

## On linear isometries of Banach lattices in $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ -spaces

JOSÉ M ISIDRO

Departamento de Análisis Matemático, Facultad de Matemáticas, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain  
 E-mail: jm.isidro@usc.es

MS received 22 November 2008; revised 19 January 2009

**Abstract.** Consider the space  $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$  endowed with a Banach lattice-norm  $\|\cdot\|$  that is not assumed to be the usual spectral norm  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  of the supremum over  $\Omega$ . A recent extension of the classical Banach-Stone theorem establishes that each surjective linear isometry  $U$  of the Banach lattice  $(\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega), \|\cdot\|)$  induces a partition  $\Pi$  of  $\Omega$  into a family of finite subsets  $S \subset \Omega$  along with a bijection  $T: \Pi \rightarrow \Pi$  which preserves cardinality, and a family  $[\mathbf{u}(S): S \in \Pi]$  of surjective linear maps  $\mathbf{u}(S): \mathcal{C}(T(S)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(S)$  of the finite-dimensional  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -algebras  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  such that

$$(Uf)|_{T(S)} = \mathbf{u}(S)(f|_S) \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega) \quad \forall S \in \Pi.$$

Here we endow the space  $\Pi$  of finite sets  $S \subset \Omega$  with a topology for which the bijection  $T$  and the map  $\mathbf{u}$  are continuous, thus completing the analogy with the classical result.

**Keywords.** Banach lattices; Banach–Stone theorem; linear isometries.

### 1. Introduction and preliminaries

In a recent article [3], the author has studied the Banach lattice  $E := (\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega), \|\cdot\|)$ , where  $\Omega$  is a locally compact Hausdorff topological space and  $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$  stands for the space of all continuous complex valued functions  $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  that vanish at infinity, endowed with a Banach lattice norm  $\|\cdot\|$  that is not assumed to be the usual spectral norm  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  of the supremum over  $\Omega$ . It is proven that each  $\|\cdot\|$ -Hermitian operator  $A$  on  $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$  gives rise to a uniquely determined partition  $\Pi$  of the set  $\Omega$  into pairwise disjoint subsets  $S \subset \Omega$  such that

$$(Af)|_S = \mathbf{a}(S)(f|_S), \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega) \quad \forall S \in \Pi \tag{1}$$

holds with a uniquely determined family of linear maps  $\mathbf{a}^A(S): \mathcal{C}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(S)$ ,  $S \in \Pi$ . There is also a uniquely determined family  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_S$  of inner products on the finite-dimensional function spaces  $\mathcal{C}(S)$ ,  $S \in \Pi$ , such that

$$\{f|_S: \|f\| \leq 1\} = \{\phi \in \mathcal{C}(S): \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_S \leq 1\}. \tag{2}$$

It is also proved that, for each surjective linear  $\|\cdot\|$ -isometry  $U: \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ , there is a uniquely determined bijection  $T: \Pi \rightarrow \Pi$  along with a family  $[\mathbf{u}(S): S \in \Pi]$  of surjective linear  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_S$ -unitary operators  $\mathbf{u}(S): \mathcal{C}(T(S)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(S)$  such that the sets  $S$  and  $T(S)$  have the same cardinalities and

$$(Uf)|_S = \mathbf{u}(S)(f|_{T(S)}) \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega) \quad \forall S \in \Pi. \tag{3}$$

In the classical case (when the lattice norm  $\|\cdot\|$  coincides with the spectral norm  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ ), each element  $S \in \Pi$  is a singleton  $S = \{\omega\}$  for some  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the family  $\mathbf{a}^A$  can be identified with a continuous real-valued function  $\mathbf{a}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the inner products  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\omega$  are all equal to the usual inner product in  $\mathbb{C}$ , the family  $\mathbf{u}(S)$  of unitary operators is identified with a continuous function  $u: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ,  $|u(\omega)| = 1$ , and the permutation  $T: \Pi \rightarrow \Pi$  actually is a *homeomorphism* of  $\Omega$ .

The aim of this note is to make a study of the topological properties of the bijection  $T$  and of the other elements  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  that appear in the above situation. To be more precise, we endow the carrier space (the space whose points are the subsets  $S \in \Pi$ ) with a natural topology that makes  $T$  into a homeomorphism. However, one can not expect this task to be a straightforward generalization of the classical situation. Indeed, some of the objects involved in our considerations (the points in  $\Pi$ ) now are *finite subsets* of  $\Omega$  rather than *points* (subsets of one single element) in  $\Omega$ . We also deal with functions  $T: S \in \Pi \rightarrow T(S) \in \Pi$  for which both the variable  $S$  and the values  $T(S)$  are finite subsets in  $\Omega$ . A relevant fact here is that a finite set  $S = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k\} \in \Pi$  and all sets  $S'$  obtained by permuting its elements are the same point in  $\Pi$ , and hence we must have  $T(S) = T(S')$ , which poses a real difficulty concerning the continuity of  $T$  since the action of  $T$  on those singletons  $S = \{\omega\}$  that lie in  $\Pi$  has to be continuous. In particular, we have to consider topologies  $\sigma$  in the space of finite subsets of  $\Omega$  and an *appropriate* notion of continuity. One candidate for  $\sigma$  is the classical Hausdorff extension of the topology  $\tau$  in  $\Omega$  to a topology  $\sigma$  in the space  $\mathcal{K}$  of all compact subsets  $K \subset \Omega$ . Since the elements of  $\Pi$  are finite (hence compact) sets, we can endow  $\Pi$  with the topology induced on it by  $\sigma$ . However, it is known that then the cardinality function  $\#: \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  given by  $S \mapsto \#(S)$ , though upper semicontinuous, in general, is not continuous. To overcome this trouble, we consider  $\Pi$  as the disjoint union

