



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Positive representations of algebras of continuous functions

Jiang, X.

Citation

Jiang, X. (2018, September 25). *Positive representations of algebras of continuous functions*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66030>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66030>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/66030> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Jiang, X.

Title: Positive representations of algebras of continuous functions

Issue Date: 2018-09-25

Positive representations of algebras of continuous functions

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 25 september 2018
klokke 12.30 uur

door

Xingni Jiang

geboren te Chengdu
in 1988

Promotores:

Dr. M.F.E. de Jeu

Universiteit Leiden

Prof. dr. S.J. Edixhoven

Universiteit Leiden

Promotiecommissie:Prof. dr. A.W. van der Vaart (*voorzitter*)

Universiteit Leiden

Prof. dr. W.Th.F. den Hollander (*secretaris*)

Universiteit Leiden

Dr. ir. O.W. van Gaans

Universiteit Leiden

Dr. M.Z. Orhon

University of New Hampshire

Prof. dr. B. de Pagter

Technische Universiteit Delft

Prof. dr. A.W. Wickstead

Queen's University Belfast

This research was carried out at Universiteit Leiden and was funded by China Scholarship Council (CSC) through a research grant awarded to Xingni Jiang.

Cover design by Anja Rüten-Budde, Carlo Lancia and the author.

Positive representations of algebras of continuous functions

This thesis consists of two chapters. Chapter I focuses on positive representations of algebras of continuous functions on partially ordered vector spaces. Chapter II focuses on simultaneous power factorization in modules over Banach algebras.

Preface

One of the main questions in representation theory is to determine if arbitrary representations are built from irreducible ones. For unitary representations of locally compact groups and for representations of C^* -algebras on Hilbert spaces, the answer is affirmative and a rather satisfactory theory is available. There may be several reasons why representation theory in Hilbert spaces is so well developed. For analysts, these are the easiest of Banach spaces to work with. Furthermore, their central position in quantum theory has put these spaces into the mathematical spotlight in the first half of the 20th century, and the story of representations in these spaces and of operator algebras has unfolded naturally since then.

Outside quantum theory, however, Hilbert spaces are often not a canonical type of function spaces to work with in the natural sciences. Integrability of functions (reflecting finiteness of quantities) or boundedness are often more natural conditions than the square integrability that is imposed on wave functions. Functions in these spaces are usually real-valued, and, more often than not, there is a meaningful notion of positivity in these spaces. Symmetry groups of the system tend to act in a natural way on these spaces as positive linear maps. Positive representations of groups and algebras on partially ordered vector space are, therefore, quite natural. Yet there is no theory available of, say, positive representations on Banach lattices, that even remotely resembles that of representations on Hilbert spaces.

This thesis covers a part of such a theory of positive representations.

An important class of C^* -algebras that is of interest in its own right, and that is particularly helpful when understanding more complicated situations in representation theory in Hilbert spaces, are the commutative C^* -algebras. These are the algebras of continuous complex-valued functions on a locally compact Hausdorff space that vanish at infinity. One of the tools to describe their representations on Hilbert spaces are the spectral measures that correspond to such representations.

When developing representation theory in an ordered context, it is desirable to have a similar tool available for positive representations of such algebras of continuous real-valued functions on partially ordered vector spaces, and, in particular, on Banach lattices. The principal aim of Chapter I of this thesis is, therefore, to establish the existence of spectral measures corresponding to such positive representations. We refer to the Summary for more details on this part of the work. It has led, among others, to an abstract spectral theorem for positive homomorphisms from algebras of continuous functions into partially ordered algebras that has the existence of projection-valued spectral measures in both the ordered context and in the Hilbert space context as immediate consequences.

Chapter II of this thesis is inspired by the classical Cohen-Hewitt factorization theorem. In a Banach algebra with a bounded left approximate identity, this states that every element can be factored. There is a more general statement for non-degenerate Banach modules over such algebras. In our context, supposing that the Banach algebra and the module are ordered, and that the module is a positive module over the algebra, it is natural to ask if such factorizations of a positive element of the module are possible with both factors positive. This is not generally possible, but for our algebras

of continuous functions the answer is affirmative. Apart from this, Chapter II contains a systematic investigation of simultaneous power factorization in modules over Banach algebras, generalising and unifying several results in the literature.

Chapter II has been published as *M. de Jeu and X. Jiang*, Simultaneous power factorization in modules over Banach algebras, *Positivity* **21** (2017), 633–672. This issue of *Positivity* was a special issue dedicated to Ordered Banach Algebras.

Contents

I	Positive representations of algebras of continuous functions	1
I.1	Introduction and overview	2
I.2	Partially ordered vector spaces	10
I.3	Operators and duality	13
I.4	Partially ordered algebras	18
I.5	Positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measures	19
I.6	Positive $\overline{E}$ -valued outer measures	24
I.7	Measures on locally compact Hausdorff spaces	27
I.8	Cones of measures	31
I.8.1	Cones of general measures	31
I.8.2	Cones of measures on locally compact Hausdorff spaces	36
I.9	Integration with respect to a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure . . .	40
I.9.1	Integrals	40
I.9.2	Convergence theorems	47
I.10	Positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measures arising from densities	50
I.11	Positive measures with values in partially ordered algebras .	54
I.12	Riesz representation theorem for $C_c(X)$: normed case	56
I.13	Riesz representation theorems for $C_c(X)$: normal case	64
I.14	Riesz representation theorems for $C_0(X)$	71
I.15	Positive representations of $C_c(X)$ and $C_0(X)$	76
I.15.1	Positive representations of $C_0(X)$ on KB-spaces	80
I.15.2	Representations of $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ on Hilbert spaces	82
	Bibliography of Chapter I	85
II	Simultaneous power factorization	87
II.1	Introduction and overview	88
II.2	Conventions and notation	90
II.3	Uniform convergence on subsets of Banach modules	91
II.4	Simultaneous power factorization	95
II.5	Positive simultaneous power factorization	108

II.6 Simultaneous power factorization for sets of maps	112
II.7 Worked example	114
Bibliography of Chapter II	121
Summary	123
Samenvatting	127
Acknowledgements	131
Curriculum Vitae	133

Chapter I

Positive representations of algebras of continuous functions

Abstract

Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space. We establish several Riesz representation theorems for positive linear maps from $C_c(X)$ or $C_0(X)$ to partially ordered vector spaces. Analogously to the case where the partially ordered vector space is the real numbers, the theorems state that such positive linear maps are given by integration with respect to vector-valued measures. If the partially ordered vector space is a partially ordered algebra, and if the positive linear map is also multiplicative, then the representing measure is shown to be a spectral measure. The resulting abstract spectral theorem is applied to positive representations of $C_0(X)$ on KB-spaces and to representations of (the complexification of) $C_0(X)$ on Hilbert spaces. The known results in the literature on the existence of spectral measures for such representations are thus seen to stem from one common underlying theorem.

A theory of measures with values in partially ordered vector spaces and of integration with respect to such measures is developed, since this needed to formulate the representation theorems.

