

C^* -algebras: The (Quantum) Path Less Traveled

Senan Sekhon

Project Supervisor: Benjamin Doyon

Module: 6CCM345A

2020/21

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	The Name of the Game	2
1.2	What This Project is About	3
2	Banach Algebras	4
2.1	Banach Algebras	4
2.2	The Spectrum	12
2.3	Characters	17
2.4	The Exponential	20
3	C^*-algebras	25
3.1	C^* -algebras	25
3.2	Positive Elements and Positive Linear Functionals	30
3.3	The GNS Construction	33
4	Rebuilding Quantum Mechanics	37
4.1	Unbounded Operators	38
4.2	Concluding Remarks	39
A	Embedding	40
B	The Weak* Topology	41
	References	42

Conventions

- \mathbb{F} denotes either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} .
- \mathbb{N} denotes the set $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ of natural numbers (excluding 0).
- \mathbb{N}_0 denotes the set $\{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ of natural numbers (including 0).
- $D(z_0, r)$ denotes the open disk $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z - z_0| < r\}$ in the complex plane.
- $\overline{D}(z_0, r)$ denotes the closed disk $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z - z_0| \leq r\}$ in the complex plane.
- Inner products are assumed to be linear in the first argument and conjugate linear in the second.
- \mathcal{H} denotes a (real or complex) Hilbert space.
- All algebras are assumed to be associative.



Abstract

In this project, we will develop the theory of Banach algebras and prove two celebrated theorems, the Gelfand representation theorem and the GKZ theorem. We will then proceed to develop the theory of C^* -algebras and prove the Gelfand-Naimark theorem and the GNS theorem. Finally, we will show how they can be used to give an alternative formulation of quantum mechanics.

The cover image was created by the author using TikZ and PGF. It depicts a set of quantum particles (or equivalently, wave packets) moving around in an oscillating potential, interfering with it as they vibrate.

1 Introduction

When quantum mechanics was first developed in the 1920s by Erwin Schrödinger (1887–1961), Werner Heisenberg (1901–1976), Wolfgang Pauli (1900–1958) and Max Born¹ (1882–1970) (among many others), it was formulated in terms of matrix mechanics, differential equations and calculus of variations. While these are sufficient in practice for modeling simple quantum systems (e.g. a particle in a potential well), they are not mathematically rigorous, and this leads to problems when trying to generalize them to more complicated (e.g. infinite-dimensional) systems.



The first rigorous mathematical formulation of quantum mechanics was given in 1930 by Dirac [18] and in 1932 by von Neumann² [36]. This is primarily based on functional analysis in Hilbert spaces, and boils down to a set of three axioms, now known as the *Dirac-von Neumann axioms*:

Dirac-von Neumann Axioms (Hilbert space version)

Every quantum system can be modeled using a complex Hilbert space \mathcal{H} .

1. The observables of the system are the self-adjoint operators $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$.
2. The states of the system are the unit vectors in \mathcal{H} .
3. The expected value of an observable A when the system is in a state ψ is³ $\langle A\psi, \psi \rangle$.

Dirac and von Neumann's formulation of quantum mechanics starts with a Hilbert space of states and builds the observables from there (using operators). But we can do this the other way around. This leads to an alternative description of the Dirac-von Neumann axioms, using what are now known as *C^* -algebras*:

Dirac-von Neumann Axioms (C^* -algebra version)

Every quantum system can be modeled using a complex C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} .

1. The observables of the system are the self-adjoint elements of \mathcal{A} .
2. The states of the system are the unit positive linear functionals $\omega : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.
3. The expected value of an observable a when the system is in a state ω is $\omega(a)$.

In this formulation, we start with a C^* -algebra of observables and build the states from there (using linear functionals). This time, it is the *states* that act on the *observables*, rather than the *observables* acting on the *states*. The fact that this is compatible with the Hilbert space formulation is a consequence of the GNS theorem, which we will prove in Chapter 3.

The move to consolidate the mathematics of quantum mechanics into an abstract theory was pioneered in 1933 by Pascual Jordan⁴ (1902–1980), though the abstract theory of C^* -algebras did not come until 1946. Meanwhile, other formulations of quantum mechanics were also under way, such as the phase space formulation (developed in 1946 by Hilbrand Groenewold (1910–1996)) and the path integral formulation (developed in 1948 by Richard Feynman (1918–1988)).

¹Outside of the physics community, Born is more famous as the grandfather of singer and actress Olivia Newton-John.

²Not to be confused with Carl Neumann (1832–1925), known for Neumann series and Neumann boundary conditions, or Ezra T. Newman (1929–), known for the Newman-Penrose (NP) formalism and the Kerr-Newman metric.

³Most texts on quantum mechanics define this as $\langle \psi, A\psi \rangle$ instead. This is because they assume inner products to be linear in the second argument, rather than the first as we do here.

⁴Not to be confused with Wilhelm Jordan (1842–1899), known for Gauss-Jordan elimination, or Camille Jordan (1838–1922), known for the Jordan curve theorem and the Jordan normal form.

1.1 The Name of the Game

We first introduce the two most important and fundamental examples, the Batman and Robin⁵ of C^* -algebras:

$C_0(X)$: Continuous functions vanishing at infinity on a locally compact Hausdorff space

Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space. Then $C_0(X)$ is the space of all functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ such that:

Continuous: For any open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}$, the pre-image $f^{-1}(U) = \{x \in X \mid f(x) \in U\}$ is open in X .

Vanishing at infinity: For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a compact set $K \subseteq X$ such that $|f(x)| < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in X \setminus K$.

Elements of $C_0(X)$ can be added, scaled and multiplied in the usual way:

$$(f + g)(x) = f(x) + g(x) \quad (\alpha f)(x) = \alpha f(x) \quad (fg)(x) = f(x)g(x)$$

We also define the following operations on $C_0(X)$:

$$\text{Adjoint: } f^* : X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}, f^*(x) = \overline{f(x)} \quad \text{Norm: } \|f\| = \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|$$

Example. If $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, then $C_0(X)$ is the set of all continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^n that vanish as $|\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. those that decay to zero (hence the name *vanishing at infinity*).

For any locally compact Hausdorff space X , we can define three other related spaces:

- $C(X)$, the space of *all* continuous functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$.
- $C_b(X)$, the space of all *bounded* continuous functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$.
- $C_c(X)$, the space of all continuous functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ with *compact support*, i.e. there is a compact set $K \subseteq X$ such that $f(x) = 0$ for all $x \in X \setminus K$.

These spaces are nested as follows:

$$C_c(X) \subseteq C_0(X) \subseteq C_b(X) \subseteq C(X)$$

All of these inclusions are strict unless X is compact, in which case all four spaces are identical.

$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$: Bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space

Suppose \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space. Then $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is the space of all functions $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that:

Linear: For any $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ and any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$, we have $T(x + y) = T(x) + T(y)$ and $T(\alpha x) = \alpha T(x)$.

Bounded: There exists $M \geq 0$ such that $\|Tx\| \leq M\|x\|$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

Elements of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ can be added, scaled and multiplied in the usual way:

$$(S + T)(x) = S(x) + T(x) \quad (\alpha T)(x) = \alpha T(x) \quad (ST)(x) = S(T(x))$$

We also define the following operations on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$:

$$\text{Adjoint: } T^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \langle T^*(x), y \rangle = \langle x, T(y) \rangle \quad \text{Norm: } \|T\| = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{H}, \|x\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1} \|T(x)\|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

Examples.

1. If $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{F}^n$, then $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) = M_n(\mathbb{F})$, the set of all $n \times n$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{F} . If we use the standard (Euclidean) inner product on \mathbb{F}^n , then the adjoint of any matrix $A \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ is simply its conjugate transpose (if $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$, this is even more simply its transpose). This C^* -algebra can be used to describe a single quantum particle with a finite number of eigenstates, e.g. a stationary particle with spin.
2. If $\mathcal{H} = \ell^2 = \left\{ (x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \mid \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|^2 < \infty \right\}$ (the set of all square-summable sequences in \mathbb{F}), then $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of all bounded operators $T : \ell^2 \rightarrow \ell^2$. This C^* -algebra can be used to describe a single quantum particle with a countably infinite number of eigenstates, e.g. a particle in a box.


The key difference between the examples $C_0(X)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is that the former is *abelian*, i.e. $f(x)g(x) = g(x)f(x)$, while the latter is *non-abelian*, i.e. $S \circ T \neq T \circ S$ (in general). As we will see later, this will lead us to formulate two different theorems, one for abelian C^* -algebras (the Gelfand-Naimark theorem) and the other for non-abelian C^* -algebras (the GNS theorem⁶). Together, these will allow us to characterize *all* C^* -algebras.

⁵or Bonnie and Clyde, or Thelma and Louise, or whichever dynamic duo you prefer.

⁶Technically, the GNS theorem is also applicable to abelian C^* -algebras, but in this case, the Gelfand-Naimark theorem is simpler.

1.2 What This Project is About

With the end (quantum mechanics) in mind, let us outline the journey to get there. We will combine tools from algebra and analysis with concepts from theoretical physics to develop a theory that is mathematically rigorous, yet also suitable to describe real-world physical systems. Before the 1930s, this was a delicate balance that was rarely emphasized, let alone achieved⁷. As the 20th century progressed, there were several major developments that helped strike this balance, such as topological manifolds (used in string theory and supergravity), compact Lie algebras (used in Yang-Mills theory) and, as we will discuss here, C^* -algebras.



This diagram is not exhaustive, there are *many* other topics in the overlapping regions.

In Chapter 2, we will build the theory of Banach algebras and use the combined power of algebra and analysis to prove some powerful results in spectral theory and representation theory. In particular, we will prove the Gelfand representation theorem and the GKZ theorem.

In Chapter 3, we will strengthen these ideas and construct the theory of C^* -algebras, and show how just one axiom combining the algebraic and analytic sides of the game leads to such a rich and vivid structure. We will then use these to prove the Gelfand-Naimark theorem and the GNS theorem, thereby explicitly classifying all C^* -algebras.

Finally, in Chapter 4, we will recast the Dirac-von Neumann axioms in terms of C^* -algebras and discuss how they can be used to model quantum mechanical systems.

Now that we have an idea of the journey ahead, let's take a trip down the (quantum) path less traveled...

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my project supervisor, Prof. Benjamin Doyon, for his invaluable feedback and comments on my project. I would also like to thank Dr. Paul Cook for his unwavering support in my learning endeavors and his encouragement for me to embark on mathematical research from early on, some of which has led to this project. Finally, I would like to thank my peers for their support throughout my years at King's College London. In particular, I would like to thank Tamanna Sehgal and John Campbell for their help and feedback on the format and aesthetics of this project.

Senan Sekhon
March 31, 2021

⁷Perhaps the closest approximation of this is when Einstein first formulated his theory of general relativity in 1915, using tools from tensor calculus and differential geometry of manifolds, developed merely 20 years earlier by Ricci and Levi-Civita.

2 Banach Algebras

Before we can talk about C^* -algebras, we first need to introduce the concept of *Banach algebras*. Banach algebras are where algebra meets analysis. They have a norm structure (which allows us to talk about things like distances, convergence and continuity), as well as an algebra structure (which allows us to talk about things like polynomials, ideals and homomorphisms). Combining these two structures opens up more concepts for us, such as power series and spectra, which are fundamental to the theory of functional calculus.

While these concepts will play a vital role in our study of C^* -algebras and quantum mechanics, they are also interesting on their own. As such, we will spend some time investigating the general theory of Banach algebras before we specialize to C^* -algebras.

For further reading on Banach algebras, see [34], [20], [28], [19], [15], [40] and [39].

2.1 Banach Algebras

Definition 2.1. An **algebra** over a field \mathbb{F} is a vector space \mathcal{A} over \mathbb{F} , together with a binary operation $\cdot : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ (known as **multiplication** or *vector multiplication*), that satisfies the following:

1. If $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$, then $x \cdot y \in \mathcal{A}$. (Closure)
2. If $x, y, z \in \mathcal{A}$, then $x \cdot (y + z) = x \cdot y + x \cdot z$. (Left distributivity)
3. If $x, y, z \in \mathcal{A}$, then $(x + y) \cdot z = x \cdot z + y \cdot z$. (Right distributivity)
4. If $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$, then $(\alpha x) \cdot y = \alpha(x \cdot y) = x \cdot (\alpha y)$. (Compatibility with scalar multiplication)
5. If $x, y, z \in \mathcal{A}$, then $x \cdot (y \cdot z) = (x \cdot y) \cdot z$. (Associativity)

Examples.

1. Every field \mathbb{F} is an algebra over itself, with the vector multiplication operation given by the field multiplication.
2. \mathbb{F}^n is an algebra over \mathbb{F} , with componentwise addition, scalar multiplication and vector multiplication, e.g. $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \cdot (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) = (a_1 b_1, a_2 b_2, \dots, a_n b_n)$.
3. Suppose X is a set. Then the set \mathbb{F}^X of all functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is an algebra, with pointwise addition, scalar multiplication and vector multiplication, e.g. $(f \cdot g)(x) = f(x)g(x)$.
4. Suppose X is a vector space. Then the set $\mathcal{L}(X)$ of all linear maps $T : X \rightarrow X$ is an algebra, with the multiplication operation given by composition.
5. The set $M_n(\mathbb{F})$ of all $n \times n$ matrices is an algebra, with matrix addition, scalar multiplication and matrix multiplication.

Remark. Some sources do not require algebras to be associative. Indeed, there are non-associative algebras, such as \mathbb{R}^3 with the cross product. Here, we will require all algebras to be associative. In particular, this makes them rings under the addition and multiplication operations. We will also usually omit the symbol for vector multiplication, i.e. write ab instead of $a \cdot b$.

Definition 2.2. An algebra \mathcal{A} is **abelian** (or *commutative*) if $a \cdot b = b \cdot a$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$.

Examples.

1. \mathbb{F}^n (with componentwise multiplication) is abelian.
2. \mathbb{F}^X (with pointwise multiplication) is abelian.
3. $M_n(\mathbb{F})$ is non-abelian if $n \geq 2$.
4. If X is a vector space and $\dim(X) \geq 2$, then $\mathcal{L}(X)$ is non-abelian.

Definition 2.3. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an algebra. A **subalgebra** of \mathcal{A} is a subset $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ that is also an algebra (with the same operations as \mathcal{A}).

Remark. Equivalently, a subalgebra of \mathcal{A} is a (vector) subspace \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{A} that is closed under vector multiplication, i.e. for all $a, b \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $a \cdot b \in \mathcal{B}$.

The intersection of any collection of subalgebras of \mathcal{A} is a subalgebra of \mathcal{A} . The proof of this is straightforward from the definition. An important consequence is that every subset of \mathcal{A} “generates” a subalgebra of \mathcal{A} , the intersection of all subalgebras of \mathcal{A} containing it. This is analogous to the concept of span in linear algebra.

We can easily construct larger algebras from smaller ones. If \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are algebras over \mathbb{F} , then the Cartesian product $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ is an algebra over \mathbb{F} , with coordinatewise addition, scalar multiplication and vector multiplication:

$$(a_1, b_1) + (a_2, b_2) = (a_1 + a_2, b_1 + b_2) \quad \lambda(a, b) = (\lambda a, \lambda b) \quad (a_1, b_1) \cdot (a_2, b_2) = (a_1 \cdot a_2, b_1 \cdot b_2)$$

Definition 2.4. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an algebra. An **identity** (or *identity element* or *unit*) of \mathcal{A} is an element $\mathbb{1} \in \mathcal{A}$, $\mathbb{1} \neq 0$ such that $\mathbb{1}a = a\mathbb{1} = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. An algebra \mathcal{A} is **unital** if it has an identity.

⚠ This is NOT the same as a unit in a ring (where it refers to any element with a multiplicative inverse). For example, both 1 and -1 are units in \mathbb{Z} , but only 1 is an identity element.

Remark. The assumption $\mathbb{1} \neq 0$ is necessary to exclude the case where $\mathcal{A} = \{0\}$ (although $0 \cdot a = a \cdot 0 = 0$ for all $a \in \{0\}$, we do not consider 0 an identity).

Examples.

1. \mathbb{F}^n is unital, its identity is $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$.
2. $M_n(\mathbb{F})$ is unital, its identity is I_n (the $n \times n$ identity matrix).
3. The set $\mathcal{A} = \{[a_{ij}] \in M_n(\mathbb{F}) \mid a_{ij} = 0 \text{ for all } i > j\}$ of all upper triangular $n \times n$ matrices is a subalgebra of $M_n(\mathbb{F})$. It is unital as $I_n \in \mathcal{A}$.
4. The set $\mathcal{A} = \{[a_{ij}] \in M_n(\mathbb{F}) \mid a_{ij} = 0 \text{ for all } i \geq j\}$ of all strictly upper triangular $n \times n$ matrices is a subalgebra of $M_n(\mathbb{F})$. It is not unital as $I_n \notin \mathcal{A}$.

Proposition 2.5. The identity of any algebra is unique.

Proof. Suppose $\mathbb{1}_1$ and $\mathbb{1}_2$ are two identities of \mathcal{A} . Since $\mathbb{1}_2$ is an identity, we have $\mathbb{1}_1\mathbb{1}_2 = \mathbb{1}_1$, and since $\mathbb{1}_1$ is an identity, we have $\mathbb{1}_1\mathbb{1}_2 = \mathbb{1}_2$. Thus $\mathbb{1}_1 = \mathbb{1}_2$. 🧐

Definition 2.6. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital algebra. An element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is **invertible** if there is an element $b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $ab = ba = \mathbb{1}$. If so, we call b the **inverse** of a and denote it by a^{-1} . The set of all invertible elements of \mathcal{A} is denoted by \mathcal{A}^\times .

Remark. It is enough that there are elements $b, c \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $ab = \mathbb{1}$ and $ca = \mathbb{1}$, as this implies that $b = c$ (since $b = \mathbb{1}b = (ca)b = c(ab) = c\mathbb{1} = c$).

⚠ It is NOT enough that there is an element $b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $ab = \mathbb{1}$, see the example after the next lemma.

Examples.

1. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{F}^n$ with componentwise multiplication. Then \mathcal{A}^\times is the set of all elements of \mathbb{F}^n with all components nonzero.
2. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = M_n(\mathbb{F})$. Then $\mathcal{A}^\times = GL_n(\mathbb{F})$, the set of all $n \times n$ matrices with nonzero determinant.
3. Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space and $f \in C_0(X)$. Then f is invertible if and only if it does not vanish, i.e. $f(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in X$.

Lemma 2.7. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital algebra and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. If ab and ba are invertible, then a and b are also invertible.

Proof. Since $ab(ab)^{-1} = \mathbb{1}$ and $(ba)^{-1}ba = \mathbb{1}$, it follows that a is invertible and $a^{-1} = b(ab)^{-1} = (ba)^{-1}b$. Switching a and b shows that b is also invertible. 🧐

⚠ It is NOT sufficient that ab is invertible!

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\ell^\infty)$ and define the *left shift* and *right shift* operators $L, R \in \mathcal{A}$ respectively by $L((x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)) = (x_2, x_3, \dots)$ and $R((x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)) = (0, x_1, x_2, \dots)$. Then $LR = \mathbb{1}$ is invertible, but L, R and RL are not. This is because L is surjective but not injective, and vice versa for R .

Definition 2.8. An **algebra norm** (or *norm*) on an algebra \mathcal{A} is a vector space norm $\|\cdot\| : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\|x \cdot y\| \leq \|x\|\|y\|$. An algebra with a norm is known as a **normed algebra**.

Remark. Since every normed algebra is (by definition) a normed vector space, it is also a metric space with respect to the induced metric $d(x, y) = \|x - y\|$.

Examples.

1. \mathbb{F}^n is a normed algebra with the p -norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p = (\sum_{k=1}^n |x_k|^p)^{1/p}$ for any $1 \leq p < \infty$ (if $p = 2$, this is simply the Euclidean norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n |x_k|^2}$). It is also a normed algebra with the maximum norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} |x_k|$.
2. $M_n(\mathbb{F})$ is a normed algebra with the spectral norm $\|A\| = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^n, \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq 1} \|A\mathbf{x}\|_2$. It is also a normed algebra with the Frobenius norm $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n |a_{kl}|^2}$.
3. Suppose X is a normed vector space. Then the set $\mathcal{B}(X)$ of all bounded linear operators $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a normed algebra (with the operator norm).
4. Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space. Then $C_0(X)$ is a normed algebra with the *supremum norm* $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|$ and the pointwise product $(fg)(x) = f(x)g(x)$.
5. Suppose (X, \mathcal{A}, μ) is a measure space. Then the Lebesgue space $L^\infty(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is a normed algebra with the *essential supremum norm*:

$$\|f\|_\infty = \inf \{M \geq 0 \mid \mu(\{x \in X \mid |f(x)| > M\}) = 0\}$$

And the pointwise product. In particular, we have the following important special cases:

- (a) If $X = \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ and μ is the counting measure, we get the sequence space ℓ^∞ .
- (b) If $X = \mathbb{R}$, \mathcal{A} is the Lebesgue σ -algebra on \mathbb{R} and μ is the Lebesgue measure, we get the Lebesgue space $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.

Two notable examples of normed algebras arise from the concept of *convolution*:

Example. The sequence space $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$ is a normed algebra with the pointwise product $(a \cdot b)_n = a_n b_n$. It is also a (different) normed algebra with the convolution product:

$$(a * b)_n = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} a_m b_{n-m}$$

More generally, suppose G is a group. Then the space $\ell^1(G)$ of all absolutely summable functions $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is a normed algebra with the convolution product:

$$(f * g)(x) = \sum_{y \in G} f(y)g(y^{-1}x)$$

This is known as the *discrete group algebra* of G .

Example. The Lebesgue space $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is NOT a normed algebra with the pointwise product $(fg)(x) = f(x)g(x)$, as the product of two functions in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ may not be in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$. However, it is a normed algebra with the convolution product:

$$(f * g)(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y)g(x-y) dy$$

More generally, suppose G is a topological group, $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is the Borel σ -algebra on G and μ is a left-invariant Haar measure on $(G, \mathcal{B}(G))$. Then the space $L^1(G, \mathcal{B}(G), \mu)$ of all absolutely integrable functions $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is a normed algebra with the convolution product:

$$(f * g)(x) = \int_G f(y)g(y^{-1}x) d\mu$$

This is known as the *Haar measure algebra* of $(G, \mathcal{B}(G), \mu)$.

Definition 2.9. A normed algebra \mathcal{A} is **unital** if it has an identity $\mathbb{1} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|\mathbb{1}\| = 1$.

Remark. A unital normed algebra is NOT simply a normed algebra with an identity, it has the additional requirement that $\|\mathbb{1}\| = 1$. This is not vacuous, as the next example shows.

Example. \mathbb{R} is a unital normed algebra with the norm $\|x\| = |x|$. However, it is not a unital normed algebra with the norm $\|x\| = 2|x|$ since $\|\mathbb{1}\| = 2 \neq 1$. (though it is still a normed algebra and a unital algebra).