$$\Pi = \bigcup_n \Omega_n, \quad \Omega_n := \{S \in \Pi: \#S = n\}$$

where each  $\Omega_n$  is equipped with the topology induced by  $\sigma$  and  $\Pi$  is considered as the disjoint topological direct sum of the  $\Omega_n$ , a topology that we denote by  $\kappa$ . In this way, the  $\Omega_n$  are open and closed subsets in  $(\Pi, \kappa)$  and, in order to study the continuity of a function  $f: \Pi \rightarrow X$ , where  $X$  is a topological space, we only need to analyse its restriction to the  $\Omega_n$ . The fact that a net  $(S_i)$  in  $\Omega_n$  with  $S_i = \{\omega_i^1, \dots, \omega_i^n\}$ ,  $(i \in I)$ , converges to  $S_0 = \{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\} \in \Omega_n$  relative to  $\kappa$  only provides us with the following information on the components: There is a subnet  $(S_j)$ ,  $(J \subset I)$ , along with a reordering of  $S_0 = \{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\}$  (that is, a permutation  $\pi$  of the indices  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ) such that  $\lim_{j \in J} \omega_j^k = \eta^{\pi(k)}$  holds in  $\Omega$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Thus, we have had to weaken the notion of continuity, though, of course, the new notion agrees with the classical one when restricted to singletons  $S = \{\omega\} \in \Pi$ . For details, see §§2, 3 and 4 below.

In what follows  $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$  is endowed with a complete complex *lattice norm*, denoted by  $\|\cdot\|$ , whose open unit ball is

$$D := \{f \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega): \|f\| < 1\}.$$

Notice that we *do not* assume that  $\|\cdot\|$  coincides with  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ . We let  $\mathfrak{M}(\Omega) := (\mathfrak{M}(\Omega), \|\cdot\|^*)$  be the topological dual of  $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ , that is, the space of all Radon measures on  $\Omega$ , endowed with the corresponding dual norm  $\|\cdot\|^*$ , whose open unit ball is

$$D^* = \{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega): \|\mu\|^* < 1\}.$$

Notice that, in general  $\|\cdot\|^*$  does not coincide with the usual norm of total variation on  $\Omega$ . We recall that both  $C_0(\Omega)$  and  $\mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$  are Banach lattices when endowed with their respective usual order.

## 2. Preliminaries on the space of measures $\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)$

Denote by  $\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega) := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega) : \text{supp } \mu \in \Pi\}$  the set of the Radon measures on  $\Omega$  whose support  $S := \text{supp } \mu$  is an element of the partition  $\Pi$  of  $\Omega$ . Remark that  $\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)$  is not a vector subspace of  $\mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$  and that whenever  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are measures in  $\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)$  with  $\mu \neq \nu$  we have  $\text{supp } \mu \cap \text{supp } \nu = \emptyset$ . Define an equivalence on  $\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)$  by setting  $\mu \sim \nu$  if and only if  $\text{supp } \mu = \text{supp } \nu$ . Clearly we can identify the quotient set  $\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)/\sim$  and the partition  $\Pi$  by the map  $\text{supp} : \mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)/\sim \leftrightarrow \Pi$  taking each class of measures  $[\mu]$  to their common support. If  $S := \text{supp } \mu$  for some  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)$ , then  $S \subset \Omega$  is a finite subset  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_r\}$  for certain pairwise distinct points  $s_j \in \Omega$  and we have

$$[\mu] = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^r \alpha_k \delta_{s_k} : \alpha_k \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, 1 \leq k \leq r \right\},$$

where  $\delta_s$  denotes the Dirac measure at the point  $s \in \Omega$  and none of the coefficients  $\alpha_k$  can vanish in order to ensure  $\text{supp } \mu = S$ . Thus the class  $[\mu]$  is not a vector space. Let  $S \in \Pi$  be given and, instead of the condition  $\text{supp } \nu = S$ , consider the weaker one  $\text{supp } \nu \subset S$ ; then the set

$$\mathfrak{N}(S, \Omega) := \{\nu \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega) : \text{supp } \nu \subset S\}$$

is a vector subspace of  $\mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$  that is linearly spanned by the elements in the class  $[\mu]$ , that is  $\mathfrak{N}(S, \Omega) = \text{span } [\mu]$ . Notice, however, that  $\mathfrak{N}(S, \Omega)$  fails to be contained in  $\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)$  since there are measures  $\nu \in \mathfrak{N}(S, \Omega)$  whose support  $S' := \text{supp } \nu$  is a proper subset  $S' \subset S$  and therefore  $S' \notin \Pi$ . According to the proof of Theorem 1.4 of [3], for every surjective linear isometry  $U : C_0(\Omega) \rightarrow C_0(\Omega)$ , the family of vector spaces

