A x_{i}, x_{j}\right)=\left(P A P x_{i}, x_{j}\right)=\sum_{\rho} T_{i \rho} \lambda_{\rho} \bar{T}_{j \rho}$. So if we let $R^{k}$ denote the matrix with entries $R_{i \rho}^{k}=T_{i \rho}(i \neq k)$ and $R_{k \rho}^{k}=T_{k \rho} \lambda_{\rho}$, we have $G\left(x_{k} ; A x_{k}\right)$ $=\operatorname{det}\left(R^{k} T^{*}\right), \quad \sum_{k} G\left(x_{k} ; A x_{k}\right)=\operatorname{det} T^{*} \sum_{k} \operatorname{det} R^{k}$. In the expansion

$$
\sum_{k} \operatorname{det} R^{k}=\sum_{k} \sum_{\rho_{1}, \cdots, \rho_{n}} \frac{1 \cdots n}{\epsilon_{\rho_{1}}, \cdots, \rho_{n}} T_{1 \rho_{1}} \cdots T_{n \rho_{n} \lambda_{\rho_{k}}}
$$

the summation over $k$ may be carried out first: $\sum_{k} \lambda_{\rho_{k}}=\operatorname{tr}(P A P)$ for any ( $\rho_{1}, \cdots, \rho_{n}$ ) giving a nonzero contribution. This gives the result.

The proof would have been simpler if I had exploited the evident properties of $G\left(x_{k} ; z\right)$. I gave this version because Formula 3 is proved altogether analogously, without introducing any new notions.

Instead of the trace $c_{1}$, consider now $c_{\nu}$, where for any $B$

$$
\operatorname{det}(\lambda+B)=\sum_{\nu} c_{\nu}(B) \lambda^{n-\nu} ;
$$

that is, $c_{\nu}$ is the $\nu$ th elementary symmetric polynomial of the eigenvalues. Extend the notation: $G\left(x_{k_{1}} ; z_{1}\right)\left(x_{k_{2}} ; z_{2}\right)$ is the determinant of the matrix which differs from the Gramian in having $k_{1}$ th row $\left(z_{1}, x_{1}\right), \cdots,\left(z_{1}, x_{n}\right)$ and in having $k_{2}$ th row $\left(z_{2}, x_{1}\right), \cdots,\left(z_{2}, x_{n}\right)$; and so forth.

Formula 3. ${ }^{2} c_{\nu}(P A P)=G^{-1} \sum G\left(x_{k_{1}} ; A x_{k_{1}}\right) \cdots\left(x_{k_{\nu}} ; A x_{k_{\nu}}\right)$. (In this equation summation is over all distinct $\nu$-tuples $\left\{k_{1}, \cdots, k_{\nu}\right\}$ from among $\{1, \cdots, n\}$.)

Proof. See under Formula 2.
An interesting case is where $A$ is another projection $Q$. A complete set of unitary-invariants for the pair of subspaces $P \mathscr{H}$ and $Q \mathbb{H}$ is the spectrum of $P Q P$ and its multiplicity function (together with the dimensionalities of $Q \mathscr{H} \cap(1-P) \mathscr{H}$ and $(1-Q) \mathscr{H} \cap(1-P) \mathscr{C})[1 ; 2] .{ }^{3}$ For a simple numerical measure of the closeness of $P \mathfrak{H}$ to being contained in $Q \mathfrak{K}, \operatorname{tr}(P Q P)$ recommends itself (or, if you like, $n^{-1} \operatorname{tr}(P Q P)$ ). If $Q \mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional, one may ask for a modification of Formula 2 which treats $P$ and $Q$ symmetrically.
$y_{1}, \cdots, y_{m}$ form a linear basis of $Q \mathcal{H} . H$ denotes the determinant of their Gramian ; $H\left(y_{l} ; z\right)$, etc. are defined in analogy to previous notations.

Formula 4. $\operatorname{tr}(P Q P)=\operatorname{tr}(Q P Q)=(G H)^{-1} \sum_{k l} G\left(x_{k} ; y_{l}\right) H\left(y_{l} ; x_{k}\right)$.

[^0]Proof. I have proofs of Formulas 4 and 5 along the unsophisticated lines followed above for Formulas 2 and 3, but they are clumsy. Instead, rewrite the right side of Formula 4 in terms of the biorthonormal bases $\left\{x_{1}, \cdots, x_{n}\right\},\left\{x_{1}^{*}, \cdots, x_{n}^{*}\right\}$ of $P \mathfrak{H},\left\{y_{1}, \cdots, y_{m}\right\}$, $\left\{y_{1}^{*}, \cdots, y_{m}^{*}\right\}$ of $Q \mathfrak{H}$. It equals

$$
\sum_{k l}\left(y_{l}, x_{k}^{*}\right)\left(x_{k}, y_{l}^{*}\right)=\sum_{k l}\left(\left(x_{k}, \stackrel{y_{l}}{l}\right) y_{l}, x_{k}^{*}\right)=\sum_{k}\left(Q x_{k}, x_{k}^{*}\right)=\operatorname{tr}(P Q P),
$$

by Formulas 1 and 2.
Formula 5.