If a normed algebra \mathcal{A} has an identity $\mathbb{1}$, it follows automatically that $\|\mathbb{1}\| \geq 1$, since $\|\mathbb{1}\| = \|\mathbb{1} \cdot \mathbb{1}\| \leq \|\mathbb{1}\| \|\mathbb{1}\|$. In practice, we usually assume that $\|\mathbb{1}\| = 1$, as we can always replace the norm with an equivalent norm to make this true. See [28, Proposition 1.1.1, Page 2] for a proof.


Example. Suppose X is a locally compact (but not compact) Hausdorff space. Then $C_0(X)$ is a non-unital normed algebra, since the identity element (the constant function 1) is not in $C_0(X)$.

Some normed algebras do not have an identity, but they have an *approximate identity*, i.e. a sequence $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|e_n a - a\| = 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Example. Suppose e is the identity element in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$. Then for all $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, we must have $e * f = f$, i.e.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e(x-y)f(y) dy = f(x)$$

This is satisfied if and only if $e(x) = \delta(x)$, the Dirac delta function. This function is not in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$, and so $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ has no identity. However, we can define a sequence $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of functions in $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ such that for any $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, we have $\|e_n * f - f\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Below are some examples of such a sequence:



Approximate identities of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$, such as those above, are also known as *summability kernels*. They are vital in Fourier analysis, harmonic analysis, PDEs and distribution theory.

Some normed algebras do not even have an approximate identity.

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} \neq \{0\}$ is a normed vector space and define the multiplication operation by $ab = 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Then \mathcal{A} has no approximate identity, since for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, $a \neq 0$, we have $\|ba - a\| = \|0 - a\| = \|a\|$, so this cannot approach 0.

Proposition 2.10. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a normed algebra. Then the addition, scalar multiplication and vector multiplication operations are continuous.

Proof. Suppose $a_0, b_0 \in \mathcal{A}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.

Addition: Set $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Then for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|a - a_0\|, \|b - b_0\| < \delta$, we have:

$$\|(a + b) - (a_0 + b_0)\| = \|(a - a_0) + (b - b_0)\| \leq \|a - a_0\| + \|b - b_0\| < \delta + \delta = 2\delta = \varepsilon$$

Scalar multiplication: Set $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{|\lambda|+1}$. Then for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|a - a_0\| < \delta$, we have:

$$\|\lambda a - \lambda a_0\| = \|\lambda(a - a_0)\| = |\lambda| \|a - a_0\| < |\lambda| \delta = |\lambda| \frac{\varepsilon}{|\lambda|+1} < \varepsilon$$

Vector multiplication: Set $m = \frac{\|a_0\| + \|b_0\|}{2}$ and set $\delta = \sqrt{m^2 + \varepsilon} - m$. Note that $\delta > 0$ and $\delta^2 + 2m\delta = \varepsilon$. Then for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|a - a_0\|, \|b - b_0\| < \delta$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|ab - a_0 b_0\| &= \|ab - a_0 b + a_0 b - a_0 b_0\| = \|(a - a_0)b + a_0(b - b_0)\| \leq \|a - a_0\| \|b\| + \|a_0\| \|b - b_0\| \\ &< \delta \|b\| + \delta \|a_0\| = \delta(\|b\| + \|a_0\|) = \delta(\|b - b_0 + b_0\| + \|a_0\|) \leq \delta(\|b - b_0\| + \|b_0\| + \|a_0\|) \\ &\leq \delta(\delta + 2m) = \delta^2 + 2m\delta = \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$



Definition 2.11. A **Banach algebra** is a normed algebra \mathcal{A} that is complete, i.e. every Cauchy sequence in \mathcal{A} converges in \mathcal{A} .

This simply means that, as a normed vector space, it is a Banach space, hence the name ‘Banach algebra’.

Examples.

1. \mathbb{F}^n is a Banach algebra with any of the p -norms, as well as with the maximum norm. More generally, every finite-dimensional normed algebra is a Banach algebra.
2. Suppose X is a Banach space. Then $\mathcal{B}(X)$ is a Banach algebra.
3. Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space. Then $C_b(X)$ and $C_0(X)$ are Banach algebras. However, $C_c(X)$ is not a Banach algebra (unless X is compact), as it is incomplete.
4. Suppose (X, \mathcal{A}, μ) is a measure space. Then $L^\infty(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is a Banach algebra (the fact that it is complete follows from the Riesz-Fischer theorem).
5. The set $C^1[a, b]$ of all continuously differentiable functions $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is NOT a Banach algebra with

the supremum norm $\|f\| = \sup_{x \in [a,b]} |f(x)|$ (as it is not complete). However, it is a Banach algebra with the norm $\|f\| = \sup_{x \in [a,b]} |f(x)| + \sup_{x \in [a,b]} |f'(x)|$.

Definition 2.12. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an algebra and \mathcal{I} is a subspace of \mathcal{A} .

- \mathcal{I} is a **left ideal** of \mathcal{A} if $ab \in \mathcal{I}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $b \in \mathcal{I}$.
- \mathcal{I} is a **right ideal** of \mathcal{A} if $ba \in \mathcal{I}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $b \in \mathcal{I}$.
- \mathcal{I} is an **ideal** (or *two-sided ideal*) of \mathcal{A} if it is both a left ideal and a right ideal of \mathcal{A} .

Examples.

1. Every algebra \mathcal{A} has $\{0\}$ and \mathcal{A} as ideals (these are the *trivial* ideals of \mathcal{A}).
2. For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$, the set $\mathcal{A}a = \{ba \mid b \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is a left ideal of \mathcal{A} . Similarly, the set $a\mathcal{A} = \{ab \mid b \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is a right ideal of \mathcal{A} .
3. Suppose X is a normed vector space. Then the set $\mathcal{K}(X)$ of all compact operators in $\mathcal{B}(X)$ is a (two-sided) ideal of $\mathcal{B}(X)$.
4. Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space. Then $C_0(X)$ is a (two-sided) ideal of $C_b(X)$.
5. $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b \in \mathbb{F} \right\}$ is a right ideal of $M_2(\mathbb{F})$, but not a left ideal. Similarly, $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ b & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b \in \mathbb{F} \right\}$ is a left ideal of $M_2(\mathbb{F})$, but not a right ideal.

Every left/right/two-sided ideal of \mathcal{A} is a subalgebra of \mathcal{A} . The intersection of any collection of left (resp. right, two-sided) ideals of \mathcal{A} is a left (resp. right, two-sided) ideal of \mathcal{A} . The proofs of these are straightforward from the definitions.

Definition 2.13. Suppose \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are algebras. A **homomorphism** (or *algebra homomorphism*) from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} is a linear map $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that $\phi(ab) = \phi(a)\phi(b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$.

An **isomorphism** (or *algebra isomorphism*) is a bijective homomorphism.

Basically, a homomorphism is a linear map that is also multiplicative.

Examples.

1. The map $\phi : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, $\phi(z) = \bar{z}$ is an isomorphism (if $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$, then ϕ is the identity map).
2. The map $\phi : M_n(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, $\phi(A) = \det(A)$ is NOT a homomorphism, as it is not linear.

Proposition 2.14. Suppose \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are algebras and $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a homomorphism. Then:

1. $\text{im}(\phi)$ is a subalgebra of \mathcal{B} .
2. $\ker(\phi)$ is an ideal of \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Since ϕ is a homomorphism, it is linear, so $\text{im}(\phi)$ is a subspace of \mathcal{B} , while $\ker(\phi)$ is a subspace of \mathcal{A} .

1. Suppose $x, y \in \text{im}(\phi)$. Then we have $x = \phi(a)$ and $y = \phi(b)$ for some $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. This yields $xy = \phi(a)\phi(b) = \phi(ab)$, so $xy \in \text{im}(\phi)$. Thus $\text{im}(\phi)$ is a subalgebra of \mathcal{B} .
2. Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \ker(\phi)$. Then $\phi(b) = 0$. This yields $\phi(ab) = \phi(a)\phi(b) = \phi(a)0 = 0$ and $\phi(ba) = \phi(b)\phi(a) = 0\phi(a) = 0$, so $ab \in \ker(\phi)$. Thus $\ker(\phi)$ is an ideal of \mathcal{A} . 🤓

Definition 2.15. Suppose \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are unital algebras. A **unital homomorphism** (or *unital algebra homomorphism*) from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} is an algebra homomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that $\phi(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}}$.

In other words, a unital homomorphism is a homomorphism that maps the identity to the identity.

Examples.

1. If \mathcal{A} is a subalgebra of \mathcal{B} , then the inclusion map $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, $\iota(a) = a$ is a unital homomorphism.
2. The map $\phi : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow M_2(\mathbb{F})$, $\phi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 0 & x \end{pmatrix}$ is a unital homomorphism.
3. The map $\phi : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow M_2(\mathbb{F})$, $\phi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is a non-unital homomorphism.

Proposition 2.16. Suppose \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are unital algebras and $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a unital homomorphism. Then for all $a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$, we have $\phi(a) \in \mathcal{B}^\times$ and $(\phi(a))^{-1} = \phi(a^{-1})$.

Proof. Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$. Then $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} = \phi(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \phi(aa^{-1}) = \phi(a)\phi(a^{-1})$ and $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} = \phi(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \phi(a^{-1}a) = \phi(a^{-1})\phi(a)$. Thus $\phi(a) \in \mathcal{B}^\times$ and $(\phi(a))^{-1} = \phi(a^{-1})$. 🤔

Definition 2.17. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an algebra. An ideal \mathcal{I} of \mathcal{A} is **proper** if $\mathcal{I} \neq \mathcal{A}$. It is **maximal** if it is a proper ideal of \mathcal{A} and it is not contained in any other proper ideal of \mathcal{A} .

If \mathcal{A} is unital, then every proper ideal of \mathcal{A} is contained in a maximal ideal of \mathcal{A} . This is a special case of Krull's theorem, which is equivalent to the axiom of choice.

Example. Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space and $a \in X$. Then $\mathcal{I} = \{f \in C_0(X) \mid f(a) = 0\}$ is a maximal ideal of $C_0(X)$. To see this, suppose $\mathcal{J} \supset \mathcal{I}$ is an ideal of $C_0(X)$ that strictly contains \mathcal{I} . Then there exists $f \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $f(a) = c \neq 0$. Suppose $g \in C_0(X)$ and define $h = \frac{g(a)}{c}f - g$. Then $h \in C_0(X)$ as it is a linear combination of two functions in $C_0(X)$. We also have $h(a) = \frac{g(a)}{c}c - g(a) = 0$, so $h \in \mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{J}$. Thus $g = \frac{g(a)}{c}f - h$ is a linear combination of two functions in \mathcal{J} , and so $g \in \mathcal{J}$. Thus $\mathcal{J} = C_0(X)$, and so \mathcal{I} is a maximal ideal of $C_0(X)$.

Example. Suppose $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\mathcal{I} = \left\{f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \mid \widehat{f}(\eta) = 0\right\}$ is a maximal ideal of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$, where $\widehat{f}(\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi i \xi x} f(x) dx$ is the Fourier transform of f . To see this, we can use Fourier transforms, i.e. pass from the time domain to the frequency domain. This is an algebra homomorphism from $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ into $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ (as it is linear and turns convolution into pointwise multiplication), and so the previous example shows that \mathcal{I} is maximal.

Lemma 2.18. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital algebra and \mathcal{I} is a proper ideal of \mathcal{A} . Then $\mathcal{A}^\times \cap \mathcal{I} = \emptyset$, i.e. \mathcal{I} does not contain any invertible elements of \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}^\times \cap \mathcal{I}$. Since $a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$, it has an inverse a^{-1} . Since $a \in \mathcal{I}$ and \mathcal{I} is an ideal of \mathcal{A} , we have $aa^{-1} = \mathbb{1} \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus for any $b \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $b = b\mathbb{1} \in \mathcal{I}$, and so $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{A}$. Therefore if $\mathcal{I} \neq \mathcal{A}$, then $\mathcal{A}^\times \cap \mathcal{I} = \emptyset$. 🤔

Proposition 2.19. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an algebra and \mathcal{I} is an ideal of \mathcal{A} . Then \mathcal{I} is maximal if and only if \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is simple, i.e. it does not have a non-trivial ideal.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Suppose \mathcal{I} is maximal but $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}$ has a non-trivial ideal $\mathcal{J} \neq \{0\}, \mathcal{B}$. Then the quotient maps $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $\psi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{J}$ are nonzero homomorphisms. Thus $\psi \circ \phi$ is also a nonzero homomorphism, and so $\ker(\psi \circ \phi)$ is an ideal of \mathcal{A} containing \mathcal{I} . Since $\mathcal{J} \neq \{0\}$, there exists $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $[a] \neq [0]$, i.e. $a + \mathcal{I} \neq \mathcal{I}$. Thus $a \in \ker(\psi \circ \phi)$ but $a \notin \mathcal{I}$, which contradicts the maximality of \mathcal{I} .

(\Leftarrow) Suppose \mathcal{I} is not maximal. Then there is a proper ideal $\mathcal{K} \supset \mathcal{I}$. Define $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{B}} = \{x + \mathcal{I} \mid x \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{I}\}$. Since $\mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$, we have $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{B}} \neq \{0\}$. Since $\mathcal{K} \neq \mathcal{A}$, we have $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{B}} \neq \mathcal{B}$. Also, for all $[a] \in \mathcal{B}$ and all $[j] \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{B}}$, we have $[a][j] = [aj] = [j]$ and $[j][a] = [ja] = [j]$, since $ja \in \mathcal{K}$ and $aj \in \mathcal{K}$ as \mathcal{K} is an ideal of \mathcal{A} . Thus $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a non-trivial ideal of \mathcal{B} . 🤔

We can easily construct larger normed algebras from smaller ones. If \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are normed algebras, then $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ is a normed algebra, with coordinatewise operations and the norm given by:

$$\|(a, b)\| = \max \{\|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}, \|b\|_{\mathcal{B}}\}$$

Of course, there are other possible norms on $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$, such as $\|(a, b)\|_1 = \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}} + \|b\|_{\mathcal{B}}$.

We can also do this for infinite collections of algebras, though this requires more care. See [13, §26, Definition 10, Page 136] for details.

Definition 2.20. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an algebra and \mathcal{I} is an ideal of \mathcal{A} . The **quotient algebra of \mathcal{A} modulo \mathcal{I}** , denoted by \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} , is given by:

$$\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} = \{[a] \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

Where $[a] = a + \mathcal{I} = \{a + b \mid b \in \mathcal{I}\}$. The addition, scalar multiplication and vector multiplication operations in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} are given by:

$$[a] + [b] = [a + b] \qquad \lambda[a] = [\lambda a] \qquad [a][b] = [ab]$$

The **quotient map** from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is given by $q : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}$, $q(a) = [a] = a + \mathcal{I}$.

Proposition 2.21. The quotient algebra \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is an algebra, and the quotient map q is an algebra homomorphism.

Proof. Clearly \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is a vector space and q is a linear map. We now show that \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is an algebra:

1. Suppose $a + \mathcal{I}, b + \mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}$. Then $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, so $ab \in \mathcal{A}$, and so $(a + \mathcal{I})(b + \mathcal{I}) = ab + \mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}$.
2. $[a]([b] + [c]) = [a][b + c] = [a(b + c)] = [ab + ac] = [ab] + [ac] = [a][b] + [a][c]$
3. $([a] + [b])[c] = [a + b][c] = [(a + b)c] = [ac + bc] = [ac] + [bc] = [a][c] + [b][c]$
4. $(\lambda[a])[b] = [\lambda a][b] = [(\lambda a)b] = [\lambda(ab)] = \lambda[ab]$ and $[a](\lambda[b]) = [a][\lambda b] = [a(\lambda b)] = [\lambda(ab)] = \lambda[ab]$
5. $[a]([b][c]) = [a][bc] = [a(bc)] = [(ab)c] = [ab][c] = ([a][b])[c]$

Thus \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is an algebra. We also have $q(ab) = [ab] = [a][b] = q(a)q(b)$, so q is an algebra homomorphism. 😊

Theorem 2.22 (Neumann Series). Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital Banach algebra, $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\|a\| < 1$. Then $\mathbb{1} - a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ and $(\mathbb{1} - a)^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a^n$.

Remark. This is reminiscent of the formula for a geometric series of numbers: $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a^n = \frac{1}{1-a}$.

Proof. Since $\|a\| < 1$, we have $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|a^n\| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|a\|^n < \infty$, so $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a^n$ is absolutely convergent (and thus convergent, since \mathcal{A} is a Banach space). Define $b = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a^n$. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have $(\mathbb{1} - a)(\sum_{n=0}^N a^n) = \sum_{n=0}^N a^n - \sum_{n=0}^N a^{n+1} = 1 - a^{N+1}$. Taking the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ yields $(\mathbb{1} - a)b = \mathbb{1}$, since $\|a^{N+1}\| \leq \|a\|^{N+1} \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. A similar argument shows that $b(\mathbb{1} - a) = \mathbb{1}$. Thus $b = (\mathbb{1} - a)^{-1}$. 😊

Proposition 2.23. \mathcal{A}^\times is an open set in \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ and $b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|a - b\| < \frac{1}{\|a^{-1}\|}$. Then we have:

$$\|\mathbb{1} - a^{-1}b\| = \|a^{-1}a - a^{-1}b\| = \|a^{-1}(a - b)\| \leq \|a^{-1}\| \|a - b\| < 1$$

By the previous theorem, $a^{-1}b \in \mathcal{A}^\times$, and so $b = a(a^{-1}b) \in \mathcal{A}^\times$. Thus \mathcal{A}^\times is open in \mathcal{A} . 😊

Proposition 2.24. The inversion map $f : \mathcal{A}^\times \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^\times$, $f(a) = a^{-1}$ is a homeomorphism.

Proof. Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ and $b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|a - b\| \leq \frac{1}{2\|a^{-1}\|}$. Then $\|a - b\| < \frac{1}{\|a^{-1}\|}$, so by the previous proposition, we have $b \in \mathcal{A}^\times$. We also have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|b^{-1}\| - \|a^{-1}\| &\leq \left| \|b^{-1}\| - \|a^{-1}\| \right| \leq \|b^{-1} - a^{-1}\| = \|b^{-1}aa^{-1} - b^{-1}ba^{-1}\| = \|b^{-1}(a - b)a^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \|b^{-1}\| \|a - b\| \|a^{-1}\| \leq \|b^{-1}\| \frac{1}{2\|a^{-1}\|} \|a^{-1}\| = \frac{\|b^{-1}\|}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging yields $\frac{\|b^{-1}\|}{2} \leq \|a^{-1}\|$, and so $\|b^{-1}\| \leq 2\|a^{-1}\|$. We now have:

$$\|b^{-1} - a^{-1}\| \leq \|b^{-1}\| \|a - b\| \|a^{-1}\| \leq 2\|a^{-1}\| \|a - b\| \|a^{-1}\| = 2\|a^{-1}\|^2 \|a - b\|$$

Now suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Set $\delta = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2\|a^{-1}\|}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2\|a^{-1}\|^2} \right\}$. Then for all $b \in \mathcal{A}$, $\|a - b\| < \delta$, we have $\|a - b\| < \frac{1}{2\|a^{-1}\|}$, so $b \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ and $\|b^{-1} - a^{-1}\| \leq 2\|a^{-1}\|^2 \|a - b\| < 2\|a^{-1}\|^2 \frac{\varepsilon}{2\|a^{-1}\|^2} = \varepsilon$. Thus f is continuous. Since f maps each element of \mathcal{A}^\times to its inverse, we have $f^{-1} = f$, so f^{-1} is also continuous. Thus f is a homeomorphism. 😊

Proposition 2.10 and Proposition 2.24 show that \mathcal{A}^\times is a topological group (with the subspace topology from the norm topology on \mathcal{A}). As a subset of a normed vector space, it is also a metric space (and thus Hausdorff).

Lemma 2.25. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a normed algebra and \mathcal{B} is a subalgebra (resp. ideal) of \mathcal{A} . Then $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ (the closure of \mathcal{B}) is also a subalgebra (resp. ideal) of \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Since \mathcal{B} is a subspace of \mathcal{A} , so is $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$. Suppose $a, b \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$. Then there are sequences $(a_n), (b_n)$ in \mathcal{B} such that $a_n \rightarrow a$ and $b_n \rightarrow b$. Since \mathcal{B} is a subalgebra of \mathcal{A} , we have $a_n b_n \in \mathcal{B}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $a_n \rightarrow a$ and $b_n \rightarrow b$, we have $a_n b_n \rightarrow ab$. Thus $ab \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$, and so $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ is a subalgebra of \mathcal{A} .

Now suppose \mathcal{B} is an ideal of \mathcal{A} , $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$. Then there is a sequence (b_n) in \mathcal{B} such that $b_n \rightarrow b$. Since \mathcal{B} is an ideal of \mathcal{A} , we have $ab_n, b_n a \in \mathcal{B}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $b_n \rightarrow b$, we have $ab_n \rightarrow ab$ and $b_n a \rightarrow ba$. Thus $ab, ba \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$, and so $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ is an ideal of \mathcal{A} . 😊

Proposition 2.26. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital Banach algebra and \mathcal{I} is a proper ideal of \mathcal{A} . Then $\overline{\mathcal{I}}$ (the closure of \mathcal{I}) is also a proper ideal of \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Since \mathcal{I} is a proper ideal of \mathcal{A} , it cannot contain any invertible elements, i.e. $\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{A}^\times = \emptyset$, so $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}^\times$. Since \mathcal{A}^\times is open, its complement $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}^\times$ is closed, and so $\overline{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}^\times$. In particular, $\overline{\mathcal{I}} \neq \mathcal{A}$. Since \mathcal{I} is an ideal of \mathcal{A} , so is $\overline{\mathcal{I}}$, by the previous lemma. Thus $\overline{\mathcal{I}}$ is a proper ideal of \mathcal{A} . 😊

Theorem 2.27. Every maximal ideal of a unital Banach algebra is closed.

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital Banach algebra and \mathcal{M} is a maximal ideal of \mathcal{A} . By the previous proposition, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ is a proper ideal of \mathcal{A} . Since \mathcal{M} is maximal, we must have $\overline{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}$, and so \mathcal{M} is closed. 😊

The following example shows that a maximal ideal of a *non-unital* Banach algebra may not be closed:

Example. Suppose X is an infinite-dimensional Banach space and define vector multiplication on X by $ab = 0$ for all $a, b \in X$. Then X is a non-unital abelian Banach algebra. Now suppose f is an unbounded linear functional⁸ on X . Then $\ker(f)$ is a dense subspace of X with codimension 1. Since $ab = ba = 0 \in \ker(f)$, it is also an ideal of X , and since it has codimension 1, it must be maximal. However, it is dense in X and not equal to X , so it cannot be closed.

We will now extend Proposition 2.21 to Banach algebras:

Theorem 2.28. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a Banach algebra and \mathcal{I} is a closed ideal of \mathcal{A} . Define the norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} by $\|a + \mathcal{I}\| = \inf_{b \in \mathcal{I}} \|a + b\|$. Then \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is a Banach algebra, and the quotient map $q : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}$, $q(a) = a + \mathcal{I}$ is a homomorphism and $\|q\| \leq 1$. If \mathcal{A} is unital, then \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is unital with identity $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} + \mathcal{I}$.