$$\mathfrak{N}(S, \Omega), \quad S \in \Pi \tag{4}$$

is invariant under the operator  $U^*$ . Therefore,  $U^*$  takes each  $\mathfrak{N}(S, \Omega)$  with  $S \in \Pi$  into another element of the family (4)

$$U^*(\mathfrak{N}(S, \Omega)) = \mathfrak{N}(S^*, \Omega), \quad S \in \Pi$$

for some  $S^* \in \Pi$  which depends on the operator  $U^*$  and satisfies  $\#S^* = \#S$ . Besides,  $[\mu]$  contains a maximal free set  $\{\delta_s : s \in S\}$  which spans  $\mathfrak{N}(S, \Omega)$ . Since  $U^*$  is invertible, it must transform the maximal free set  $S$  into a maximal free set  $S^*$  which spans  $\mathfrak{N}(\Omega, S^*)$ , and hence  $U^*$  takes the class  $[\mu]$  into a class  $[\mu^*]$  with  $\text{supp } \mu^* = S^*$ .

Recall that the transposed  $U^* : \mathfrak{M}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$  is a surjective linear  $\|\cdot\|^*$ -isometry, and  $U^*$  is weak\*-weak\*-continuous, hence  $U^*$  is a homeomorphism of  $(\mathfrak{M}(\Omega), \|\cdot\|^*)$  and of  $(\mathfrak{M}(\Omega), w^*)$ . By the preceding discussion, the set  $\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega) \subset \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$  is invariant under  $U^*$  and, in the terminology introduced above,  $U^*$  is compatible with the equivalence  $\sim$ . Moreover,  $U^*$  induces a bijection  $T : \Pi \rightarrow \Pi$  as suggested by the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{N}(S, \Omega) & \xrightarrow{U^*} & \mathfrak{N}(S^*, \Omega) \\ \text{supp}^{-1} \uparrow & & \downarrow \text{supp} \\ S \in \Pi & \xrightarrow{T} & S^* = T(S) \in \Pi \end{array}$$

in which the left hand side vertical arrow  $S \rightarrow \text{supp}^{-1}S$  takes each  $S \in \Pi$  to the vector space  $\mathfrak{M}(S, \Omega)$  of the Radon measures whose support is contained in  $S$ , and the right hand side vertical arrow  $\mathfrak{M}(S^*, \Omega) \rightarrow S^*$  takes the vector space  $\mathfrak{M}(S^*, \Omega)$  to its *joint support*. Here, by joint support of a vector space  $M \subset \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$  of measures we mean the set  $\bigcup_{\mu \in M} \text{supp } \mu$ . Clearly its complement  $\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{\mu \in M} \text{supp } \mu$  can be characterized as the largest open subset  $U \subset \Omega$  with the following property:

$$\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega), \text{supp } \phi \subset U \implies \langle \mu, \phi \rangle = 0, \quad \forall \mu \in M.$$

In our case the spaces  $M$  under consideration are finite-dimensional, and the joint support is nothing but the union of the supports of the elements in a maximal free set in  $M$ , and it does not depend on the spanning set we choose in  $M$ . Thus

$$T := \text{supp} \circ U^* \circ \text{supp}^{-1}. \tag{5}$$

Remark that in the classical case, all classes  $S \in \Pi$  are of the form  $S = \{\omega\}$  for a unique  $\omega \in \Omega$  and we reobtain the homeomorphism  $\Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  provided by the Banach-Stone representation theorem for surjective linear isometries of  $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ .

### 3. Convergence of nets in $\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)$

By Proposition 4.3 of [3], we have  $N := \sup_{S \in \Pi} \#S < \infty$  where  $N$  is a characteristic of the Banach lattice  $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ . Remark that  $\emptyset \notin \Pi$ , hence  $0 \notin \mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)$ . Thus  $\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega)$  is a finite union of pairwise disjoint subsets

$$\mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega) = \bigcup_1^N \mathfrak{M}_k(\Omega), \quad \mathfrak{M}_k(\Omega) := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_\Pi(\Omega) : \#\text{supp } \mu = k\}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N.$$

#### PROPOSITION 3.1

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be given. Let  $\mu_i = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_i^k \delta_{\omega_i^k}$ , ( $i \in I$ ), where  $\omega_i^k \in \Omega$  and  $\alpha_i^k \in \mathbb{C}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and  $i \in I$ , be a net in  $\mathfrak{M}_n(\Omega)$ , and assume that

- (i)  $\mu_i$  is weak\*-convergent to a point  $\nu = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha^k \delta_{\eta^k}$  that belongs to  $\mathfrak{M}_n(\Omega)$ .
- (ii) None of the nets  $(\omega_i^1), (\omega_i^2) \cdots (\omega_i^{n-1})$  contains a subnet convergent to  $\eta^n$  in  $\Omega$ .

Then  $\omega_k^n \rightarrow \eta^n$  in  $\Omega$  and  $\alpha_k^n \rightarrow \alpha^n$  in  $\mathbb{C}$ .