§1. Introduction and overview

If X is a locally compact Hausdorff space, then we let $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ denote the continuous complex-valued functions on X that vanish at infinity. If $\pi : C_0(X, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a representation of the complex C^* -algebra $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ on a complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, then it is a classical result (see e.g. [14, Corollary 1.55]) that there exists a unique regular spectral measure P on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$(1.1) \quad \pi(f) = \int_X f \, dP$$

for all $f \in C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$. We recall that, in this Hilbert space context, a spectral measure is a map $P : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that

- (1) $P(A)$ is an orthogonal projection for every Borel set A ;
- (2) $P(\emptyset) = 0$;
- (3) $P\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right)x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(A_n)x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and every pairwise disjoint sequence $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathcal{B}$;
- (4) $P(A_1 \cap A_2) = P(A_1)P(A_2)$ for all $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}$.

The classical result is actually for non-degenerate representations, in which case $P(X) = I$, but the statement for the general case follows easily from that for the non-degenerate case.

Associated with a spectral measure is a family of complex-valued measures $P_{x,x'} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for $x, x' \in \mathcal{H}$, defined by $P_{x,x'}(A) := \langle P(A)x, x' \rangle$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}$. The spectral measure P is then said to be a regular Borel measure if the measure $P_{x,x'}$ is a regular Borel measure for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{H}$. One of the ways to interpret the statement involving equation (1.1) is that

$$(1.2) \quad \langle \pi(f)x, x' \rangle = \int_X f \, dP_{x,x'}$$

for all $f \in C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ and $x, x' \in \mathcal{H}$.

In [12], a similar result was obtained for a positive representation $\pi : C_0(X) \rightarrow L_r(E)$ of the algebra $C_0(X)$ —the algebra of continuous real-valued functions on X that vanish at infinity—on a KB-space E . Again equations (1.1) and (1.2) hold, where now the spectral measure takes its values in the positive projections on E , and where the pairing in the definition of the $P_{x,x'}$ and in the left hand side of equation (1.2) is now between an element of E and an element of the dual E^* of E . Since the KB-spaces include, for example, all reflexive Banach lattices and also non-reflexive ones such as L^1 -spaces, this result covers a reasonably large class of Banach lattices.

The approach in [12] for KB-spaces is strongly inspired by that in the literature for Hilbert spaces. It is a Banach space approach, with an order-theoretical component that, although crucial at one point, is otherwise not so prominent. However, after the existence of the spectral measure has been established, there are a few results in [12] that indicate that there may be a greater role for ordering than has become clear so far. For example, [12, Theorem 5.12] shows that

$$(1.3) \quad P(V) = \bigvee \{ \pi(f) : f \in C_c(X), 0 \leq f \leq 1, \text{supp } f \subseteq V \}$$

for every non-empty open subset V of X . Here $C_c(X)$ denotes the algebra of real-valued continuous functions on X with compact support, and the supremum is taken in the regular operators on the KB-space E . The proof of this uses the previous Banach space oriented results,

but, in the end, the expression is a purely order-theoretical one, and it is also a perfect analogue of the corresponding formula in the classical context of positive linear functionals on $C_0(X)$ (or $C_c(X)$). One could have written down this expression as an Ansatz at the very beginning. Could it, therefore, perhaps be the case that the Banach space structure is not essential, and that an order-theoretical approach to these spectral measures in the context of KB-spaces is also possible?

This question was the starting point for the research leading to the present body of work. The answer is affirmative. Investigating this order-theoretical approach has, however, led to a little bit more than a new proof for the existence of a spectral measure for a positive representation of $C_0(X)$ on a KB-space. As has become clear, this result, as well as the classical result for spectral measures regarding representations of $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ on Hilbert spaces, are immediate consequences of the same underlying more general theorem involving positive homomorphisms from $C_0(X)$ or $C_c(X)$ into partially ordered algebras. We shall now explain how such a result (Theorem 15.1) is obtained through various stages, and how it specialises in the case of KB-spaces of Hilbert spaces.

The first step is to establish a Riesz representation theorem for a positive linear map T from $C_0(X)$ (or $C_c(X)$) into a partially ordered vector space E . Under reasonably mild conditions, it can be shown that there exists a positive E -valued measure μ (one usually also has to allow μ to assume the value ∞) on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$(1.4) \quad T(f) = \int_X f \, d\mu$$

for all $f \in C_0(X)$ (or $C_c(X)$). This measure μ is unique within the class of measures that represent T in this fashion and that have certain regularity properties.

The second step is to consider the case where E is not just a partially ordered vector space, but a partially ordered algebra $\mathcal{A}$, and where the map T is not just a positive linear map, but a positive algebra homomorphism π from $C_0(X)$ (or $C_c(X)$) into $\mathcal{A}$. Under reasonably mild conditions, the representing measure for the positive linear map π now has an extra property: it is a spectral measure. Conforming to tradition, we shall then denote the representing measure by P rather than μ . The fact that P is a spectral measure then means, by definition, that $P(A_1 \cap A_2) = P(A_1)P(A_2)$ for all $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}$. This implies that $P : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ takes its values in the positive idempotents in $\mathcal{A}$.

In the end, an abstract spectral theorem is thus available, stating that there is a spectral measure that represents a positive algebra homomorphism $\pi : C_0(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ or $\pi : C_c(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ into a partially ordered algebra $\mathcal{A}$, provided that $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies a few natural conditions.

Although the general result does not suppose this, the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ can be an algebra of operators that has a partial ordering. In that case, the spectral measures supplied by it are spectral measures in the classical sense, i.e. measures that take values in the positive projections.

In the case of a positive representation $\pi : C_0(X) \rightarrow L_r(E)$ of $C_0(X)$ on a KB-space E , one easily checks that the partially ordered algebra $L_r(E)$ of regular operators on a KB-spaces meets the requirements in the abstract spectral theorem. The main result of [12] on the existence of a spectral measure for π is then immediate. It takes its values in the positive idempotents in $L_r(E)$, i.e. in the positive projections on E .

In the case of a representation $\pi : C_0(X, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ on a complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, one starts by noting that the self-adjoint elements of the von Neumann algebra that is generated by $\pi(C_0(X, \mathbb{C}))$ form a partially ordered algebra that has the correct properties. An

application of the abstract spectral theorem to the restricted positive homomorphism of $C_0(X)$ into this (real) partially ordered algebra then immediately furnishes the classical spectral measure. It takes its values in the positive idempotents in the algebra of the self-adjoint elements of the von Neumann algebra that is generated by $\pi(C_0(X, \mathbb{C}))$; these are orthogonal projections on $\mathcal{H}$.

There is one important aspect that we have not yet mentioned in the above outline, and that is the definition of integrals such as in equation (1.4) for a measure taking values in a partially ordered vector space. In general, the partially ordered vector spaces under consideration do not carry a topology, and one cannot use limits in the topological sense to define an integral. However, the spaces do carry a partial ordering, and this provides a means to introduce an integral after all. The construction of this (order) integral is as follows. The definition of the integral of a positive measurable function that takes only finitely many values is the natural one. Imposing a mild order completeness condition on the space, the integral of a positive measurable function can then be defined as the supremum of the integrals of an increasing sequence of positive elementary functions that approximate the function pointwise from below. From positive measurable functions one then proceeds to arbitrary integrable ones in the obvious fashion. This is all analogous to the introduction of the integral with respect to real-valued measures in many (though not all) text books, and if $E = \mathbb{R}$ the usual Lebesgue integral results. The notion of a positive measure with values in a partially ordered vector space has to be changed, though, because σ -additivity can no longer be expressed using a convergent or divergent series with positive terms. The sum of such a series has to be replaced with the supremum (possibly infinity) of the sequence of its partial sums.