Proof. Since \mathcal{I} is an ideal of \mathcal{A} , by Proposition 2.21, the quotient \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is an algebra. Since \mathcal{I} is a closed ideal (and thus a closed subspace) of \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is also a Banach space. We now show that the quotient norm is an algebra norm:

$$\begin{aligned} \|[a][b]\|_{\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}} &= \|[ab]\|_{\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}} = \inf_{c \in \mathcal{I}} \|ab + c\| = \inf_{c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{I}} \|ab + ac_2 + bc_1 + c_1c_2\| = \inf_{c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{I}} \|(a + c_1)(b + c_2)\| \\ &\leq \inf_{c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{I}} \|a + c_1\| \|b + c_2\| \leq \inf_{c_1 \in \mathcal{I}} \|a + c_1\| \inf_{c_2 \in \mathcal{I}} \|b + c_2\| = \|[a]\|_{\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}} \|[b]\|_{\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus the quotient norm is an algebra norm, and so \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is a Banach algebra.

We also have $\|q(a)\| = \|a + \mathcal{I}\| = \inf_{b \in \mathcal{I}} \|a + b\| \leq \|a + 0\| = \|a\|$. Thus q is bounded and $\|q\| \leq 1$.

Finally, suppose \mathcal{A} is unital. Then for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have:

$$(a + \mathcal{I})(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} + \mathcal{I}) = a\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} + \mathcal{I} = a + \mathcal{I} \quad (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} + \mathcal{I})(a + \mathcal{I}) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}a + \mathcal{I} = a + \mathcal{I}$$

Thus \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I} is unital with identity $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} + \mathcal{I}$. 😊

Remark. One can also show that if $\mathcal{I} \neq \mathcal{A}$, then $\|q\| = 1$. This is slightly more involved, and requires Riesz's lemma (see [1]).

We will see in Section 2.3 what happens in the case that \mathcal{I} is a *maximal* ideal of \mathcal{A} .

We conclude this section with the definition and some basic results about isometries, which we will revisit later in Chapter 3.

Definition 2.29. Suppose X and Y are normed vector spaces. An **isometry** (or *linear isometry*) from X to Y is a linear map $T : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $\|Tx\| = \|x\|$ for all $x \in X$.

A **isometric isomorphism** (or *global linear isometry*) is an isometry that is also surjective.

Basically, an isometry is a homomorphism of normed vector spaces, i.e. a map that preserves the vector space structure as well as the norm structure. Likewise, an isometric isomorphism is an isomorphism of normed vector spaces.

⁸This is always possible, as every infinite-dimensional Banach space has unbounded linear functionals. In general, however, these functionals cannot be constructed explicitly, and proving they exist requires the axiom of choice. See [25, Example 4.2, Page 126] for more details.

Lemma 2.30. Every isometry is continuous and injective.

Proof. Since $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is an isometry, we have $\|Tx\| = \|x\|$ for all $x \in X$, so T is bounded (and thus continuous) and $\|T\| \leq 1$. Now suppose $T(x) = T(y)$ for some $x, y \in X$. Then we have $\|x - y\| = \|T(x) - T(y)\| = \|0\| = 0$, so $x = y$. Thus T is injective. 😊

Proposition 2.31. Suppose X is a Banach space, Y is a normed vector space and $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is an isometry. Then $\text{im}(T)$ is closed in Y .

Proof. Suppose (y_n) is a sequence in $\text{im}(T)$ that converges to some $y \in Y$. We want to show that $y \in \text{im}(T)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since $y_n \in \text{im}(T)$, there exists $x_n \in X$ such that $T(x_n) = y_n$. Since the sequence (y_n) converges in Y , it is Cauchy, and since T is an isometry, we have $\|y_m - y_n\| = \|x_m - x_n\|$ for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus the sequence (x_n) is also Cauchy. Since X is complete, (x_n) converges to some $x \in X$. By the previous lemma, T is continuous, so $(y_n) = (Tx_n)$ converges to Tx . Thus $y = Tx \in \text{im}(T)$, and so $\text{im}(T)$ is closed in Y . 😊

Remark. A slight modification of this proof shows that $\text{im}(T)$ is also complete, i.e. it is a Banach space (even if Y is not).

Since every isometry $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is injective, it has an inverse $T^{-1} : \text{im}(T) \rightarrow X$. Also, since $\|Tx\| = \|x\|$ for all $x \in X$, it follows that T^{-1} is also an isometry (and thus continuous). In particular, every isometry is a homeomorphism onto its image. Of course, the converse is not true (you can multiply an isometry by any nonzero constant and it would still be a homeomorphism, but not an isometry).

2.2 The Spectrum

One of the most important concepts in linear algebra is that of eigenvalues and eigenvectors. Recall that if V is a vector space and $T : V \rightarrow V$ is a linear operator, we say that $v \in V \setminus \{0\}$ is an *eigenvector* of T with *eigenvalue* $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ if $Tv = \lambda v$. If $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ and V is finite-dimensional, every linear operator $T : V \rightarrow V$ must have at least one eigenvector (this is a consequence of the fundamental theorem of algebra). However, for infinite-dimensional spaces, this fails horribly, even in the simplest cases:

Example. Suppose $T : C[0, 1] \rightarrow C[0, 1]$, $(Tf)(x) = xf(x)$. Then T has NO eigenvalues or eigenvectors. To see this, suppose f is an eigenvector of T with eigenvalue λ , i.e. $Tf = \lambda f$. Then we have $xf(x) = \lambda f(x)$, i.e. $(x - \lambda)f(x) = 0$. This must be true for all $x \in [0, 1]$, which implies that $f \equiv 0$, a contradiction. Thus T has no eigenvalues or eigenvectors.

To develop a meaningful analogous concept for infinite-dimensional spaces, we need to introduce a different definition: $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ is in the *spectrum* of T if $T - \lambda I$ is *not* invertible (where I is the identity operator). For finite-dimensional spaces, this is equivalent to λ being an eigenvalue of T , but for infinite-dimensional spaces, this definition is much more general (in particular, if $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$, this eliminates the problem of such values not existing). It also has the advantage of being applicable to all unital algebras, not just those that arise from linear operators on vector spaces.


The theory of eigenvalues and eigenvectors, now known as *spectral theory*, has a very rich history, which you can read about in [43].

Definition 2.32. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. The **spectrum** of a , denoted by $\sigma(a)$, is given by:

$$\sigma(a) = \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{F} \mid a - \lambda \mathbb{1} \notin \mathcal{A}^\times \}$$

The **resolvent set** of a , denoted by $\rho(a)$, is given by $\rho(a) = \mathbb{F} \setminus \sigma(a)$.

In other words, the spectrum of a is the set of all numbers $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $a - \lambda \mathbb{1}$ is *not* invertible.



Some possible spectra of elements.

Examples.

1. Suppose V is a finite-dimensional vector space and $T : V \rightarrow V$ is a linear operator. Then $\lambda \in \sigma(T)$ if and only if λ is an eigenvalue of T .
2. Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space and $f \in C_0(X)$. Then $\sigma(f) = \text{im}(f)$ (the image of f).
3. Suppose (X, \mathcal{A}, μ) is a measure space and $f \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$. Then:

$$\sigma(f) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{F} \mid \mu(\{x \in X \mid |f(x) - \lambda| < \varepsilon\}) > 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0\}$$

This is sometimes known as the *essential image* of f .

The definition of the spectrum requires \mathcal{A} to be unital, as it directly uses the identity and invertibility. We will restrict our discussion of the spectrum to unital Banach algebras (and usually, unital *complex* Banach algebras) as far as possible. When required, we define the spectrum of $a \in \mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{A} is a *non-unital* Banach algebra, to be the spectrum of a as an element of the unitization \mathcal{A}_1 (see Appendix A).

Definition 2.33. Suppose $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is open and \mathcal{A} is a complex Banach algebra. A function $f : U \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is **holomorphic** on U if for all $z_0 \in U$, the limit $\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} \frac{f(z) - f(z_0)}{z - z_0}$ exists in \mathcal{A} .

Remark. This notion is sometimes known as *strongly holomorphic*, as opposed to *weakly holomorphic*, which means that for all $\phi \in \mathcal{A}^*$, the function $\phi \circ f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is holomorphic on U . In fact, these are equivalent (see [20, Theorem 8.20] for a proof), so there is no need to distinguish them, and so we will call them both “holomorphic”.

Theorem 2.34. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital complex Banach algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Then the function $f : \rho(a) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, $f(z) = (a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}$ is holomorphic on $\rho(a)$.

Remark. The function f is sometimes known as the *resolvent* of a . By the definition of $\rho(a)$, it is well-defined. Also, as we will show in Theorem 2.36, $\rho(a)$ is open, so it makes sense to say that f is holomorphic on $\rho(a)$.

Proof. Suppose $z, z_0 \in \rho(a)$. Since $a - z\mathbb{1}$ and $a - z_0\mathbb{1}$ are linear functions of a , they commute, and so their inverses also commute (*). This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) - f(z_0) &= (a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1} - (a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-1} \\ &= (a - z_0\mathbb{1})(a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-1}(a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1} - (a - z\mathbb{1})(a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}(a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-1} \\ &= (a - z_0\mathbb{1})(a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}(a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-1} - (a - z\mathbb{1})(a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}(a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-1} \\ &= ((a - z_0\mathbb{1}) - (a - z\mathbb{1}))(a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}(a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-1} \\ &= ((z - z_0)\mathbb{1})(a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}(a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-1} \\ &= (z - z_0)(a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}(a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (*)$$

Dividing by $z - z_0$, we get $\frac{f(z) - f(z_0)}{z - z_0} = (a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}(a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-1}$. Taking the limit as $z \rightarrow z_0$ yields:

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} \frac{f(z) - f(z_0)}{z - z_0} = \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} (a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}(a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-1} = (a - z_0\mathbb{1})^{-2} \in \mathcal{A}$$

Thus f is holomorphic on $\rho(a)$. 🤖

The next lemma is a generalization of Liouville’s theorem, which states that every bounded entire function $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is constant⁹ (see [44, Theorem 3.3.1, Page 89] for a proof). This is the starting point of the discussion we will soon embark on that is specific to complex normed algebras. Indeed, almost every result in functional analysis that holds for complex normed algebras but not for real ones can be traced back to Liouville’s theorem.

Lemma 2.35 (Liouville’s Theorem for Normed Vector Spaces). Suppose X is a complex normed vector space. Then every bounded entire function $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$ is constant.

Proof. Suppose f is not constant. Then there exist $z, w \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $f(z) \neq f(w)$, i.e. $f(z) - f(w) \neq 0$. By the Hahn-Banach theorem, there exists $\phi \in X^*$ such that $\phi(f(z) - f(w)) \neq 0$, i.e. $\phi(f(z)) \neq \phi(f(w))$. Thus $\phi \circ f$ is not constant. Since f is bounded and entire, the composition $\phi \circ f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is also bounded and entire, so by Liouville’s theorem, it must be constant, a contradiction. Thus f is constant. 🤖

Theorem 2.36 (Fundamental Theorem of Banach Algebras). Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital complex Banach algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $\sigma(a)$ is non-empty and compact.

⁹An *entire* function is a function that is holomorphic on all of \mathbb{C} .

Proof. Suppose $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $|\lambda| > \|a\|$. We want to show that $a - \lambda\mathbb{1}$ is invertible. Since $|\lambda| > \|a\|$, we have $\|\frac{1}{\lambda}a\| < 1$, so by Theorem 2.22, $\mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{\lambda}a$ is invertible, and so is $a - \lambda\mathbb{1} = -\lambda(\mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{\lambda}a)$. Thus every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $|\lambda| > \|a\|$ is in $\rho(a)$, and so $\sigma(a) \subseteq \overline{D}(0, \|a\|)$. Thus $\sigma(a)$ is bounded.

Define $g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, $g(z) = a - z\mathbb{1}$. Then for all $z, w \in \mathbb{C}$, we have $\|g(z) - g(w)\| = \|(a - z\mathbb{1}) - (a - w\mathbb{1})\| = \|(z - w)\mathbb{1}\| = |z - w|$. Thus g is continuous. By Proposition 2.23, the set \mathcal{A}^\times is open in \mathcal{A} , so its pre-image $g^{-1}(\mathcal{A}^\times) = \rho(a)$ is open in \mathbb{C} . Thus $\sigma(a) = \mathbb{C} \setminus \rho(a)$ is closed. Since $\sigma(a)$ is closed and bounded, by the Heine-Borel theorem, it is compact.

Suppose $\sigma(a) = \emptyset$. Then $\rho(a) = \mathbb{C}$. Thus the function f from Theorem 2.34 is holomorphic on \mathbb{C} (and thus entire). We also have $\|f(z)\| = \|(a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}\| \geq \frac{1}{\|a - z\mathbb{1}\|} \geq \frac{1}{\|a\| + |z|} \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. Thus f is bounded on \mathbb{C} . By Lemma 2.35, f is constant, and since it vanishes as $z \rightarrow \infty$, it must be identically zero. This is a contradiction, as $f(z) = (a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1} \in \mathcal{A}^\times$. Thus $\sigma(a) \neq \emptyset$. 😊

Remark. If \mathcal{A} is a unital *real* Banach algebra, $\sigma(a)$ is still compact, but it may be empty, as the next example shows.

Example. Suppose $A \in M_2(\mathbb{R})$, $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $\sigma(A) = \emptyset$ as its characteristic polynomial is $\lambda^2 + 1$, which has no real roots. If we instead view A as an element of $M_2(\mathbb{C})$, then $\sigma(A) = \{i, -i\}$.

In general, there are no other restrictions on the spectrum of an element, besides being non-empty and compact. This can be seen as follows: Suppose $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is non-empty and compact. Then we can find a sequence $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ in K that is dense in K . Define $T : \ell^\infty \rightarrow \ell^\infty$ by $T(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) = (a_1x_1, a_2x_2, a_3x_3, \dots)$. Then $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^\infty)$ and $\sigma(T) = K$.


Definition 2.37. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital Banach algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. The **spectral radius** of \mathcal{A} , denoted by $r(a)$, is given by:

$$r(a) = \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma(a)} |\lambda|$$

In other words, the spectral radius of a is the largest absolute value of all the numbers in $\sigma(a)$.

Remarks.

1. Since $\sigma(a)$ is non-empty and compact, this supremum is always attained and finite, i.e. it is a maximum.
2. By the proof of the previous theorem, we have $\sigma(a) \subseteq \overline{D}(0, \|a\|)$. Thus $r(a) \leq \|a\|$.



The spectral radius of an element.

Example. Suppose $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $A - \lambda I$ is invertible for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ except $\lambda = 0$. Thus $\sigma(A) = \{0\}$, and so $r(A) = 0$. However, since $A \neq 0$, we have $\|A\| > 0$ (in fact, $\|A\| = 1$).

The above example shows that $r(a)$ is not necessarily equal to $\|a\|$. We now present two classes of examples where equality always holds. These are special cases of a more general phenomenon we will encounter in Chapter 3, when we discuss abelian C^* -algebras.

Examples.

1. Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space and $f \in C_0(X)$. Then $r(f) = \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma(f)} |\lambda| = \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|$. This is the supremum of $|f|$, which by definition is $\|f\|$.
2. Suppose (X, \mathcal{A}, μ) is a measure space and $f \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$. Then:

$$r(f) = \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma(f)} |\lambda| = \inf \{M \geq 0 \mid \mu(\{x \in X \mid |f(x)| > M\}) = 0\}$$

This is the essential supremum of $|f|$, which by definition is $\|f\|$.

The next theorem, which first appeared in [21], is a remarkable result that links the algebraic and analytic aspects of Banach algebras. To prove it, we will need a special case of Laurent's theorem, which says that a series of the form $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n z^{-n}$ converges for all $|z| > R$, where $R = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |c_n|^{1/n}$.

Theorem 2.38 (Spectral Radius Formula or Beurling-Gelfand Formula). Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital complex Banach algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Then:

$$r(a) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|^{1/n} = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|a^n\|^{1/n}$$

Remarks.

1. The fact that the above limit exists is highly nontrivial (and thus surprising in itself), and is part of the theorem.
2. The spectrum (and thus the spectral radius) does not depend on the norm used. As such, the above formula holds for *every* norm on \mathcal{A} that makes it a Banach algebra.

Proof. We first show that $r(a) \leq \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|a^n\|^{1/n}$. Suppose $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have:

$$a^n - \lambda^n \mathbb{1} = (a - \lambda \mathbb{1})(a^{n-1} + \lambda a^{n-2} + \dots + \lambda^{n-2} a + \lambda^{n-1} \mathbb{1})$$

Also, these factors commute as they are polynomials in a . Thus if $a - \lambda \mathbb{1}$ is not invertible, neither is $a^n - \lambda^n \mathbb{1}$. In other words, if $\lambda \in \sigma(a)$, then $\lambda^n \in \sigma(a^n)$. This yields $|\lambda|^n = |\lambda^n| \leq \|a^n\|$, and so $|\lambda| \leq \|a^n\|^{1/n}$. Taking the supremum over all $\lambda \in \sigma(a)$, we get $r(a) \leq \|a^n\|^{1/n}$, and taking the infimum over all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we get $r(a) \leq \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|a^n\|^{1/n}$.

We now show that $r(a) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|^{1/n}$. Define $f: \rho(a) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ by $f(z) = (a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1}$. By definition, this is well-defined on $\rho(a)$, and for $|z| > \|a\|$, we can use Theorem 2.22 to get:

$$(a - z\mathbb{1})^{-1} = -\frac{1}{z} \left(\mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{z} a \right)^{-1} = -\frac{1}{z} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{z} a \right)^n = -\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^{-n-1} a^n$$

This is a Laurent series in z with no terms in positive powers of z . By Laurent's theorem, it converges absolutely for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $|z| > R$, where $R = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|^{1/n}$. Thus every $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $|z| > R$ is in $\rho(a)$, and so $r(a) \leq R$.

We now have $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|a^n\|^{1/n} \geq r(a) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|^{1/n}$. Since $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n \geq \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \beta_n$ for any sequence (β_n) in \mathbb{R} , it follows that:

$$\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|a^n\|^{1/n} \geq r(a) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|^{1/n} \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|^{1/n} \geq \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|a^n\|^{1/n}$$

Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|^{1/n}$ exists and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|^{1/n} = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|a^n\|^{1/n} = r(a)$. 😊

Example. Suppose $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$. Then the eigenvalues of A are 1 and 2, so $\rho(A) = 2$. We also have $A^n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2^n - 1 \\ 0 & 2^n \end{pmatrix}$, and (after a lot of computation), $\|A^n\| = \sqrt{2^{2n} - 2^n + 1 + (2^n - 1)\sqrt{2^{2n} + 1}}$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, this is asymptotic to $2^{n+\frac{1}{2}}$, so $\|A^n\|^{1/n} \sim 2^{1+\frac{1}{2n}}$. Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A^n\|^{1/n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2^{1+\frac{1}{2n}} = 2^1 = 2$, which agrees with the spectral radius formula (for comparison, $\|A\| = \sqrt{3 + \sqrt{5}} \approx 2.28825$, while $\|A^{100}\|^{1/100} \approx 2.00694$).

While the spectral radius is perfectly well-defined for elements of *real* unital Banach algebras, it is customary to use the *complex* spectral radius even if \mathcal{A} is real. One reason is intuition: It makes more sense to say that the spectral radius of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is 1, even though as an element of $M_2(\mathbb{R})$, the definition gives it a spectral radius of 0 (since it has no real eigenvalues). Another reason is to ensure various important theorems still hold, such as Theorem 2.38. In particular, this convention will find its way into the proofs of the Gelfand representation theorem and the Gelfand-Naimark theorem, which will allow us to conclude that they still hold if \mathcal{A} is real.

Corollary 2.39. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital complex Banach algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\| = 0$ if and only if $r(a) < 1$.

Proof. Note that $r(a) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|^{1/n}$ implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r(a))^n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|$. Thus:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\| = 0 \Leftrightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r(a))^n = 0 \Leftrightarrow r(a) < 1$$

The last corollary is especially important in stability theory, where dynamical systems are modeled by matrices and one would like to know if such a system stabilizes over time, blows up to infinity or does something else.

While the proofs of Theorem 2.36 and Theorem 2.38 here relied heavily on methods from complex analysis, it is actually possible to prove them without any complex analysis (of course, still assuming the algebra is complex). See [28, Theorem 1.2.8, Pages 10-13].

Theorem 2.40 (Spectral Mapping Theorem). Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital complex Banach algebra, $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $p(z) = c_n z^n + c_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \dots + c_1 z + c_0$ is a polynomial. Then $\sigma(p(a)) = p(\sigma(a))$. Here, $p(a) \in \mathcal{A}$ denotes the element $c_n a^n + c_{n-1} a^{n-1} + \dots + c_1 a + c_0 \mathbb{1}$, while $p(\sigma(a)) \subset \mathbb{C}$ denotes the set $\{p(\zeta) \mid \zeta \in \sigma(a)\}$, i.e. the image of $\sigma(a)$ under the polynomial p .

Basically, when an element of \mathcal{A} is mapped by a polynomial, its spectrum is also mapped by the same polynomial. In other words, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a & \xrightarrow{p} & p(a) \\ \sigma \downarrow & & \downarrow \sigma \\ \sigma(a) & \xrightarrow{p} & \sigma(p(a)) \end{array}$$

Proof. Suppose $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$. Then the equation $p(z) = \mu$ is a polynomial equation of degree n , so by the fundamental theorem of algebra, it has n solutions $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$ (including multiplicity). This yields $p(z) - \mu = c_n(z - \lambda_1)(z - \lambda_2) \dots (z - \lambda_n)$, and similarly, $p(a) - \mu \mathbb{1} = c_n(a - \lambda_1 \mathbb{1})(a - \lambda_2 \mathbb{1}) \dots (a - \lambda_n \mathbb{1})$. Note that all the factors $a - \lambda_k \mathbb{1}$ commute as they are polynomials in a . By definition, $\mu \notin \sigma(p(a))$ if and only if $p(a) - \mu \mathbb{1} \notin \mathcal{A}^\times$. Since all the factors $a - \lambda_k \mathbb{1}$ commute, this is equivalent to all of them being invertible. In other words, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n \notin \sigma(a)$. Since $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ are the zeros of $p(z) - \mu$, this is equivalent to $\mu \notin p(\sigma(a))$. Thus $\sigma(p(a)) = p(\sigma(a))$. 🧐

Remark. Using functional calculus, this theorem can be generalized to larger classes of functions than just polynomials, see [40, Theorem 10.28, Page 263], [15, Chapter VIII, Theorem 2.7, Page 239] and [33, Theorem 2.1.14, Page 43].

