

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

INVOLUTIONS ON LOCALLY COMPACT RINGS

PAUL CIVIN

INVOLUTIONS ON LOCALLY COMPACT RINGS

PAUL CIVIN

By a proper involution $*$ on a ring R we mean a mapping $x \rightarrow x^*$ defined on R with the following properties:

(i) $(x + y)^* = x^* + y^*$,

(ii) $(xy)^* = y^*x^*$,

(iii) $(x^*)^* = x$ and

(iv) $xx^* = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$. If (iv) is not assumed, the mapping is simply termed an involution. If F is a field with an involution $\#$ and R is an algebra over F , we say that an involution on R is an algebra involution if in addition to (i)-(iv) above the following holds:

(v) $(\alpha x)^* = \alpha^*x^*$ for all $x \in R$ and $\alpha \in F$.

We are concerned principally with involutions on two types of locally compact semi-simple rings, namely those which are compact or connected. The main result is that involutions on such rings are automatically continuous. As a byproduct we determine the form of any proper involution on a total matrix ring R over a division ring. If in addition R is topological and the division ring admits only continuous involutions, then we note that R has only continuous involutions.

LEMMA *Let D be a division ring with center Z . Let R be a total matrix ring over D . Any ring involution $*$ on R induces an involution $\#$ on Z , and $*$ is an algebra involution on R with respect to the involution $\#$ on Z .*

Direct calculation shows that the center of R consists of the totality of elements of the form αI where $\alpha \in Z$ and I is the identity of R . Suppose x is in the center of R and $y \in R$, then $x^*y = (y^*x)^* = (xy^*)^* = yx^*$, so x^* is in the center of R . Since $I^* = I$ is immediate, it follows that for any $\alpha \in Z$, there is a $\beta \in Z$ such that $(\alpha I)^* = \beta I$. Denote β by α^* . It is clear that $\#$ is an involution on Z . Moreover, if $\alpha \in Z$ and $x \in R$, $(\alpha x)^* = [(\alpha I)x]^* = x^*\alpha^*I = \alpha^*x$, so $*$ is an algebra involution on R with respect to the involution $\#$ on Z .

THEOREM 2. *Let R be a total matrix ring over D , where D is a division ring with center Z . Let $*$ be a proper ring involution on R , and let $\#$ be the induced involution on Z . Then there exist a set of matrix units $\{g_{ij}\}$ in R such that $g_{ii}^* = g_{ii}$ and a set of non-zero elements γ_i of Z such that $\gamma_i^* = \gamma_i$ such that the involution $*$ has the following form: If $x = \sum \alpha_{ij}e_{ij}$, with $\alpha_{ij} \in D$, then $x^* = \sum \gamma_j^{-1}\alpha_{ij}\gamma_i e_{ji}$.*

Received August 31, 1959, and in revised form January 28, 1960. This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation, under grant NSF-G5865.

Let e_{ij} , $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ be a set of matrix units for R . The right ideal $e_{11}R$ is minimal, so by a theorem of Rickart [7] there is a unique idempotent $u_1 \in e_{11}R$ such that $u_1^* = u_1 \neq 0$. Let $L_1 = Ru_1$, and $L_k = Re_{1k} = Re_{k1}$, $k = 2, \dots, n$. The L_k are minimal left ideals so by the Rickart theorem there are unique idempotents $u_k \in L_k$ such that $u_k^* = u_k \neq 0$, $k = 1, \dots, n$.

We denote by $[A, B, \dots, C]$ the smallest left ideal containing A, B, \dots, C . The linear independence of u_1 and the e_{1k} , $k = 2, \dots, n$ implies that $L_k \not\subset [L_1, \dots, L_{k-1}]$ for $1 < k \leq n$. It is readily verified that $R = [L_1, \dots, L_n]$.

Let $g_1 = u_1$ and suppose that g_1, \dots, g_{k-1} have been defined so that $g_j = g_j^2 = g_j^* \neq 0$, $g_j \in [L_1, \dots, L_j]$ and $g_i g_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. We next show that g_k may be defined with the corresponding properties.

Let $v = u_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} u_k g_j$. Since $L_k \not\subset [L_1, \dots, L_{k-1}]$, $u_k \notin [L_1, \dots, L_{k-1}]$ and thus $v \neq 0$. Since $L_k = Ru_k$ is a minimal left ideal $u_k Ru_k$ is a division ring with unit u_k . The propriety of the involution then yields $vv^* \neq 0$. Since $vv^* \in u_k Ru_k$, there is an element $s \in u_k Ru_k$ such that $s(vv^*) = (vv^*)s = u_k$. If we apply the involution to the prior relation $(vv^*)s^* = s^*(vv^*) = u_k$, and the uniqueness of inverses in a division ring yields $s = s^*$.

