

VECTOR MEASURES AND THE STRONG OPERATOR TOPOLOGY

PAUL LEWIS, KIMBERLY MULLER, AND ANDY YINGST

(Communicated by N. Tomczak-Jaegermann)

ABSTRACT. A fundamental result of Nigel Kalton is used to establish a result for operator valued measures which has improved versions of the Vitali-Hahn-Saks Theorem, Phillips's Lemma, the Orlicz-Pettis Theorem and other classical results as straightforward corollaries.

Each of E , F , X , Y , and Z will denote a real (\mathbf{R}) Banach space. The space of all bounded linear functions (= operators) from X to Y will be denoted by $L(X, Y)$. Note that $X \cong L(\mathbf{R}, X)$. A generic σ -algebra of sets will be denoted by Σ . If $(A_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ is a sequence from Σ , then $\sigma((A_i)_{i=1}^\infty)$ will denote the σ -algebra of subsets of $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty A_i$ generated by $(A_i)_{i=1}^\infty$. If this sequence is pairwise disjoint, then $\sigma((A_i))$ is easily identifiable with \mathcal{P} , the power class of \mathbf{N} . If (T_i) is a sequence in $L(X, Y)$, recall that (T_i) converges to T in the strong operator topology (*sot*) if and only if $(T_i(x)) \rightarrow T(x)$ in Y for all $x \in X$. The reader should consult [3] and [2] for undefined terminology as well as the classical statements of the theorems and corollaries mentioned in this paper. The reader should note that there are non-separable subspaces of ℓ_∞ which do not contain ℓ_∞ .

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Σ is a σ -algebra of subsets of Ω , E is separable, and F is a Banach space which does not contain ℓ_∞ but does embed isomorphically into ℓ_∞ . If $\mu : \Sigma \rightarrow L(E, F)$ is bounded and finitely additive and (A_i) is a pairwise disjoint sequence from Σ , then there is a subsequence (B_i) of (A_i) so that $\mu : \sigma((B_i)) \rightarrow (L(E, F), \text{sot})$ is countably additive.*

Proof. Suppose that E , F , Σ , (A_i) , and μ are as in the statement of the theorem. As before, let \mathcal{P} be the power class of the positive integers, and identify \mathcal{P} with $\sigma((A_i)_{i=1}^\infty)$. If $b = (b_i) \in \ell_\infty$, let $T(b) = \int b \, d\mu$. Then $T : \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(E, F)$ is a bounded linear operator. For $x \in E$, define $T_x : \ell_\infty \rightarrow F$ by $T_x(b) = T(b)(x)$. Since ℓ_∞ does not embed in F , T_x is weakly compact and therefore unconditionally converging; e.g., see [7], [6, p. 270].

Now let $T_n = T(e_n)$, where (e_n) denotes the canonical unit vector basis of $c_0 \subseteq \ell_\infty$. Therefore $\sum T_n$ converges unconditionally in the strong operator topology. In

Received by the editors December 20, 2007, and, in revised form, September 16, 2008.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 28B05, 46B28, 46B25.

Key words and phrases. Operator valued measure, strong operator topology, Phillips's lemma, Orlicz-Pettis theorem.

fact, the map $\Delta : \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(E, F)$ defined by

$$\Delta(\gamma)x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \gamma_i T_i(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \gamma_i T(e_i)x$$

is bounded and linear. Let $L : F \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ be an isomorphism, and define operators $U : \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(E, \ell_\infty)$ and $V : \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(E, \ell_\infty)$ by

$$U(b)(x) = L(T(b)(x))$$

and

$$V(b)(x) = \sum b_i L T_i(x) = L(\sum b_i T_i(x)).$$

Note that $U(e_j)(x) = L(T_j(x)) = V(e_j)(x)$ for each j . Proposition 5 of Kalton [6] applies and yields an infinite set $M \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ so that $U(t) = V(t)$ for all $t = (t_i) \in \ell_\infty(M)$. Therefore $T(s)(x) = \sum s_i T_i(x)$ for $s = (s_i) \in \ell_\infty(M)$. The unconditional convergence of the series $\sum s_i T_i(x)$ and the preceding equality imply that

$$\mu : \sigma((A_i)_{i \in M}) \rightarrow (L(E, F), \text{ sot})$$

is countably additive. \square

In Corollary 5 below, we show that Theorem 1 leads to an improvement of Phillips's Lemma. Among the many consequences of Phillips's Lemma is a quick proof that c_0 is not complemented in ℓ_∞ . The next result shows that this complementation result follows immediately from Theorem 1.