*Proof.*

*Step 1.* First we show that  $\omega_i^n \rightarrow \eta^n$ , for which we proceed by contradiction. Thus, let us assume that  $\omega_i^n$  does not converge to  $\eta^n$  in  $\Omega$ . Hence there are an open neighbourhood  $U$  of  $\eta^n$  in  $\Omega$  and a subnet  $J \subset I$  such that

$$\omega_j^n \notin U, \quad \forall j \in J.$$

Now  $(\omega_j^1)$  ( $j \in J$ ) is a subnet of  $(\omega_i^1)$  which by (ii) does not converge to  $\eta^n$ . Hence there are an open neighbourhood  $V_1 \subset U$  of  $\eta^n$  in  $\Omega$  and a subnet  $J_1 \subset J \subset I$  such that

$$\omega_j^1 \notin V_1, \quad \forall j \in J_1.$$

Again  $(\omega_j^2)$ ,  $(j \in J_1)$ , is a subnet of  $(\omega_j^2)$  which by (ii) does not converge to  $\eta^n$ , and we can argue as before. After a finite number of steps we get a neighbourhood  $V$  of  $\eta^n$  in  $\Omega$  and a subnet  $K \subset I$  such that

$$\omega_k^1, \omega_k^2, \dots, \omega_k^n \notin V, \quad \forall k \in K.$$

Since the points in  $\{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\}$  are pairwise distinct, by shrinking  $V$  if needed we can assume that  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta^{n-1}$  do not lie in  $V$ . Take any function  $\phi \in C_0(\Omega)$  with  $\phi: \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $\phi(\eta^n) = 1$  and  $\text{supp } \phi \subset V$ . By construction, we have

$$\langle \mu_k \phi \rangle = 0, \quad \forall k \in K \quad \text{whereas} \quad \langle \nu \phi \rangle = \alpha^n \neq 0$$

which contradicts the assumption  $w^* \lim \mu_i = \nu$ .

*Step 2.* We claim that the net of coefficients  $\alpha_i^n$  satisfies  $\alpha_i^n \rightarrow \alpha^n$  in  $\mathbb{C}$ . Otherwise there would exist a subnet  $J \subset I$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$|\alpha_j^n - \alpha^n| \geq \varepsilon, \quad \forall j \in J.$$

By (ii) the subnets  $(\omega_j^r)$   $(j \in J)$  for  $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$  do not converge to  $\eta^n$ , hence there are a subnet  $K \subset J \subset I$  and a neighbourhood  $V$  of  $\eta^n$  in  $\Omega$  such that

$$\omega_k^1, \dots, \omega_k^{n-1} \notin V, \quad \forall k \in K.$$

Since  $\omega_j^n \rightarrow \eta^n$ , we have  $\omega_k^n \in V$  for large enough  $k \geq k_0$ . We may assume that  $V$  does not contain any of the points  $\eta^1, \dots, \eta^{n-1}$ . Take any function  $\psi \in C_0(\Omega)$  with  $\psi: \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $\psi(\eta^n) = 1$  and  $\text{supp } \psi \subset V$ . Then by construction

$$\langle \mu_k \psi \rangle = \alpha_k^n, \quad \langle \nu \psi \rangle = \alpha^n, \quad \forall k \in K$$

hence  $|\langle \mu_k - \nu \psi \rangle| = |\alpha_k^n - \alpha^n| \geq \varepsilon$  which contradicts  $w^* \lim \mu_k = \nu$ . □

**COROLLARY 3.2**

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be given. Let  $\mu_i = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_i^k \delta_{\omega_i^k}$ ,  $(i \in I)$ , be a net in  $\mathfrak{M}_n(\Omega)$ , and assume that  $\mu_i$  is weak\*-convergent to a point  $\nu = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha^k \delta_{\eta^k}$  that belongs to  $\mathfrak{M}_n(\Omega)$ . Then there is a reordering of  $(\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n)$  such that

$$\omega_i^r \rightarrow \eta^r \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_i^r \rightarrow \alpha^r \quad \text{in } \mathbb{C} \quad (1 \leq r \leq n).$$

*Proof.* By (3.1), there is an index  $k$   $(1 \leq k \leq n)$  such that

$$\omega_i^k \rightarrow \eta^k \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_i^k \rightarrow \alpha^k \quad \text{in } \mathbb{C}. \tag{6}$$

After reordering the  $n$ -tuple  $(\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n)$  if needed, we may assume that the index  $k$  is precisely  $k = n$ . Clearly  $w^* \lim \alpha_i^n \delta_{\omega_i^n} = \alpha^n \delta_{\eta^n}$  by (6). Thus from

$$\mu_i = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_i^k \delta_{\omega_i^k} \rightarrow \nu = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha^k \delta_{\eta^k} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_i^n \delta_{\omega_i^n} \rightarrow \alpha^n \delta_{\eta^n}$$

we derive

$$\tilde{\mu}_i := \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i^k \delta_{\omega_i^k} \rightarrow \tilde{\nu} := \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \alpha^k \delta_{\eta^k}.$$

A new application of (3.1), now to the net  $(\tilde{\mu}_i)$  ( $i \in I$ ) and the measure  $\tilde{\nu}$  in the space  $\mathfrak{M}_{n-1}(\Omega)$ , and an induction argument completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4. Convergence in the carrier space $\Omega$

Now we analyse the set  $\Omega = \Omega/\sim$  of the classes defined by the partition  $\Pi$  of  $\Omega$ . Clearly it is contained in the space  $\mathcal{K}$  whose points are the compact subsets of  $\Omega$  and it would be reasonable to consider the classical Hausdorff extension of the topology  $\tau$  in  $\Omega$  to a topology  $\sigma$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  and view  $\Omega$  as a topological subspace of it. However, the cardinality function  $S \mapsto \#(S)$  is not continuous, which is a trouble for our purpose. The discussion in the previous section and the definition of the bijection  $T$  induced by  $U^*$  suggest the consideration of the carrier space  $\Omega/\sim$  as the finite union of the pairwise disjoint subsets

$$\Omega = \bigcup_1^N \Omega_n, \quad \Omega_n := \{S \in \Pi: \#S = k\}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N, \tag{7}$$

where  $N := \sup_{S \in \Pi} \#(S) < \infty$  is a characteristic of the Banach lattice  $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ . Notice that  $\Omega_n$  is a subset of  $\Pi$ , but not a subset of  $\Omega$ , and that  $\text{supp}^{-1}\Omega_n = \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)_n$ .