It is claimed that $g_k = v^*sv$ has the desired properties. Since $vg_k v^* = vv^*svv^* = u_k vv^* = vv^* \neq 0$, it follows that $g_k \neq 0$. Clearly $g_k = g_k^*$ and $g_k^2 = v^*svv^*sv = v^*u_k sv = v^*sv = g_k$. If $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, $g_i v^* = g_i(u_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} g_j u_k) = 0$ by the inductive hypothesis, thus $g_i g_k = g_i v^* s v = 0$. By applying the involution we obtain $g_k g_i = 0$. The induction is thus complete and we may suppose that g_1, \dots, g_n have been defined.

Clearly $[g_1] = [L_1]$. Suppose that for $1 < k \leq n$, $[g_1, \dots, g_{k-1}] = [L_1, \dots, L_{k-1}]$. The defining property for g_k yields $[g_1, \dots, g_k] \subset [L_1, \dots, L_k] = [[g_1, \dots, g_{k-1}], L_k]$. Thus $g_k = x_1 g_1 + \dots + x_{k-1} g_{k-1} + x_k e_{1k}$. Right multiplication of the last relation by g_k shows that $x_k e_{1k} \neq 0$. Since L_k is a minimal left ideal, there is a $z \in R$ such that $z x_k e_{1k} = e_{1k}$. This may be expressed as $z[g_k - x_1 g_1 - \dots - x_{k-1} g_{k-1}] = e_{1k}$. Thus $L_k \subset [g_1, \dots, g_k]$ and hence $[g_1, \dots, g_k] = [L_1, \dots, L_k]$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$. In particular $R = [g_1, \dots, g_n]$.

The spaces Rg_k must be irreducible over R , otherwise we would have R decomposed into sums of irreducible R -spaces of different lengths. Thus the ideals Rg_k are minimal. Furthermore if we denote the unit element of R by e , we have $e = y_1 g_1 + \dots + y_n g_n$. Right multiplication by g_j shows that $g_j = y_j g_j$ and thus $e = g_1 + \dots + g_n$.

The form of an idempotent in $e_{11}R$ and Re_{kk} , $k = 2, \dots, n$, together with the fact that $\lambda e_{ij} = e_{ij} \lambda$ yields $\lambda u_k = u_k \lambda = u_k \lambda u_k$, $k = 1, \dots, n$ for any $\lambda \in D$. The inductive method of defining g_k then permits one to

deduce that $\lambda g_k = g_k \lambda = g_k \lambda g_k$. For suppose that $\lambda g_j = g_j \lambda$ for $j = 1, \dots, k - 1$. From the way in which v and v^* were defined $\lambda v = v \lambda$ and $\lambda v^* = v^* \lambda$. Since $\lambda g_k = v^* \lambda s v = v^* u_k \lambda s u_k v$, and $g_k \lambda = v^* s \lambda v = v^* u_k s \lambda u_k v$, it is sufficient if we show that $u_k \lambda s u_k = u_k s \lambda u_k$ for all $\lambda \in D$. But $(u_k s \lambda u_k)(v v^*) = s v v^* \lambda = u_k \lambda = \lambda u_k = \lambda s v v^* = u_k \lambda s u_k (v v^*)$. Since $u_k R u_k$ is a division ring, $u_k s \lambda u_k = u_k \lambda s u_k$ as desired. Hence $\lambda g_k = g_k \lambda$ for all $\lambda \in D$ and $k = 1, \dots, n$.

Since $(0) \neq R g_i R$ is a two sided ideal of R , $R g_i R g_k = R g_k \neq (0)$, and thus $g_i R g_k \neq (0)$. Suppose $i < k$, and $g_i r g_k \neq 0$. Then, by the propriety of the involution, $0 \neq (g_i r g_k)(g_i r g_k)^* = g_i r g_k r^* g_i$. Since the left ideal $R g_i$ is minimal, $g_i R g_i$ is a division ring, and there exists $t \in R$ such that $(g_i t g_i)(g_i r g_k r^* g_i) = g_i$. If we take adjoints of the expressions in the preceding equation, we see that $g_i t g_i = g_i t^* g_i$. Let $g_{ik} = g_i t g_i r g_k$ and $g_{ki} = g_k r^* g_i$. Then $g_{ik} g_{ki} = g_i$, and consequently $(g_{ik} g_{ki})(g_{ik} g_{ki}) = g_i$, so $0 \neq g_{ki} g_{ik} \in g_k R g_k$, which is a division ring. Also $g_{ki} g_{ik}$ is idempotent so $g_{ki} g_{ik} = g_k$. Finally if we define $g_{ii} = g_i$, we obtain a set of matrix units $\{g_{ij}\}$ for R such that $g_{ii}^* = g_{ii}$. The form of the involution $*$ on R is then an immediate consequence of a theorem of Jacobson and Rickart [2].

