

**\*\*This document was last updated on April 28, 2008. A more recent version may be available as part of <http://math.berkeley.edu/~theo/f/CstarAlgebras.pdf>.\*\***

## 1 April 28, 2008

### 1.1 More on vector bundles

We had been talking about vector bundles, in preparation of the non-commutative case. It will be more convenient to use right modules.

**Definition:** Let  $A$  be a unital  $C^*$ -algebra (or a “nice”  $*$ -subalgebra thereof), and  $\Xi$  a right  $A$ -module. An  $A$ -valued *inner product* on  $\Xi$  is a map

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_A : \Xi \times \Xi \rightarrow A$$

satisfying “ $A$ -sesquilinearity” and “positivity”:

- (a) Bi-additivity **\*\*bilinearity over  $\mathbb{Z}$ \*\***
- (b)  $\langle \xi, \eta a \rangle_A = \langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A a$
- (c)  $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A^* = \langle \eta, \xi \rangle_A$  (Hence  $\langle \xi a, \eta \rangle_A = a^* \langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A$ )
- (d)  $\langle \xi, \xi \rangle_A \geq 0$  (the notion of positivity requires something about  $C^*$ -algebras)
- (e) Sometimes:  $\langle \xi, \xi \rangle_A = 0$  implies  $\xi = 0$

**E.g.**  $E$  a vector bundle over  $M$  compact, and  $\Xi = \Gamma(E)$ ,  $A = C(M)$ . Then take the inner-product that’s  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear in the second variable.

We say that  $\Xi$  is a “Hilbert  $C^*$ -module over  $A$ ”. **Question from the audience:** In order to use the name “Hilbert”, shouldn’t there be some sort of completeness? **Answer:** Yes. So perhaps above is a “pre-Hilbert module”. We can set a norm

$$\|\xi\|_\Xi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\langle \xi, \xi \rangle_A\|_A^{1/2}$$

We can show this is a norm, and for Hilbert we need some sort of Cauchy-Schwartz condition. Our above example will be complete once you do all that.

Well, if you have a Hilbert space, it’s common to discuss rank-one operators. Here we can do the analogous thing: Given  $\xi, \eta \in \Xi$ , we set  $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_0 (= \langle \xi, \eta \rangle_E)$  for “endomorphism”, but a different “ $E$ ” than in the above example) to be the element of  $\text{End}_A(\Xi)$  defined by

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_0 \zeta = \xi \langle \eta, \zeta \rangle_A$$

We write  $A$ -things on the right so that we can put endomorphisms on the left; then there is no crossing. The formalism works just like with rank-one operators.

We write  $\mathcal{B}(\Xi)$  for the bounded operators for the above norm, except that sometimes operators don't have adjoints, and this is sad. Hence, we use:

- The *adjoint* (with respect to the norm  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_A$ ) of an operator  $T \in \text{End}_A(\Xi)$  is an operator  $S \in \text{End}_A(\Xi)$  such that

$$\langle T\xi, \eta \rangle_A = \langle \xi, S\eta \rangle_A$$

for every  $\xi, \eta \in \Xi$ . If  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is definite, then  $S$  is unique, and we write  $S = T^*$ .

- Then

$$\mathcal{B}(\Xi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{T \in \text{End}_A(\Xi) : \|T\|, \|T^*\| < \infty\}$$

In any case, we see that  $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_0^* = \langle \eta, \xi \rangle_0$ . If  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\Xi)$ , then  $T\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_0 = \langle T\xi, \eta \rangle_0$ . So “ $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0$  is a  $\mathcal{B}(\Xi)$ -valued inner-product, where we consider  $\Xi$  as a left-module over  $\mathcal{B}(\Xi)$ .”

**E.g.** In the above vector-bundle example, this works, and is appropriately continuous (the notion of continuity can be derived from a suitable open cover).

