

## REFLEXIVITY OF COMMUTATIVE SUBSPACE LATTICES

RICHARD HAYDON

(Communicated by Palle E. T. Jorgensen)

**ABSTRACT.** A short proof is given of Arveson's reflexivity theorem for strongly closed commutative subspace lattices.

When  $\mathcal{L}$  is a lattice of commuting selfadjoint projections on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , one can form the algebra  $\text{Alg } \mathcal{L}$  of all  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  for which  $TP = PTP$  for all  $P \in \mathcal{L}$ . Given a subalgebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  one can form the lattice  $\text{Lat } \mathcal{A}$  consisting of all selfadjoint projections  $P$  such that  $TP = PTP$  whenever  $T \in \mathcal{A}$ . It is a theorem of W. B. Arveson [1] that if  $\mathcal{L}$  is closed in the strong operator topology, then  $\mathcal{L}$  is *reflexive*, that is to say that  $\mathcal{L} = \text{Lat } \text{Alg } \mathcal{L}$ . In this note we shall give a short proof of this result. Our approach avoids topological measure theory and disintegration of measures, though we do use, in a different guise, the class  $\mathbf{A}$  of "pseudo-integral" operators that is the key to Arveson's original proof. Other proofs of the theorem have been given by K. R. Davidson [2] and by V. S. Shul'man [3].

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  be a finite measure space. We shall write  $\mathbf{A}(\mu)$  for the algebra of all linear operators  $T: L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^2(\mu)$  which are bounded from the  $L^1$ -norm to the  $L^1$ -norm and from the  $L^\infty$ -norm to the  $L^\infty$ -norm. For  $T \in \mathbf{A}(\mu)$  we define  $\|T\|_{\mathbf{A}} = \max \{ \|T: L^1 \rightarrow L^1\|, \|T: L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty\| \}$ . By interpolation, the norm of  $T$  in  $\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mu))$  is less than or equal to  $\|T\|_{\mathbf{A}}$ , so that the unit ball of  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{A}}$  is a subset of the unit ball of  $\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mu))$  for the operator norm. In fact, it is a closed subset for the weak operator topology (and hence compact for that topology) since  $\|T\|_{\mathbf{A}} \leq 1$  if and only if  $(Tf|g) \leq 1$  whenever the elements  $f, g$  of  $L^2(\mu)$  satisfy  $\|f\|_1 \leq 1$  and  $\|g\|_\infty \leq 1$  or  $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$  and  $\|g\|_1 \leq 1$ .

When  $\mathcal{L}$  is a sublattice of the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  the projections  $P_L: f \mapsto f \cdot \mathbf{1}_L$  ( $L \in \mathcal{L}$ ) form a lattice in  $\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mu))$ . We abuse notation by writing  $\text{Alg } \mathcal{L}$  for  $\text{Alg } \{P_L: L \in \mathcal{L}\}$ .

**Theorem.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  be a finite measure space and let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a sublattice of  $\mathcal{F}$ . For any  $F \in \mathcal{F}$*

$$\inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \mu(F \Delta L) = \max \{ (T\mathbf{1}_F | \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus F}) : T \in \mathbf{A}(\mu) \cap \text{Alg } \mathcal{L}, \|T\|_{\mathbf{A}} = 1 \}.$$

---

Received by the editors January 29, 1991.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification* (1985 Revision). Primary 47D25.

© 1992 American Mathematical Society  
0002-9939/92 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

*Proof.* If  $L \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $T \in \mathbf{A}(\mu) \cap \text{Alg } \mathcal{L}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} (T\mathbf{1}_F | \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus F}) &\leq (T\mathbf{1}_{F \cap L} | \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus (L \cup F)}) + (T\mathbf{1}_{F \cap L} | \mathbf{1}_{L \setminus F}) + (T\mathbf{1}_{F \setminus L} | \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus F}) \\ &\leq 0 + \|T : L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty\| \mu(L \setminus F) + \|T : L^1 \rightarrow L^1\| \mu(F \setminus L) \\ &\leq \|T\|_{\mathbf{A}} \mu(L \Delta F), \end{aligned}$$

so that one inequality ( $\geq$ ) is easily established. To establish the other, we start with the case where  $\mathcal{L}$  is a finite lattice.