It appears that Wright was the first to realise that such an adaptation of the notion of σ -additivity can profitably be made to yield a workable theory of measure and integration if the measure takes its values in a partially ordered vector space E . This was first done in [24], where E is a Stone algebra, i.e. a Riesz space of the form $C(X)$ for an extremally disconnected compact Hausdorff space X . It is mentioned in [26, p. 194] that this can also be done if E is a σ -Dedekind complete Riesz space, but details are not provided. In [27, p. 678], a similar remark is made if E is a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space, again without providing the details or precise formulations of the results. It is also mentioned there that Fatou's lemma and the dominated convergence theorem, which are not stated, become more complicated. Since a good theory of measure and integration with respect to measures with values in a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space is essential to our work, we have decided to develop this theory in this particular context of σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector spaces from scratch. We supply full proofs and precise statements, including those of Fatou's lemma and the dominated convergence theorem. Needless to say, it was of considerable help to have [24] as a starting point. We shall comment a little more on this below.

We shall now combine the remainder of this introductory discussion with an overview of the arrangement of the material that is to follow. It will become clear how the abstract spectral theorem (Theorem 15.1) is obtained, but also which types of Riesz representation theorems for positive linear maps, which have interest of their own, are encountered along the way.

Section 2 contains basic notions for partially ordered vector space, with special attention to various types of order completeness. It is also explained how we can adjoin a point at infinity to the space, which is inevitable if one wants to establish Riesz representation theorems. It

also contains a stockpile of small but important technical results that will allow us to argue with suprema and infima in the sequel.

Section 3 is concerned with operators between partially ordered vector spaces, and with duality. As will become clear in the sequel, the ‘good’ spaces for Riesz representation theorems are notably the normal and monotone complete spaces. The latter notion may speak for itself; a space is normal if there are sufficiently many (in a precise sense) order continuous linear functionals. Banach lattices with order continuous norms are normal and monotone complete, and so are the spaces that consist of the self-adjoint operators in a weakly closed subspace of the bounded operators on a Hilbert space. Spaces of operators between two partially ordered vector spaces will typically be normal and monotone complete again if the codomain is.

Section 4 is a short section on partially ordered algebras. A partially ordered algebra that has monotone continuous multiplication and that is also normal and monotone complete meets the requirements in the abstract spectral theorem. The algebra of regular operators on a Banach lattice with order continuous norm falls into this category, as does the algebra of the self-adjoint elements of a commutative von Neumann algebra.

In Section 5, measures on algebras of sets with values in the (extended) positive cone of a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space are introduced, and their basic properties are developed. The results are analogous to those for the real case, but most of the proofs need a slight adaptation when it comes to the handling of the infinite series that occur in the real case. We have taken care to supply the details, in order to convince the reader (and ourselves) that the proofs *can* be adapted to work in the more general context. This is perhaps less obvious than it may seem, because the real numbers have various properties that are used in the theory of real-valued measures and integration with respect to such measures in a very natural way, and there lies a certain danger in this. The real numbers are linearly ordered, they form a lattice, and they are a normed space with ensuing topology: these are all very convenient in proofs, but none of them can be used when passing to general partially ordered vector spaces. The only properties that *can* be used in the general case are the σ -monotone completeness and the accompanying Archimedean property, and one needs to make certain that one can indeed give a proof that uses these properties and no others. To give an example of the mistakes where a ‘real mindset’ could lead to: if S is a subset of a partially ordered vector space E that has an infimum x in E , and if $y \in E$ is positive, then it is tempting to ‘choose an element $s \in S$ such that $x \leq s \leq y$ ’, and proceed from there. However, whereas this is indeed possible if $E = \mathbb{R}$, it is already not generally possible if $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ with $d \geq 2$. One has to reconsider everything carefully and adapt the arguments where necessary.

Section 6 covers outer measures in the vector-valued context. One of our Riesz representation theorems for positive linear maps (Theorem 12.3) is established along the lines of one of the possible proofs of the classical case for the real numbers, using an outer measure. As in the classical case, one needs to know that the measurable subsets form a σ -algebra and that the restriction of the outer measure to this σ -algebra is σ -additive (in our ordered sense). We are not aware of earlier material in the literature in this direction.

Section 7 is concerned with vector-valued measures on the Borel σ -algebra of a locally compact Hausdorff spaces and their regularity properties.

In Section 8, cones of vector-valued measures are studied, both in the abstract setting of measures on a general algebra and in the context of measures on the Borel σ -algebra of a locally compact space that possess a certain degree of regularity. This material is not a part of the main line of the current development of the theory, but is intended as a stepping stone for further research. In the real case, there is a isometric lattice isomorphism between the

norm dual of $C_0(X)$ and the signed regular Borel measures on a locally compact Hausdorff space X , and an isomorphism of lattice cones between the order dual of $C_c(X)$ and the positive (possibly infinite) regular Borel measures on X . Presumably similar results can be obtained in a more general context, and we expect that the material in Section 8 will be helpful when investigating these matters.

Section 9 contains the basic theory of integration with respect to a measure with values in a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space. As with the part on measure theory, we have provided detailed proofs to make sure that there are no mistakes. As an example of what can go wrong, we consider the statement that an integrable function f that is almost everywhere zero has zero integral. For a measure μ with values in a Riesz space, one can presumably prove this for positive f and then use a triangle inequality for integrals in $|\int f \, d\mu| \leq \int |f| \, d\mu = 0$ to see that it is true for general f . For general vector-valued measures this is no longer a valid argument. One has to split f into its positive and negative part (for which it is almost immediate from the definition of the integral) to give a correct proof. Even though this is hardly a profound modification, it still shows that it is easy to make mistakes when thinking that results from the real case or Riesz space case generalise immediately to the general vector-valued case.

Compared to the seminal paper [24], we have a different starting point when it comes to the definition of the integral of a positive function. We use elementary functions that can have a support of infinite measure as pointwise approximants from below, whereas in [24] only finite measures of supports are allowed. The integral of a positive function that cannot be approximated pointwise from below by such functions is then defined to be infinity in [24]. Our approach is uniform. We also define the integral of a positive function that is allowed to take infinity as a value. We believe this is more natural to do, and it gives a more general version of Fatou's lemma and the monotone convergence theorem.

We also develop the theory a bit further than was done in [24], or than is needed to formulate the Riesz representation theorems later on. We hope that this extra material will prove to be useful in future applications. For example, we have included a systematic treatment of properties that hold almost everywhere, and how this is related to integrals. We have also included the definition and properties of the natural space of integrable functions, and of its quotient modulo the functions that vanish almost everywhere. Furthermore, Fatou's lemma and the dominated convergence theorem, which were said in [27, p. 678] to be more complicated in the case of σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector spaces that need not be lattices, are stated and proved.