Corollary 2. c_0 is not complemented in ℓ_∞ .

Proof. Suppose that $P : \ell_\infty \rightarrow c_0$ is a projection, and let $\mu : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow c_0 \cong L(\mathbf{R}, c_0)$ be the bounded and finitely additive measure so generated. By Theorem 1, there is a subsequence (n_i) of the positive integers so that $\mu : \sigma((n_i)) \rightarrow L(\mathbf{R}, c_0)$ is countably additive in the strong operator topology (= the norm topology in this case). Clearly this is false since $\|\mu(n_i)\| = 1$ for all i . \square

Now suppose that Σ is a σ -algebra of subsets of Ω , and $\lambda : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$ is an extended \mathbf{R} -valued and countably additive set function. Let X be a Banach space and $\mu_n : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ be countably additive so that $\mu_n \ll \lambda$ for all n . Suppose that $(\mu_n(A))$ is norm convergent in X for all $A \in \Sigma$, $\epsilon > 0$, $\lambda(A_n) \rightarrow 0$, and $\|\mu_n(A_n)\| > 2\epsilon$ for all n . By a standard Cantor diagonalization argument, one may choose a subsequence (A_{n_i}) of (A_n) so that

$$\|\mu_{n_i}(A_{n_i} \setminus \bigcup_{j>i} A_{n_j})\| > \epsilon$$

for each i .

Let $\nu_i = \mu_{n_i}$, $B_i = A_{n_i} \setminus \bigcup_{j>i} A_{n_j}$, $U = \{\nu_i(B_j) : i \geq 1, j \geq 1\}$, and $Y = [U] = \overline{\text{span}}(U)$. Then Y is separable. Thus the space $c(Y) = \{(y_n) : n \in \mathbf{N}\} \subseteq Y^{\mathbf{N}}$ of all convergent sequences in Y is separable when endowed with the usual pointwise operations and the sup norm. Define $\tau : \sigma((B_i)) \rightarrow c(Y)$ by

$$\tau(A) = (\nu_i(A)), \quad A \in \sigma((B_i)).$$

Note that $c(Y) \cong (L(\mathbf{R}, Y), \text{ sot})$. By Theorem 1, we know that there is a subsequence (B_{i_j}) so that $\tau : \sigma((B_{i_j})) \rightarrow (L(\mathbf{R}, c(Y)), \text{ sot})$ is countably additive. However, this is impossible since $\|\nu_i(B_i)\| > \epsilon$ for each i . Therefore Theorem 1 produces the following improved versions of the Vitali-Hahn-Saks Theorem [4, p. 24], and [5, p. 158].

Corollary 3. (i) If $\epsilon > 0$, $\lambda : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$ is extended \mathbf{R} -valued and countably additive, (μ_n) is a sequence in $ca(\sigma, X)$ with $\mu_n \ll \lambda$ for each n , and (A_n) is a pairwise disjoint sequence from Σ so that $(\lambda(A_n)) \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\mu_n(A_n)\| > \epsilon$ for all n , then no infinite subsequence of (μ_n) can converge setwise on all elements of (A_n) .

(ii) If (μ_n) is a sequence in $ca(\Sigma)$, $\epsilon > 0$, and (A_n) is a pairwise disjoint sequence in Σ so that $|\mu_n(A_n)| > \epsilon$ for each n , then no infinite subsequence of (μ_n) can converge setwise on all elements of the sequence (A_n) .

Recall that a finitely additive set function μ defined on an algebra \mathcal{A} is said to be strongly additive provided that $\mu(A_i) \rightarrow 0$ whenever (A_i) is a pairwise disjoint sequence from \mathcal{A} . It is easy to see that a family of countably additive set functions defined on a σ -algebra Σ is uniformly countably additive if and only if it is uniformly strongly additive. We say that $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow X$ is weakly strongly additive provided that $x^* \circ \mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is strongly additive for all $x^* \in X^*$. Certainly every strongly additive set function is weakly strongly additive. If $c_0 \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow L(X^*, \mathbf{R}) \cong X^{**}$, then the following proposition makes it clear that there are weakly strongly additive set functions which are not strongly additive.

Proposition 4. Every weakly strongly additive set function $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow X$ is strongly additive iff $c_0 \not\hookrightarrow X$.