**Question from the audience:** Most of these notions are in your paper? **Answer:** Various papers, yes. **Question from the audience:** Do the rank-one operators form an ideal? **Answer:** No, you have to take sums. The rank-one operators span an ideal; denote its closure  $\mathcal{K}(\Xi)$  for “compact”: these are not compact in the usual range sense, but it's an extremely useful ideal. If  $\text{span}\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A$  is dense in  $A$  (we never said how big a module we had; this means it's not tiny), then

$$\mathcal{K}(A)\Xi_A$$

is a Morita equivalence. **\*\*Perhaps the left subscript should be  $\mathcal{K}(\Xi)$ ? The board says  $\mathcal{K}(A)$ , which is a natural notion, as in the subsequent question.\*\***

**Question from the audience:** Is this a simple ideal, topologically? **Answer:** No. For instance, take  $A$ , with the obvious right-action and inner product. If  $A$  is unital, then  $\mathcal{K}(A) = A$ , so you can't say much.

In our vector-bundle  $E \xrightarrow{\pi} M$  example, we pick a cover  $\mathcal{O}_j$  with partition-of-unity  $\phi_j$  and trivialization  $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_j) \cong \mathcal{O}_j \times \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then pick unit vectors  $e_k$  of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , and set  $\zeta_k^j = \phi_j(x) e_k$ . Then

$$T_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_k \left\langle \zeta_k^j(x), \zeta_k^j(x) \right\rangle_0 \geq c(x) \mathbb{1}$$

for  $c(x) \neq 0$  if  $\phi_j(X) \neq 0$ . Then  $T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum T_j$  has

$$T(x) = \sum T_j(x) \geq c(x) \mathbb{1} \geq \epsilon \mathbb{1}$$

where  $c(x)$  is some always-positive function, and  $M$  is compact, hence  $c(x) \geq \epsilon > 0$ .

Now set  $S(x) = T(x)^{-1/2}$ , and  $\eta_k^j = S\zeta_k^j$ . Then

$$\sum_{j,k} \left\langle \eta_k^j, \eta_k^j \right\rangle_0 = \sum_{j,k} \left\langle S\zeta_k^j, S\zeta_k^j \right\rangle_0 = S \sum_{j,k} \langle \zeta_k^j, \zeta_k^j \rangle_0 S = STS = \mathbb{1}$$

so  $\mathcal{K}(E)$  includes the identity operator.

**Definition:** Given unital  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$  and a right-module  $\Xi$  with  $\langle, \rangle_A$ . By a “standard module frame” for  $\Xi$  we mean a finite set  $\{\eta_j\}$  of elements of  $\Xi$  such that  $\mathbb{1}_\Xi = \sum_j \langle \eta_j, \eta_j \rangle_0$ .

This is not entirely standard language, but is catching on. Some people think about infinite sums, with all their subsequent convergence questions. We’ve seen that any vector bundle over a compact space can receive an inner product with a standard module frame. In general, a frame has many more vectors than the dimension; nevertheless, frames are like bases, and are increasingly used in simple old Hilbert land.

**Equivalent Definition:** For any  $\xi \in \Xi$ ,

$$\xi = \mathbb{1}_\Xi \xi = \sum \langle \eta_j, \eta_j \rangle_0 \xi = \sum \eta_j \langle \eta_j, \xi \rangle_A$$

which looks just like the reconstruction formula for a basis in finite-dimensional-land. This stuff is useful for, e.g., error-correction and signal processing.

**Definition:** Let  $R$  be a unital ring (possibly non-commutative). We will always deal with finitely-generated modules. A *free module* (right or left) over  $R$  is a (right- or left-) module isomorphic to  $R^n$  (as a right- or left-) module, for some  $n$ .

**Question from the audience:** Does finitely-generated assure a unique  $n$ ? **Answer:** Absolutely not. E.g.  $R = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ .

**Definition:** A *projective module* is a direct summand of a free module.

Next time:

**Theorem:** Let  $A$  be a unital  $C^*$ -algebra (or nice subalgebra), and  $\Xi, \langle, \rangle$  a (Hilbert, but we don’t so much need this, by finite-generated-ness)  $C^*$ -module over  $A$ . If  $\Xi$  has a standard module frame, then  $\Xi$  is a projective  $A$ -module and is self-dual for  $\langle, \rangle_A$ .

**Corollary:** (Swan’s theorem)

For  $M$  a compact space and  $E$  a vector bundle,  $\Gamma(E)$  is a projective  $C(M)$ -module (and conversely).