Section 10 is a prelude to the proof of the abstract spectral theorem for positive homomorphisms from $C_0(X)$ or $C_c(X)$ into partially ordered algebras. One can canonically construct a new measure from a given one and a positive measurable function, and in this section—which contains somewhat more material than is needed in the sequel—it is studied how the regularity properties of the original measure are inherited by the new measure, and how their integrals are related. These results, together with the uniqueness statements in our Riesz representation theorems, are a key ingredient in the proof of the abstract spectral theorem.

Section 11 serves a similar purpose as Section 10: it is a preparation for the proof of the abstract spectral theorem. If a measure takes its values in a partially ordered algebra, then one can define a new measure by (left or right) multiplication of the given measure by a fixed positive element of the algebra. We need to know that the regularity properties of the original measure are inherited by the multiplies ones, and how their integrals are related.

Section 12 contains our first Riesz representation theorem. It covers the case of a positive linear map $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$, where E is a monotone complete partially ordered vector space that is also a normed space and that satisfies three reasonably mild additional requirements. It applies to every Banach lattice E with order continuous norm. The lengthy proof follows the outline of one of the existing proofs where $E = \mathbb{R}$, and uses the material from Section 6 on outer measures.

In Section 13, we move to the context of normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector spaces. Banach lattices with order continuous norm provide an important class of examples again, but this is also true for suitable spaces of self-adjoint operators on a Hilbert space that need not be lattices. Based on the classical Riesz representation theorem (which is a special case of the main result of Section 12), it is not so difficult to find a measure μ that represents a positive linear map $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$, provided that the set $\{T(f) : f \in C_c(X), 0 \leq f \leq 1\}$ is order bounded in E ; the latter is trivially the case if X is compact. If this subset of X is not order bounded, then it is still possible to obtain a representing measure by including an extra step. Indeed, if U is a relatively compact open subset of X , then it is easy to see that the set $\{T(f) : f \in C_c(X), 0 \leq f \leq 1, \text{supp}(f) \subseteq U\}$ is order bounded in E . By the previous result, there is a measure μ_U on the Borel σ -algebra of U that represents the restriction of T to $C_c(U)$, and these local measures μ_U can be patched together to a measure that is defined on the Borel σ -algebra of X . This technique is already employed in [26, proof of Theorem 1].

In Section 14, we take up representation theorems for positive linear maps $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow E$ that are defined on the larger space $C_0(X)$. The strategy to obtain such theorems is clear: one restricts T to $C_c(X)$ and applies the representation theorem to this restricted map. If the representing measure is finite, so that $C_0(X)$ consists of integrable functions, then there is good hope that the measure will also represent T on $C_0(X)$. This works in a number of cases. In each of them, the important step is to know a priori that $\{T(f) : f \in C_c(X), 0 \leq f \leq 1\}$ is order bounded in E . For this, it is vital that $C_0(X)$ is a Banach lattice. For example, if E is a Banach lattice with a Levi norm (such as a KB-space), then we know that T , being a positive linear map from a Banach lattice into a normed Riesz space, is norm continuous. This implies that the set $\{T(f) : f \in C_c(X), 0 \leq f \leq 1\}$ is norm bounded in E . Since it is obviously upward directed and the norm is a Levi norm, it has a supremum in E . The desired order boundedness of the set is thus seen to be automatic in this case.

Variations on this theme of automatic norm continuity of positive linear maps with $C_0(X)$ as domain are possible, for example, by composing T with positive linear functionals on the codomain E . This leads to representation theorems for positive linear maps defined on $C_0(X)$ if E is, as we have called it, a quasi-perfect Riesz space. This is a reasonably large class of spaces that includes the perfect Riesz spaces, and also all normal Banach lattices with a Levi norm (such as KB-spaces).

Another opportunity to exploit automatic norm continuity is given by the fact that a positive linear map from the complexification of $C_0(X)$, which is a C^* -algebra, into $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is also automatically norm continuous. Thus a number of representation theorems are obtained for $C_0(X)$, including ones where E is the partially ordered vector space of all regular operators on a KB-space, and where E is the partially ordered vector space of the self-adjoint elements of a weakly closed linear subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

In Section 15, we reach our destination, and we take up the issue of a positive homomorphism π from $C_c(X)$ or $C_0(X)$ into a partially ordered algebra $\mathcal{A}$ that is normal, monotone complete, and that has monotone continuous multiplication. Using the accumulated material, it is now not so difficult to show that, if it is finite, the measure that represents π as a positive

linear map from $C_c(X)$ into $\mathcal{A}$ is, in fact, a spectral measure. It is thus that the abstract spectral theorem is obtained; see Theorem 15.1.

The natural algebras that come to mind for possible applications of this abstract spectral theorem are algebras of operators. We can now exploit the results from Section 14, stating that the representing measure of π is finite in a number of cases, to obtain spectral measures for two natural classes of positive representations of $C_0(X)$: those on KB-spaces and those on Hilbert spaces. The two motivating theorems mentioned in the beginning of this section are now seen to be immediate consequences of the abstract spectral theorem. In the Hilbert space case, the results obtained seem even a little more precise than what is to be found in the literature.

We shall now discuss the relation of our work with the literature.

We start with earlier work on Riesz representation theorems for positive linear maps from spaces of continuous functions to various types of partially ordered vector spaces. While discussing this, we do not make any claim to completeness, and any omission is unintentional. The space X is always a locally compact Hausdorff space, unless otherwise stated.

To start with, there is the seminal paper by Wright [24] that was already mentioned earlier. It has a representation theorem for a positive linear map $T : C(X)$, where X is compact, into a Stone algebra. A second paper [25] by the same author covers the case of a positive linear map from $C(X)$, where X is compact, into a σ -Dedekind complete Riesz space. A third paper [26] contains a representation theorem for a positive linear map from $C_c(X)$ into a Dedekind complete Riesz space. A fourth [27] is concerned with a positive linear map from $C(X)$, where X is compact, into a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space.

In [16], one of Khurana's papers in this direction, it is shown that a positive linear map from $C_c(X)$ into a monotone complete partially ordered vector space can be extended to a σ -order continuous linear map defined on the bounded Borel functions with compact support; this goes in the direction of a Riesz representation theorem. In a second paper [17], a representation theorem is established, under certain additional conditions, for a positive linear map from the bounded continuous functions on a completely regular Hausdorff space into a monotone complete partially ordered vector space. In [17], he proves a representation theorem for a positive linear map from the continuous functions on a completely regular T_1 space into a Stone algebra.

In [18], Lipiecki shows the existence of a representing finitely additive measure for positive linear maps from the bounded continuous functions on an arbitrary topological space into a monotone complete partially ordered vector space; there is a second result for the bounded continuous functions if the topological space is normal.

In [10], Coquand gives a new proof of Wright's result in [27] of the existence of a representing measure for a positive linear map from $C(X)$, where X is compact, into a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space.

The results cited above also include regularity properties of the representing measures, but not always the same properties. It is, therefore, not clear if, in cases where more than one results applies, the representing measures are necessarily equal.

