Pacific Journal of Mathematics

DERIVATIONS ON B^* ALGEBRAS

PHILIP MILES

Vol. 14, No. 4 August 1964

DERIVATIONS ON B^* ALGEBRAS

PHILIP MILES

1. A *derivation* D of a B^* algebra A is a linear map of A into itself satisfying the multiplicative rule

$$D(xy) = (Dx)y + x(Dy) .$$

The obvious examples are the inner derivations D_x (x in A) defined by

$$D_x(y) = [x, y] = xy - yx .$$

All other derivations are called outer. For future use, we call a derivation D self-adjoint if

$$D(x^*) = -(Dx)^*$$

for all x in A. Thus inner derivation by a self-adjoint element is a self-adjoint derivation. Every derivation can be written in the form $D = D_1 + iD_2$ where D_1 and D_2 are self-adjoint; indeed, we may take

$$D_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}\{Dx - (Dx^*)^*\}$$

$$D_2(x) = \frac{1}{2i}\{Dx + (Dx^*)^*\} .$$

The central fact about derivations of B^* algebras is that they are bounded; this is proved by Sakai [6, Theorem 11.1]. Somewhat more may be said when A is weakly closed. In particular, Kaplansky [5] has shown that a derivation of an AW^* algebra of type I is necessarily inner. (It seems to be an open question whether or not this is true of weakly closed algebras of types II and III).

Our purpose is to state a weak sense in which every derivation of a B^* algebra is inner. This cannot be true in a strict sense, as is shown by the following typical example: Let A be all compact operators on some Hilbert space H, with an identity adjoined if desired. Then for any x in $\mathscr{B}(H)$, D_x is a derivation on A. If, for some y in $\mathscr{B}(H)$, $D_x = D_y$ on A, then D_{x-y} is zero on A, so $x - y$ commutes with all elements of A, and so $x - y$ is a scalar multiple of the identity e. Thus if x is chosen so that $x - \lambda e$ is not in A for any scalar λ (e.g., if x is a shift), D_x is an outer derivation on A. The reason for calling this example typical is made clear by the following theorem:

Received October 20, 1963. Supported by N. S. F. Grant G-19050.

THEOREM. *Let A be a B^* algebra, D a derivation on A. Then there exist a Hilbert space H, a faithful representation φ of A in $\mathscr{B}(H)$, and an operator S in the weak closure of $\varphi(A)$ such that*

$$\varphi(Dx) = D_S\varphi(x)$$

for all x in A.

As a sample consequence, we give two generalizations of Wielandt's result that if K is a self-adjoint element of $\mathscr{B}(H)$, there is no X in $\mathscr{B}(H)$ such that $KX - XK = iI$; we view this as saying that D_K does not take on the value iI.

COROLLARY. (i) (Generalized Putnam's Theorem) *If D is a self-adjoint derivation on a B^* algebra A, and if x is an element of A such that $D^2(x) = 0$, then $Dx = 0$.*

(ii) *If D is a derivation on the B^* algebra A, then $D(x)$ is not in the interior of the positive cone for any x in A.*

2. Proof of the theorem. The following fact is implicit in much of the literature on derivations.

PROPOSITION. Let A be a B^* algebra, D a derivation on A, I a closed, two-sided ideal in A. Then $D(I) \subseteqq I$, so D is a derivation on I. If $\varphi: A \to B$ is a $*$-homomorphism of A into a B^* algebra B, then the operator D_φ defined on $\varphi(A)$ by

$$D_\varphi(\varphi(x)) = \varphi(Dx)$$

is a derivation on $\varphi(A)$.

One sees this by noticing that any x in I may be written in the form

$$x = h_1^2 - h_2^2 + i(h_3^2 - h_4^2)$$

where the h_i are self-adjoint elements of I. The multiplicative rule for D and the fact that I is a two-sided ideal yield the result that Dx is in I. For φ as above, the kernel of φ is a closed, two-sided ideal, and so $\varphi(x) = 0$ implies $\varphi(Dx) = 0$. It follows that D_φ is well defined, and the obvious verifications show it a derivation.