Example. Suppose $A = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$ and $p(x) = x^3 + 10x^2 + 8x + 5$. Then $\sigma(A) = \{2, 5\}$, so $p(\sigma(A)) = \{p(2), p(5)\} = \{69, 420\}$. On the other hand, $p(A) = \begin{pmatrix} 186 & 234 \\ 117 & 303 \end{pmatrix}$, so $\sigma(p(A)) = \{69, 420\}$ as expected.

In general, Banach algebras have a lot of non-invertible elements. This is in contrast to \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{C} , where the only non-invertible element is 0. Algebras where every nonzero element has a multiplicative inverse are known as *division algebras*. As we will see now, there are only three Banach division algebras (up to isomorphism).

Theorem 2.41 (Gelfand-Mazur Theorem). Suppose \mathcal{A} is a complex Banach division algebra. Then $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathbb{C}$, i.e. $\mathcal{A} = \{\lambda \mathbb{1} \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$.

In other words, \mathbb{C} is the *only* complex Banach division algebra (up to isomorphism).

Proof. For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\sigma(a) \neq \emptyset$, so there exists $\lambda \in \sigma(a)$. Equivalently, $a - \lambda \mathbb{1}$ has no inverse, so by assumption, it must be zero. Thus $a = \lambda \mathbb{1}$. 🧐

Example. The quaternions¹⁰ \mathbb{H} form a division algebra that is not isomorphic to \mathbb{C} . Consequently, there is *no* norm on \mathbb{H} that makes it a complex Banach algebra (at least not with the usual multiplication of quaternions).

The fundamental theorem of algebra follows easily from the previous theorem and some basic results from abstract algebra, see [2].

Clearly the Gelfand-Mazur theorem cannot hold for *real* Banach algebras, as \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{H} are all real Banach division algebras. Nonetheless, we have the following result:

Theorem 2.42 (Gelfand-Mazur-Kaplansky Theorem). Suppose \mathcal{A} is a real Banach division algebra. Then $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathbb{R}$, \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{H} .

See [13, §14, Theorem 7, Pages 73-74] for a proof.

It is a well-known result in abstract algebra that the only finite-dimensional division algebra over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} (e.g. \mathbb{C}) is \mathbb{K} itself. In 1877, Ferdinand Georg Frobenius (1849–1917) proved that the

¹⁰The set \mathbb{H} of quaternions is given by $\mathbb{H} = \{a + bi + cj + dk \mid a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}\}$, with the relations $i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = ijk = -1$.

only finite-dimensional division algebras over \mathbb{R} are \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{H} . The Gelfand-Mazur theorem was first stated in 1938 by Stanisław Mazur (1905–1981) [31], and proved in 1941 by Gelfand [21]. The Gelfand-Mazur-Kaplansky theorem was proved in 1949 by Irving Kaplansky (1917–2006) [29]. These theorems further demonstrate the power of norms (and thus analysis) in extending results from finite-dimensional algebras to infinite-dimensional algebras.

Both of these theorems also hold under (certain) weaker assumptions, see [11].

Lemma 2.43. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital algebra and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $\mathbb{1} - ab \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ if and only if $\mathbb{1} - ba \in \mathcal{A}^\times$.

Proof. Suppose $\mathbb{1} - ab \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ and define $c = (\mathbb{1} - ab)^{-1}$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{1} + bca)(\mathbb{1} - ba) &= \mathbb{1} - ba + bca - bcaba = \mathbb{1} - ba + bc(\mathbb{1} - ab)a = \mathbb{1} - ba + ba = \mathbb{1} \\ (\mathbb{1} - ba)(\mathbb{1} + bca) &= \mathbb{1} - ba + bca - babca = \mathbb{1} - ba + b(\mathbb{1} - ab)ca = \mathbb{1} - ba + ba = \mathbb{1} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathbb{1} - ba \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ and $(\mathbb{1} - ba)^{-1} = \mathbb{1} + bca$. The converse follows by switching a and b . 🤔

Lemma 2.44. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital algebra and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $\sigma(ab) \setminus \{0\} = \sigma(ba) \setminus \{0\}$. In other words, ab and ba have the same spectrum, except possibly for 0.

Proof. Suppose $\lambda \in \sigma(ab)$ and $\lambda \neq 0$. Then $ab - \lambda\mathbb{1} \notin \mathcal{A}^\times$, so $\mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{\lambda}ab = -\frac{1}{\lambda}(ab - \lambda\mathbb{1}) \notin \mathcal{A}^\times$. Applying the previous lemma to a and $\frac{1}{\lambda}b$ shows that $\mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{\lambda}ba$ is also not invertible, so neither is $ba - \lambda\mathbb{1} = -\lambda(\mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{\lambda}ba)$. Thus $\lambda \in \sigma(ba)$. The converse follows by switching a and b . 🤔

Theorem 2.45. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital complex Banach algebra and $\lambda \neq 0$. Then there are no elements $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $ab - ba = \lambda\mathbb{1}$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.36, $\sigma(ab) \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $\mu \in \sigma(ab)$. Then $ab - \mu\mathbb{1} = ba - (\mu - \lambda)\mathbb{1} \notin \mathcal{A}^\times$, so $\mu - \lambda \in \sigma(ba)$. Since $\lambda \neq 0$, at least one of μ and $\mu - \lambda$ must be nonzero. Suppose $\mu \neq 0$ (the other case is similar). By the previous lemma, we have $\mu \in \sigma(ba)$, so $ba - \mu\mathbb{1} = ab - (\mu + \lambda)\mathbb{1} \notin \mathcal{A}^\times$, and so $\mu + \lambda \in \sigma(ab)$. Repeating this process yields $\mu + n\lambda \in \sigma(ab)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This is a contradiction, since by Theorem 2.36, $\sigma(ab)$ must be bounded. 🤔

This theorem has profound implications in quantum mechanics, which we will discuss in Chapter 4.

2.3 Characters

We will now develop the notion of *characters*. Characters are a central and fundamental concept in representation theory, and a topic of active research in abstract algebra. Here, we will only need them to formulate and prove the Gelfand representation theorem, which will eventually lead us to the Gelfand-Naimark theorem.

Definition 2.46. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a Banach algebra. A **character** of \mathcal{A} is a nonzero homomorphism $\chi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$. The set of all characters of \mathcal{A} is denoted by $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ or $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{F}^n$ (with componentwise operations). Then for each $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, the map $\chi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, $\chi(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = a_k$ is a character of \mathcal{A} .

⚠️ Some sources use $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ to refer to the state space of a C^* -algebra. This is unrelated to the Gelfand spectrum.

Proposition 2.47. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital Banach algebra and $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. Then:

1. $\chi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$
2. If $a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$, then $\chi(a) \neq 0$ and $\chi(a^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\chi(a)}$.

Proof.

1. For all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\chi(a) = \chi(a\mathbb{1}) = \chi(a)\chi(\mathbb{1})$. Since $\chi \neq 0$, there exists $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\chi(a) \neq 0$. Thus $\chi(\mathbb{1}) = \frac{\chi(a)}{\chi(a)} = 1$.
2. By (1), we have $1 = \chi(\mathbb{1}) = \chi(aa^{-1}) = \chi(a)\chi(a^{-1})$. Thus $\chi(a) \neq 0$ and $\chi(a^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\chi(a)}$. 🤔

You might expect the notion of characters to lead to a rich framework within the theory of Banach algebras. In some sense, it does, as we will see shortly. However, we should not get ahead of ourselves. We first need to rule out the majority of cases where characters do not tell us anything, simply because there are none of them. In most cases where \mathcal{A} is non-abelian, it has no characters. This is true even in the simplest examples one could think of:

Example. $M_n(\mathbb{F})$ has no characters if $n \geq 2$. To see this, suppose E_{kl} is the $n \times n$ matrix whose (k, l) -entry is 1 and all other entries are 0. Then $E_{k,l}E_{l,k} = E_{k,k}$, and $E_{k,l}^2 = 0$ if $k \neq l$. Suppose χ is a character of $M_n(\mathbb{F})$. Then for all $k \neq l$, we have $\chi(E_{k,l})^2 = \chi(E_{k,l}^2) = \chi(0) = 0$, and so $\chi(E_{k,l}) = 0$. As for $E_{k,k}$, we have $\chi(E_{k,k}) = \chi(E_{k,l}E_{l,k}) = \chi(E_{k,l})\chi(E_{l,k}) = 0 \cdot 0 = 0$. Thus $\chi(E_{k,l}) = 0$ for all $k, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Since every $A \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ is a linear combination of these matrices, we have $\chi(A) = 0$ for all $A \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$, and so $\chi = 0$, a contradiction. Thus $M_n(\mathbb{F})$ has no characters.


Most other non-abelian Banach algebras, such as $\mathcal{B}(X)$ (where X is a Banach space and $\dim(X) \geq 2$), have the same problem as they contain a copy of $M_2(\mathbb{F})$. As such, we will continue our discussion of characters for *abelian* Banach algebras only.

Theorem 2.48. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian Banach algebra and $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. Then χ is bounded and $\|\chi\| = 1$.

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that \mathcal{A} is unital (otherwise, replace \mathcal{A} with its unitization \mathcal{A}_1 defined in Appendix A and extend χ to \mathcal{A}_1 by defining $\chi(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1}) = 1$). Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and define $\lambda = \chi(a)$. If $|\lambda| > \|a\|$, then $\|\frac{1}{\lambda}a\| < 1$, so $1 - \frac{1}{\lambda}a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$. Define $b = (\mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{\lambda}a)^{-1}$. Then $\mathbb{1} = b(\mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{\lambda}a) = b - \frac{1}{\lambda}ba$. This yields $1 = \chi(\mathbb{1}) = \chi(b - \frac{1}{\lambda}ba) = \chi(b) - \frac{\chi(b)\chi(a)}{\lambda} = \chi(b) - \chi(b) = 0$, a contradiction. Thus $|\lambda| = |\chi(a)| \leq \|a\|$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, so χ is bounded and $\|\chi\| \leq 1$. Finally, since $\chi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$, we have $\|\chi\| = 1$. 🤔

Theorem 2.49. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital abelian complex Banach algebra and $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. Then $\ker(\chi)$ is a maximal ideal of \mathcal{A} . Moreover, if \mathcal{M} is a maximal ideal of \mathcal{A} , then there is exactly one character $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\ker(\chi) = \mathcal{M}$.

In other words, if $M(\mathcal{A})$ is the set of all maximal ideals of \mathcal{A} , then the map $\kappa : \Sigma(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M(\mathcal{A})$ given by $\kappa(\chi) = \ker(\chi)$ is a bijection.



$\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ and $M(\mathcal{A})$ are really two sides of the same coin.

Proof. Suppose $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. Then $\ker(\chi)$ is a non-trivial ideal of \mathcal{A} , and since $\text{im}(\chi) = \mathbb{C}$, we have $\mathcal{A}/\ker(\chi) \cong \mathbb{C}$. Thus $\ker(\chi)$ is a maximal ideal of \mathcal{A} .

Suppose \mathcal{M} is a maximal ideal of \mathcal{A} . By Theorem 2.27, \mathcal{M} is closed, so by Theorem 2.28, \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{M} is a unital Banach algebra. Suppose $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{M}$ is the quotient map. If $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\pi(a)$ is not invertible in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{M} , then $\pi(\mathcal{A}a) = \pi(a)[\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{M}]$ is a proper ideal of \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{M} . Define $\mathcal{I} = \{b \in \mathcal{A} \mid \pi(b) \in \pi(\mathcal{A}a)\} = \pi^{-1}(\pi(\mathcal{A}a))$. Then \mathcal{I} is a proper ideal of \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{I} \supseteq \mathcal{M}$. Since \mathcal{M} is maximal, we have $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{M}$. Thus $\pi(\mathcal{A}a) \subseteq \pi(\mathcal{M}) = \{0\}$, and so $\pi(a) = 0$. In other words, if $\pi(a)$ is not invertible, it must be zero. By the Gelfand-Mazur theorem (Theorem 2.41), $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{C}$, i.e. $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{M} = \{\lambda u + \mathcal{M} \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$ for some $u \in \mathcal{A}$. Define $g : \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $g(\lambda u + \mathcal{M}) = \lambda$ and define $\chi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $\chi = g \circ \pi$. Then χ is a homomorphism (as it is a composition of homomorphisms) and $\ker(\chi) = \mathcal{M}$.

Now suppose $\chi_1, \chi_2 \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ are nonzero homomorphisms and $\ker(\chi_1) = \ker(\chi_2)$. Since they are linear, we have $\alpha\chi_1 = \beta\chi_2$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$. This yields $\alpha = \alpha\chi_1(\mathbb{1}) = \beta\chi_2(\mathbb{1}) = \beta$, so $\alpha = \beta$, and so $\chi_1 = \chi_2$. 🤔

The last theorem only holds for *complex* unital abelian Banach algebras, i.e. it requires $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$. Specifically, we used the Gelfand-Mazur theorem to conclude that $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{C}$ and thus has complex dimension 1. In fact, if $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$, one can show that $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} and so has real dimension 1 or 2. This allows for a slight modification of the last theorem to hold, where we pass to equivalence classes of characters under complex conjugation. See [26] for details.

For the next definition and theorem, we will need the concepts of nets and the weak* topology. See Appendix B for more details.

Definition 2.50. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian Banach algebra. The **Gelfand spectrum** (or *topological spectrum*) of \mathcal{A} is the set $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ of all characters of \mathcal{A} , with the weak* topology inherited from \mathcal{A}^* .

Remark. Since every character of \mathcal{A} is a bounded linear functional, we have $\Sigma(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{A}^*$.

Theorem 2.51. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian Banach algebra. Then $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ is a locally compact Hausdorff space. If \mathcal{A} is unital, then $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ is compact.

Proof. Since \mathcal{A}^* is Hausdorff, so is $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ (since every subset of a Hausdorff space is Hausdorff). Suppose B is the closed unit ball in \mathcal{A}^* . By the Banach-Alaoglu theorem, B is weak*-compact. We will denote the set of all homomorphisms $\chi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ (including the zero homomorphism) by $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$. Then $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq B$. We will show that $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$ is weak*-closed.

Suppose (χ_α) is a net in $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$ that weak*-converges to some $\chi \in B$. Then for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\chi(ab) = \lim_\alpha \chi_\alpha(ab) = \lim_\alpha \chi_\alpha(a)\chi_\alpha(b) = \chi(a)\chi(b)$. Similarly, $\chi(\lambda a + b) = \lambda\chi(a) + \chi(b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$. Thus χ is a homomorphism, i.e. $\chi \in \overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$. Thus $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$ is weak*-closed, and so it is weak*-compact (since every closed subset of a compact set is compact).

Since \mathcal{A}^* is Hausdorff, the singleton $\{0\}$ is closed in \mathcal{A}^* (and thus in $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$), and so its complement $\Sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{0\}$ is open in $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$. Thus $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ is locally compact (since every open subset of a compact set is locally compact).

Now suppose \mathcal{A} is unital. Then for any net (χ_α) in $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ that converges to $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$, we have $\chi(\mathbb{1}) = \lim_\alpha \chi_\alpha(\mathbb{1}) = \lim_\alpha 1 = 1 \neq 0$, so $\chi \neq 0$, and so $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. Thus $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ is a weak*-closed subset of B , and so it is weak*-compact. 🤓

Remarks.

1. This proof also shows that $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$ is the one-point compactification of $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ (since it is the closure of $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ in \mathcal{A}^* and contains exactly one more point). See [42, Pages 117-118] for more details.
2. If \mathcal{A} is not unital, then the set $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$ of all homomorphisms $\chi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is still weak*-closed (and thus weak*-compact), but there may be nets of nonzero homomorphisms that converge to the zero homomorphism, as the next example shows. If \mathcal{A} is unital, this is not possible, as they all have to satisfy $\chi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$.

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = C_0(\mathbb{R})$ and define the sequence (ϕ_n) by $\phi_n : C_0(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $\phi_n(f) = f(n)$. Then each ϕ_n is a nonzero homomorphism. However, for all $f \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n) = 0$, so (ϕ_n) weak*-converges to 0.

Theorem 2.52. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital abelian complex Banach algebra. Then for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have:

$$\sigma(a) = \{\chi(a) \mid \chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})\}$$

In other words, the set of values attained by the characters $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ at a is exactly $\sigma(a)$.

This explains the name ‘‘Gelfand spectrum’’ and the notation $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$, since for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$, the elements of $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ can be evaluated at a to recover its spectrum $\sigma(a)$.

Proof. Suppose $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ and define $\lambda = \chi(a)$. Then $\chi(a - \lambda\mathbb{1}) = \chi(a) - \lambda\chi(\mathbb{1}) = \chi(a) - \chi(a) = 0$, so $a - \lambda\mathbb{1} \in \ker(\chi)$. Thus $a - \lambda\mathbb{1} \notin \mathcal{A}^\times$, and so $\lambda \in \sigma(a)$.

Now suppose $\lambda \in \sigma(a)$. Then $a - \lambda\mathbb{1}$ is not invertible. Thus $(a - \lambda\mathbb{1})\mathcal{A}$ is a proper ideal of \mathcal{A} . Suppose \mathcal{M} is a maximal ideal of \mathcal{A} containing $(a - \lambda\mathbb{1})\mathcal{A}$. By Theorem 2.49, there is a character $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\ker(\chi) = \mathcal{M}$. This yields $0 = \chi(a - \lambda\mathbb{1}) = \chi(a) - \lambda\chi(\mathbb{1}) = \chi(a) - \lambda$. Thus $\chi(a) = \lambda \in \sigma(a)$. Thus $\sigma(a) = \{\chi(a) \mid \chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})\}$. 🤓

Definition 2.53. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian Banach algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. The **Gelfand transform** of a is the function $\widehat{a} : \Sigma(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ given by $\widehat{a}(h) = h(a)$.

The **Gelfand transform** of \mathcal{A} is the function $\gamma : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$ given by $\gamma(a) = \widehat{a}$.

Remarks.

1. We do not know *a priori* that $\widehat{a} \in C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$, but we will show this in the proof of the next theorem.
2. Some sources refer to the Gelfand transform (both of an individual element and of the whole algebra) as the *Gelfand representation*.

Theorem 2.54 (Gelfand Representation Theorem). Suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian Banach algebra. Then for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\widehat{a} \in C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$. Moreover, the Gelfand transform of \mathcal{A} is a continuous homomorphism and $\|\gamma\| \leq 1$, and for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\|\widehat{a}\|_\infty = r(a)$. Furthermore, if \mathcal{A} is unital and complex, then $\ker(\gamma)$ is the intersection of all maximal ideals¹¹ of \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Suppose $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ and (χ_α) is a net in $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\chi_\alpha \rightarrow \chi$ in $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. Then $\chi_\alpha \rightarrow \chi$ weak* in \mathcal{A}^* . Thus for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\widehat{a}(\chi_\alpha) = \chi_\alpha(a) \rightarrow \chi(a) = \widehat{a}(\chi)$. Thus \widehat{a} is continuous. Moreover, we can extend \widehat{a} to a continuous function on $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$ by defining¹² $\widehat{a}(0) = 0$. Thus \widehat{a} vanishes at infinity, and so $\widehat{a} \in C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$.

We now show that γ is a homomorphism. Suppose $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$. Then for all $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$, we have:

$$\gamma(\lambda a + b)(\chi) = \widehat{\lambda a + b}(\chi) = \chi(\lambda a + b) = \lambda \chi(a) + \chi(b) = \lambda \widehat{a}(\chi) + \widehat{b}(\chi) = \lambda \gamma(a)(\chi) + \gamma(b)(\chi)$$

Thus $\gamma(\lambda a + b) = \lambda \gamma(a) + \gamma(b)$, and so γ is linear. Now suppose $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Then for all $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$, we have:

$$\gamma(ab)(\chi) = \widehat{ab}(\chi) = \chi(ab) = \chi(a)\chi(b) = \widehat{a}(\chi)\widehat{b}(\chi) = \gamma(a)(\chi)\gamma(b)(\chi)$$


Thus $\gamma(ab) = \gamma(a)\gamma(b)$, and so γ is a homomorphism.

For all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $|\widehat{a}(\chi)| = |\chi(a)| \leq \|a\|$ (since $\|\chi\| = 1$), so $\|\gamma(a)\|_\infty = \|\widehat{a}\|_\infty \leq \|a\|$. Thus γ is bounded and $\|\gamma\| \leq 1$. Also, for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have:

$$\|\widehat{a}\|_\infty = \sup_{\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})} |\chi(a)| = \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma(a)} |\lambda| = r(a)$$

Finally, if \mathcal{A} is unital and complex, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} a \in \ker(\gamma) &\Leftrightarrow \gamma(a) = \widehat{a} \equiv 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow h(a) = 0 \text{ for all } h \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A}) \\ &\Leftrightarrow a \in \ker(h) \text{ for all } h \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A}) \\ &\Leftrightarrow a \in \mathcal{M} \text{ for every maximal ideal } \mathcal{M} \text{ of } \mathcal{A} \quad (\text{by Theorem 2.49}) \\ &\Leftrightarrow a \in \bigcap_{\substack{\mathcal{M} \text{ is a maximal} \\ \text{ideal of } \mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{M} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\ker(\gamma)$ is the intersection of all maximal ideals of \mathcal{A} . 

Remark. If \mathcal{A} is unital, it also follows directly that $\|\gamma\| = 1$, since $\gamma(\mathbb{1})(\chi) = \widehat{\mathbb{1}}(\chi) = \chi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$ for all $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$.

The correspondence between characters and maximal ideals in Theorem 2.49 is used to show that $\ker(\gamma)$ is the intersection of all maximal ideals of \mathcal{A} . This is the only part of the proof that requires \mathcal{A} to be unital and complex. However, even if \mathcal{A} is real or non-unital, the Gelfand transform still gives a meaningful representation of $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ into $C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$. See [8] for related results.

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = L^1(\mathbb{R})$ (with the convolution product). The characters of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ are point evaluations of the Fourier transform, i.e. maps that send $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ to $\widehat{f}(\eta) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi i \eta x} f(x) dx$ for fixed $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus each $\chi \in \Sigma(L^1(\mathbb{R}))$ corresponds to exactly one $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, and the Gelfand transform of $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is \widehat{f} . In other words, the Gelfand transform of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is simply the Fourier transform.

2.4 The Exponential

In calculus, one learns about the all-important power series formula for the natural exponential: $e^x = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} x^n$. In linear algebra (or perhaps a first course on differential equations), one learns how this formula can be adapted to define the *matrix exponential*:

$$e^A = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} A^n$$

The first remarkable fact about this is that it is always well-defined (as long as we use the convention $A^0 = I$, the identity matrix). The second is how it can be used to solve systems of linear differential equations (or linear difference equations, or several other types of equations). But this is merely a special case of a *much* more general type of exponential, which we will discuss here.

Definition 2.55. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital Banach algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. The **exponential** of a , denoted by $\exp(a)$ or e^a , is given by:

$$\exp(a) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} a^n$$

Where we define $a^0 = \mathbb{1}$, the identity of \mathcal{A} .

Remark. This is well-defined for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, as it is a power series in a and its radius of convergence is ∞ .