As may have become clear in the discussion preceding the literature overview, the condition that the subset $\{T(f) : f \in C_c(X), 0 \leq f \leq 1\}$ of E be order bounded in E is an important one. It is equivalent to the finiteness of the representing measure. For finite measures many difficulties disappear since there are no problems at all when manipulating with suprema and infima, or when one wants to compose the measure with positive linear functionals on

E . If the constant function $\mathbf{1}$ is in the domain of T (for example, if X is compact), then this is automatically the case: the subset is bounded from above by $T(\mathbf{1})$. If E is, in addition, a normed Riesz space, then this subset is also norm bounded. Most of the results cited above are in this relatively convenient context, but as our Theorem 13.5 (a representation theorem for a positive linear map from $C_c(X)$ into a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space) shows, this is not a necessary prerequisite for representation theorems to hold. There are two papers in the above overview that ‘avoid’ this automatic order boundedness. Khurana’s paper [16] is for positive linear maps defined on $C_c(X)$, but the result obtained does not yet yield a measure. Wright’s paper [26] contains a representation theorem for positive linear maps defined on $C_c(X)$, and this is the existing result that appears to be most closely related to ours in Theorem 13.5. The main difference with our result is that Wright supposes that E is a Riesz space (which is used in the proof) and that we suppose that the space is normal (which is also used in the proof). It appears that both results are complementary. Ours is not applicable if the space E is not normal, whereas Wright’s is not applicable if E is not a Riesz space, for example, if E is the set of self-adjoint elements of a weakly closed subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

It appears that the proofs of the existing representation theorems in the literature usually rely on the classical Riesz representation theorem for $E = \mathbb{R}$. The same is true for our proofs where the space is normal and monotone complete. There is an important difference, though: we are not aware of existing proofs in the literature that follow our approach of simply writing down the representing measure on open subsets of X as in equation (1.3), and proceeding from there.

We are not aware of a previous occurrence of an abstract spectral theorem such as Theorem 15.1.

Although they are beyond the current body of work, we mention two perspectives for possible applications of the present results.

Firstly, it should be mentioned that there are possible applications when studying a positive linear map (not necessarily a $*$ -homomorphism) $T : A \rightarrow B$ between two complex C^* -algebras A and B , if we suppose that B has been embedded into $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ for some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. There are many commutative C^* -algebras in A , and to each of them Theorem 14.10 applies, yielding representing measures for the restricted maps that take their values in the von Neumann algebra generated by (the embedded) B .

Secondly, we expect that our results for positive representations can be used to obtain a better insight into the structure of (algebras of) orthomorphisms on Banach lattices. If E is a KB-space, then its center $Z(E)$ is isometrically lattice isomorphic to a space $C(X)$ for some compact Hausdorff space X . The inverse of this map is a positive representation of $C(X)$, and an application of the spectral theorem to this representation gives a spectral measure on X that takes its values in the order projections on E . This not only shows that every orthomorphism is built from order projections (something we already knew from Freudenthal’s theorem), but also how this can be done in a uniform way for all orthomorphisms, and with an integration theory available. Of course, one can also do this for algebras of orthomorphisms other than $Z(E)$ itself, such as the algebra that is generated by one orthomorphism. It is hoped that in the latter case the spectral theorem will clarify the structure of a single orthomorphism in a way that is not dissimilar from that for a normal operator on a separable Hilbert space. Such an operator is built from multiplication operators on L^2 -spaces (see [9, Theorem IX.10.1]), and the starting point for establishing this is the spectral theorem for the commutative C^* -algebra

that is generated by the operator. Hopefully the same can be achieved in the ordered case now that we have a similar starting point.

§2. Partially ordered vector spaces

In this section, we establish some terminology and notation for partially ordered vector spaces, and collect a few basic facts about various types of order completeness, also in relation to the extended space that is obtained by adjoining a point at infinity.

All vector spaces we shall consider are over the real numbers, unless otherwise stated.

If E is a partially ordered vector space, then E^+ denotes its positive cone. We do not require that E^+ is generating, i.e. it need not be the case that $E = E^+ - E^+$. Stated equivalently, we not require E to be directed.

Subsets of a partially ordered vector space E of the form $\{x \in E : a \leq x \leq b\}$ for $a, b \in E$ such that $a \leq b$, are called *order intervals* in E ; they are denoted by $[a, b]$. A subset of E is called *order bounded* if it is contained in an order interval.

The order completeness properties that we are interested in are relevant when introducing the integral with respect to vector-valued measures, and also when establishing convergence theorems for integrals. They are also necessary to be able to define regularity properties of vector-valued measures on a locally compact Hausdorff space. We list them in the following definition, which also contains some self-evident notation that we shall use.

Definition 2.1. A partially ordered vector space E is called

- (1) *σ -monotone complete* if every increasing sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in E that is bounded from above has a supremum $\bigvee_{n=1}^\infty a_n$ in E ;
- (2) *monotone complete* if every increasing net $\{a_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ in E that is bounded from above has a supremum $\bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} a_\lambda$ in E ;
- (3) *σ -Dedekind complete* if every non-empty at most countably infinite subset S of E that is bounded from above has a supremum $\bigvee \{x : x \in S\}$ in E ;
- (4) *Dedekind complete* if every non-empty subset S that is bounded from above has a supremum $\bigvee \{x : x \in S\}$ in E .

Equivalently, one can define these properties by requiring the existence of infima when replacing ‘increasing’ with ‘decreasing’ and ‘bounded from above’ with ‘bounded from below’.

There are evident logical implications between these four properties. For Riesz spaces, Dedekind completeness (resp. σ -Dedekind completeness) and monotone completeness (resp. σ -monotone completeness) are equivalent. If E has a generating cone and if E is σ -Dedekind complete, then, for every $x_1, x_2 \in E$, the subset $\{x_1, x_2\}$ is bounded from above, so that it has a supremum. Hence E is then a Riesz space.

A partially ordered vector space E is *Archimedean* if $\bigwedge \{\varepsilon x : \varepsilon > 0\} = 0$ for all $x \in E^+$. One can equivalently require that $\bigwedge \{r_n x : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = 0$ for every $x \in E^+$ and every (or just one) sequence $\{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\}$ such that $r_n \downarrow 0$. Still equivalently, one can require that, whenever $y \in E^+$ and x are such that $nx \leq y$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (or such that $rx \leq y$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$), it follows that $x \leq 0$. As was observed in [27, Lemma 1.1], every σ -monotone complete partially vector space (and then also every monotone complete, σ -Dedekind complete, or Dedekind complete partially order vector space) is Archimedean. Indeed, if $x \geq 0$, then $\bigwedge \{x/n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ exists since E is σ -Dedekind complete, and it satisfies $\bigwedge \{x/n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = \bigwedge \{x/(2n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\} =$

$1/2 \wedge \{x/n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Hence $\bigwedge \{x/n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = 0$. We shall use this automatic Archimedean property a few times.