Proof. Suppose that $c_0 \hookrightarrow X$ and let \mathcal{A} be the finite-cofinite algebra of subsets of \mathbf{N} . Define $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow X$ by

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{n \in A} e_n, \quad A \text{ finite}$$

and

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{n \in A^c} e_n, \quad A \text{ cofinite.}$$

Suppose that (B_i) is a pairwise disjoint sequence from \mathcal{A} . Note that there is an N so that if $n > N$, then B_n is finite. Let $x^* \in X^*$, and choose $\lambda = (\lambda_i) \in \ell_1$ so that $x^* \mu(A) = \langle \lambda, \mu(A) \rangle$ for each A . Since $\sum_{i > n} |\lambda_i| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and at most one member of the sequence (B_i) is cofinite, it follows that $(x^* \mu(B_n)) \xrightarrow{n} 0$. Thus μ is weakly strongly additive and not strongly additive.

Now suppose that \mathcal{A} is an algebra of sets and $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow X$ is weakly strongly additive and not strongly additive. Let (A_i) be a pairwise disjoint sequence in \mathcal{A} and ϵ be a positive number so that $\|\mu(A_i)\| > \epsilon$ for each i . If $x^* \in X^*$, then the weak strong additivity guarantees that $\sum |x^* \mu(A_i)| < \infty$. Thus $\sum \mu(A_i)$ is weakly unconditionally convergent and not unconditionally convergent. Classical results of Bessaga and Pelczynski [1] ensure that $c_0 \hookrightarrow X$. \square

Let $c_0(Y)$ be the subspace of $c(Y)$ consisting of null sequences.

Corollary 5 (Phillips's Lemma). If E and F are separable, $\mu_n : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow L(E, F)$ is strongly additive in the sot for each n , and $(\mu_n(A)) \rightarrow 0$ in the sot for each A , then

$$\sum_{k \in A} \mu_n(k) \xrightarrow{n} 0$$

in the sot uniformly for $A \in \mathcal{P}$.

Proof. Suppose not, and select $\epsilon > 0$, (A_i) from \mathcal{P} , $x \in E$, and a subsequence (λ_i) of (μ_n) so that $\|\sum_{k \in A_i} \lambda_i(k)x\| > 2\epsilon$ for each i . Using the unconditional convergence

of $\sum \lambda_i(k)x$ (strong additivity in the *sot*) and the fact that $(\mu_n(A)x) \rightarrow 0$ for all A , obtain a strictly increasing sequence (N_i) of positive integers so that

$$(*) \quad \left\| \sum_{k \in A_{n_i} \cup [N_{i-1}, N_i)} \lambda_{N_i}(k)x \right\| > \epsilon$$

for each i . Let $B_i = A_{N_i} \cap [N_{i-1}, N_i)$, let $\Sigma = \sigma((B_i))$, and set $\nu(A)(u) = (\lambda_i(A)(u))_i \in c_0(F)$ for $A \in \Sigma$ and $u \in E$. Inequality $(*)$ and an application of Theorem 1 to the set functions ν just defined are incompatible. \square

In the next corollary, $bfa(\mathcal{P}, X)$ is the set of all bounded and finitely additive set functions $\mu : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow X$. Equip $bfa(\mathcal{P}, X)$ with the sup norm; i.e., $\|\mu\| = \sup\{\|\mu(A)\| : A \in \mathcal{P}\}$.

Corollary 6. *If X^* is separable and $(\mu_n) \rightarrow 0$ weakly in $bfa(\mathcal{P}, X)$, then*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |x^*(\mu_n(k))| \xrightarrow{n} 0$$

for all $x^* \in X^*$.

Proof. Since $x^*\mu_n$ is bounded and finitely additive for all $x^* \in X^*$, $x^*\mu_n$ is strongly additive. Further, $(x^*\mu_n(A)) \xrightarrow{n} 0$ for all $x^* \in X^*$ and $A \in \mathcal{P}$. Therefore $(\mu_n(A)) \rightarrow 0$ in the *sot* when X is canonically embedded in $X^{**} = L(X^*, \mathbf{R})$. By the preceding corollary, $\sum_{k \in A} x^*\mu_n(k) \xrightarrow{n} 0$ uniformly for $A \in \mathcal{P}$. Thus $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x^*(\mu_n(k))| \xrightarrow{n} 0$. \square

Since the sup norm on $ca(\mathcal{P})$ is equivalent to the total variation norm when ℓ_1 is interpreted in this space, Corollary 6 shows that ℓ_1 has the Schur property.