¹¹This is also known as the *Jacobson radical* of \mathcal{A} , though this terminology is rarely used outside of ring theory.

¹²In other words, we extend \widehat{a} from $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ (which corresponds to \mathcal{A}) to its closure $\overline{\Sigma}(\mathcal{A})$ (which corresponds to the unitization \mathcal{A}_1 of \mathcal{A} , see Appendix A). Since the new ‘point’ is the zero homomorphism, the only suitable value of $\widehat{a}(0)$ is 0.

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = M_2(\mathbb{C})$ and $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 5 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have $A^n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 5(2^n - 1) \\ 0 & 2^n \end{pmatrix}$. This yields:

$$\exp(A) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} A^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 5(2^n - 1) \\ 0 & 2^n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} & 5 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^n - 1}{n!} \\ 0 & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^n}{n!} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e & 5(e^2 - e) \\ 0 & e^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Proposition 2.56. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital Banach algebra and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Then:

1. $\|\exp(a)\| \leq e^{\|a\|}$
2. If a and b commute, then $\exp(a + b) = \exp(a) \exp(b)$.
3. $\exp(a) \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ and $(\exp(a))^{-1} = \exp(-a)$.

Proof.

1. $\|\exp(a)\| = \left\| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} a^n \right\| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \|a^n\| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \|a\|^n = e^{\|a\|}$

2. Since a and b commute, we can use the binomial theorem to rewrite $\exp(a + b)$ as follows:

$$\exp(a + b) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (a + b)^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^k = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{(n-k)!} a^{n-k} \frac{1}{k!} b^k$$

Substituting $r = n - k$ and $s = k$, we get:

$$\exp(a + b) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r!} a^r \frac{1}{s!} b^s = \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r!} a^r \right) \left(\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s!} b^s \right) = \exp(a) \exp(b)$$

3. Since a and $-a$ commute, by (2), we have $\exp(a - a) = \exp(a) \exp(-a)$ and $\exp(a - a) = \exp(-a) \exp(a)$. Since $\exp(a - a) = \exp(0) = \mathbb{1}$, we have that $\exp(a) \in \mathcal{A}^\times$ and $\exp(a)^{-1} = \exp(-a)$. 🤓

Equation (2) above does not hold in general, as the following example shows.

Example. Suppose $A, B \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$, $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $\exp(A) = \begin{pmatrix} e & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $\exp(B) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $A + B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. This yields $\exp(A + B) = \begin{pmatrix} e & e - 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, which is not equal to $\exp(A) \exp(B) = \begin{pmatrix} e & e \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ or $\exp(B) \exp(A) = \begin{pmatrix} e & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. This is possible because A and B do not commute.

While $\exp(a + b) \neq \exp(a) \exp(b)$ in general, there are several formulas that can be used to mitigate this problem, such as the Lie product formula (see [3, Corollary 14.4, Page 208]) and the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula (see [3, Theorem 14.21, Page 218]).

This idea of extending the exponential function to Banach algebras using its series definition can be applied with other analytic functions, such as $\sin(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{(2n+1)!} x^{2n+1}$. This leads to the theory of functional calculus, which is discussed in [20, Chapter 12], [40, Chapter 10] and [47].

The rest of this chapter is a side quest, intended to lead up to the GKZ theorem. It will not be required for our later discussion of C^* -algebras and quantum mechanics. You could skip to the next chapter if you *really* want, but where's the fun in that?

Lemma 2.57. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital complex Banach algebra and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Also suppose there is a constant $M > 0$ such that $\|\exp(\lambda a) b \exp(-\lambda a)\| \leq M$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Then $ab = ba$.

Basically, given any $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, either b commutes with a , or its norm can be made arbitrarily large by conjugating it with $\exp(\lambda a)$ for some sufficiently large λ .

Proof. Define $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ by $f(\lambda) = \exp(\lambda a) b \exp(-\lambda a)$. Since the exponential function is entire, f is a product of entire functions, and so it is entire. By assumption, it is also bounded, so by Lemma 2.35, it is constant. Thus $f(\lambda) = f(0) = b$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Expanding f as a power series in λ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda) &= (1 + \lambda a + O(\lambda^2)) b (1 - \lambda a + O(\lambda^2)) = (b + \lambda ab + O(\lambda^2)) (1 - \lambda a + O(\lambda^2)) = b + \lambda ab - \lambda ba + O(\lambda^2) \\ &= b + \lambda(ab - ba) + O(\lambda^2) \end{aligned}$$

Thus $ab = ba$. 🤓

Remark. The higher-order terms in the above expansion do not tell us anything, as they all automatically vanish if $ab = ba$.

The following example shows that this lemma does not hold for *real* Banach algebras.

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = M_2(\mathbb{R})$ and define $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $AB = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ but $BA = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, so A and B do not commute. However, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\exp(\lambda A) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\lambda) & -\sin(\lambda) \\ \sin(\lambda) & \cos(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}$, and so $\|\exp(\lambda A)\| = 1$. Thus $\|\exp(\lambda A)B \exp(-\lambda A)\| \leq \|\exp(\lambda A)\| \|B\| \|\exp(-\lambda A)\| = 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 = 1$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, even though A and B do not commute. Note that if we allow $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, then for $\lambda = it$ where $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\|\exp(\lambda A)B \exp(-\lambda A)\| = \cosh(2t)$. Since $\cosh(2t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$, this is indeed unbounded.

Corollary 2.58. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital non-abelian complex algebra. Then there is NO norm on \mathcal{A} that makes it a unital complex Banach algebra and is preserved by similarity transformations, i.e. transformations of the form $b \mapsto aba^{-1}$.

Proof. Suppose $\|\cdot\|$ is such a norm and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $\|\cdot\|$ is preserved by similarity transformations, we have $\|\exp(\lambda a)b \exp(-\lambda a)\| = \|\exp(\lambda a)b(\exp(\lambda a))^{-1}\| = \|b\|$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. By the previous lemma, we have $ab = ba$, and so \mathcal{A} is abelian. 😊

Example. $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ is a unital complex algebra, and it is non-abelian if $n \geq 2$. Thus there is no matrix norm that is preserved by similarity transformations. The standard operator norm is preserved by *unitary* similarity transformations, but not by arbitrary ones.

To prove the next lemma, we will need the following result from complex analysis:

Theorem 2.59 (Borel-Carathéodory theorem). Suppose $g : \overline{D}(0, R) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is holomorphic on $\overline{D}(0, R)$, the closed disk of radius R centered at 0. Then for any $r < R$, we have:

$$\sup_{|z| \leq r} |g(z)| \leq \frac{2r}{R-r} \sup_{|z| \leq R} \operatorname{Re}(g(z)) + \frac{R+r}{R-r} |g(0)|$$

See [44, Theorem 8.3.3, Pages 258-259] for a proof.

Lemma 2.60. Suppose $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is an entire function such that $f(0) = 1$, $f'(0) = 0$ and there is a constant $M > 0$ such that $0 < |f(z)| < e^{M|z|}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Then $f(z) = 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. Since f is entire and never zero, there is an entire function g such that $f(z) = e^{g(z)}$. By assumption, we have $1 = f(0) = e^{g(0)}$, so we can assume $g(0) = 0$ (by adding an integer multiple of $2\pi i$ to g). We also have $0 = f'(0) = g'(0)e^{g(0)}$, so $g'(0) = 0$. Note that $e^{\operatorname{Re}(g(z))} = |f(z)| < e^{M|z|}$, so $\operatorname{Re}(g(z)) < M|z|$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Suppose $0 < r < R$. By the Borel-Carathéodory theorem, for all $|z| \leq r$, we have:

$$|g(z)| \leq \frac{2r}{R-r} \sup_{|z| \leq R} \operatorname{Re}(g(z)) + \frac{R+r}{R-r} |g(0)| \leq \frac{2r}{R-r} MR + 0 = \frac{2MrR}{R-r}$$

Setting $R = 2r$ yields $|g(z)| \leq 4mr$ for all $|z| \leq r$. In other words, $|g(z)|$ can be bounded above on $\overline{D}(0, r)$ by $4mr$, which is linear in r . Thus g is either constant or linear in z . Since $g(0) = g'(0) = 0$, it follows that $g \equiv 0$. Thus $f \equiv 1$. 😊

Lemma 2.61. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital algebra, $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is linear and $\phi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. If $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\phi(a) = 0$, then $\phi(a^2) = 0$.
2. If $a \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\phi(a^2) = \phi(a)^2$.
3. If $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\phi(a) = 0$, then $\phi(ab) = 0$.
4. If $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\phi(ab) = \phi(a)\phi(b)$.

Proof.

(1 \Rightarrow 2) Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Since ϕ is linear and $\phi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$, we have $\phi(a - \phi(a)\mathbb{1}) = \phi(a) - \phi(a)\phi(\mathbb{1}) = \phi(a) - \phi(a) = 0$. By (1), we have $\phi((a - \phi(a)\mathbb{1})^2) = 0$. Expanding this, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \phi((a - \phi(a)\mathbb{1})^2) = \phi(a^2 - 2\phi(a)a + \phi(a)^2\mathbb{1}) = \phi(a^2) - 2\phi(a)\phi(a) + \phi(a)^2\phi(\mathbb{1}) \\ &= \phi(a^2) - 2\phi(a)^2 + \phi(a)^2 = \phi(a^2) - \phi(a)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\phi(a^2) = \phi(a)^2$.

(2 \Rightarrow 3) We first show that if $\phi(a) = 0$, then $\phi(ab + ba) = 0$. Replacing a with $a + b$ in (2) yields $\phi((a + b)^2) = \phi(a + b)^2$. Expanding both sides, we get:

$$\phi(a)^2 + \phi(ab + ba) + \phi(b)^2 = \phi(a)^2 + 2\phi(a)\phi(b) + \phi(b)^2 \quad \therefore \quad \phi(ab + ba) = 2\phi(a)\phi(b)$$

Thus, if $\phi(a) = 0$, then $\phi(ab + ba) = 0$. By (2), this implies $\phi((ab + ba)^2) = 0^2 = 0$. Since this holds for all $b \in \mathcal{A}$, we can replace b with bab to get $\phi(a(bab) + (bab)a) = 0$. Note that $(ab + ba)^2 + (ab - ba)^2 = 2(a(bab) + (bab)a)$. This yields:

$$\phi((ab + ba)^2) + \phi((ab - ba)^2) = 2\phi(a(bab) + (bab)a) \quad \therefore \quad \phi((ab - ba)^2) = 0$$

By (2), we have $\phi(ab - ba)^2 = 0$, and so $\phi(ab - ba) = 0$. Finally, we have $ab = \frac{1}{2}((ab + ba) + (ab - ba))$, and so $\phi(ab) = \frac{1}{2}(\phi(ab + ba) + \phi(ab - ba)) = \frac{1}{2}(0 + 0) = 0$.

(3 \Rightarrow 4) Suppose $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. As in the proof of 1 \Rightarrow 2, we have $\phi(a - \phi(a)\mathbb{1}) = 0$. By (3), we have $\phi((a - \phi(a)\mathbb{1})b) = 0$. Expanding the left side, we get:


$$0 = \phi((a - \phi(a)\mathbb{1})b) = \phi(ab - \phi(a)b) = \phi(ab) - \phi(a)\phi(b)$$

Thus $\phi(ab) = \phi(a)\phi(b)$.

(4 \Rightarrow 1) This follows trivially by setting $a = b$. 🕶️

Remark. The condition $\phi(a) = 0 \Rightarrow \phi(ba) = 0$ is also equivalent to the above conditions, which can be seen by using $ba = \frac{1}{2}((ab + ba) - (ab - ba))$ at the end of the proof of 2 \Rightarrow 3.

We are now ready to prove the Gleason-Kahane-Żelazko (GKZ) theorem, a remarkable theorem about characters of unital complex Banach algebras. We know from Proposition 2.47 that for a linear functional on such an algebra to be a character, at the very least, it must map the identity element to 1 and invertible elements to nonzero numbers. The GKZ theorem states that this is enough: *every* linear functional with these two properties is a character!



The GKZ theorem was first proved for unital *abelian* complex Banach algebras in 1967 by Gleason¹³ [22], and then in 1968 by Kahane and Żelazko [27]. The general (non-abelian) case was proved by Żelazko¹⁴ in 1968 [48].

Theorem 2.62 (Gleason-Kahane-Żelazko Theorem or GKZ Theorem). Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital complex Banach algebra and $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is linear. Then $\phi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ if and only if $\phi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$ and $\phi(a) \neq 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) This follows directly from Proposition 2.47.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose $\phi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$ and $\phi(a) \neq 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}^\times$. We first show that ϕ is bounded. Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$. If $\phi(a) = 0$, then $|\phi(a)| \leq \|a\|$ holds trivially. If $\phi(a) \neq 0$, then $\phi\left(\mathbb{1} - \frac{a}{\phi(a)}\right) = \phi(\mathbb{1}) - \frac{\phi(a)}{\phi(a)} = 1 - 1 = 0$, so $\mathbb{1} - \frac{a}{\phi(a)} \in \ker(\phi)$. Thus $\mathbb{1} - \frac{a}{\phi(a)} \notin \mathcal{A}^\times$, so by Theorem 2.22, we must have $\left\|\frac{a}{\phi(a)}\right\| \geq 1$, i.e. $\|\phi(a)\| \leq \|a\|$. Thus ϕ is bounded.

Now suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\phi(a) = 0$. We will show that $\phi(a^2) = 0$. Assume without loss of generality that $\|a\| \leq 1$ (otherwise, replace a with $\frac{a}{\|a\|}$). Define $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\phi(a^n)}{n!} z^n$. Since $|\phi(a^n)| \leq \|a^n\| \leq \|a\|^n \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, it follows that f is entire and $|f(z)| \leq e^{\|a\||z|}$. We also have $f(0) = \phi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$ and $f'(0) = \phi(a) = 0$. Since ϕ is bounded (and thus continuous), we have:

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\phi((za)^n)}{n!} = \phi\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(za)^n}{n!}\right) = \phi(\exp(za))$$

Since $\exp(za) \in \mathcal{A}^\times$, we have $f(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, i.e. $|f(z)| > 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. By Lemma 2.60, we have $f(z) = 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Thus all terms in the definition of f with $n \geq 1$ vanish. In particular, $\phi(a^2) = 0$.

¹³In addition to being a mathematician, Gleason was also a codebreaker in the US Navy in World War II and the Korean War. Leslie Lamport (1941–), the inventor of L^AT_EX, was a second-generation student of Gleason.

¹⁴Żelazko was a student of Mazur (known for the Gelfand-Mazur theorem).

We have just shown that if $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\phi(a) = 0$, then $\phi(a^2) = 0$. By Lemma 2.61, we have $\phi(ab) = \phi(a)\phi(b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus ϕ is a homomorphism (and it is nonzero by assumption), and so $\phi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. 🤖

⚠️ The GKZ theorem is NOT true for general linear operators $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, i.e. if $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is linear and maps invertible elements to invertible elements, it may not be multiplicative.

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is given by $\phi(A) = A^T$. Then ϕ is linear and maps invertible matrices to invertible matrices. However, it is not multiplicative as $\phi(AB) = (AB)^T = B^T A^T \neq A^T B^T$.

⚠️ The GKZ theorem is NOT true for *real* Banach algebras, as the next example shows.

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = C([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ and define $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\phi(f) = \int_0^1 f(x) dx$. Then $\phi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$. Also, if $f \in \mathcal{A}^\times$, it is continuous and does not vanish, so it is always positive or always negative, and so its integral cannot be zero. Thus $\phi(f) \neq 0$ for every $f \in \mathcal{A}^\times$. However, ϕ is not multiplicative. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{A} = C([0, 1], \mathbb{C})$, then $f(x) = e^{2\pi i x}$ is invertible, but $\phi(f) = 0$.

There is a modification of the GKZ theorem for real Banach algebras due to S. H. Kulkarni (1984) [30]: $\phi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ if and only if $\phi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$ and $\phi(a)^2 + \phi(b)^2 \neq 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $ab = ba$ and $a^2 + b^2 \in \mathcal{A}^\times$.

There is also a generalization to topological vector spaces, due to A. Golbaharan (2020) [23].

Chapter 2 Conclusion

The results we have proved thus far show the power of combining algebra and analysis: Using the Neumann series and tools from complex analysis (specifically Liouville's theorem and Laurent's theorem), we proved the fundamental theorem of Banach algebras and the spectral radius formula. We then went on to prove the Gelfand-Mazur theorem and established the correspondence between characters and maximal ideals in Theorem 2.49. Finally, we proved the Gelfand representation theorem, thereby linking all abelian Banach algebras to the example of $C_0(X)$ through the Gelfand transform.

In general, however, the Gelfand transform may not be injective or surjective. Indeed, there are abelian Banach algebras that cannot be realized as $C_0(X)$, such as those with the trivial multiplication operation $ab = 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. In the next chapter, we will explore a special class of Banach algebras, known as C^* -algebras, that are much more well-behaved. In particular, we will show that for abelian C^* -algebras, the Gelfand transform is bijective, and as such, all abelian C^* -algebras can be realized as $C_0(X)$.

3 C^* -algebras

Having developed the rich and insightful theory of Banach algebras in the previous chapter, we are now ready to move on to C^* -algebras. Essentially, C^* -algebras are Banach algebras with an additional operation $*$ that works like the conjugate transpose of a matrix or the conjugate of a complex-valued function, that satisfies the all-important C^* -axiom:

$$\|a^*a\| = \|a\|^2$$

C^* -algebras were first defined in 1946 by Rickart [38]. He originally called them B^* -algebras (the B stands for ‘Banach’), and the condition $\|a^*a\| = \|a\|^2$ was called the B^* -axiom. In 1947, Segal [41] defined a C^* -algebra as a closed $*$ -subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, where \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space. As we will see, these definitions turn out to be essentially equivalent.

The C in C^* -algebra stands for “closed”, not “complex”. It is perfectly fine to consider C^* -algebras over \mathbb{R} , but in applications (primarily in quantum mechanics), all of our vector spaces are over \mathbb{C} , so we are naturally more interested in C^* -algebras over \mathbb{C} . We should also emphasize that despite the presence of $*$ everywhere, C^* -algebras are *not* required to be inner product spaces.



The main theorems we will prove in this chapter are the Gelfand-Naimark theorem and the Gelfand-Naimark-Segal (GNS) theorem. The former is for abelian C^* -algebras and uses the example of $C_0(X)$, while the latter is for arbitrary C^* -algebras and uses the example of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

⚠ Some sources refer to both of the aforementioned theorems as the Gelfand-Naimark theorem.

For further reading on C^* -algebras, see [34], [17], [4], [15], [33] and [14].

3.1 C^* -algebras

Definition 3.1. A $*$ -algebra (or *star algebra* or *involution algebra*) is an associative algebra \mathcal{A} , together with a map $*$: $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, such that:

1. If $a \in \mathcal{A}$, then $(a^*)^* = a$. (* is an involution)
2. If $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, then $(a + b)^* = a^* + b^*$. (* is conjugate linear)
3. If $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$, then $(\lambda a)^* = \bar{\lambda}a^*$.
4. If $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, then $(ab)^* = b^*a^*$. (* is anti-multiplicative)

Proposition 3.2. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital $*$ -algebra. Then $\mathbb{1}^* = \mathbb{1}$.

Proof. By definition, we have $\mathbb{1}a = a\mathbb{1} = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Applying $*$ to all three expressions yields $a^*\mathbb{1}^* = \mathbb{1}^*a^* = a^*$. Thus $\mathbb{1}^*$ is also an identity of \mathcal{A} . Since the identity of \mathcal{A} is unique, we have $\mathbb{1}^* = \mathbb{1}$. 😊

Definition 3.3. A **normed $*$ -algebra** is a normed algebra with a map $*$: $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ that satisfies the above properties. A **Banach $*$ -algebra** is a normed $*$ -algebra that is complete with respect to the induced metric.

The norm provides *analytic* structure to the algebra, while the $*$ operation provides *algebraic* structure. In general, there is no link between them. The necessary link comes now, with the following definition:

Definition 3.4. A C^* -algebra is a Banach $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} such that $\|a^*a\| = \|a\|^2$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

The above property (the C^* -axiom) links the norm and the $*$ operation together. It is sort of a compatibility requirement, and it has profound implications on both the algebraic and analytic structures of \mathcal{A} , as we will see later¹⁵.

Remark. It is enough to require that $\|a^*a\| \geq \|a\|^2$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, since this would imply that $\|a\|^2 \leq \|a^*a\| \leq \|a^*\| \|a\|$, so $\|a\| \leq \|a^*\|$. Switching a and a^* yields $\|a^*\| \leq \|a\|$, so $\|a^*\| = \|a\|$, and so $\|a^*a\| \leq \|a\|^2$.

Examples.

1. \mathbb{F} is a C^* -algebra, with the absolute value norm and the complex conjugate as the adjoint.
2. $M_n(\mathbb{F})$ is a C^* -algebra, with the operator norm and the conjugate transpose as the adjoint.

¹⁵Think, if you will, of two people at a party who are perfect for each other. Alone, they are sad and depressed, not having any fun. But once they start chatting, sparks fly, and the story of a lifetime begins. This is the beauty of the C^* -axiom.

In Definition 2.9, we remarked that the condition $\|\mathbb{1}\| = 1$ is not vacuous and thus a necessary part of the definition. However, if \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra, this is indeed vacuous, as the C^* -axiom prevents any other possibility.

Corollary 3.8. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra with an identity. Then $\|\mathbb{1}\| = 1$.

This follows directly from the previous proposition by setting $a = \mathbb{1}$.

Theorem 3.9. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra. Then \mathcal{A} is isometrically isomorphic to a subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. For each $a \in \mathcal{A}$, define $f_a : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ by $f_a(x) = ax$. Clearly f_a is linear. By Proposition 3.7, we have $\|f_a\| = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{A}, \|x\| \leq 1} \|ax\| = \|a\|$. Thus f_a is bounded and $\|f_a\| = \|a\|$.

Now define $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$ by $\rho(a) = f_a$. Clearly ρ is linear, and as we have just shown, $\|\rho(a)\| = \|f_a\| = \|a\|$, so ρ is an isometry. It is also a homomorphism as $\rho(ab) = f_{ab} = f_a \circ f_b = \rho(a) \circ \rho(b)$. Thus $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$ is an isometric homomorphism, and so it is an isometric isomorphism from \mathcal{A} to $\text{im}(\rho) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$. 🧐

Remark. This theorem holds for all Banach algebras \mathcal{A} in which $\|a\| = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{A}, \|x\| \leq 1} \|ax\|$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. This is reminiscent of Cayley's theorem, which states that every group G is isomorphic (as a group) to a subgroup of the corresponding symmetric group $\text{Sym}(G)$.

Definition 3.10. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

- a is **Hermitian** (or *self-adjoint*) if $a^* = a$.
- a is **unitary** if $aa^* = a^*a = \mathbb{1}$ (this only applies if \mathcal{A} is unital).
- a is **normal** if $aa^* = a^*a$.

Remark. It follows directly that every Hermitian or unitary element is normal.