The Gelfand-Naimark representation referred to in the following lemma is standard; it is described in some detail immediately following the proof of the lemma.

LEMMA 1. *Let A be a B^* algebra, D a derivation on A. Let $\tilde{A}$ be the weak closure of (the image of) A in the Gelfand-Naimark* *representation formed by using all states of A. Then there is a derivation $\tilde{D}$ on $\tilde{A}$ which agrees with D on (the image of) A.*

Proof. Since D is necessarily bounded, the transformation D^* defined on A^* by

$$(D^*f)(x) = f(Dx)$$

is a bounded transformation of A^* into itself. Likewise the transformation D^{**} defined on A^{**} by

$$(D^{**}\xi)(f) = \xi(D^*f)$$

is a bounded transformation of A^{**} into itself. But A^{**} can be identified with $\tilde{A}$ so that Arens multiplication on A^{**} corresponds to ordinary operator multiplication on $\tilde{A}$ (and so that the linear and norm structures of the two spaces coincide) [1, p. 869]. A straightforward verification via the definition of Arens multiplication shows that D^{**} is a derivation on A^{**}, which we identify with the derivation $\tilde{D}$ on $\tilde{A}$.

To fix notation, we review the construction of the Gelfand-Naimark representation of a B^* algebra A.

Given a state f on A, we form the left ideal

$$I_f = \{x \in A : f(x^*x) = 0\}$$

and the difference space

$$X_f = A \ominus I_f .$$

We denote by x_f the image of x in X_f. X_f has an inner product

$$(x_f, y_f) = f(y^*x)$$

and the completion of X_f under the norm induced by this inner product is a Hilbert space, denoted by H_f.

Given x in A, the operator $\varphi_f(x)$ defined on X_f by

$$\varphi_f(x)y_f = (xy)_f$$

is bounded, and so has a bounded extension to H_f, also denoted by $\varphi_f(x)$. To obtain the Gelfand-Naimark representation, we form the direct sum of the H_f, extended over all states f; this Hilbert space we call H. We think of its elements ξ as "sequences,"

$$\xi = \{\xi^f\}$$

where ξ^f is the component of ξ in H_f. The Gelfand-Naimark representation φ is then the direct sum of the φ_f:

$$\varphi(x)\{\xi^f\} = \{\varphi_f(x)\xi^f\}\,.$$

Given a pure state f_0 on A, let $\omega = \{\omega^f\}$ be the element of H defined by

$$\omega^f = \begin{cases} e_{f_0} & f = f_0 \\ 0 & f \neq f_0\,. \end{cases}$$

Define the vector state f_ω on $\tilde{A}$ by

$$f_\omega(T) = (T\omega, \omega)\,.$$

As above, let $I_\omega = \{S \in \tilde{A} : f_\omega(S^*S) = 0\}$, let $X_\omega = \tilde{A} \ominus I_\omega$, let S_ω be the image of S in X_ω, and let H_ω be the completion of X_ω in the norm induced by f_ω.

LEMMA 2. *The map $U\colon X_{f_0} \to X_\omega$ defined by*

$$U(x_{f_0}) = x_\omega$$

is in fact an isometry of H_{f_0} onto H_ω (For simplicity, we have identified A with its image in $\tilde{A}$).

Proof. Throughout the proof we replace "f_0" by "0" in sub- and superscripts.

Identifying A with its image in $\tilde{A}$, we have $f_0 = f_\omega$ on A. Therefore

$$(U_{x_0}, U_{y_0}) = (x_\omega, y_\omega) = f_\omega(y^*x) = f_0(y^*x) = (x_0, y_0)$$

and U is an isometry on X_0.