We record the following analogue of the well-known inequality for the limit inferior and the limit superior of a sequence of real numbers. We shall need it in the proof of the dominated convergence theorem (Theorem 9.13). The proof is completely analogous to the proof for the case where $E = \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let E be a σ -Dedekind complete partially ordered vector space, and let $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be an order bounded sequence in E . Then $\bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty x_k$ and $\bigwedge_{n=1}^\infty \bigvee_{k=n}^\infty x_k$ exist in E , and*

$$\bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty x_k \leq \bigwedge_{n=1}^\infty \bigvee_{k=n}^\infty x_k.$$

In the sequel, we shall consider Riesz representation theorems for positive linear maps $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$, where X is a locally compact Hausdorff space and E is a partially ordered vector space. One could hope that, ideally, these theorems would state that this map T is given by integration of a scalar-valued function with respect to an E -valued measure. However, as the case where $E = \mathbb{R}$ already shows, we cannot expect this measure to be actually finite. In order to be able to develop an appropriate theory of measure and integration that incorporates this inevitable phenomenon, we need to adjoin an element ∞ to E^+ and let $\mathbb{R}^+$ act on the augmented structure. As is also done in e.g. [24, 26], we shall actually adjoin ∞ to the whole space E , which is necessary for a formulation of some of the results (see e.g. part (4) of Lemma 5.4). The construction is as follows.

Firstly, we let $\bar{E} := E \cup \{\infty\}$ be a disjoint union, and we extend the partial ordering from E to $\bar{E}$ by declaring that $x \leq \infty$ for all $x \in E$. The elements of $\bar{E}$ that are in E will be called *finite*. We set $\bar{E}^+ := E^+ \cup \{\infty\}$; then $\bar{E}^+$ is the set of positive elements of $\bar{E}$. Secondly, we make $\bar{E}$ into an abelian additive semigroup with zero element by defining $\infty + x := \infty$ and $x + \infty := \infty$ for all $x \in \bar{E}$; then $\bar{E}^+$ is a sub-semigroup of $\bar{E}$. Thirdly, we define $r \cdot \infty := \infty$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\}$, and define $0 \cdot \infty := 0$. Thus the additive semigroup $\mathbb{R}^+$ acts as semigroup homomorphisms on $\bar{E}$. It is easily checked that, if $x, y \in \bar{E}$ are such that $x \leq y$, then $x + z \leq y + z$ for all $z \in \bar{E}$, and that $rx \leq sy$ for all $r, s \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $r \leq s$. If $x \in \bar{E}$ and $r, s \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then $(rs)x = r(sx)$. Hence the multiplicative semigroup $\mathbb{R}^+$ also acts as semigroup homomorphisms on $\bar{E}^+$.

We have now carried out the desired construction, but one can also go a little bit further, as follows. The construction in the previous paragraph can be applied to $\mathbb{R}$. The set of positive elements of $\mathbb{R}$ is then the familiar extended positive real half line $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$. It is an abelian additive semigroup with zero element. The action of $\mathbb{R}^+$ on $\bar{E}^+$ can then be extended to an action of $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ on $\bar{E}^+$ by defining $\infty \cdot 0 := 0$ and $\infty \cdot x := \infty$ for all $x \in \bar{E}^+ \setminus \{0\}$. Then the additive semigroup $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ acts as semigroup homomorphisms on $\bar{E}^+$. If $x, y \in \bar{E}^+$ are such that $x \leq y$ and $r, s \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ are such that $r \leq s$, then $rx \leq sy$.

The previous construction be applied with $E = \mathbb{R}$, which yields an action of $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ on itself. Thus the familiar multiplicative structure on the extended positive real half line is obtained. It is compatible with the action of $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ on $\bar{E}^+$: if $r, s \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ and $x \in \bar{E}^+$, then $r \cdot (s \cdot x) = (rs) \cdot x$. Hence the multiplicative semigroup $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ also acts as semigroup homomorphisms on $\bar{E}^+$.

We shall employ the usual notation in which $a_\lambda \uparrow$ means that $\{a_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is an increasing net in E (or in $\bar{E}$), and in which $a_\lambda \uparrow x$ means that $\{a_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is an increasing net in E (or in $\bar{E}$) with supremum x in E (or in $\bar{E}$). The notations $a_\lambda \downarrow$ and $a_\lambda \downarrow x$ are similarly defined. If necessary we shall indicate explicitly whether we are working in E or in $\bar{E}$.

We collect a few basic technical facts that will be used repeatedly in the sequel. The proofs are elementary.

Lemma 2.3. *Let E be a partially ordered vector space, and let $S \subseteq \bar{E}$ be non-empty.*

- (1) *If $S \subseteq E$ and $\bigvee \{s : s \in S\}$ exists in E , then this supremum is also the supremum of S in $\bar{E}$; likewise for the infimum.*
- (2) *If $\bigvee \{s : s \in S\}$ exists in $\bar{E}$ and is finite, then S consists of finite elements, and the supremum of S exists in E and equals the supremum of S in $\bar{E}$.*
- (3) *If $S \neq \{\infty\}$, then $\bigwedge \{s : s \in S\}$ exists in $\bar{E}$ if and only if $\bigwedge \{s : s \in S \cap E\}$ exists in E . If this is the case, then these infima are equal.*
- (4) *$\bigvee \{s : s \in S\} = \infty$ in $\bar{E}$ if and only if S is not bounded from above by a finite element.*
- (5) *If $\bigvee \{s : s \in S\}$ exists in $\bar{E}$, then, for all $x \in \bar{E}$, $\bigvee \{x + s : s \in S\}$ exists in $\bar{E}$ and equals $x + \bigvee \{s : s \in S\}$; likewise for the infimum.*
- (6) *If $\bigvee \{x + s : s \in S\}$ exists in $\bar{E}$ for some $x \in E$, then $\bigvee \{s : s \in S\}$ exists in $\bar{E}$, and $\bigvee \{x + s : s \in S\} = x + \bigvee \{s : s \in S\}$; likewise for the infimum.*
- (7) *If $\bigvee \{s : s \in S\}$ exists in $\bar{E}$, then, for all $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\bigvee \{rs : s \in S\}$ exists in $\bar{E}$ and equals $r \bigvee \{s : s \in S\}$; likewise for the infimum.*

Lemma 2.4. *Let E be a partially ordered vector space.*

- (1) *If A and B are two non-empty subsets of $\bar{E}$ such that $\bigvee \{a : a \in A\}$ and $\bigvee \{b : b \in B\}$ exist in $\bar{E}$, then $\bigvee \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$ exists in $\bar{E}$ and equals $\bigvee \{a : a \in A\} + \bigvee \{b : b \in B\}$; likewise for the infima.*
- (2) *If $\{a_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and $\{b_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \subseteq \bar{E}$ are two nets in $\bar{E}$ such that $\{a_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \uparrow a$ and $\{b_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \uparrow b$ in $\bar{E}$, then $\{a_\lambda + b_\lambda\} \uparrow (a + b)$ in $\bar{E}$; likewise for decreasing nets.*