Just like for matrices, every element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ can be expressed uniquely as $a = b + ic$, where $b, c \in \mathcal{A}$ are Hermitian. Explicitly, these are given by $b = \frac{a+a^*}{2}$ and $c = \frac{a-a^*}{2i}$.

Theorem 3.11. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is normal. Then $r(a) = \|a\|$.

Proof. Since a is normal, we have:

$$(a^*a)^*(a^*a) = (a^*(a^*)^*)(a^*a) = (a^*a)^2 = a^*aa^*a = a^*a^*aa = (a^*)^2a^2 = (a^2)^*a^2$$

Thus $\|a^2\|^2 = \|(a^2)^*a^2\| = \|(a^*a)^*(a^*a)\| = \|a^*a\|^2 = \|a\|^4$. Taking the square root of both sides yields $\|a^2\| = \|a\|^2$. It follows by induction that $\|a^{2^m}\| = \|a\|^{2^m}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. By the spectral radius formula (Theorem 2.38), we have:

$$r(a) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|^{1/n} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|a^{2^m}\|^{2^{-m}} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\|a\|^{2^m})^{2^{-m}} = \|a\|$$
 🧐

Remark. An important special case of this theorem is when \mathcal{A} is abelian. In this case, every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is normal, and so $r(a) = \|a\|$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Corollary 3.12. For any $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} , there is at most one norm on \mathcal{A} that makes it a C^* -algebra. This norm is given by $\|\cdot\| : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $\|a\| = \sqrt{r(a^*a)}$.

Proof. Suppose $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm on \mathcal{A} that makes it a C^* -algebra. Since a^*a is Hermitian (and thus normal), by the previous theorem, we have $r(a^*a) = \|a^*a\| = \|a\|^2$. Thus $\|a\| = \sqrt{r(a^*a)}$. Since the spectral radius does not depend on the norm, this formula uniquely determines the norm $\|\cdot\|$. 🧐

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ with the usual operations and the $*$ operation given by the conjugate transpose. Then the only norm that makes it a C^* -algebra is the spectral norm. For any matrix $A \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$, its singular values are the square roots of the eigenvalues of A^*A . Thus $\|A\| = \sqrt{r(A^*A)}$ is also the largest singular value of A .

The last corollary shows that the norm of a C^* -algebra is uniquely determined. On the other hand, the $*$ operation is also uniquely determined: For any Banach algebra \mathcal{A} , there is at most one $*$ operation on \mathcal{A} that makes it a C^* -algebra. See [5, Theorem 7.9, Page 59] for a proof.

Definition 3.13. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a $*$ -algebra. A **$*$ -subalgebra** of \mathcal{A} is a subalgebra \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{A} such that $a^* \in \mathcal{B}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{B}$.

In other words, a $*$ -subalgebra of \mathcal{A} is a subalgebra of \mathcal{A} that is also closed under the $*$ operation.

Remark. Some sources simply call this a *subalgebra*. To avoid confusion, we will not do this here.

It follows directly from the definitions that a subset of a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra if and only if it is a closed $*$ -subalgebra of \mathcal{A} .

Definition 3.14. Suppose \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are C^* -algebras. A **$*$ -homomorphism** from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} is an algebra homomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that $\phi(a^*) = \phi(a)^*$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

A **$*$ -isomorphism** is a $*$ -homomorphism that is also a bijection.

In other words, a $*$ -homomorphism is an algebra homomorphism that preserves the structure of the adjoint operation.

Proposition 3.15. Suppose \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are C^* -algebras and $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a $*$ -homomorphism. Then $\text{im}(\phi)$ is a $*$ -subalgebra of \mathcal{B} .

Proof. Since ϕ is a homomorphism, by Proposition 2.14, $\text{im}(\phi)$ is a subalgebra of \mathcal{B} . Suppose $b \in \text{im}(\phi)$. Then we have $b = \phi(a)$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus $\phi(a^*) = \phi(a)^* = b^* \in \text{im}(\phi)$, and so $\text{im}(\phi)$ is a $*$ -subalgebra of \mathcal{B} . 😊

Remark. It can be shown that $\text{im}(\phi)$ is also closed in \mathcal{B} (and thus also a C^* -algebra), see [10, Theorem 1.3.2, Page 13].

Lemma 3.16. Suppose \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are unital algebras and $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a unital homomorphism. Then for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\sigma(\phi(a)) \subseteq \sigma(a)$.

In other words, unital homomorphisms cannot add new elements to the spectrum.

Proof. Suppose $\lambda \notin \sigma(a)$. Then $a - \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{A}^\times$. By Proposition 2.16, we have $\phi(a - \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \phi(a) - \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \in \mathcal{B}^\times$, and so $\lambda \notin \sigma(\phi(a))$. Thus $\sigma(\phi(a)) \subseteq \sigma(a)$. 😊

Theorem 3.17. Suppose \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are C^* -algebras and $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a $*$ -homomorphism. Then ϕ is bounded and $\|\phi\| \leq 1$.

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are unital and ϕ is a unital $*$ -homomorphism (otherwise, replace them with their unitizations \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{B}_1 defined in Appendix A and extend ϕ to \mathcal{A}_1 by defining $\phi(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1}) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}_1}$). Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is Hermitian. Then $\phi(a) = \phi(a^*) = \phi(a)^*$, so $\phi(a)$ is also Hermitian. Thus $r(a) = \|a\|$ and $r(\phi(a)) = \|\phi(a)\|$. By Lemma 3.16, we have $\sigma(\phi(a)) \subseteq \sigma(a)$, so $r(\phi(a)) \leq r(a)$. Thus $\|\phi(a)\| \leq \|a\|$.

Now suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Since a^*a is Hermitian, so is $\phi(a^*a)$, and so $\|\phi(a)\|^2 = \|\phi(a)^*\phi(a)\| = \|\phi(a^*a)\| \leq \|a^*a\| = \|a\|^2$. Thus $\|\phi(a)\| \leq \|a\|$, and so ϕ is bounded and $\|\phi\| \leq 1$. 😊

The last theorem should surprise (and hopefully delight) you. A $*$ -homomorphism is a purely *algebraic* notion. Why on Earth should $*$ -homomorphisms automatically be continuous? This is yet another example of the power of the C^* -axiom. Once you demand enough structure for a map between C^* -algebras (in this case, that the map is a $*$ -homomorphism), you get even *more* structure (in this case, continuity) for free!

In fact, ϕ does not even need to be a $*$ -homomorphism. As long as it preserves addition, vector multiplication and the adjoint (but not necessarily scalar multiplication), it is automatically continuous, and $\|\phi(a)\| \leq \|a\|$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. See [46] for a proof.

Proposition 3.18. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian C^* -algebra, $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. Then:

1. If a is Hermitian, then $\chi(a) \in \mathbb{R}$.
2. $\chi(a^*) = \overline{\chi(a)}$
3. $\chi(a^*a) \geq 0$
4. If \mathcal{A} is unital and a is unitary, then $|\chi(a)| = 1$.

Proof. We will assume $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ to prove (1) and (2), since they hold trivially if $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$.

1. Suppose $c \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\chi(c) = 1$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we have:

$$|\chi(a + itc)|^2 \leq \|a + itc\|^2 = \|(a + itc)(a - itc)\| = \|a^2 + t^2c^2\| \leq \|a\|^2 + |t|^2\|c\|^2 = \|a\|^2 + |t|^2$$

Suppose $\chi(a) = \alpha + i\beta$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then:

$$\|a\|^2 + t^2 \geq |\chi(a + itc)|^2 = |\alpha + i(\beta + t)c|^2 = \alpha^2 + \beta^2 + 2\beta t + t^2$$

Thus $\|a\|^2 \geq \alpha^2 + \beta^2 + 2\beta t$. This cannot hold for arbitrarily large $t \in \mathbb{R}$ unless $\beta = 0$. Thus $\beta = 0$, and so $\chi(a) \in \mathbb{R}$.

2. Suppose $a = b + ic$, where b and c are Hermitian. By (1), we have $\chi(b), \chi(c) \in \mathbb{R}$. This yields:

$$\chi(a^*) = \chi(b - ic) = \chi(b) - i\chi(c) = \overline{\chi(b) + i\chi(c)} = \overline{\chi(b + ic)} = \overline{\chi(a)}$$

3. By (2), we have $\chi(a^*a) = \chi(a^*)\chi(a) = \overline{\chi(a)}\chi(a) = |\chi(a)|^2 \geq 0$.

4. By Proposition 2.47 and Theorem 2.48, we have $\|\chi\| = 1$ and $\chi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$. By (2), we have $|\chi(a)|^2 = \chi(a^*)\chi(a) = \chi(a^*a) = \chi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$, so $|\chi(a)| = 1$. 😊

Remark. (2) shows that every homomorphism $\chi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a $*$ -homomorphism.

Lemma 3.19. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital algebra and \mathcal{B} is a unital subalgebra of \mathcal{A} . Then for all $a \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \subseteq \sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(a)$.

In other words, the spectrum of a in the larger algebra is contained in the spectrum of a in the smaller algebra.

This follows directly from Lemma 3.16 by setting $\phi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, $\phi(a) = a$ (the inclusion map, which is a unital homomorphism).

Theorem 3.20. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

1. If a is Hermitian, then $\sigma(a) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.
2. If $a = c^*c$ for some $c \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\sigma(a) \subseteq [0, \infty)$.
3. If a is unitary, then $\sigma(a) \subseteq \partial D(0, 1)$ (the unit circle $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| = 1\}$).

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that \mathcal{A} is unital (otherwise, replace \mathcal{A} with its unitization \mathcal{A}_1 defined in Appendix A). We will prove these results by first passing to a subalgebra of \mathcal{A} that is abelian, which will allow us to use characters to help us.

Define \mathcal{S} as the closed unital $*$ -subalgebra of \mathcal{A} generated by a (or equivalently, the closure of the smallest subalgebra of \mathcal{A} containing $\mathbb{1}$, a and a^*). Then every element of \mathcal{A} can be expressed as a (finite or infinite) power series in a and a^* . Since a is normal, all such elements commute, and so \mathcal{S} is abelian.

We now consider the set $\{\chi(a) \mid \chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{S})\}$, i.e. the set of values obtained by evaluating all characters of \mathcal{S} at a . By Theorem 2.52, we have $\{\chi(a) \mid \chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{S})\} = \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(a)$, and by Lemma 3.19, we have $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \subseteq \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(a)$. Thus $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \subseteq \{\chi(a) \mid \chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{S})\}$.

Finally, we use Proposition 3.18 to conclude all three results at once:

1. If a is Hermitian, then $\chi(a) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{S})$, and so $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.
2. If $a = c^*c$ for some $c \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\chi(a) = \chi(c^*c) \geq 0$ for all $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{S})$, and so $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \subseteq [0, \infty)$.
3. If a is unitary, then $|\chi(a)| = 1$ for all $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{S})$, and so $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \subseteq \partial D(0, 1)$. 😊

Theorem 3.21. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital Banach $*$ -algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Then:

1. $\exp(a^*) = \exp(a)^*$
2. If a is Hermitian, then $\exp(ia)$ is unitary.

Proof.

$$1. \exp(a^*) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (a^*)^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (a^n)^* = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} a^n \right)^* = \exp(a)^*$$

2. Replacing a with ia in (1) yields $\exp((ia)^*) = \exp(ia)^*$, i.e. $\exp(ia)^* = \exp(-ia)$. Since a is Hermitian, we have $\exp(-ia) = \exp(-ia) = (\exp(ia))^{-1}$. Thus $\exp(ia)^* = \exp(ia)^{-1}$, and so $\exp(ia)$ is unitary. 😊

Example. $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \pi \\ \pi & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is Hermitian, and $\exp(iA) = \exp \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\pi \\ i\pi & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ is unitary.

We are almost ready to prove the Gelfand-Naimark theorem. The last ingredient we will need is the following result, which is a slight generalization of the Stone-Weierstrass theorem.

Theorem 3.22. Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space and \mathcal{R} is a $*$ -subalgebra of $C_0(X)$ such that:

- \mathcal{R} separates points: For any $x, y \in X$, $x \neq y$, there exists $f \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $f(x) \neq f(y)$.
- \mathcal{R} vanishes nowhere: For any $x \in X$, there exists $f \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $f(x) \neq 0$.

Then \mathcal{R} is dense in $C_0(X)$.

See [6] for a proof.

Theorem 3.23. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian C^* -algebra. Then the Gelfand transform γ of \mathcal{A} is an isometric $*$ -isomorphism from \mathcal{A} onto $C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$.

Proof. By the Gelfand representation theorem (Theorem 2.54), the Gelfand transform γ of \mathcal{A} is a continuous $*$ -homomorphism from \mathcal{A} to $C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$, and for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\|\widehat{a}\|_\infty = r(a)$. Since \mathcal{A} is abelian, every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is normal, so by Theorem 3.11, we have $r(a) = \|a\|$. Thus $\|\widehat{a}\|_\infty = r(a) = \|a\|$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and so γ is an isometry.

For all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$, we have $\widehat{a^*}(\chi) = \chi(a^*) = \overline{\chi(a)} = \overline{\widehat{a}(\chi)} = \widehat{a^*}(\chi)$. Thus $\widehat{a^*} = \widehat{a}^*$, i.e. $\gamma(a^*) = \gamma(a)^*$, and so γ is a $*$ -homomorphism.

We now show that γ is onto. Define $\mathcal{R} = \text{im}(\gamma)$. Since γ is a $*$ -homomorphism, \mathcal{R} is a $*$ -subalgebra of $C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$.

- Suppose $\chi_1, \chi_2 \in \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ and $\chi_1 \neq \chi_2$. Then there exists $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\chi_1(a) \neq \chi_2(a)$, i.e. $\widehat{a}(\chi_1) \neq \widehat{a}(\chi_2)$. Thus \mathcal{R} separates points.
- Now suppose $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. Then $\chi \neq 0$ by assumption, so there exists $b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\chi(b) \neq 0$, i.e. $\widehat{b}(\chi) \neq 0$. Thus \mathcal{R} vanishes nowhere.

By Theorem 3.22, \mathcal{R} is dense in $C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$. Finally, by Proposition 2.31, \mathcal{R} is closed in $C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$, so it must be equal to $C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$. Thus γ is onto, and so it is an isometric $*$ -isomorphism. 🤓

In the above proof, we did not need to show directly that γ is injective, this follows automatically (using Lemma 2.30) from the fact that it is an isometry. Consequently, the Gelfand transform of any abelian C^* -algebra is injective. Furthermore, if \mathcal{A} is unital and complex, we can deduce that the intersection of all maximal ideals of \mathcal{A} is the zero ideal¹⁶ $\{0\}$ (since it is $\ker(\gamma)$ and γ is injective).

Theorem 3.24 (Gelfand-Naimark Theorem). Every abelian C^* -algebra is isometrically $*$ -isomorphic to $C_0(X)$, where X is some locally compact Hausdorff space.

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian C^* -algebra. Define $X = \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ and $\gamma : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_0(X)$ as the Gelfand transform of \mathcal{A} . By the previous theorem, γ is an isometric $*$ -isomorphism. 🤓

Example. Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space. We already know that $C_0(X)$ is an abelian C^* -algebra. Let's see what happens when we construct the Gelfand transform of $C_0(X)$. The characters of $C_0(X)$ are the evaluation maps $\chi_z : C_0(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, $\chi_z(f) = f(z)$ (where $z \in X$). Each character χ_z naturally corresponds to exactly one $z \in X$. Also, for each $f \in C_0(X)$, the Gelfand transform of f is given by $\widehat{f} : \Sigma(C_0(X)) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, $\widehat{f}(\chi_z) = \chi_z(f) = f(z)$. Thus $C_0(\Sigma(C_0(X))) \cong C_0(X)$. In other words, if we perform this construction on $C_0(X)$, we get back $C_0(X)$.

3.2 Positive Elements and Positive Linear Functionals

We now introduce the notions of *positive elements* and *positive linear functionals*. Both of these are generalizations of non-negative real numbers, positive semidefinite matrices (Hermitian matrices whose eigenvalues are all non-negative), and non-negative functions (real-valued functions that only assume non-negative values). It may be more appropriate to call these *non-negative* elements and linear functionals, since strictly speaking, the aforementioned values are allowed to be zero. Nonetheless, we call them “positive” as it is simpler.

Definition 3.25. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra. An element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is **positive** if $a^* = a$ and $\sigma(a) \subseteq [0, \infty)$. In other words, a is positive if it is Hermitian and its spectrum consists only of non-negative real numbers.

¹⁶In the language of ring theory, we would say every unital abelian complex C^* -algebra is *Jacobson semisimple*.

Examples.

1. A matrix $A \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ is positive if and only if it is positive semidefinite.
2. Suppose X is a locally compact Hausdorff space. An element $f \in C_0(X)$ is positive if and only if $f(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$.
3. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space. An element $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is positive if and only if $\langle Tx, x \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$.
4. Suppose (X, \mathcal{A}, μ) is a measure space. An element $f \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is positive if and only if $f(x) \geq 0$ a.e. on X .

Proposition 3.26. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. a is positive.
2. $a = b^2$ for some Hermitian $b \in \mathcal{A}$.
3. $a = c^*c$ for some $c \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proof.

- (1 \Rightarrow 2) Note that $\sigma(a) \subseteq [0, \|a\|]$ and the square root function $\Phi : [0, \|a\|] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\Phi(x) = \sqrt{x}$ is continuous on $[0, \|a\|]$. Thus $b = \Phi(a)$ is well-defined. Since Φ is real-valued, b is Hermitian, and $b^2 = \Phi(a)^2 = a$.
- (2 \Rightarrow 3) Since b is Hermitian, we have $a = b^2 = b^*b$, so we can set $c = b$.
- (3 \Rightarrow 1) Clearly a is Hermitian, as $a^* = (c^*c)^* = c^*(c^*)^* = c^*c = a$. By Theorem 3.20, we have $\sigma(a) \subseteq [0, \infty)$, and so a is positive. 😊

Example. The matrix $A = \begin{pmatrix} 25 & 40 \\ 40 & 65 \end{pmatrix}$ is positive (it is Hermitian and its spectrum is $\{0.28, 89.72\} \subset [0, \infty)$).

It can be expressed as $A = B^2$, where $B = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 4 \\ 4 & 7 \end{pmatrix}$ is Hermitian (and thus $A = B^*B$ as well). This is not the only way to express A as C^*C , e.g. we could also use $C = \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 8 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

Example. The function $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $f(x) = x^4$ is positive (since $f(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [-1, 1]$). It can be expressed as $f = g^2$, where $g(x) = x^2$ (and g is Hermitian as it is real-valued). We could also express f as h^*h , where $h = ix|x|$.

Definition 3.27. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra. A linear functional $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is **positive** if $f(a^*a) \geq 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

A **state** on \mathcal{A} is a positive linear functional $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ such that $\|f\| = 1$.

Remark. A state is simply a normalized positive linear functional, i.e. if $f \neq 0$ is a positive linear functional on \mathcal{A} , then $\frac{f}{\|f\|}$ is a state on \mathcal{A} . You might be wondering if this requires us to assume f is bounded, but as we will show in Theorem 3.34, this follows automatically from being positive.

Example. Suppose $f : M_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $f \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = a$. This is clearly linear, and it is positive as every matrix of the form A^*A is positive semidefinite, so its upper-left entry must be non-negative.

We first present two important examples of states that we will need later:

Proposition 3.28. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space and $x \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|x\| = 1$. Define $f : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ by $f(A) = \langle Ax, x \rangle$. Then f is a state on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. For any $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and any $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$, we have:

$$f(\lambda A + B) = \langle (\lambda A + B)x, x \rangle = \langle \lambda Ax + Bx, x \rangle = \lambda \langle Ax, x \rangle + \langle Bx, x \rangle = \lambda f(A) + f(B)$$

Thus f is linear. Also, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we have $f(A^*A) = \langle A^*A x, x \rangle = \langle Ax, Ax \rangle = \|Ax\|^2 \geq 0$. Thus f is positive. Moreover, we have:

$$|f(A)| = |\langle Ax, x \rangle| \leq \|Ax\| \|x\| = \|A\| \|x\|^2 = \|A\|$$

Thus f is bounded and $\|f\| \leq 1$. Finally, if $A = I$ (the identity operator on \mathcal{H}), we have:

$$f(I) = \langle Ix, x \rangle = \langle x, x \rangle = \|x\|^2 = 1$$

Thus $\|f\| = 1$, and so f is a state on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. 😊

Remark. The vector x is not unique, for example we can use αx for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$, $|\alpha| = 1$ (or for general $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$, the corresponding f will be a positive linear functional with norm $\|f\| = |\alpha|^2$).

Proposition 3.29. Suppose \mathcal{A} is an abelian C^* -algebra. Then every character of \mathcal{A} is a state on \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Suppose $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. By definition, χ is a linear functional on \mathcal{A} . By Proposition 3.18, we have $\chi(a^*a) \geq 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, so χ is positive. By Theorem 2.48, χ is bounded and $\|\chi\| = 1$. Thus χ is a state on \mathcal{A} . 🤓

To prove the next proposition, we will need the following modification of the Hahn-Banach theorem:

Theorem 3.30 (Hahn-Banach Theorem for Positive Linear Functionals on C^* -algebras). Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra, \mathcal{B} is a closed subalgebra of \mathcal{A} and $f : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is a positive linear functional. Then f has an extension to a positive linear functional on \mathcal{A} with the same norm, i.e. there is a positive linear functional $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ such that $F(a) = f(a)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\|F\| = \|f\|$.

This is a special case of a much more general theorem. See [32] for a proof and related results.

Proposition 3.31. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is normal. If $\lambda \in \sigma(a)$, then there is a state $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ such that $f(a) = \lambda$.

Proof. Define \mathcal{S} as in Theorem 3.20 (again, \mathcal{S} is abelian as a is normal). By Theorem 2.52, we have $\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(a) = \{\chi(a) \mid \chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{S})\}$, and by Lemma 3.19, we have $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \subseteq \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}(a)$. Thus if $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(a)$, there is a character $\chi \in \Sigma(\mathcal{S})$ such that $\chi(a) = \lambda$. By Proposition 3.29, χ is a state on \mathcal{S} , so by Theorem 3.30, χ can be extended to a positive linear functional F on \mathcal{A} with $\|F\| = \|\chi\| = 1$. 🤓

Corollary 3.32. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is positive. Then there is a state $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ such that $f(a) = \|a\|$.

Proof. Since a is positive, it is Hermitian (and thus normal), so by Theorem 3.11, we have $r(a) = \|a\|$. By Theorem 2.36, $\sigma(a)$ is compact, so there exists $\lambda \in \sigma(a)$ such that $|\lambda| = r(a)$. Since $\sigma(a) \subseteq [0, \infty)$, this implies that $\lambda = r(a)$, and so $\lambda \in \sigma(a)$. By the previous proposition, there is a state $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ such that $f(a) = \lambda = \|a\|$. 🤓

We will now prove a version of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for positive linear functionals. Usually in functional analysis, one would first prove that a map is an inner product and then deduce that it satisfies the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Here, we are going the other way: We first prove the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality holds for some “inner product” (which we will define in Section 3.3), and later use this to prove it is indeed an inner product.