We are now in a position in which we may discuss the continuity of involutions.

THEOREM 3. *Let D be a topological division ring such that any involution on D is continuous. If R is a total matrix ring over D , then any proper ring involution on R is continuous.*

The result is immediate by virtue of the representation of the involution given in Theorem 2, together with the fact that convergence in R , when it is regarded as a finite dimensional vector space, involves [1] convergence of the coefficients of the representation in terms of a given basis.

We turn now to locally compact semi-simple rings which are either connected or compact. The first item needed concerns their topological algebraic structure.

LEMMA. (a) *A compact semi-simple ring is the topological direct sum of total matrix algebras over finite fields.*

(b) *A locally compact connected semi-simple ring is the topological direct sum of a finite number of total matrix rings over locally compact division rings.*

Statement (a) is immediate from Theorem 16 of Kaplansky [4]. In the second statement, the semi-simplicity allows the use of Theorem 2 of Kaplansky [5], which shows that the ring is the direct sum of a semi-simple algebra over the reals with a unit and a totally disconnected ring. Since the decomposition is the Peirce decomposition relative to

the algebra unit, it is easily seen that one has a topological direct sum. The connectedness then forces the second summand to be zero. The conclusion of the lemmas then follows from Theorem 10 of [5].

It might further be noted that the division rings involved must be connected. Consequently, since the only connected locally compact division rings are the reals, the complexes and the quaternions [3], [6], these are the only rings involved in the conclusion of (b).

LEMMA 5. *If $*$ is a proper involution on a direct sum of total matric rings over division rings, then each matric ring is invariant under $*$. Thus $*$ restricted to an individual matric ring is a proper involution on that ring.*

Let R be the direct sum of rings R_j . Let e° be the unit of a summand R° . Say $e^\circ = e_1 + \cdots + e_n$ is the decomposition of e° in terms of the vector units of R° . The right ideal $e_i R = e_i R^\circ$ is a minimal right ideal of R . Hence, by the theorem of Rickart used previously, there exists a unique idempotent f_k in $e_i R$ such that $0 \neq f_i = f_i^*$. Thus $e_i = f_i e_i$ and $e_i^* = e_i^* f_i$. Consequently if $x \in R^\circ$, $x = e_1 x + \cdots + e_n x = f_1 e_1 x + \cdots + f_n e_n x$, and $x^* = x^* e_1^* f_1 + \cdots + x^* e_n^* f_n$ is in R° .

We are now in a position to establish the continuity of proper involutions on the class of semisimple rings under discussion.

THEOREM 6. *If R is a semi-simple locally compact ring which is either compact or connected then any proper involution $*$ on R is continuous.*

In view of Lemmas 4 and 5, it is sufficient to prove the continuity of $*$ on an individual matric ring. Thus the proof is complete for the compact ring. For the connected ring, all we need note is that the only involutions on the reals, complexes and quaternions are automatically continuous. Hence Theorem 3 applies and the proof is complete.

REFERENCES

1. N. Bourbaki, *Eléments de mathématique, Livre V, Espaces vectoriels topologiques*, Herman et Cie, Act. Sci. et Ind. 1189, 1229, Paris 1953, 1955.
2. N. Jacobson and C. E. Rickart, *Homomorphisms of Jordan rings of self-adjoint elements*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **72** (1952), 310-322.
3. N. Jacobson and O. Taussky, *Locally compact rings*, Proc. Nat. Acad., Sci. U.S.A., **21** (1935), 106-108.
4. I. Kaplansky, *Topological rings*, Amer. J. Math., **69** (1947), 153-183.
5. ———, *Locally compact rings*, Amer. J. Math., **70** (1948), 447-459.
6. Y. Otobe, *Note on locally compact simple rings*, Proc. Imp. Acad. Tokyo, **20** (1944), 283.
7. C. E. Rickart, *Representation of certain Bancach algebras*, Duke Math. J., **18** (1951), 27-39.