We endow each  $\Omega_n$  with the topology that  $\sigma$  induces on it and view  $\Omega$  as the disjoint direct topological sum of these spaces  $\Omega_n$ . In this way we get a topological space  $(\Omega, \kappa)$  in which each of the  $\Omega_n$  is an open and closed subspace. Hence, in order to study the continuity properties of a function  $f: \Omega \rightarrow X$ , where  $X$  is an arbitrary topological space, we need only to analyse the restrictions of  $f$  to the  $\Omega_n$ .

Recall that for  $S \in \Omega$  we have  $S = \text{supp } \mu = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_r\}$  for some pairwise distinct points  $\omega_k$  in  $\Omega$ . For  $\eta \in \Omega$ , let  $S_\eta$  denote the unique element of the partition  $\Pi$  such that  $\eta \in S_\eta$ , and take open disjoint neighbourhoods  $V_k$  of  $\omega_k$  in  $\Omega$ . Then the family

$$\mathcal{E}_{(V_1, \dots, V_r)}(S) := \{S_\eta: \eta \in V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r\}, \tag{8}$$

where  $(V_1, \dots, V_r)$  ranges over the  $r$ -tuples of open disjoint neighbourhoods of the points  $\omega_k$  in  $S$ , form a basis of neighbourhoods of  $S$  for the restriction to  $\Pi$  of the Hausdorff topology  $\sigma$  on  $\mathcal{K}$ . First we consider the subspace  $(\Omega_n, \kappa)$  with  $n$  fixed and study convergence of nets. Recall that each point  $S \in \Omega_n$  is a finite subset of  $\Omega$ ,  $S \in \Pi$ . In what follows we assume  $S$  to have been ordered  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ , however the particular order given to  $S$  is not relevant.

##### PROPOSITION 4.1

Let  $S_i = \{\omega_i^1, \dots, \omega_i^n\}$ , ( $i \in I$ ), and  $S = \{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\}$  be a net and a point in  $\Omega_n$  such that  $\kappa \lim_{i \in I} S_i = S$ . Then there are a subnet  $S_j$ , ( $j \in J$ ) and an index  $l$  with  $1 \leq l \leq n$  such that the net  $(\omega_j^l)$  converges to  $\eta^l$  in  $\Omega$ .

*Proof.* Let  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  open pairwise disjoint neighbourhoods of the points  $\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n$  in  $\Omega$ . Then

$$\mathcal{E}_{(V_1, \dots, V_n)} := \{ \{\zeta^1, \dots, \zeta^n\} \in \Omega_n: \zeta^k \in V_k, 1 \leq k \leq n \}$$

is a  $\kappa$ -neighborhood of  $S$  in  $\Omega_n$ . By assumption we have  $\kappa \lim_{i \in I} S_i = S$ , hence there is an index  $i_0 \in I$  such that

$$S_i \subset V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n, \quad \forall i \geq i_0. \tag{9}$$

Now we proceed by contradiction. Assume that for every subnet  $S_j$  ( $J \subset I$ ), the net  $(\omega_j^1)$  does not converge in  $\Omega$  to any of the points  $\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n$ . Thus there exists a subnet  $J \subset I$  such that

$$\omega_j^1 \notin V_1, \quad \forall j \in J.$$

Consider now the net  $S_j$  ( $J \in J$ ), which satisfies  $\kappa \lim_{j \in J} S_j = S$ . By assumption the net  $(\omega_j^1)$  does not converge to any of the points  $\eta^2, \dots, \eta^n$ , hence there exists a subnet  $J' \subset J \subset I$  such that

$$\omega_j^1 \notin V_2, \quad \forall j \in J'.$$

After repeating this argument  $n$  times we get a subnet  $J^n \subset J^{n-1} \subset \dots \subset I$  such that

$$\omega_j^1 \notin V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n, \quad \forall j \in J^n$$

which contradicts (9) and completes the proof. □

**COROLLARY 4.2**

Let  $S_i = \{\omega_i^1, \dots, \omega_i^n\}$ , ( $i \in I$ ), and  $S = \{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\}$  be a net and a point in  $\Omega_n$  such that  $\kappa \lim_{i \in I} S_i = S$ . Then, after reordering  $S$  if needed, there is a subnet  $(S_k)$ , ( $K \subset I$ ), such that  $\lim_{i \in I} \omega_i^l = \eta^l$  for all  $l$  with  $1 \leq l \leq n$ .