Theorem 3.33 (Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality for Positive Linear Functionals). Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a positive linear functional. Then for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, we have:

$$|f(b^*a)|^2 \leq f(a^*a)f(b^*b)$$

Proof. Since f is positive, for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{F}$, we have $f((\lambda a + \mu b)^*(\lambda a + \mu b)) \geq 0$. Expanding the left side, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} f((\lambda a + \mu b)^*(\lambda a + \mu b)) &= f((\overline{\lambda}a^* + \overline{\mu}b^*)(\lambda a + \mu b)) = f(\overline{\lambda}\lambda a^*a + \overline{\lambda}\mu a^*b + \overline{\mu}\lambda b^*a + \overline{\mu}\mu b^*b) \\ &= \overline{\lambda}\lambda f(a^*a) + \overline{\lambda}\mu f(a^*b) + \overline{\mu}\lambda f(b^*a) + \overline{\mu}\mu f(b^*b) \end{aligned}$$

We now set $\lambda = \overline{f(b^*a)}$ and $\mu = -f(a^*a)$ (note that $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$) to get:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq f(b^*a)\overline{f(b^*a)}f(a^*a) - f(b^*a)f(a^*a)\overline{f(b^*a)} - \overline{f(b^*a)}f(b^*a)f(a^*a) + \overline{f(b^*a)}f(a^*a)f(b^*b) \\ &= f(b^*a)\overline{f(b^*a)}f(a^*a) - f(b^*a)f(a^*a)\overline{f(b^*a)} - \overline{f(b^*a)}f(b^*a)f(a^*a) + f(a^*a)f(a^*a)f(b^*b) \\ &= f(a^*a) \left(f(b^*a)\overline{f(b^*a)} - f(b^*a)\overline{f(b^*a)} - \overline{f(b^*a)}f(b^*a) + f(a^*a)f(b^*b) \right) \\ &= f(a^*a) \left(|f(b^*a)|^2 - |f(b^*a)|^2 - |f(b^*a)|^2 + f(a^*a)f(b^*b) \right) \\ &= f(a^*a) \left(f(a^*a)f(b^*b) - |f(b^*a)|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

Since f is positive, we have $f(a^*a) \geq 0$. Thus the second factor $f(a^*a)f(b^*b) - |f(b^*a)|^2$ must also be non-negative, i.e. $|f(b^*a)|^2 \leq f(a^*a)f(b^*b)$. 🤓

Theorem 3.34. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital C^* -algebra and $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is a linear functional. Then f is positive if and only if it is bounded and $\|f\| = f(\mathbb{1})$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is Hermitian and $\|a\| < 1$. We will show that there exists $b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathbb{1} - a = b^*b$. Note that the function $\phi : D(0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $\phi(z) = \sqrt{1-z}$ is holomorphic on $D(0, 1)$, so it has a Taylor series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_n z^n$ that converges absolutely for all $|z| < 1$ (explicitly, $r_n = \frac{1}{4^n(1-2n)} \binom{2n}{n}$). Define $b = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n a^n$. Then $b \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b^2 = 1 - a$. Also, since all $r_n \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $b^* = b$, and so $b^*b = b^2 = 1 - a$. This yields $f(\mathbb{1}) - f(a) = f(\mathbb{1} - a) = f(b^*b) \geq 0$. Thus $f(a) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f(\mathbb{1}) \geq f(a)$. Replacing a with $-a$ yields $f(\mathbb{1}) \geq f(-a) = -f(a)$, and so $f(\mathbb{1}) \geq |f(a)|$.

Now suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\|a\| < 1$. Then a^*a is Hermitian and $\|a^*a\| = \|a\|^2 < 1$. Thus $f(a^*a) \leq f(\mathbb{1})$. By Theorem 3.33, we have:

$$|f(a)|^2 = |f(a^*)|^2 = |f(a^*\mathbb{1})|^2 \leq f(\mathbb{1}^*\mathbb{1})f(a^*a) = f(\mathbb{1})f(a^*a) \leq f(\mathbb{1})^2$$

All in all, we have $|f(a)| \leq f(\mathbb{1})$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $\|a\| < 1$. Thus f is bounded and $\|f\| \leq f(\mathbb{1})$. Finally, since $\|\mathbb{1}\| = 1$, we have $\|f\| = f(\mathbb{1})$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose f is bounded and $\|f\| = f(\mathbb{1})$. We want to show that $f(c^*c) \geq 0$ for all $c \in \mathcal{A}$. Assume without loss of generality that $\|c\| \leq 1$ (otherwise, replace c with $\frac{c}{\|c\|}$). Then $|f(\mathbb{1}) - f(c^*c)| = |f(\mathbb{1} - c^*c)| \leq \|f\| \|\mathbb{1} - c^*c\| = f(\mathbb{1}) \|\mathbb{1} - c^*c\| \leq f(\mathbb{1})$. Thus $f(c^*c) \geq 0$ for all $c \in \mathcal{A}$, $\|c\| \leq 1$, and so f is positive. 🧐


Remark. If \mathcal{A} is not unital, it still follows that every positive linear functional on \mathcal{A} is bounded, which can be shown by unitizing \mathcal{A} (see Appendix A).

3.3 The GNS Construction

We are now ready to define the Gelfand-Naimark-Segal construction (or *GNS construction*), which will lead us to the GNS theorem.



Israel M. Gelfand
(1913–2009)



Mark A. Naimark
(1909–1978)



Irving E. Segal
(1918–1998)

Definition 3.35. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra. A **representation** (or $*$ -representation) of \mathcal{A} is a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , together with a $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

A representation of \mathcal{A} is **faithful** if the map π is injective.

Remark. Formally, the representation is the pair (\mathcal{H}, π) , but we usually refer to π itself as the representation, as is customary in representation theory.

The GNS Construction Explained

The steps of the GNS construction can be outlined as follows:

1. Construct an inner product space from the positive linear functional f and complete it to get a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_f .
2. For each element of the C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , define a bounded operator on \mathcal{H}_f by left-multiplication.
3. Define a map π_f sending each element of \mathcal{A} to the corresponding operator.

We now have a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_f and a $*$ -homomorphism π_f . This is the GNS representation of (\mathcal{A}, f) .

It is important to note that the results in the rest of this section are constructed from an arbitrary C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} as well as a positive linear functional $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Thus whatever we construct in the end will (in general) depend on the choice of f .

Theorem 3.36. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and f is a positive linear functional on \mathcal{A} . Define \mathcal{N}_f and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : (\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_f) \times (\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{N}_f = \{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid f(a^*a) = 0\} \qquad \langle a + \mathcal{N}_f, b + \mathcal{N}_f \rangle = f(b^*a)$$

Then \mathcal{N}_f is a closed left ideal of \mathcal{A} , and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is an inner product on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_f$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.33, if $f(a^*a) = 0$, then for all $b \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $|f(b^*a)|^2 \leq f(a^*a)f(b^*b) = 0$, and so $f(b^*a) = 0$. Thus \mathcal{N}_f is equivalently given by $\mathcal{N}_f = \{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid f(b^*a) = 0 \text{ for all } b \in \mathcal{A}\}$.

We first show that \mathcal{N}_f is a closed left ideal of \mathcal{A} . Suppose $a \in \mathcal{N}_f$ and $b \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $f((ba)^*(ba)) = f(a^*b^*ba) = f((b^*ba)^*a) = 0$, so $ba \in \mathcal{N}_f$. Thus \mathcal{N}_f is a left ideal of \mathcal{A} . It is also closed as it is the pre-image of $\{0\}$ under the continuous map $a \mapsto f(a^*a)$.

We now show that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is well-defined. Suppose $a, b, c, d \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $c \in a + \mathcal{N}_f$ and $d \in b + \mathcal{N}_f$, i.e. a and c are in the same equivalence class under \mathcal{N}_f , as are b and d . Then we have $c = a + m$ and $d = b + n$ for some $m, n \in \mathcal{N}_f$. This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} f(d^*c) &= f((b+n)^*(a+m)) = f((b^*+n^*)(a+m)) = f(b^*a + b^*m + n^*a + n^*m) \\ &= f(b^*a) + f(b^*m) + f(n^*a) + f(n^*m) = f(b^*a) + f(b^*m) + \overline{f(a^*n)} + f(n^*m) \\ &= f(b^*a) + 0 + \overline{0} + 0 = f(b^*a) \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is well-defined.

We now show that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is an inner product on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_f$. We will denote equivalence classes $d + \mathcal{N}_f \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_f$ by $[d]$.

1. $\langle a, a \rangle = f(a^*a) \geq 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and $\langle a, a \rangle = 0 \Leftrightarrow f(a^*a) = 0 \Leftrightarrow a \in \mathcal{N}_f \Leftrightarrow [a] = [0]$.
2. $\langle [a], [b] \rangle = f(b^*a) = \overline{f(a^*b)} = \overline{\langle [b], [a] \rangle}$
3. $\langle \lambda[a] + [b], [c] \rangle = \langle [\lambda a + b], [c] \rangle = f(c^*(\lambda a + b)) = f(\lambda c^*a + c^*b) = \lambda f(c^*a) + f(c^*b) = \lambda \langle [a], [c] \rangle + \langle [b], [c] \rangle$

Thus $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is an inner product on $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_f$. 🤓

Now that we have constructed an inner product space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_f$, we can start to devise a representation of \mathcal{A} . First, we complete the inner product space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_f$ to get a Hilbert space, call it \mathcal{H} (see Appendix A for details). We now need to define a $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. To do this, we need the following result from functional analysis:

Lemma 3.37. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space, \mathcal{V} is a dense subspace of \mathcal{H} and $S : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a bounded linear operator. Then there is exactly one $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $T|_{\mathcal{V}} = S$ and $\|T\| = \|S\|$.

In other words, every bounded linear operator defined on a dense subspace of \mathcal{H} can be extended uniquely to a bounded linear operator on all of \mathcal{H} without changing its operator norm. See [20, Proposition 2.59, Page 58] or [24, Theorem 9.28, Pages 168-169] for a proof.

Definition 3.38. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a positive linear functional. The **Gelfand-Naimark-Segal representation** (or *GNS representation*) of f is the representation (\mathcal{H}_f, π_f) , where \mathcal{H}_f is the completion of the inner product space $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_f$, and $\pi_f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_f)$ is given by:

$$\pi_f(a) : \mathcal{H}_f \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_f \qquad \pi_f(a)(b + \mathcal{N}_f) = ab + \mathcal{N}_f$$

And $\pi_f(a)$ is extended to all of \mathcal{H}_f by Lemma 3.37.

Remark. Formally, (\mathcal{H}_f, π_f) is the GNS representation of the pair (\mathcal{A}, f) , but we usually refer to it as the GNS representation of f , as the C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is usually clear from the context (and can be deduced from f , being its domain).

Proposition 3.39. The GNS representation of f is a representation of \mathcal{A} .

Proof. By construction, \mathcal{H}_f is a Hilbert space. We will denote equivalence classes $d + \mathcal{N}_f \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_f$ by $[d]$. Suppose $a, b, c \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$. Then we have:

- $\pi_f(\lambda a + b)([c]) = [(\lambda a + b)c] = [\lambda ac + bc] = \lambda[ac] + [bc] = \lambda\pi_f(a)([c]) + \pi_f(b)([c])$
- $\pi_f(ab)([c]) = [(ab)c] = [abc] = [a][bc] = [a]\pi_f(b)([c]) = \pi_f(a)\pi_f(b)([c])$
- $\pi_f(a^*)([c]) = [a^*c] = [a]^*[c] = \pi_f(a)^*([c])$

Thus π_f is a $*$ -homomorphism, and so the GNS representation of f is a representation of \mathcal{A} . 🤓

Remark. It follows directly from Theorem 3.17 that π_f is bounded and $\|\pi_f\| \leq 1$.

If π_f was an isometry, we could immediately conclude the GNS theorem, as we already have all the other ingredients for the proof. Clearly π_f is not an isometry in general, as we could choose f to be the zero functional, which would yield $\mathcal{N}_f = \mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{H}_f = 0$ and so $\pi_f(a) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. One might hope that we can choose a particular “non-degenerate” positive linear functional f that makes π_f an isometry. Unfortunately, this is not always possible.

What we have to do instead is construct many representations from different positive linear functionals and “patch” them together to create a representation with no degeneracy¹⁷. This is done via the *direct sum representation*:

Definition 3.40. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra and $\{(\mathcal{H}_\alpha, \pi_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in I}$ is a collection of representations of \mathcal{A} . The **direct sum** of $\{(\mathcal{H}_\alpha, \pi_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in I}$ is given by:

$$\left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{H}_\alpha, \bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \pi_\alpha \right)$$

Where $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{H}_\alpha$ is the direct sum of the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_α , and $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \pi_\alpha : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{H}_\alpha)$ is the direct sum of the maps $\pi_\alpha : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\alpha)$.

Remark. The indexing set I can be *any* set, it can even be uncountable.

To explain the above definition a bit more, the direct sum (of the *Hilbert spaces*) $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{H}_\alpha$ is the space of all elements $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$ of the Cartesian product $\prod_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{H}_\alpha$ such that $\sum_{\alpha \in I} \|x_\alpha\|_{\mathcal{H}_\alpha}^2 < \infty$, equipped with the inner product given by¹⁸ $\langle \{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}, \{y_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I} \rangle = \sum_{\alpha \in I} \langle x_\alpha, y_\alpha \rangle$. This is indeed a Hilbert space, see [15, Page 24].

The direct sum (of the *maps*) $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \pi_\alpha : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{H}_\alpha)$ is the map that sends each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ to $(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \pi_\alpha)(a) \in \mathcal{B}(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{H}_\alpha)$, which is the operator that sends $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$ to $\{\pi_\alpha(x_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in I}$. If I is finite, this operator can be viewed as a block-diagonal matrix. The fact that $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \pi_\alpha$ is a $*$ -homomorphism follows easily from the definitions.

Example. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}$, $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathbb{C}$, $\mathcal{H}_2 = \mathbb{C}^2$ and $\pi_1 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow M_1(\mathbb{C})$ and $\pi_2 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow M_2(\mathbb{C})$ are given by:

$$\pi_1(z) = 4z(1) \qquad \qquad \qquad \pi_2(z) = z \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Where (1) is the 1×1 identity matrix. Then $\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 = \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^2$, which can be identified with \mathbb{C}^3 in the natural way, and:

$$\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow M_3(\mathbb{C}), \quad (\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2)(z) = z \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Definition 3.41. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra. The **universal representation** of \mathcal{A} is given by:

$$(\mathcal{H}, \pi) = \left(\bigoplus_{f \in S(\mathcal{A})} \mathcal{H}_f, \bigoplus_{f \in S(\mathcal{A})} \pi_f \right)$$

Where $S(\mathcal{A})$ is the set of all states on \mathcal{A} , and for each $f \in S(\mathcal{A})$, (\mathcal{H}_f, π_f) is the GNS representation of f .

Proposition 3.42. The universal representation of \mathcal{A} is faithful, and the map π is an isometry.

Proof. Suppose $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Assume without loss of generality that $\|a\| \leq 1$ (otherwise, replace a with $\frac{a}{\|a\|}$). We will show that $\|\pi(a)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}$. Since $(aa^*)^2 = (aa^*)^*(aa^*)$ is positive, by Corollary 3.32, there is a state $f \in S(\mathcal{A})$ such that $f((aa^*)^2) = \|(aa^*)^2\|$. This yields:

$$\|[aa^*]\|_{\mathcal{H}_f}^2 = \langle [aa^*], [aa^*] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_f} = f((aa^*)^*(aa^*)) = f((aa^*)^2) = \|(aa^*)^2\|_{\mathcal{A}} = \|(aa^*)^*(aa^*)\|_{\mathcal{A}} = \|aa^*\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2$$

Thus $\|[aa^*]\|_{\mathcal{H}_f} = \|aa^*\|_{\mathcal{A}}$. Since $\|a\| \leq 1$, we have:

$$\|\pi(a)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \|\pi_f(a)\|_{\mathcal{H}_f} \geq \|\pi_f(a)[a^*]\|_{\mathcal{H}_f} = \|[aa^*]\|_{\mathcal{H}_f} = \|aa^*\|_{\mathcal{A}} = \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}^2$$

Thus $\|\pi(a)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}$. Since π is a $*$ -homomorphism, we also have $\|\pi(a)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}$, and so $\|\pi(a)\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|a\|_{\mathcal{A}}$. Thus π is an isometry. By Lemma 2.30, π is injective, and so (\mathcal{H}, π) is faithful. 🤖

Theorem 3.43 (Gelfand-Naimark-Segal Theorem or GNS Theorem). Every C^* -algebra is isometrically $*$ -isomorphic to a closed $*$ -subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, where \mathcal{H} is some Hilbert space.

¹⁷Think of a video game where you have to move an aircraft with a joystick. If you only have one joystick (say, that moves forward and backward), you can only move the aircraft forward or backward. If you have three joysticks, one forward/backward, one left/right and one up/down, you can move the aircraft anywhere you like. This is what we are doing with the direct sum representation: A single joystick (positive linear functional) is not enough, so we combine many joysticks to gain full control of the C^* -algebra.

¹⁸You might be wondering if this is well-defined. The sum $\sum_{\alpha \in I} \|x_\alpha\|_{\mathcal{H}_\alpha}^2$ is defined as the supremum of all partial sums of finitely many terms. If this is finite, there can only be countably many terms that are nonzero. Consequently, the sum $\sum_{\alpha \in I} \langle x_\alpha, y_\alpha \rangle$ is a countable sum of complex numbers, and by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it is absolutely convergent. Thus the inner product on $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{H}_\alpha$ is well-defined, i.e. it is independent of the order in which the terms are added.

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a C^* -algebra. Define \mathcal{H} and π by the universal representation of \mathcal{A} . By the previous proposition, π is an isometric $*$ -homomorphism, so its image $\text{im}(\pi)$ is a closed $*$ -subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Thus π is an isometric $*$ -isomorphism from \mathcal{A} onto $\text{im}(\pi)$. 🤓

Example. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space. We already know that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a C^* -algebra. Let's see what happens when we construct the universal representation of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. By Proposition 3.28, we can construct states on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ by $f_x(A) = \langle Ax, x \rangle$, where $x \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|x\| = 1$. Each state f_x naturally corresponds to at least one $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus the universal representation of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ embeds it into a (possibly larger) C^* -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

The way we concluded the GNS theorem from the universal representation of a C^* -algebra is not the usual way this is done in the literature. Most sources, such as [16], [15], [10], [7] and [47], use a different approach involving *cyclic vectors* and *cyclic representations*.

Chapter 3 Conclusion

Through the Gelfand-Naimark theorem and the GNS theorem, we have classified *all* C^* -algebras: They can all be realized as a closed $*$ -subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ for some Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . This shows that Segal's definition of a C^* -algebra is essentially equivalent to Rickart's definition: B^* -algebras and C^* -algebras are one and the same. In addition, every *abelian* C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} can be realized as $C_0(X)$ for some locally compact Hausdorff space X , and in this case, we also have that X is homeomorphic to $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ (strictly speaking, we only have that $C_0(X)$ is isometrically isomorphic to $C_0(\Sigma(\mathcal{A}))$, but this implies that X is homeomorphic to $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$ by the Banach-Stone theorem, see [15, Chapter VI, Theorem 2.1, Page 172]).

There is much more to be said about C^* -algebras, particularly the representation theory that arises from them. Since the GNS representation depends on our choice of positive linear functional(s), we can have many isometric $*$ -isomorphisms from the same C^* -algebra into algebras of bounded operators on different Hilbert spaces. Some of these will have more desirable properties than others. This is further discussed in [4], [7] and [45].

There are also special classes of C^* -algebras with additional properties, such as von Neumann algebras (also known as W^* -algebras), approximately finite-dimensional (AF) algebras and uniformly hyperfinite (UHF) algebras. See [4], [17], [16], [33] and [45] for more information on these.

4 Rebuilding Quantum Mechanics


Now that we have developed all the necessary mathematical tools, we are ready to see how they tie in to the theory of quantum mechanics. Our first goal is to draw the link between the two formulations of the Dirac-von Neumann axioms that we saw in Chapter 1.

The link between bounded operators on a Hilbert space and elements of a C^* -algebra was established in the GNS theorem. This, together with Proposition 3.28, shows that we can view states in the Hilbert space formulation (unit vectors in \mathcal{H}) as states in the C^* -algebra formulation (unit positive linear functionals on \mathcal{A}). This settles the question of compatibility of the two formulations.

We will now consider the “particle in a box” model. Suppose we have a quantum particle of mass m in a (one-dimensional) box $[0, L]$. The state space here is $\mathcal{H} = L^2([0, L])$. We can find the energy eigenstates, as one would in a first course on quantum mechanics, by solving the one-dimensional time-independent Schrödinger equation:

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \psi(x)}{\partial x^2} + V(x)\psi(x) = 0 \quad V(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & 0 \leq x \leq L \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This yields the following energy eigenstates ψ_n with corresponding energies E_n :

$$\psi_n(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{L}} \sin\left(\frac{n\pi x}{L}\right) \quad E_n = \frac{n^2 \pi^2 \hbar^2}{2mL^2}$$


In this system, the position operator \hat{x} is *bounded*, since for any state $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$, we have:

$$\|\hat{x}\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \|x\psi(x)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \int_0^L |x\psi(x)|^2 dx \leq \int_0^L L^2 |\psi(x)|^2 dx = L^2$$

Intuitively, it *must* be bounded, since the particle is confined to the region $[0, L]$.

In the C^* -algebra formulation, the position operator \hat{x} will be a self-adjoint element of our C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , which is itself a closed $*$ -subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. How big this C^* -algebra is depends on how many observables we want to include: The more quantities you wish to measure, the larger your space needs to be. This is true even in the Hilbert space formulation.

What about the states ψ_n ? As we saw in the Dirac-von Neumann axioms, the states are now given by positive linear functionals $\omega_n : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Again, what these are exactly will depend on the C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , but we can work out what they will evaluate to for the observables we wish to consider. For example, evaluating the position operator on the eigenstates ψ_n , we get:

$$\langle \hat{x}\psi_n, \psi_n \rangle = \int_0^L x\psi_n(x)\overline{\psi_n(x)} dx = \int_0^L x|\psi_n(x)|^2 dx = \frac{2}{L} \int_0^L x \sin^2\left(\frac{n\pi x}{L}\right) dx = \frac{2}{L} \frac{L^2}{4} = \frac{L}{2}$$

In other words, the expected value of \hat{x} in any eigenstate is $\frac{L}{2}$. Thus in the C^* -algebra formulation, we have $\omega_n(\hat{x}) = \frac{L}{2}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This makes sense, as \hat{x} measures the position of the particle in a homogeneous box $[0, L]$, so on average, it should be $\frac{L}{2}$. For mixed states, the expected value of \hat{x} will depend on time, as the time evolution of each eigenstate is different (it is proportional to the energy E_n).