**Lemma.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  be a finite measure space and let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a finite sublattice of  $\mathcal{F}$ . For any  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  there exist  $L \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $T \in \text{Alg } \mathcal{L}$  with  $\|T\|_{\mathbf{A}} = 1$  such that*

$$\mu(F \Delta L) = (T\mathbf{1}_F | \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus F}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the algebra generated by  $\mathcal{L} \cup \{F\}$  and let  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  be the atoms of  $\mathcal{G}$  that are contained in  $F$ ,  $B_1, \dots, B_n$  the atoms that are disjoint from  $F$ . Let  $G$  be the set of pairs  $(i, j)$  such that there is no  $L \in \mathcal{L}$  with  $A_i \subseteq L$ ,  $B_j \cap L = \emptyset$ . If  $\mathbf{x} = (x_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in G}$  is a family of positive real numbers then we may define an operator  $T_{\mathbf{x}}$  in  $\text{Alg } \mathcal{L}$  by

$$T_{\mathbf{x}}f = \sum_{(i,j) \in G} \frac{x_{i,j}}{\mu(A_i)\mu(B_j)} (f | \mathbf{1}_{A_i}) \mathbf{1}_{B_j}.$$

We easily calculate the norms

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{\mathbf{x}} : L^1 \rightarrow L^1\| &= \max_i \sum_j \frac{x_{i,j}}{\mu(A_i)}, \\ \|T_{\mathbf{x}} : L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty\| &= \max_j \sum_i \frac{x_{i,j}}{\mu(B_j)} \end{aligned}$$

as well as the quantity

$$(T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{1}_F | \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus F}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in G} x_{i,j}.$$

Let  $\delta$  be the maximum of this quantity for  $\mathbf{x}$  as above and  $\|T_{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\mathbf{A}} \leq 1$ . We shall have proved the lemma if we find an element  $L$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $\mu(F \Delta L) \leq \delta$ .

Now  $\delta$  is thus the solution of the following linear programming problem: Maximize  $\sum_{(i,j) \in G} x_{i,j}$  subject to  $x_{i,j} \geq 0$ ,  $\sum_j x_{i,j} \leq \alpha_i$  for all  $i$ , and  $\sum_i x_{i,j} \leq \beta_j$  for all  $j$ , where  $\alpha_i = \mu(A_i)$  and  $\beta_j = \mu(B_j)$ . This may be regarded as a network-flow problem: we consider a directed graph whose nodes are  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m$ ,  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n$  together with a "source"  $S$  and a "sink"  $T$ . For each  $i$  there is a channel from  $S$  to  $A_i$  with maximum capacity  $\alpha_i$ , for each  $j$  there is a channel from  $B_j$  to  $T$  with capacity  $\beta_j$ , and there is a channel of infinite capacity from  $A_i$  to  $B_j$  whenever  $(i, j) \in G$ . Our problem is to find the maximal flow through this network. By the Min-Cut Max-Flow Theorem this maximal flow equals

$$\min_C \sum_{c \in C} \text{capacity of } c,$$

where the minimum is taken over sets  $C$  of channels such that  $S$  is separated from  $T$  if all channels in  $C$  are removed from the network. Evidently, we

shall not achieve this minimum if we remove a channel of infinite capacity so that the minimizing  $C$  will consist of the channels  $SA_i$  for  $i$  in a certain set  $I$ , and the  $B_jT$  for  $j$  in some  $J$ .