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

DAVID GILBARG
Stanford University
Stanford, California

F. H. BROWNELL
University of Washington
Seattle 5, Washington

A. L. WHITEMAN
University of Southern California
Los Angeles 7, California

L. J. PAIGE
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH
T. M. CHERRY
D. DERRY

E. HEWITT
A. HORN
L. NACHBIN

M. OHTSUKA
H. L. ROYDEN
M. M. SCHIFFER

E. SPANIER
E. G. STRAUS
F. WOLF

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
OSAKA UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
* * *

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
CALIFORNIA RESEARCH CORPORATION
HUGHES AIRCRAFT COMPANY
SPACE TECHNOLOGY LABORATORIES
NAVAL ORDNANCE TEST STATION

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be typewritten (double spaced), and the author should keep a complete copy. 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. The price per volume (4 numbers) is \$12.00; single issues, \$3.50. Back numbers are available. Special price to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: \$4.00 per volume; single issues, \$1.25.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 2120 Oxford Street, Berkeley 4, 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

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

M. Altman, <i>An optimum cubically convergent iterative method of inverting a linear bounded operator in Hilbert space</i>	1107
Nesmith Cornett Ankeny, <i>Criterion for rth power residuacity</i>	1115
Julius Rubin Blum and David Lee Hanson, <i>On invariant probability measures I</i>	1125
Frank Featherstone Bonsall, <i>Positive operators compact in an auxiliary topology</i>	1131
Billy Joe Boyer, <i>Summability of derived conjugate series</i>	1139
Delmar L. Boyer, <i>A note on a problem of Fuchs</i>	1147
Hans-Joachim Bremermann, <i>The envelopes of holomorphy of tube domains in infinite dimensional Banach spaces</i>	1149
Andrew Michael Bruckner, <i>Minimal superadditive extensions of superadditive functions</i>	1155
Billy Finney Bryant, <i>On expansive homeomorphisms</i>	1163
Jean W. Butler, <i>On complete and independent sets of operations in finite algebras</i>	1169
Lucien Le Cam, <i>An approximation theorem for the Poisson binomial distribution</i>	1181
Paul Civin, <i>Involutions on locally compact rings</i>	1199
Earl A. Coddington, <i>Normal extensions of formally normal operators</i>	1203
Jacob Feldman, <i>Some classes of equivalent Gaussian processes on an interval</i>	1211
Shaul Foguel, <i>Weak and strong convergence for Markov processes</i>	1221
Martin Fox, <i>Some zero sum two-person games with moves in the unit interval</i>	1235
Robert Pertsch Gilbert, <i>Singularities of three-dimensional harmonic functions</i>	1243
Branko Grünbaum, <i>Partitions of mass-distributions and of convex bodies by hyperplanes</i>	1257
Sidney Morris Harmon, <i>Regular covering surfaces of Riemann surfaces</i>	1263
Edwin Hewitt and Herbert S. Zuckerman, <i>The multiplicative semigroup of integers modulo m</i>	1291
Paul Daniel Hill, <i>Relation of a direct limit group to associated vector groups</i>	1309
Calvin Virgil Holmes, <i>Commutator groups of monomial groups</i>	1313
James Fredrik Jakobsen and W. R. Utz, <i>The non-existence of expansive homeomorphisms on a closed 2-cell</i>	1319
John William Jewett, <i>Multiplication on classes of pseudo-analytic functions</i>	1323
Helmut Klingen, <i>Analytic automorphisms of bounded symmetric complex domains</i>	1327
Robert Jacob Koch, <i>Ordered semigroups in partially ordered semigroups</i>	1333
Marvin David Marcus and N. A. Khan, <i>On a commutator result of Taussky and Zassenhaus</i>	1337
John Glen Marica and Steve Jerome Bryant, <i>Unary algebras</i>	1347
Edward Peter Merkes and W. T. Scott, <i>On univalence of a continued fraction</i>	1361
Shu-Teh Chen Moy, <i>Asymptotic properties of derivatives of stationary measures</i>	1371
John William Neuberger, <i>Concerning boundary value problems</i>	1385
Edward C. Posner, <i>Integral closure of differential rings</i>	1393
Marian Reichaw-Reichbach, <i>Some theorems on mappings onto</i>	1397
Marvin Rosenblum and Harold Widom, <i>Two extremal problems</i>	1409
Morton Lincoln Slater and Herbert S. Wilf, <i>A class of linear differential-difference equations</i>	1419
Charles Robson Storey, Jr., <i>The structure of threads</i>	1429
J. François Treves, <i>An estimate for differential polynomials in $\partial/\partial z_1, \dots, \partial/\partial z_n$</i>	1447
J. D. Weston, <i>On the representation of operators by convolutions integrals</i>	1453
James Victor Whittaker, <i>Normal subgroups of some homeomorphism groups</i>	1469