We now consider another observable. Define $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ as follows:

$$A\psi(x) = -2 \cos\left(\frac{2\pi x}{L}\right) \psi(x)$$

This is a self-adjoint operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, so it is indeed an observable. The expected value of A when the system is in the eigenstate ψ_n is:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A\psi_n, \psi_n \rangle &= \int_0^L -2 \cos\left(\frac{2\pi x}{L}\right) \psi_n(x)\overline{\psi_n(x)} dx = -2 \int_0^L \cos\left(\frac{2\pi x}{L}\right) |\psi_n(x)|^2 dx \\ &= -\frac{4}{L} \int_0^L \cos\left(\frac{2\pi x}{L}\right) \sin^2\left(\frac{n\pi x}{L}\right) dx = \begin{cases} 1 & n = 1 \\ 0 & n \neq 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This observable has an expected value of 1 in the ground state ψ_1 and 0 in every other eigenstate. Again, for

mixed states, the expected value will depend on time. Evaluating these expected values for all the observables we wish to consider lets us construct the states $\omega_n : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ corresponding to the eigenstates ψ_n .

The distinction between pure states and mixed states can be formalized, and is in fact already built into the C^* -algebra formulation: The state space of a quantum system is a *convex cone* in the dual space \mathcal{A}^* of the C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , and the pure states of the system correspond to the *extreme points* of this cone. The notions of convex cones and extreme points are part of a wider theory of *topological vector spaces*. See [20, Chapter 8] for more details.

4.1 Unbounded Operators

There is one final issue that we have swept under the rug until now. While the GNS theorem asserts that every C^* -algebra can be embedded into some $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ (the space of *bounded* operators on a Hilbert space), it does not tell us anything about how to deal with *unbounded* operators. This issue cannot be ignored, as many of the observables we deal with in quantum mechanics are unbounded. Fortunately though, most of the analysis still follows through. We will outline one instance of this here, but for a rigorous treatment, see [37, Chapter VIII].

As an example, we will look at the *position* and *momentum* operators (in one spatial dimension, though the general case follows similarly):

$$\widehat{x}\psi(x) = x\psi(x) \qquad \widehat{p}\psi(x) = -i\hbar \frac{\partial\psi(x)}{\partial x}$$

These are both self-adjoint¹⁹ operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. They satisfy the *canonical commutation relation*:

$$\widehat{x}\widehat{p} - \widehat{p}\widehat{x} = i\hbar\mathbb{1}$$

At first glance, this seems to contradict Theorem 2.45. However, since both \widehat{x} and \widehat{p} are unbounded, they are not elements of the Banach algebra in question (in this case $\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}))$), and so they are able to satisfy this relation. This has the (unfortunate but interesting) consequence that quantum mechanics is an *incomplete* theory of physics, as it does not allow us to simultaneously predict the position and momentum of any particle. This is formally manifested in the *Heisenberg uncertainty principle*:

$$\Delta\widehat{x}\Delta\widehat{p} \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}$$

We know from Theorem 3.21 that self-adjoint *bounded* operators on a Hilbert space can be transformed into unitary operators via the complex exponential. Although \widehat{x} and \widehat{p} are unbounded, we can try taking complex exponentials of them, just like we did in Section 2.4:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{ik\widehat{x}}\psi(x) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (ik\widehat{x})^n \psi(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (ik)^n x^n \psi(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (ikx)^n \psi(x) = e^{ikx}\psi(x) \\ e^{im\widehat{p}}\psi(x) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left(i \left(-im\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) \right)^n \psi(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left(-m\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right)^n \psi(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (-m\hbar)^n \frac{\partial^n \psi(x)}{\partial x^n} = \psi(x - m\hbar) \end{aligned}$$

In the end, we see that $e^{ik\widehat{x}}$ is nothing but the phase shift operator, and $e^{im\widehat{p}}$ is nothing but the spatial translation operator. These are perfectly well-defined (and also unitary) operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$!

While our computation just now was not rigorous, it shows that unbounded operators can still meaningfully generate unitary operators via the complex exponential²⁰. This idea can be formalized through Stone's theorem on one-parameter unitary groups. See [37, Section VIII.4] and [35] for more details.

¹⁹Strictly speaking, they are not self-adjoint, as they are not defined on all of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. They are not even densely defined. However, they are *essentially self-adjoint*, i.e. they can be extended to closed self-adjoint operators, see [20, Chapter 13].

²⁰There is a similar phenomenon in probability theory: Non-integrable random variables may still have a well-defined characteristic function, and this allows the central limit theorem to be applied in more general settings.

4.2 Concluding Remarks

So what have we done? We introduced the notion of C^* -algebras in Chapter 3 and linked them to algebras of bounded operators on Hilbert spaces via the GNS construction. This shows that the Dirac-von Neumann axioms are valid in the C^* -algebra formulation, and they are compatible with everything we already know about quantum mechanics from the Hilbert space formulation.

But why is the C^* -algebra formulation any better? With simple quantum systems, such as a particle in a finite potential well, a particle in a box or a simple harmonic oscillator (these are among what physicists like to call ‘toy examples’), the Hilbert space formulation works just fine, and there is no reason to bring in C^* -algebras. But for more complicated quantum systems, especially those with an infinite number of particles, the C^* -algebra formulation becomes essential.

Suppose we want to study a quantum system consisting of many particles by analyzing them individually. We can create a state space for each particle and ‘patch’ these spaces together (via a direct sum representation) to get the state space for the entire system. This sounds good in principle, but it has a few issues:

- The states of the particles may depend on one another for physical reasons (e.g. quantum entanglement, Pauli exclusion principle).
- If the number of particles is infinite, we need to be careful when ‘patching’ their state spaces together as this may not yield a Hilbert space of states (in the same way that an infinite sum of bounded functions or operators may not be bounded).
- If the particles are interacting with one another (e.g. radioactive decay, pair production), then the state spaces of each particle are insufficient to model the system, as the particles are not conserved throughout the experiment (particles may be created or destroyed).

If any of these issues is present in our system (which, physically speaking, is very likely), the Hilbert space formulation will be extremely cumbersome, or even inadequate, to properly analyze it.


This is where the C^* -algebra formulation comes in: It solves *all* of these issues at once. We can build the dependence between the states of particles into the linear functionals we use to construct our states, we can take direct sums of infinitely many representations just as easily as we do with finitely many, and we can account for particle interactions simply by introducing more observables (formally, we might have a larger C^* -algebra to deal with, but this is not intrinsically any more difficult as we have the GNS theorem to help us).

Besides showing how powerful C^* -algebras are as a mathematical tool for quantum mechanics, the mere fact that it allows us to deal with systems of large (finite or infinite) numbers of particles is far-reaching in itself. Importantly, it allows us to study the collective behavior of particles in a macroscopic system, e.g. the kinetic theory of gases, even at the quantum level. This naturally leads on to the theory of *quantum statistical mechanics*, which is discussed in [14] and [12].

But that is another story.....

A Embedding

In Chapter 2, we introduced normed algebras in their most general form, but we were quick to specialize to unital complex Banach algebras. At that point, this seemed like a matter of necessity. Indeed, the fundamental theorem of Banach algebras, the spectral radius formula and the GKZ theorem require all three assumptions: *unital*, *complex* and *Banach*. As far as the theory goes, however, we do not actually lose any generality by making these assumptions. This is because every normed algebra “lives inside” a unital complex Banach algebra. More formally, it can be embedded into a unital complex Banach algebra while preserving its algebra operations and its norm. We will now outline how to do this:



Completion. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a normed algebra. Define \mathfrak{C} as the set of all Cauchy sequences in \mathcal{A} , and define the equivalence relation \sim on \mathfrak{C} by $(a_n) \sim (b_n) \Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a_n - b_n\| = 0$. Finally, define $\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \mathfrak{C} / \sim$ with the following operations:

$$[(a_n)] + [(b_n)] = [(a_n + b_n)] \quad \lambda[(a_n)] = [(\lambda a_n)] \quad [(a_n)][(b_n)] = [(a_n b_n)] \quad \|[a_n]\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a_n\|$$

Then $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ is a Banach algebra, and the function $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$, $f(a) = [(a)]$ (f maps a to the equivalence class of the constant sequence (a, a, a, \dots)) is an isometry. $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ is known as the **completion** of \mathcal{A} .

See [34, Proposition 7.17, Page 107] or [20, Theorem 2.32] for a proof of the corresponding theorem for normed vector spaces, and [13, §1, Proposition 12] for a proof of the extension to normed algebras. If \mathcal{A} is an inner product space (not necessarily an algebra), we can also extend the inner product to the completion by defining $\langle [(a_n)], [(b_n)] \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle a_n, b_n \rangle$.

Unitization. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a non-unital Banach algebra. Define $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{F}$ with the following operations:

$$\begin{aligned} (a, x) + (b, y) &= (a + b, x + y) & \lambda(a, x) &= (\lambda a, \lambda x) \\ (a, x)(b, y) &= (ab + xb + ya, xy) & \|(a, x)\|_1 &= \|a\| + |x| \end{aligned}$$

Then \mathcal{A}_1 is a unital Banach algebra with identity $(0, 1)$. Also, the function $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1$, $f(a) = (a, 0)$ is an isometric homomorphism. \mathcal{A}_1 is known as the **unitization** of \mathcal{A} .

See [5, Lemma 1.4] or [17, Proposition I.1.3, Pages 2-3] for a proof.

Complexification. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a unital real Banach algebra. Define $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ with the following operations:

$$(a, b) + (c, d) = (a + c, b + d) \quad (\mu + i\nu)(a, b) = (\mu a - \nu b, \mu b + \nu a) \quad (a, b)(c, d) = (ac - bd, ad + bc)$$

For each $a \in \mathcal{A}$, define $T_a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A})$ by $T_a(b) = ab$ (this is known as the *left regular representation* of \mathcal{A}). Define $T'_a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}})$ by $T'_a(b, c) = (T_a(b), T_a(c)) = (ab, ac)$. Finally, define the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{C}}$ on $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}}$ by $\|(a, b)\|_{\mathbb{C}} = \|S_a + iS_b\|$. Then $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is a unital complex Banach algebra with identity $(\mathbb{1}, 0)$, and the function $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}}$, $f(a) = (a, 0)$ is an isometric homomorphism. $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is known as the **complexification** of \mathcal{A} .

See [39, Theorem 1.3.1] for a proof.

Example. Suppose X is a locally compact (but not compact) Hausdorff space and $\mathcal{A} = C_c(X, \mathbb{R})$, the set of all continuous functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with compact support. This normed algebra is not unital, complex or Banach. We can give it all three of these properties by successively applying the above procedures:

1. The completion of $C_c(X, \mathbb{R})$ is $C_0(X, \mathbb{R})$, the set of all continuous functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that vanish at infinity.
2. The unitization of $C_0(X, \mathbb{R})$ is $C_0(X, \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathbb{R}1$, the set of all functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that can be expressed as the sum of a function in $C_0(X, \mathbb{R})$ and a (real) constant function.
3. The complexification of $C_0(X, \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathbb{R}1$ is $C_0(X, \mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathbb{C}1$, the set of all functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that can be expressed as the sum of a function in $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ and a (complex) constant function.

As intended, $C_0(X, \mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathbb{C}1$ is a unital complex Banach algebra.

B The Weak* Topology

In Definition 2.50 and Theorem 2.51, we used the notions of nets and the weak* topology. Here, we will elaborate a little on these.

Definition B.1. Suppose X is a normed vector space. For each $x \in X$, the **evaluation map** of x is given by $\hat{x} : X^* \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, $\hat{x}(f) = f(x)$.

The **weak* topology** on X^* is the smallest topology on X^* that makes all of the evaluation maps continuous.

Remarks.

1. A sequence (f_n) in X^* converges to $f \in X^*$ in the weak* topology if and only if it converges pointwise to f , i.e. $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ (in \mathbb{F}) for all $x \in X$.
2. The weak* topology is smaller than the weak topology, which is smaller than the strong topology.
3. If X is a reflexive Banach space (in particular, if X is a Hilbert space), then the weak* topology is identical to the weak topology.

Definition B.2. A **directed set** is a non-empty set P , together with a binary relation \preceq on P , such that:

1. If $a \in P$, then $a \preceq a$. (Reflexivity)
2. If $a, b, c \in P$, $a \preceq b$ and $b \preceq c$, then $a \preceq c$. (Transitivity)
3. If $a, b \in P$, then there exists $c \in P$ such that $a \preceq c$ and $b \preceq c$. (Upper bound property)

A **net** in a set X is a function $f : X \rightarrow P$, where P is any directed set.

Examples.

1. \mathbb{N} is a directed set with the relation \leq . The resulting nets are simply sequences, e.g. $a_n = 2n$.
2. \mathbb{R} is a directed set with the relation \leq . The resulting nets are functions on \mathbb{R} , e.g. $f(x) = x^2 - 1$.

You might be wondering why we used nets instead of sequences to prove Theorem 2.51. This is a necessary adjustment, due to the following result:

Theorem B.3. Suppose X is an infinite-dimensional normed vector space. Then the weak* topology on X^* is not first countable.

See [9, Theorem 6.26, Pages 237-238] for a proof.

Since the weak* topology on X^* is not first countable, sequences are not general enough to describe its topological behavior, and so we have to resort to nets. See [42] for a more detailed discussion of nets and first countability.

Theorem B.4 (Banach-Alaoglu Theorem). Suppose X is a normed vector space. Then the closed unit ball in X^* is weak*-compact.

See [19, Theorem 1.23, Page 9] or [15, Chapter V, Theorem 3.1] for a proof.

⚠ This does NOT imply that X^* is weak*-locally compact! While every closed ball centered at any $f \in X^*$ is weak*-compact, it is not a weak*-neighborhood of f . In fact, it is not even a weak neighborhood of f , see [9, Corollary 6.27, Page 238].

References

- [1] URL: http://www-users.math.umn.edu/~garrett/m/fun/riesz_lemma.pdf.
- [2] URL: <http://emis.impa.br/EMIS/journals/DM/v13-2/art5.pdf>.
- [3] URL: <http://www.math.ucsd.edu/~tkemp/251/250-251.Notes.pdf>.
- [4] URL: <https://strung.me/karen/CStarIntroDraft.pdf>.
- [5] URL: http://www.math.nagoya-u.ac.jp/~richard/teaching/s2014/Course_Wilde.pdf.
- [6] URL: <https://statmathbc.files.wordpress.com/2017/07/stonewei.pdf>.
- [7] URL: <http://categorified.net/CstarAlgebras.pdf>.
- [8] F. Albiac, E. Briem. “Gelfand theory for real Banach algebras”. In: *The Royal Academy of Sciences, Madrid* 114 (2020), p. 163. DOI: 10.1007/s13398-020-00894-4.
- [9] Charalambos D. Aliprantis, Kim C. Border. *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker’s Guide*. 2nd ed. Springer, 2006. ISBN: 978-3-540-29586-0.
- [10] William Arveson. *An Invitation to C^* -algebras*. Springer, 1976. ISBN: 978-0-387-90176-3.
- [11] S. J. Bhatt, S. H. Kulkarni. “Gelfand–Mazur Theorems in normed algebras: A survey”. In: *Expositiones Mathematicae* 36 (2) (2018), pp. 166–177. URL: <https://iitpkd.ac.in/sites/default/files/2020-02/gelmazsurvey.pdf>.
- [12] N. N. Bogolubov, N. N. Bogolubov Jr. *Introduction to Quantum Statistical Mechanics*. World Scientific, 2010. ISBN: 978-981-4295-19-2.
- [13] Frank F. Bonsall, John Duncan. *Complete Normed Algebras*. Springer, 1973. ISBN: 978-3-642-65671-2.
- [14] Ola Bratteli, Derek W. Robinson. *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics 1*. 2nd ed. Springer, 1987. ISBN: 978-3-540-17093-8.
- [15] John B. Conway. *A Course in Functional Analysis*. 2nd ed. Springer, 2007. ISBN: 978-0-387-97245-9.
- [16] John B. Conway. *A Course in Operator Theory*. AMS, 2000. ISBN: 978-0-8218-2065-0.
- [17] Kenneth R. Davidson. *C^* -Algebras by Example*. AMS, 1996. ISBN: 978-0-8218-0599-2.
- [18] P. A. M. Dirac. *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*. Snowball Publishing, 2012. ISBN: 978-1-60796-446-9. (Third edition (1947) by Dirac available at <https://digbib.ubka.uni-karlsruhe.de/volltexte/wasbleibt/57355817/57355817.pdf>).
- [19] Ronald G. Douglas. *Banach Algebra Techniques in Operator Theory*. 2nd ed. Springer, 1998. ISBN: 978-0-387-98377-6.
- [20] Manfred Einsiedler, Thomas Ward. *Functional Analysis, Spectral Theory, and Applications*. Springer, 2017. ISBN: 978-3-319-58539-0.
- [21] I. M. Gelfand. “Normierte Ringe”. German. In: *Mat. Sbornik N. S.* 9 (51) (1941), pp. 3–24. URL: <http://www.mathnet.ru/links/1c19e176cb46bfc01978b9f920fe1d3c/sm6046.pdf>.
- [22] A. M. Gleason. “A characterization of maximal ideals”. In: *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique* 19 (1967), pp. 171–172. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02788714>. URL: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF02788714>.
- [23] A. Golbaharan. “A Generalization of the Gleason–Kahane–Żelazko Theorem to Topological Vector Spaces”. In: *Mediterranean Journal of Mathematics* 17 (2020). 69. DOI: 10.1007/s00009-020-1499-3.
- [24] Markus Haase. *Functional Analysis: An Elementary Introduction*. AMS, 2014. ISBN: 978-0-8218-9171-1.
- [25] Christopher Heil. *A Basis Theory Primer: Expanded Edition*. Birkhäuser Basel, 2011. ISBN: 978-0-8176-4686-8.
- [26] Lars Ingelstam. “Real Banach algebras”. In: *Arkiv för Matematik* 5 (3-4) (1964), pp. 239–270. DOI: 10.1007/BF02591126.
- [27] J.-P. Kahane, W. Żelazko. “A characterization of maximal ideals in commutative Banach algebras”. In: *Studia Mathematica* 29 (1968), pp. 339–343. URL: <http://matwbn.icm.edu.pl/ksiazki/sm/sm29/sm29126.pdf>.
- [28] Eberhard Kaniuth. *A Course in Commutative Banach Algebras*. Springer, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-387-72475-1.
- [29] Irving Kaplansky. “Normed Algebras”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 16 (3) (1949), pp. 399–418. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org/journals/duke-mathematical-journal/volume-16/issue-3/Normed-algebras/10.1215/S0012-7094-49-01640-3.short>.

- [30] S. H. Kulkarni. “Gleason-Kahane-Zelazko theorem for real Banach algebras”. In: *Journal of Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 18 (S) (1983–84), S19–S28. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268839337_Gleason-Kahane-Zelazko_theorem_for_real_Banach_algebras.
- [31] Stanislaw Mazur. “Sur les anneaux linéaires”. In: *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 207.7 (1938), pp. 1025–1027.
- [32] Ergashboy Muhamadiev, Adel T. Diab. “On the extension of positive linear functionals”. In: *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.* 23 (1) (2000), pp. 31–35. DOI: 10.1155/S0161171200001721.
- [33] Gerard J. Murphy. *C*-Algebras and Operator Theory*. Academic Press, 1990. ISBN: 978-0-12-511360-1.
- [34] Joseph Muscat. *Functional Analysis: An Introduction to Metric Spaces, Hilbert Spaces, and Banach Algebras*. Springer, 2014. ISBN: 978-3-319-06727-8.
- [35] Sven Möller. “Stone’s Theorem and Applications”. Bachelor’s Thesis. Lunds Universitet, Technische Universität Darmstadt, 2010. URL: <http://www.maths.lth.se/media11/thesis/2010/MATX01.pdf>.
- [36] John von Neumann. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton University Press, 2018. ISBN: 978-0-691-17856-1.
- [37] Michael Reed, Barry Simon. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I: Functional Analysis (Revised and Enlarged Edition)*. Academic Press, 1980. ISBN: 978-0-12-585050-6. URL: http://www.astro.una.mx/~aceves/Methodos/ebooks/reed_simon1.pdf.
- [38] C. E. Rickart. “Banach Algebras with an Adjoint Operation”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 47.3 (1946), pp. 528–550. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1969091>.
- [39] C. E. Rickart. *General Theory of Banach Algebras*. Van Nostrand, 1960. ISBN: 978-0-88275-091-0.
- [40] Walter Rudin. *Functional Analysis*. 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill, 1991. ISBN: 978-0-07-054236-5. URL: https://59clc.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/functional-analysis-_rudin-2th.pdf.
- [41] I. E. Segal. “Irreducible Representations of Operator Algebras”. In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 53 (1947), pp. 73–88. URL: <https://www.ams.org/journals/bull/1947-53-02/S0002-9904-1947-08742-5/S0002-9904-1947-08742-5.pdf>.
- [42] Tej Bahadur Singh. *Introduction to Topology*. Springer, 2019. ISBN: 978-981-13-6953-7.
- [43] L. A. Steen. “Highlights in the History of Spectral Theory”. In: *The American Mathematical Monthly* 80 (1973), pp. 359–381. URL: <http://www.steen-frost.org/Steen/Papers/73spectral.pdf>.
- [44] Joseph L. Taylor. *Complex Variables*. AMS, 2011. ISBN: 978-0-8218-6901-7.
- [45] Marco Thill. *Introduction to Normed *-Algebras and their Representations*. 8th ed. Independently Published, 2020. ISBN: 979-8-6465-5547-3. (7th edition available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1011.1558v3.pdf>).
- [46] Mark Tomforde. “Continuity of ring *-homomorphisms between C*-algebras”. In: *New York Journal of Mathematics* 15 (2009), pp. 161–167. URL: <http://nyjm.albany.edu/j/2009/15-8.pdf>.
- [47] Robin C. Verstraten. “The Gelfand–Naimark theorem for commutative Banach star algebras”. Bachelor’s Thesis. Universiteit Utrecht, 2017. URL: <http://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/353044>.
- [48] W. Żelazko. “A characterization of multiplicative linear functionals in complex Banach algebras”. In: *Studia Mathematica* 30 (1968), pp. 83–85. URL: <http://matwbn.icm.edu.pl/ksiazki/sm/sm30/sm3019.pdf>.

Photo Credits

Dirac: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-pleasure-and-pain-of-scientific-predictions-11597935357>

von Neumann: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_von_Neumann

Gleason: <https://www.geni.com/people/Andrew-Gleason/6000000030388180603>

Kahane: <http://www.bibmath.net/bios/index.php?action=affiche&quoi=kahane>

Żelazko: <https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Q657990>

Rickart: <https://peoplepill.com/people/charles-earl-rickart/>

Gelfand: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:IM_Gelfand.jpg

Naimark: <https://www.maa.org/book/export/html/117813>

Segal: <https://www.gf.org/fellows/all-fellows/irving-e-segal/>