Lemma 2.5. *Let E be a partially ordered vector space.*

- (1) *If E is σ -monotone complete (resp. σ -Dedekind complete), then every increasing sequence in (resp. every at most countably infinite subset of) $\bar{E}$ has a supremum in $\bar{E}$. If the sequence (resp. set) is bounded from above by a finite element, then the supremum in $\bar{E}$ equals the supremum in E . If the sequence (resp. subset) is not bounded from above by a finite element, then the supremum in $\bar{E}$ equals ∞ .*
- (2) *If E is σ -monotone complete (resp. σ -Dedekind complete), then every decreasing sequence in (resp. every non-empty at most countably infinite subset of) $\bar{E}$ that is bounded from below in $\bar{E}$ has an infimum in $\bar{E}$. If all terms of the sequence are equal to ∞ (resp. if the set equals $\{\infty\}$), then this infimum in $\bar{E}$ equals ∞ . If the sequence contains finite terms (resp. if the subset contains finite elements), then the infimum in $\bar{E}$ equals the infimum in E of the decreasing subsequence of finite terms (resp. the subset of finite elements of the subset), which is bounded from below by a finite element.*
- (3) *If E is monotone complete (resp. Dedekind complete), then every increasing net in (resp. every non-empty subset of) $\bar{E}$ has a supremum in $\bar{E}$. If the set (resp. net) is bounded from above by a finite element, then the supremum in $\bar{E}$ equals the supremum in E . If the set (resp. net) is not bounded from above by a finite element, then the supremum in $\bar{E}$ equals ∞ .*
- (4) *If E is monotone complete (resp. Dedekind complete), then every decreasing net in (resp. every non-empty subset of) $\bar{E}$ that is bounded from below in $\bar{E}$ has an infimum in $\bar{E}$. If all terms of the net are equal to ∞ (resp. if the subset equals $\{\infty\}$), then this infimum in $\bar{E}$ equals ∞ . If the net contains finite terms (resp. if the subset contains*

finite elements), then the infimum in $\bar{E}$ equals the infimum in E of the decreasing subnet of finite terms (resp. the subset of finite elements of the subnet), which is bounded from below by a finite element.

§3. Operators and duality

It will become apparent in the sequel that the partially ordered vector spaces E for which Riesz representation theorems for positive linear maps $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow E$ can be established, are notably the monotone complete partially ordered vector spaces that are also normal. The latter property will be defined below (see Definition 3.6); Proposition 3.8 shows its relevance for us.

This section is, therefore, primarily concerned with establishing that several common classes of partially ordered vector spaces (including partially vector spaces of operators) are normal and monotone complete. The pertinent results are contained in Propositions 3.10 to 3.12 and Theorem 3.13.

We start by recalling some of the usual notions and introducing the notations that we shall use.

If E and F are vector spaces, then $L(E, F)$ denotes the vector space of linear operators from E into F . An operator $T \in L(E, F)$ between two partially ordered vector spaces is *order bounded* if it maps order bounded subsets of E into order bounded subsets of F . The order bounded operators from E into F form a vector space that is denoted by $L_b(E, F)$. An operator $T \in L(E, F)$ is *positive* if $TE^+ \subseteq F^+$, and *regular* if it is the difference of two positive operators. The regular operators from E into F form a vector space that is denoted by $L_r(E, F)$. A positive operator is order bounded, so that $L_r(E, F) \subseteq L_b(E, F) \subseteq L(E, F)$. If E^+ is generating in E , then these three vector spaces are all partially ordered via their positive cones $L_r(E, F)^+$. We shall write $E^\sim$ for $L_b(E, \mathbb{R})$. If E is a Banach lattice, then $E^\sim$ coincides with the norm dual E^* of E .

Completeness properties of partially ordered vector spaces can be inherited by spaces of operators between them. For example, if E is a partially ordered vector space that has a generating cone and that has the Riesz decomposition property, and if F is a Dedekind complete Riesz space, then the spaces $L_r(E, F)$ and $L_b(E, F)$ coincide and are Dedekind complete Riesz spaces; see [4, Theorem 1.59]. In particular, they are monotone complete partially ordered vector spaces. The latter statement is also a consequence of the following result.

Proposition 3.1. *Let E be a partially ordered vector space with a generating positive cone, let F be a monotone complete (resp. σ -monotone complete) partially ordered vector space, and let V be a linear subspace of $L(E, F)$ containing $L_r(E, F)$.*

Let $\{T_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be an increasing net (resp. Let $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be an increasing sequence) in V . Then $\{T_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ (resp. $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$) is bounded from above in V if and only if, for all $x \in E^+$, $\{T_\lambda x\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ (resp. $\{T_n x\}_{n=1}^\infty$) is bounded from above in F . In that case, $\{T_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ (resp. $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$) has a supremum T in V . For $x \in E^+$, it is given by $Tx = \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} T_\lambda x$ (resp. $Tx = \sup_{n \geq 1} T_n x$).

In particular, V is a monotone complete (resp. σ -monotone complete) partially ordered vector space.

PROOF. We prove the statements for the monotone completeness and the σ -monotone completeness of V at the same time. Let $\{T_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be an increasing net (possibly an increasing sequence) in V .

If the net is bounded from above by an element S of V , then $T_\lambda x \leq Sx$ for all $x \in E^+$, so that $\{T_\lambda x\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is bounded from above in F for all $x \in E^+$.

Conversely, suppose that $\{T_\lambda x\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is bounded from above in F for all $x \in E^+$. We shall show that the pointwise formula for T as in the statement of the theorem actually defines an element of V . This is then clearly the least upper bound of the net in V .

Choose any $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$. Using that the nets $\{T_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and $\{T_\lambda x\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ for $x \in E^+$ are increasing, one easily sees, by considering the net $\{T_\lambda - T_{\lambda_0}\}_{\lambda \geq \lambda_0} \subseteq V^+$, that it is sufficient to prove that the pointwise formula defines an element of V when $T_\lambda \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

Supposing, therefore, that $\{T_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \subseteq V^+$, we define $T : E^+ \rightarrow F^+$ as in the statement of the theorem by

$$(3.1) \quad Tx := \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} T_\lambda x$$

for $x \in E^+$. Since $\{T_\lambda x\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is increasing and bounded from above, the supremum in the right hand side of equation (3.1) exists as a consequence of the pertinent completeness property of F . It is clear that $T(\lambda x) = \lambda T(x)$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$ and $x \in E^+$. Next we show that T is additive on E^+ . Fix $x_1, x_2 \in E^+$. For all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we have

$$T_\lambda(x_1 + x_2) = T_\lambda(x_1) + T_\lambda(x_2) \leq Tx_1 + Tx_2,$$

so $T(x_1 + x_2) \leq Tx_1 + Tx_2$. For the reverse inequality, consider arbitrary $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda$. Choose $\lambda_3 \in \Lambda$ such that $\lambda_3 \geq \lambda_1$ and $\lambda_3 \geq \lambda_2$. Then, using that $\{T_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is increasing, we have

$$T_{\lambda_1}x_1 + T_{\lambda_2}x_2 \leq T_{\lambda_3}x_1 + T_{\lambda_3}x_2 = T_{\lambda_3}(x_1 + x_2) \leq T(x_1 + x_2),$$

which easily implies that $T(x_1 + x_2) \geq Tx_1 + Tx_2$. Hence T is additive on E^+ .

Next, if $x \in E$ is arbitrary, we choose $x_1, x_2 \in E^+$ such that $x = x_1 - x_2$, and we define $Tx := Tx_1 - Tx_2$. It is then easy to see that T is well-defined and that T is linear, so that $T \in L(E, F)$. Since clearly $T \geq 0$, we also have $T \in L_r(E, F)$. Since $L_r(E, F) \subseteq V$, we have $T \in V$, as required. □

The underlying spaces of the monotone (σ -)partially ordered vector spaces of operators in Proposition 3.1 are themselves partially ordered vector spaces, but there also exist monotone complete partially ordered vector spaces of operators where this is no longer the case. An important class of examples is provided by the following result, which is a direct consequence of [11, Lemma I.6.4].