Corollary 7 (Vitali-Hahn-Saks-Nikodym Theorem). *If X and Y are separable, $\mu_n : \Sigma \rightarrow L(X, Y)$ is a bounded and finitely additive set function which is strongly additive in the *sot* for each n , and $(\mu_n(A)) \rightarrow 0$ in the *sot* for each A , then $\sup_n \|\mu_n(A_i)x\| \xrightarrow{i} 0$ for each $x \in X$ whenever (A_i) is pairwise disjoint in Σ .*

Proof. Suppose not. Let $\epsilon > 0$, (A_i) be a pairwise disjoint sequence in Σ , and $x \in X$ so that $\sup_n \|\mu_n(A_i)x\| > \epsilon$ for each i . Let $\Sigma_1 = \sigma((A_i))$, and define $\nu : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow L(X, c_0(Y))$ by $\nu(A)(u) = (\mu_n(A)u)_{n=1}^{\infty}$. The preceding inequality and Theorem 1 applied to the vector measure ν provide the contradiction which completes the proof. \square

The proof of the Vitali-Hahn-Saks-Nikodym Theorem in Chapter 1 of [4] shows that there is no loss of generality in insisting that Y be separable in the preceding corollary.

Corollary 8. *Suppose that $\mu : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow X$ is bounded and finitely additive, Γ is a subset of X^* which separates the points of X , and μ is countably additive in the weak topology on X defined by Γ . The set function μ is countably additive in the norm topology if and only if $U = \overline{\text{co}}\{\mu(A) : A \in \mathcal{P}, A \text{ finite}\}$ is Γ -closed.*

Proof. Since Γ separates the points of X and μ is Γ -countably additive, μ is countably additive in the norm topology if μ is strongly additive with respect to the norm on X . Suppose then that U is Γ -closed, and let $W = [U]$. The Γ -countable additivity of μ ensures that $\mu(\mathcal{P}) \subseteq W = L(\mathbf{R}, W)$. By Theorem 1, there does not

exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a disjoint sequence (A_i) in \mathcal{P} so that $\|\mu(A_i)\| > \epsilon$ for all i ; i.e., μ is strongly additive.

Conversely, suppose that $\mu : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow (X, \|\bullet\|)$ is countably additive. Thus μ has relatively weakly compact range, and U is weakly compact. Then U is Γ -compact and Γ -closed since Γ separates points. \square

Since a norm-closed convex set is weakly closed, the preceding corollary certainly demonstrates that a weakly countably additive vector measure on a σ -algebra is countably additive. Thus this corollary contains the measure-theoretic version of the Orlicz–Pettis Theorem.

Next we note that Theorem 1 also yields a quick proof of the standard statement of the Orlicz–Pettis Theorem: *If $\sum x_n$ is weakly subseries convergent in X , then $\sum x_n$ is unconditionally convergent in X .*

Note first that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |x^*(x_n)| < \infty$ for all $x^* \in X^*$, and let $Y = [\{x_n : n \in \mathbf{N}\}]$. Suppose that $\sum x_n$ is not unconditionally convergent. Let $\epsilon > 0$, $\sigma : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ be a permutation, and (p_i) and (q_i) be intertwining sequences of natural numbers so that $\|w_i\| > \epsilon$ for all i , where $w_i = \sum_{n=p_i}^{q_i} x_{\sigma(n)}$. The hypothesis and the weak absolute summability of $\sum x_n$ noted above guarantee that $\nu(S) = \text{weak-lim}_{i \in S} w_i$ defines a bounded and finitely additive set function $\nu : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow Y$. Apply Theorem 1 to obtain a contradiction.

Corollary 9. *If K is a relatively weakly compact subset of $ca(\Sigma)$, then the elements of K are uniformly countably additive.*

Proof. As noted above, it suffices to show that K is uniformly strongly additive. Let (μ_n) be a sequence from K , and, without loss of generality (Eberlein–Smulian Theorem), suppose that (μ_n) converges weakly to a point in $ca(\Sigma)$. Let

$$\nu(A) = (\mu_n(A))_{n=1}^{\infty}$$

for $A \in \Sigma$, and let c denote the space of all convergent sequences of real numbers equipped with the sup norm. Then $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow L(\mathbf{R}, c)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1, and we conclude that (μ_n) is uniformly strongly additive. \square

At a crucial point in the proof of Theorem 1 above we used the following theorem of Rosenthal [7]: *If ℓ_{∞} does not embed in F , then every operator $T : \ell_{\infty} \rightarrow F$ is weakly compact.* A key ingredient in the proof of Rosenthal’s theorem is the following lemma.