We have established the existence of  $I$  and  $J$  such that

$$\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i + \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j = \delta$$

and such that for every  $(i, j) \in G$  at least one of  $i \in I$ ,  $j \in J$  is true. By the definition of  $G$  there exists, whenever  $i \notin I$  and  $j \notin J$ , an element  $L_{i,j}$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $A_i \subseteq L_{i,j}$  and  $B_j \cap L_{i,j} = \emptyset$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is a lattice the set

$$L = \bigcap_{j \notin J} \bigcup_{i \notin I} L_{i,j}$$

is in  $\mathcal{L}$ . Also  $A_i \subseteq L$  whenever  $i \notin I$  and  $B_j \cap L = \emptyset$  whenever  $j \notin J$ , so that

$$\mu(F \Delta L) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \mu(A_i) + \sum_{j \in J} \mu(B_j) = \delta.$$

We can now resume the proof of the theorem. Let  $\delta = \inf\{\mu(F \Delta L) : L \in \mathcal{L}\}$  and let  $K$  be the set of all  $T \in \mathbf{A}(\mu)$  such that  $\|T\|_{\mathbf{A}} \leq 1$  and  $(T\mathbf{1}_F | \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus F}) \geq \delta$ . This set is compact in the weak operator topology. If  $\mathcal{L}'$  is a finite sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}$ , then

$$K \cap \text{Alg } \mathcal{L}' = \{T \in K : (Tf | g) = 0 \text{ whenever there exists } L \in \mathcal{L}' \text{ such that } \text{supp } f \subseteq L \text{ and } \text{supp } g \subseteq \Omega \setminus L\}$$

is closed in the weak operator topology, and is nonempty by the lemma. By compactness we deduce that  $K \cap \text{Alg } \mathcal{L}$  is nonempty, which is what we wanted to prove.  $\square$

**Corollary.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a Hilbert space and let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a strongly closed lattice of commuting selfadjoint projections on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $\text{Lat Alg } \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}$ .*

*Proof.* The reduction of the problem on a general Hilbert space to the measure-theoretic version that we have just been looking at is rather standard. Let  $Q$  be a selfadjoint projection that is not in  $\mathcal{L}$ ; we have to show that  $Q$  is not in  $\text{Lat Alg } \mathcal{L}$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a maximal abelian selfadjoint subalgebra of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  containing the lattice  $\mathcal{L}$ ; then  $\text{Alg } \mathcal{L} \supseteq \mathcal{M}$ , so that  $\text{Lat Alg } \mathcal{L} \subseteq \text{Lat } \mathcal{M}$ . It is known that  $\text{Lat } \mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}$  so that we can certainly assume that  $Q \in \mathcal{M}$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is strongly closed, there exist  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{H}$  such that

$$\max_{i \leq m} \|(P - Q)f_i\| \geq 1$$

for all  $P \in \mathcal{L}$ . Let  $\mathcal{H}_0$  be the closed subspace generated by  $\mathcal{M}\{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$ . The orthogonal projection  $P_0$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_0$  is in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_0 = \mathcal{M}|_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  is a maximal abelian selfadjoint subalgebra of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ . We can regard  $\mathcal{H}_0$  as  $L^2(\mu)$  and identify  $\mathcal{M}_0$  with  $L^\infty(\mu)$  for a suitable finite measure  $\mu$ . The lattice  $\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  of idempotents in  $\mathcal{M}_0$  has the form  $\{P_L : L \in \mathcal{L}_0\}$  for some sublattice  $\mathcal{L}_0$  of  $\mathcal{F}$ . The restriction to  $\mathcal{H}_0$  of  $Q$  is  $P_F$  for some  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . The existence in  $\mathcal{H}_0 = L^2(\mu)$  of the elements  $f_1, \dots, f_m$ , implies that there is some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\mu(F \Delta L) \geq \delta$  for all  $L \in \mathcal{L}_0$ . The theorem gives some  $T_0 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$  such that  $T_0 P_L = P_L T_0 P_L$  for all  $L \in \mathcal{L}_0$  but  $T_0 P_F \neq P_F T_0 P_F$ . If we define  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  by  $T = T_0 P_0$ , then  $T \in \text{Alg } \mathcal{L}$  but  $TQ \neq QTQ$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

1. W. B. Arveson, *Operator algebras and invariant subspaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **100** (1974), 433–532.
2. K. R. Davidson, *Commutative subspace lattices*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **27** (1978), 479–490.
3. V. S. Shulman, *Projection lattices in Hilbert space*, Functional Anal. Appl. **23** (1990), 158–159; translation of Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen. **23** (1989), 86–89.

BRASENOSE COLLEGE, OXFORD, OX1 4AJ, UNITED KINGDOM