But since f_0 is a pure state, $\varphi_0(A)$ acts irreducibly on H_0. It follows from the theorem of Kadison [4, Theorem 1] that irreducibility may be taken in a purely algebraic sense: thus, given any ξ in H_0, there is an x in A such that

$$\xi = \varphi_0(x)e_0 = x_0\,.$$

Therefore, $X_0 = H_0$. Since H_0 is complete and U an isometry, UH_0 is complete, and so closed in H_ω. Thus any η in H_ω may be written uniquely in the form

$$\eta = \eta_1 + \eta_2\,, \quad \eta_1 \varepsilon UH_0\,, \quad \eta_2 \varepsilon (UH_0)^\perp\,.$$

If η is in X_ω then, since $\eta_1 \varepsilon UH_0 \subseteqq X_\omega$, η_2 is also in X_ω, and so there is some S in $\tilde{A}$ with $\eta_2 = S_\omega$. Since $\eta_2 \varepsilon (UH_0)^\perp$,

$$0 = (\eta_2, Ux_0) = (S_\omega, x_\omega) = f_\omega(x^*S) = (S\omega, x\omega)$$

for all x in A. On the other hand, since S is in $\tilde{A}$, we can find x in A making

$$|(S\omega, (x - S)\omega)|$$

arbitrarily small. It follows that $(S\omega, S\omega) = 0$, so $S\varepsilon I_\omega$, $S_\omega = 0$.

Thus $X_\omega \subseteqq UH_0$. Since X_ω is dense, and UH_0 closed, in H_ω, we have $UH_0 = H_\omega$.

LEMMA 3. $$\varphi_\omega(\tilde{A}) = \mathscr{B}(H_\omega)\,.$$

Proof. Evidently the map ψ: $\mathscr{B}(H_0) \to \mathscr{B}(H_\omega)$ given by $\psi(S) = USU^*$ is a $*$-isomorphism of $\mathscr{B}(H_0)$ onto $\mathscr{B}(H_\omega)$, bi-continuous with respect to the weak operator topologies. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\text{weak closure } \varphi_0(A)) &= \text{weak closure } \psi(\varphi_0(A)) \\ &= \text{weak closure } \varphi_\omega(A)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi_0(A)$ acts irreducibly on H_0, weak closure $\varphi_0(A) = \mathscr{B}(H_0)$. On the other hand, f_ω is a vector state on $\tilde{A}$, and so normal [2, p. 54]. Consequently, $\varphi_\omega(\tilde{A})$ is a weakly closed subalgebra of $\mathscr{B}(H_\omega)$ [2, p. 57]. Thus

$$\text{weak closure } \varphi_\omega(A) \subseteqq \text{weak closure } \varphi_\omega(\tilde{A}) = \varphi_\omega(\tilde{A})\,.$$

$\mathscr{B}(H_\omega) = \psi(\text{weak closure } \varphi_0(A)) = \text{weak closure } \varphi_\omega(A) \subseteqq \varphi_\omega(\tilde{A})$.

We now get at the proof of the theorem. By Lemma 1, the derivation D on A extends to a derivation $\tilde{D}$ on $\tilde{A}$. Since φ_ω is a $*$-homomorphism, $\tilde{D}$ induces a derivation D_ω on $\varphi_\omega(\tilde{A})$ by

$$D_\omega(\varphi_\omega(T)) = \varphi_\omega(\tilde{D}(T))\,.$$

As we have just seen, $\varphi_\omega(\tilde{A})$ is very much a type I weakly closed algebra, so we may appeal to Kaplansky's result to find an S in $\mathscr{B}(H_\omega)$ such that

$$D_\omega(\varphi_\omega(T)) = [S, \varphi_\omega(T)]$$

for all T in $\tilde{A}$.

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_0(Dx) &= U^*\varphi_\omega(Dx)U = U^*D_\omega(\varphi_\omega(x))U \\ &= (U^*SU)(U^*\varphi_\omega(x)U) - (U^*\varphi_\omega(x)U)(U^*SU)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Letting $S_0 = U^*SU$, we thus have

$$(*) \qquad \varphi_0(Dx) = S_0\varphi_0(x) - \varphi_0(x)S_0\,.$$

Assume for the moment that D is self-adjoint; it follows that

$$\varphi_0(D(x^*)) = -(\varphi_0(Dx))^*$$

and so

$$S_0\varphi_0(x)^* - \varphi_0(x)^*S_0 = S_0^*\varphi_0(x)^* - \varphi_0(x)^*S_0^*$$

for all x in A. In other words, $S_0 - S_0^*$ commutes with $\varphi_0(A)$, and so is a scalar multiple of the identity. Now altering S_0 by adding a scalar multiple of the identity does not affect any of the Lie products $[S_0, T]$. Consequently we may choose S_0 so as to satisfy $(*)$ and to be self-adjoint.