*Proof.* By (4.1) we have  $\lim_{j \in J} \omega_j = \eta^l$  for a suitable subnet  $J \subset I$  and some  $l$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq n$ . Reordering  $S$  we may assume that  $l = 1$ . A repetition of the argument gives the result. □

The above results clearly suggest the following weakened notion of continuity.

**DEFINITION 4.3**

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be fixed, and let  $X$  be a topological space. A function  $T: \Omega_n \rightarrow X$  is said to be  $\kappa$ -continuous at a point  $S_0 = \{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\}$  if, for each net  $S_i = \{\omega_i^1, \dots, \omega_i^n\}$  in  $\Omega_n$  with  $\kappa \lim_{i \in I} S_i = S_0$ , for each permutation  $\pi$  of the indices  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  and for each subnet  $(S_j)$  ( $J \subset I$ ) such that

$$\lim_{j \in J} \omega_j^k = \eta^{\pi(k)}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n \text{ (convergence in } \Omega),$$

we have  $\lim_{j \in J} T(S_j) = T(S_0)$  in the space  $X$ .

And  $T$  is said to be  $\kappa$ -continuous in  $\Omega_n$  if it is  $\kappa$ -continuous at each point of  $\Omega_n$ . Remark that  $X$  is an arbitrary topological space, hence the case  $X = \Omega_n$  is not excluded. Notice also that for  $n = 1$ , the above definition clearly coincides with the usual notion of continuity.

**PROPOSITION 4.4**

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the restriction to  $\Omega_n$  of the map  $T: \Pi \rightarrow \Pi$  defined by (4.3) is  $\kappa$ -continuous on  $\Omega_n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $S_i = \{\omega_i^1, \dots, \omega_i^n\}$  and  $S_0 = \{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\}$  be a net and a point in  $\Omega_n$  and assume that  $\kappa \lim S_i = S_0$ . By the definition, after a reordering of  $S_0$  if needed, we may assume that

$$\omega_i^1 \rightarrow \eta^1, \dots, \omega_i^n \rightarrow \eta^n \quad (\text{convergence in } \Omega).$$

Hence  $w^* \lim_i \delta_{\omega_i^k} = \delta_{\eta^k}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and therefore for the Radon measures  $\mu_i := \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{\omega_i^k}$  and  $\nu := \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{\eta^k}$  we have

$$w^* \lim_i \mu_i = \nu. \tag{10}$$

Now apply the operator  $U^*: \mathfrak{M}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$  and remark these two facts:

- (1) The measures  $\mu_i$  belong to the space  $\mathfrak{M}_n(\Omega)$  which is invariant under  $U^*$ , therefore we have

$$\mu_i^* := U^* \mu_i = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_i^k \delta_{\omega_i^{*k}}, \quad \nu^* := U^* \nu = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha^k \delta_{\eta^{*k}}$$

for some  $S_i^* = \{\omega_i^{*1}, \dots, \omega_i^{*n}\}$  and  $S_0^* = \{\eta^{*1}, \dots, \eta^{*n}\}$  where  $S_i^*$  and  $S_0^*$  are elements of  $\Pi$ .

- (2) The operator  $U^*$  is  $w^*$ - $w^*$ -continuous, hence (10) gives  $w^* \lim_i \mu_i^* = \nu^*$ , that is

$$w^* \lim_i \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_i^k \delta_{\omega_i^{*k}} = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha^k \delta_{\eta^{*k}}.$$

By (3.1), after a reordering of  $S_0^* = \{\eta^{*1}, \dots, \eta^{*n}\}$  if needed, we may assume that

$$\omega_i^{*1} \rightarrow \eta^{*1}, \dots, \omega_i^{*n} \rightarrow \eta^{*n} \quad (\text{convergence in } \Omega),$$

which means that the net of finite sets  $S_i^* = \{\omega_i^{*1}, \dots, \omega_i^{*n}\}$  is  $\kappa$ -convergent to the finite set  $S_0^* = \{\eta^{*1}, \dots, \eta^{*n}\}$ . Since  $S_i^* = \text{supp } \mu_i^* = T(S_i)$  and  $S_0^* = \text{supp } \nu^* = T(S_0)$ , we have proven

$$\kappa \lim S_i = S_0 \implies \kappa \lim T(S_i) = T(S_0)$$

that is, the map  $T = \text{supp} \circ U^* \circ \text{supp}^{-1}$  is  $\kappa$ -continuous. □

### 5. Continuity of Hermitian operators

As stated in the introduction, each hermitian operator  $A: \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$  on the Banach lattice  $E := (\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega), \|\cdot\|)$  gives rise to a uniquely determined family of maps  $\mathbf{a}^A: S \rightarrow \mathbf{a}^A(S)$ , where for each  $S \in \Pi$ ,  $\mathbf{a}^A(S)$  is a linear transformation of the finite-dimensional  $\mathbf{C}^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  (that is,  $\mathbf{a}^A(S) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}(S))$ ), such that

$$(Af)|_S = \mathbf{a}^A(S)(f|_S), \quad \forall S \in \Pi, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega). \tag{11}$$

We discuss the continuity properties of the map  $S \mapsto \mathbf{a}^A(S)$ ,  $S \in \Pi$ , for which we first analyse its restriction to  $\Omega_n$  with  $n$  fixed.