Rosenthal’s Lemma. *If \mathcal{A} is an algebra of sets, (μ_n) is a uniformly bounded sequence of non-negative and real valued measures on \mathcal{A} , (A_n) is a pairwise disjoint sequence of sets in \mathcal{A} , and $\epsilon > 0$, then there is a subsequence (n_k) of positive integers so that $\sum_{i=1}^N \mu_{n_j}(A_{n_i}) < \epsilon$ for each N and for each j .*

One may check Chapter 1 of [4] for numerous applications of Rosenthal’s Lemma. We close with a particularly quick inductive proof of this lemma. The argument below naturally generates a subsequence (ν_k) of (μ_n) so that the co-finite and terminal subsequences of (ν_k) automatically satisfy the conclusion of Rosenthal’s Lemma.

Lemma 10. *Suppose that (μ_n, A_n) is a sequence of pairs of measures and sets so that (A_n) is distinct and pairwise disjoint and (μ_n) is uniformly bounded. If $\epsilon > 0$, then there is an n_0 so that $\{n : \mu_n(A_{n_0}) < \epsilon\}$ is infinite.*

Proof. Suppose that $\|\mu_n\| < M$ for each n , and choose N so that $N\epsilon > M$. Choose distinct positive integers i_1, i_2, \dots, i_N . If none of these choices satisfy the conclusion, then $S_k = \{n : \mu_n(A_{i_k}) \geq \epsilon\}$ is cofinite for $k = i_1, \dots, i_N$. Thus $\bigcap_{k=1}^N S_k$ is cofinite. Consequently, $\{n : \mu_n(A_{i_k}) \geq \epsilon, k = 1, \dots, N\}$ is cofinite. Therefore, for some n , $\mu_n(\bigcup_{k=1}^N A_{i_k}) \geq N\epsilon$, and we have a contradiction. \square

Use the preceding lemma and choose n_1 so that $S_1 = \{n > n_1 : \mu_n(A_{n_1}) < 1/2\}$ is infinite. Since S_1 is infinite and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_{n_1}(A_i) < \infty$, we may assume that $\sum_{i > n_1} \mu_{n_1}(A_i) < 1/(2^2)$. Now use the lemma again and choose $n_2 \in S_1$ so that $S_2 = \{n \in S_1 : n > n_2, \mu_n(A_{n_2}) < 1/(2^2)\}$ is infinite. As above, we may assume that

$$\sum_{i > n_2} \mu_{n_2}(A_i) < 1/(2^3).$$

Continue this process inductively to manufacture a subsequence $(\nu_k) = (\mu_{n_k})$. Note that if $\epsilon > 0$ and $1/(2^{k-1}) < \epsilon$, then $(\nu_i)_{i \geq k}$ satisfies the conclusion of Rosenthal's Lemma.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bessaga and A. Pelczynski, On bases and unconditional convergence of series in Banach spaces, *Studia Math.* 17(1958), 151-164. MR0115069 (22:5872)
- [2] R. Bilyeu and P. Lewis, Uniform differentiability, uniform absolute continuity, and the Vitali-Hahn-Saks theorem, *Rocky Mtn. J. Math.* 10(1980), 533-557. MR590217 (82g:46083)
- [3] J. Diestel, Sequences and Series in Banach Spaces, *Grad. Texts in Math.* 92, Springer, New York, 1984. MR737004 (85i:46020)
- [4] J. Diestel and J.J. Uhl, Jr., Vector Measures, *Amer. Math. Soc.*, Providence, RI, 1977. MR0453964 (56:12216)
- [5] N. Dunford and J. Schwartz, Linear Operators, Part I: General Theory, Wiley, New York, 1958. MR1009162 (90g:47001a)
- [6] N. Kalton, Spaces of compact operators, *Math. Ann.* 208(1974), 267-278. MR0341154 (49:5904)
- [7] H. Rosenthal, On relatively disjoint families of measures, with some applications to Banach space theory, *Studia Math.* 37(1970), 13-36. MR0270122 (42:5015)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS, BOX 311430, DENTON, TEXAS 76203-1430

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, LAKE SUPERIOR STATE UNIVERSITY, 650 W. EASTERDAY AVENUE, SAULT ST. MARIE, MICHIGAN 49783-1699

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, P.O. BOX 889, LANCASTER, SOUTH CAROLINA 29721