By further addition of a real scalar multiple of the identity, we may assure that the spectrum $\sigma(S_0)$ is centered at the origin. We assert that when this has been done, we have

$$\| S_0 \| \leqq \| \tilde{D} \| = \| D \|,$$

the norm on the left being the norm in $\mathscr{B}(H_0)$ and the two on the right (whose equality is easily verified via the identification $\tilde{D} = D^{**}$) the norms $\tilde{D}$ and D have as operators on $\tilde{A}$ and A respectively.

For, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, the spectral theorem applied to the self-adjoint S_0 supplies us with vectors ξ and η in H_0 such that

$$\begin{gathered} \| \xi \| = \| \eta \| = 1, \quad \xi \perp \eta \\ \left\| S_0\xi + \frac{1}{2} \| S_0 \| \xi \right\| < \varepsilon \\ \left\| S_0\eta - \frac{1}{2} \| S \| \eta \right\| < \varepsilon . \end{gathered}$$

Since ξ and η are orthogonal, there is a unitary element of $\mathscr{B}(H_0)$ which interchanges them. Appealing again to Kadison's theorem [4, Theorem 1], we have a unitary v in A such that $\varphi_0(v)$ interchanges ξ and η.

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| S_0\varphi_0(v)\xi - \frac{1}{2} \| S_0 \| \eta \right\| &= \left\| S_0\eta - \frac{1}{2} \| S_0 \| \eta \right\| < \varepsilon \\ \left\| \varphi_0(v)S_0\xi + \frac{1}{2} \| S_0 \| \eta \right\| &= \left\| \varphi_0(v)\Big(S_0\xi + \frac{1}{2} \| S_0 \| \xi\Big) \right\| \\ &\leqq \| \varphi_0(v) \| \cdot \left\| S_0\xi + \frac{1}{2} \| S_0 \| \xi \right\| < \varepsilon . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\left\| [S_0, \varphi_0(v)]\xi - \| S_0 \| \eta \right\| < 2\varepsilon$$

and so

$$\|[S_0, \varphi_0(v)]\xi\| \geqq \|S_0\| \cdot \|\eta\| - 2\varepsilon = \|S_0\| - 2\varepsilon .$$

On the other hand,

$$\|[S_0, \varphi_0(v)]\xi\| = \|\varphi_0(Dv)\xi\| \leqq \|\varphi_0\| \cdot \|D\| \cdot \|v\| \cdot \|\xi\| = \|D\| .$$

Combining these inequalities, we obtain $\|D\| \geqq \|S_0\| - 2\varepsilon$ for any positive ε, which proves our assertion.

To obtain the promised representation, let $\mathscr{F}$ be any family of pure states maximal with respect to the property that the representations induced by any two distinct members of $\mathscr{F}$ shall not be unitarily equivalent. Let H be the direct sum of the H_f, extended over all f in $\mathscr{F}$, and φ the direct sum of the φ_f, also extended over $\mathscr{F}$. Since the direct sum representation extended over all pure states is faithful, φ must also be faithful. By the argument just finished, there exists for each f in $\mathscr{F}$ an element S^f in $\mathscr{B}(H_f)$ satisfying

$$\varphi_f(Dx) = S^f\varphi_f(x) - \varphi_f(x)S^f , \quad \text{all } x \varepsilon A \quad \|S^f\| \leqq \|D\|.$$

Thus the operator S defined on H by

$$S\{\xi^f\} = \{S^f\xi^f\}$$

is in $\mathscr{B}(H)$, and indeed $\|S\| \leqq \|D\|$. It is at once verified that for any x in A,

$$\varphi(Dx) = [S, \varphi(x)] .$$

That S is in the weak closure of $\varphi(A)$ is a consequence of the fact [3, Cor. 4] that our choice of $\mathscr{F}$ causes the weak closure of $\varphi(A)$ to be the C^* direct sum $\Sigma \oplus (H_f)$ extended over $\mathscr{F}$.