Let us assume that  $\Omega$  is compact, hence  $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$  is a unital  $\mathbf{C}^*$ -algebra with unit element the constant function  $\mathbf{1}_\Omega$ . When the relation (11) is applied to  $f := \mathbf{1}_\Omega$ , we get

$$(A\mathbf{1}_\Omega)|_S = \mathbf{a}^A(S)(\mathbf{1}_S), \quad \forall S \in \mathbf{\Omega}_n. \tag{12}$$

Here  $\mathbf{1}_S$  is the unit of the  $\mathbf{C}^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  (hence defined in an intrinsic way) and neither  $\mathbf{1}_S$  nor its image by  $\mathbf{a}^A(S)$  (which is  $(A\mathbf{1}_\Omega)|_S$  in accordance with (6.1)) depend on the particular order we choose for the set  $S$ . We refer to  $S \mapsto \mathbf{a}^A(S)(\mathbf{1}_S)$  as the *action* of the family  $\mathbf{a}^A$  on the units  $\mathbf{1}_S$ , and we shall prove that this action  $\mathbf{a}^A: \mathbf{\Omega}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is continuous (in the sense of Definition (4.3)). Remark that in the classical case, when all sets  $S$  are singletons  $S = \{\omega\}$ , this action can be identified with the multiplication by a continuous complex-valued function.

**PROPOSITION 5.1**

Let  $\Omega$  be a compact topological space and let  $A$  be a hermitian operator on the Banach lattice  $E = (\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega), \|\cdot\|)$ . Then for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the action of the family  $\mathbf{a}^A: S \rightarrow \mathbf{a}^A(S)$ , ( $S \in \mathbf{\Omega}_n$ ), associated to  $A$  by (6.1) is  $\kappa$ -continuous on  $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $S_i = \{\omega_i^1, \dots, \omega_i^n\}$  ( $i \in I$ ) and  $S_0 = \{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\}$  be a net and a point in  $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$  such that  $\lim_{i \in I} S_i = S_0$  in the  $\kappa$  topology of the space  $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$ . We have to show that, for any reordering of  $S_0$  and for every subnet  $(S_j)$  ( $J \subset I$ ) such that

$$\lim_{j \in J} \omega_j^1 = \eta^{\pi(1)}, \dots, \lim_{j \in J} \omega_j^n = \eta^{\pi(n)} \quad (\text{convergence in } \Omega),$$

we have  $\lim_{j \in J} \mathbf{a}^A(S_j) = \mathbf{a}^A(S_0)$  (convergence in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ).

Let a reordering of  $S_0$  and a subnet  $(S_j)$  ( $J \subset I$ ) of  $(S_i)$  be given in the above conditions. Without loss of generality we may assume that the reordering of  $S_0$  corresponds with the natural permutation  $\pi = \text{Id}$  of the indices  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Since  $\mathbf{1}_\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ , its image  $A\mathbf{1}_\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$  is uniformly continuous on the compact set  $K := \{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\}$ . Thus, given any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there are pairwise disjoint open neighbourhoods  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  of the points  $\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n$  in  $\Omega$  such that

$$|(A\mathbf{1}_\Omega)(s) - (A\mathbf{1}_\Omega)(t)| \leq \varepsilon \tag{13}$$

whenever  $s$  and  $t$  lie in one of the  $V_k$  for some  $k$  with  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Now

$$\mathcal{E}_{(V_1, \dots, V_n)} := \{\{\zeta^1, \dots, \zeta^n\} \in \mathbf{\Omega}_n: \zeta^k \in V_k, 1 \leq k \leq n\}$$

is a  $\kappa$ -neighbourhood of  $S_0$  in  $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$  and by assumption the subnet  $(S_j)$  satisfies

$$\lim_{j \in J} \omega_j^1 = \eta^1, \dots, \lim_{j \in J} \omega_j^n = \eta^n \quad (\text{convergence in } \Omega).$$

Therefore, if  $j \geq j_0$  is large enough we have  $\omega_j^k \in V_k$  ( $1 \leq k \leq n$ ), and by (13)

$$|(A\mathbf{1}_\Omega)(\omega_j^k) - (A\mathbf{1}_\Omega)(\eta^k)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \quad \forall j \geq j_0.$$

Since the action  $\mathbf{a}^A$  is given by  $\mathbf{a}^A(S) := \mathbf{a}^A(S)(\mathbf{1}_S) = (A\mathbf{1}_\Omega)|_S$  for all  $S \in \mathbf{\Omega}_n$ , the above can be written in the form

$$|\mathbf{a}^A(S_j)(\mathbf{1}_{S_j}) - \mathbf{a}^A(S_0)(\mathbf{1}_{S_0})| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall j \geq j_0$$

which completes the proof. □

**6. Continuity of the isometry-valued map  $S \mapsto \mathbf{u}(S)$**

As stated in the Introduction, each surjective linear isometry  $U: \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$  of the Banach lattice  $E := (\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega), \|\cdot\|)$  gives rise to the following intertwined elements:

- (1) A uniquely determined partition  $\Pi$  of the set  $\Omega$  into pairwise disjoint subsets  $S \subset \Omega$  and a uniquely determined bijection  $T: \Pi \rightarrow \Pi$  such that  $\#T(S) = \#S$  for all  $S \in \Pi$ .
- (2) A family  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_S$  of inner products on the finite-dimensional function spaces  $\mathcal{C}(S)$ ,  $S \in \Pi$ , such that

$$\{f|_S: \|f\| \leq 1\} = \{\phi \in \mathcal{C}(S): \langle \phi \phi \rangle_S \leq 1\}.$$