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{\nu}(P Q P) & =c_{\nu}(Q P Q) \\
& =(G H)^{-1} \sum G\left(x_{k_{1}} ; y_{l_{1}}\right) \cdots\left(x_{k_{\nu}} ; y_{l_{\nu}}\right) H\left(y_{l_{1}} ; x_{k_{1}}\right) \cdots\left(y_{l_{\nu}} ; x_{k_{\nu}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

(In this equation summation is over all distinct pairs of $\nu$-tuples, $\left\{k_{1}, \cdots, k_{\nu}\right\}$ from among $\{1, \cdots, n\}$ and $\left\{l_{1}, \cdots, l_{\nu}\right\}$ from among $\{1, \cdots, m\}$.)

Proof. The equation

$$
G\left(x_{k_{1}} ; z_{1}\right) \cdots\left(x_{k_{\nu}} ; z_{\nu}\right)=G \nu!\left(z_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes z_{\nu}, G_{k_{1} \cdots k_{\nu}}^{*}\right)
$$

defines an element $G_{k_{1}}^{*} \cdots k_{\nu}$ of $\mathscr{K}^{\nu}$, the tensor product of $\nu$ copies of $\mathfrak{K}$. Extend $\left\{x_{1}, \cdots, x_{n}\right\}$ to a basis of $\mathfrak{H C}$ by adjoining an orthonormal basis $\left\{x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \cdots\right\}$ of $(1-P) \mathcal{H}$. The elements $x_{\sigma_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\sigma_{\nu}}$ form a linear basis of $\mathscr{K}^{\nu}$. By considering its scalar products with these basis vectors, $G_{\boldsymbol{k}_{1} \ldots k_{\nu}}^{*}$ is identified as

$$
\left.\frac{1}{\nu!} \sum_{l_{1} \cdots l_{\nu}}{ }_{\epsilon_{l_{1}} \cdots l_{\nu}}^{k_{1} \cdots k_{l_{1}}} *\right) \otimes \otimes x_{l_{\nu}}^{*}=x_{\left[k_{1}\right.}^{*} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\left.k_{\nu}\right]}^{*} .
$$

(Again $\epsilon$ is defined by $\epsilon= \pm 1$ if $\left(l_{1}, \cdots, l_{\nu}\right)$ is respectively an even or an odd permutation of $\left(k_{1}, \cdots, k_{\nu}\right), \epsilon=0$ otherwise. The bracket on the subscripts, denoting antisymmetrization, is defined by the equation.)

The easily-proved analog of Formula 1 is
$P z_{[1} \otimes \cdots \otimes P z_{\nu]}$

$$
=\sum_{k_{1} \cdots k_{\nu}}\left(z_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes z_{\nu}, x_{\left[k_{1}\right.}^{*} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\left.k_{\nu}\right]}^{*}\right) x_{k_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{k_{\nu}} .
$$

Formula 3 in the new notation reads

$$
c_{\nu}(P A P)=\sum_{k_{1} \cdots k_{\nu}}\left(A x_{k_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes A x_{k_{\nu}}, x_{\left[k_{1}\right.}^{*} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\left.k_{k_{1}}\right]}^{*}\right)
$$

this is not disturbed if the subscripts of the $A x_{k_{i}}$ are also bracketed. The right side of Formula 5 becomes

$$
\sum_{k_{1} \cdots k_{\nu} ; l_{1} \cdots l_{\nu}}\left(y_{l_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes y_{l_{\nu}}, x_{\left[k_{1}\right.}^{*} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\left.k_{\nu}\right]}^{*}\right)\left(x_{k_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{k_{\nu}}, \cdots{ }_{y_{\left[l_{1}\right.}^{*}}^{*} \otimes \cdots \otimes{ }_{\left.l_{\nu}\right]}\right) .
$$

By the analog of Formula 1 this is equal to

$$
\sum_{k_{1} \cdots k_{v}}\left(Q x_{\left[k_{1}\right.} \otimes \cdots \otimes Q x_{\left.k_{v}\right]}, x_{\left[k_{1}\right.}^{*} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\left.k_{p}\right]}^{*}\right),
$$

and by Formula 3 this is $c_{\nu}(P Q P)$, as claimed.
The analogy to the special case, Formula 4, could be strengthened by mentioning that $P z_{[1} \otimes \cdots \otimes P z_{\nu]}=P_{\nu}\left(z_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes z_{\nu}\right)$, where $P_{\nu}$ is the hermitian projection on the subspace of $\mathscr{K}^{\nu}$ linearly spanned by antisymmetrized products of elements of $P \mathscr{F}$. The $x_{\left[k_{1}\right.} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\left.k_{y}\right]}$ and the $x_{\left[k_{1}\right.}^{*} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\left.\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{v}}\right]}^{*}$ are almost biorthonormal bases of $P_{\nu} \mathcal{F e}^{\nu}$ :

$$
\left(x_{\left[l_{1}\right.} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\left.l_{\nu}\right]}, x_{\left[k_{1}\right.}^{*} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{\left.k_{\nu}\right]}^{*}\right)=\frac{1}{\nu!} \underset{\epsilon_{1} \cdots k_{\nu}}{l_{1} \cdots l_{\nu}}
$$
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[^0]:    ${ }^{2}$ The case $\nu=n$ shows the equivalence of Theorem 1 of [4] to Weyl's theorem which it generalizes.
    ${ }^{8}$ One might prefer replacing $P Q P$ by $P Q P+(1-P)(1-Q)(1-P)=1-P-Q+P Q$ $+Q P$, making apparent the symmetrical roles of $P$ and $Q$ [1].