We have been operating for some time under the assumption that D was self-adjoint. Since any derivation is a linear combination of self-adjoint ones, and since the representation φ did not depend on the derivation, it is clear that the theorem has in fact been proved for any derivation D.

The relation of $\|S\|$ and $\|D\|$ when D is arbitrary remains a loose end.

3. Proof of the corollary. (i) Given the self-adjoint derivation D on the B^* algebra A, we take a faithful representation φ of A in some $\mathscr{B}(H)$ and a self-adjoint S in $\mathscr{B}(H)$ such that

$$\varphi(Dx) = S\varphi(x) - \varphi(x)S$$

for all x in A. If $D^2(x) = 0$, then

$$0 = \varphi(D^2x) = \varphi(D(Dx)) = [S, [S, \varphi(x)]] .$$

We can now apply the well known theorem of Putnam to conclude that $[S, \varphi(x)] = 0$, and so that $Dx = 0$.

(ii) If D is self-adjoint and $D(x)$ is self-adjoint, then $x = ik$ for some self-adjoint k. Let φ, S, H be as above: We may also take $\varphi(e)$ to be the identity I on H. If $iD(k)$ is in the interior of the positive cone of A, then $iD(k) \geqq \delta e$ for some $\delta > 0$, and consequently $i\varphi(Dk) \geqq \delta I$.

Given any state f on $\mathscr{B}(H)$, let $f(S\varphi(k)) = \alpha + i\beta$. Then

$$f(\varphi(k)S) = \alpha - i\beta$$

Thus

$$if(\varphi(Dk)) = if([S, \varphi(k)]) = -2\beta \geqq \delta f(I) = \delta .$$

Consequently

$$f(\varphi(k)^2)f(S^2) \geqq |f(S\varphi(k)|^2 \geqq \alpha^2 + \beta^2 \geqq \delta^2/4 .$$

Thus $f(\varphi(k)^2)$ is not zero for any state f. Since all multiplicative functionals on the closed (commutative) algebra generated by $\varphi(k)$ and I extend to states of $\mathscr{B}(H)$, this implies $\varphi(k)$ regular.

Now for any scalar λ, $D(k + \lambda e) = D(k)$. We may therefore repeat the argument above with k replaced by $k + \lambda e$, coming to the conclusion that $k + \lambda e$ is regular for all scalars λ, an impossibility. Thus our original assumption was false, and (ii) is proved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. P. Civin and B. Yood, *The second conjugate space of a Banach algebra as an algebra*, Pacific J. Math., **II** (1961), 847–870.
2. J. Dixmier, *Les Algebres D'Operateurs dans L'Espace Hilbertien*, Paris, Gauthier-Villars 1957.
3. J. G. Glimm and R. V. Kadison, *Unitary operators in C* algebras*, Pacific J. Math., **10** (1960), 547–556.
4. R. V. Kadison, *Irreducible operator algebras*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., U.S.A. **43** (1957), 304–379.
5. I. Kaplansky, *Modules over operator algebras*, Amer. J. Math., **75** (1953), 839–858,
6. S. Sakai, *The theory of W* algebras*, (Mimeographed lecture notes). Yale University, 1962.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should by typewritten (double spaced), and on submission, must be accompanied by a separate author's résumé. Manuscripts may be sent to any one of the four editors. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, L. J. Paige at the University of California, Los Angeles 24, California.

50 reprints per author of each article are furnished free of charge; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December. Effective with Volume 13 the price per volume (4 numbers) is $18.00; single issues, $5.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: $8.00 per volume; single issues $2.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley 8, California.

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), No. 6, 2-chome, Fujimi-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Vol. 14, No. 4 August, 1964