- (3) A family  $\{\mathbf{u}(S): S \in \Pi\}$  of surjective linear  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_S$ -unitary operators  $\mathbf{u}(S): \mathcal{C}(T(S)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(S)$  such that

$$(Uf)|_S = \mathbf{u}(S)(f|_{T(S)}), \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega), \quad \forall S \in \Pi.$$

If  $\Omega$  is compact and we apply the above relation to the unit  $\mathbf{1}_\Omega$  of the  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$  we get

$$(U\mathbf{1}_\Omega)|_S = \mathbf{u}(S)(\mathbf{1}_{T(S)}), \quad \forall S \in \Pi. \tag{14}$$

In the classical case both  $\mathcal{C}(T(S))$  and  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  are canonically isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$ , and the isometry  $\mathbf{u}(S)$  can be identified with its value  $\mathbf{u}(T(S))$  at the unit  $\mathbf{1}_{T(S)}$  of  $\mathcal{C}(T(S))$ . Thus, in general we are led to consider the *action* of the isometry  $\mathbf{u}$  at the unit  $\mathbf{1}_{T(S)}$ , that is, the map  $\Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  given by  $S \mapsto \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{1}_{T(S)})$  and we have

**PROPOSITION 6.1**

*Let  $\Omega$  be a compact topological space and let  $U$  be a surjective linear isometry of the Banach lattice  $E = (\mathcal{C}_0(\Omega), \|\cdot\|)$ . Then for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the function  $\mathbf{u}: \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  given by  $S \mapsto \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{1}_{T(S)})$  is  $\kappa$ -continuous on  $\Omega_n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $S_i = \{\omega_i^1, \dots, \omega_i^n\}$  ( $i \in I$ ) and  $S_0 = \{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\}$  be a net and a point in  $\Omega_n$  such that  $\lim_{i \in I} S_i = S_0$  in the  $\kappa$  topology of the space  $\Omega_n$ . We have to show that, for any reordering  $\pi$  of  $S_0$  and for every subnet  $(S_j)$  ( $J \subset I$ ) such that

$$\lim_{j \in J} \omega_j^1 = \eta^{\pi(1)}, \dots, \lim_{j \in J} \omega_j^n = \eta^{\pi(n)} \quad (\text{convergence in } \Omega),$$

we have  $\lim_{j \in J} \mathbf{u}(S_j)(\mathbf{1}_{T(S_j)}) = \mathbf{u}(S_0)(\mathbf{1}_{T(S_0)})$ , where the limit is taken in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . By (14) the latter is equivalent to

$$\lim_{j \in J} (U\mathbf{1}_\Omega)|_{S_j} = (U\mathbf{1}_\Omega)|_{S_0}. \tag{15}$$

Let a reordering of  $S_0$  and a subnet  $(S_j)$  ( $J \subset I$ ) of  $(S_i)$  be given in the above mentioned conditions. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the reordering of  $S_0$  corresponds with the natural permutation  $\pi = \text{Id}$  of the indices  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Since  $\mathbf{1}_\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ , its image  $U\mathbf{1}_\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$  is uniformly continuous on the compact set  $K := \{\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n\}$ . Thus, given any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there are pairwise disjoint open neighbourhoods  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  of the points  $\eta^1, \dots, \eta^n$  in  $\Omega$  such that

$$|(U\mathbf{1}_\Omega)(s) - (U\mathbf{1}_\Omega)(t)| \leq \varepsilon \tag{16}$$

whenever  $s$  and  $t$  lie in one of the  $V_k$  for some  $k$  with  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Now

$$\mathcal{E}_{(V_1, \dots, V_n)} := \{ \{ \zeta^1, \dots, \zeta^n \} \in \mathbf{\Omega}_n : \zeta^k \in V_k, 1 \leq k \leq n \}$$

is a  $\kappa$ -neighbourhood of  $S_0$  in  $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$  and by assumption the subnet  $(S_j)$  satisfies

$$\lim_{j \in J} \omega_j^1 = \eta^1, \dots, \lim_{j \in J} \omega_j^n = \eta^n \quad (\text{convergence in } \Omega).$$

Therefore for  $j \geq j_0$  large enough, we have

$$\omega_j^k \in V_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n \quad \forall j \geq j_0$$

and so from (16) we obtain

$$|(U\mathbf{1}_\Omega)(\omega_j^k) - (U\mathbf{1}_\Omega)(\eta^k)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \quad \forall j \geq j_0$$

which is (15) and completes the proof.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Isidro J M and Stachó L L, Holomorphic invariants for continuous bounded symmetric Reinhardt domains, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **70** (2004) 623–637
- [2] Schaeffer H H, Banach lattices of positive operators, *Grundl. Math. Wiss.* **215** (Berlin: Springer) (1974)
- [3] Stachó L L, A Banach-Stone type theorem for lattice norms in  $\mathcal{C}_0$ -spaces, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **73** (2007) 193–208
- [4] Stachó L L, Continuous Reinhardt domains from a Jordan viewpoint, *Studia Math.* **185(2)** (2008) 177–199
- [5] Stachó L L and Zalar B, Symmetric continuous Reinhardt domains, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **81(2)** (2003) 619–636