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space, and let L be a weakly closed (equivalently: strongly closed) complex linear subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Let L_{sa} be the real vector space that consists of the self-adjoint elements of L , supplied with the partial ordering that is inherited from the usual partial ordering on the self-adjoint elements of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then L_{sa} is a monotone complete partially ordered vector space.*

More precisely, if $\{T_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is an increasing net in L_{sa} that is bounded from above in L_{sa} , then $\{T_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ convergence with respect to the strong operator topology, i.e. $\text{SOT-}\lim_\lambda T_\lambda$ exists in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, is an element of L_{sa} , and is equal to the supremum $\bigvee \{T_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ of the T_λ in L_{sa} .

Remark 3.3. In view of Kadison's anti-lattice theorem [15, Theorem 6], the space L_{sa} figuring in Proposition 3.2 will not generally be a Riesz space. For example, if $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 2$, then, by Kadison's result, $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\text{sa}}$ is not a Riesz space. The space $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\text{sa}}$ for $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 2$ also provides an example of a monotone complete partially ordered vector space that is not Dedekind complete. It is, in fact, not even σ -Dedekind complete. To see this, suppose that it is σ -Dedekind complete. Since $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\text{sa}}$ is directed, every subset $\{T_1, T_2\}$ is bounded from above, so that it then has a supremum. Thus $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\text{sa}}$ is a Riesz space, but we know this not to be the case.

Although many of the proofs in the sequel can be given entirely while working in the partially ordered vector space at hand, there are a few passages where it seems unavoidable to invoke the real numbers and their linear ordering as an aid; see e.g. the proof of Proposition 7.6. On other occasions (see e.g. the proof of Theorem 13.4), a proof using the real numbers can be given that runs so smoothly that the need to look for a possible direct proof is hardly felt anymore. The real numbers enter the picture by using certain linear functionals, which we are about to introduce. The relevant definition, where we also include the sequential case for future reference, can still be given in a more general context, as follows.

Definition 3.4. Let E and F be partially ordered vector spaces, and let $T : E \rightarrow F$ be a positive operator. Then T is called *order continuous* (resp. *σ -order continuous*) if $Tx_\lambda \downarrow 0$ in F whenever $x_\lambda \downarrow 0$ in E (resp. if $Tx_n \downarrow 0$ in F whenever $x_n \downarrow 0$ in E). A general operator in $L_r(E, F)$ is order continuous (resp. *σ -order continuous*) if it is the difference of two positive order continuous operators. We shall write $L_n(E, F)$ (resp. $L_c(E, F)$) for the order continuous (resp. *σ -order continuous*) operators from E into F .

It is easy to see that the sum of two positive order continuous (resp. *σ -order continuous*) operators is again a positive order continuous (resp. positive *σ -order continuous*) operator, and it follows that $L_n(E, F)$ (resp. $L_c(E, F)$) is a linear subspace of $L_r(E, F)$. If E is directed, then it is a partially ordered vector space with the positive order continuous operators (resp. the positive *σ -order continuous* operators) as positive cone, which is generating by definition. We shall write $E_n^\sim$ for $L_n(E, \mathbb{R})$ and $E_c^\sim$ for $L_c(E, \mathbb{R})$. It is the space $E_n^\sim$ that will be our aid in the context of vector-valued Riesz representation theorems. It has $(E_n^\sim)^+$, the positive order continuous functionals, as generating positive cone.

Remark 3.5. If E and F are Riesz spaces, where F is Dedekind complete, then the above notion of order continuous operators agrees with the usual one in the literature. To see this, recall that $T : E \rightarrow F$ is order continuous in the sense of [28, p. 123] if $|Tx_\lambda| \downarrow 0$ in F whenever $x_\lambda \downarrow 0$ in E . Hence a positive T is order continuous in the sense of [28, p. 123] precisely when it is order continuous in the sense of our Definition 3.4. Furthermore, by [28, Lemma 84.1], $T : E \rightarrow F$ is order continuous in the sense of [28, p. 123] if and only if T^+ and T^- are order continuous in the sense of that same definition, i.e. if and only if they are positive order continuous operators in the sense of Definition 3.4. In addition, [28, Theorem 84.2] implies that the set of all $T : E \rightarrow F$ that are order continuous in the sense of [28, p. 123] form a vector space. It follows that the notions of (and notations for) order continuous operators coincide if E and F are Riesz spaces, where F is Dedekind complete. A similar argument shows that this is also the case for *σ -order continuous* operators.

The relation between the general case and the case when $E = \mathbb{R}$ is most profitably exploited if there are sufficiently many order continuous linear functionals in the sense of the first part of the following definition.

Definition 3.6. Let E be a partially ordered vector space. Then E is called *normal* if, for $x \in E$, $(x, x') \geq 0$ for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$ if and only if $x \in E^+$. We say that E is *σ -normal* if, for $x \in E$, $(x, x') \geq 0$ for all $x' \in (E_c^\sim)^+$ if and only if $x \in E^+$.

Clearly, if E is normal, then $(E_n^\sim)^+$ separates the points of E .

As with order continuous operators, if E is a Riesz space, then our notion of normality coincides with that in the literature. To see this, we include the following result.

Lemma 3.7. *Let E be a Riesz space, and let A be an order ideal of $E^\sim$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) A^+ separates the points of E ;
- (2) A separates the points of E ;
- (3) For $x \in E$, $(x, x') \geq 0$ for all $x' \in A^+$ if and only if $x \in E^+$.

If $A = E^\sim$, then the fact that part (2) implies part (3) can be found as [3, Theorem 1.66]]. The following proof is an adaptation of the proof for that case.

PROOF. It is clear that part (1) implies part (2), and also that part (3) implies part (1). It remains to be shown that part (2) implies part (3).

One implication in (3) is trivial, so we turn to the non-trivial one. Let $x \in E$ be such that $(x, x') \geq 0$ for all $x' \in A^+$. If $x' \in A^+$, then [3, Theorem 1.23] shows that there exists $y' \in E^\sim$ such that $0 \leq y' \leq x'$ and

$$(x^-, x') = -(x, y'),$$

Since A is an order ideal, we have $y' \in A^+$. Hence $(x, y') \geq 0$ by assumption, and we see that $(x^-, x') \leq 0$. On the other hand, it is clear that $(x^-, x') \geq 0$. We conclude that $(x^-, x') = 0$ for all $x' \in A^+$, so that $(x^-, x') = 0$ for all $x' \in A$. Then $x^- = 0$ by the separation property of A , and therefore $x \in E^+$. $\square$

As a consequence, a Riesz space is normal in the sense of our Definition 3.6 if and only if $E_n^\sim$ separates the points of E , i.e. if and only if it is normal in the sense of [1, p. 21]. For Riesz spaces, therefore, our notion of normality coincides with the one in the literature.

The importance of normality for our work lies in the following observation.

Proposition 3.8. *Let E be a normal partially ordered vector space. Suppose that $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a net in E , and that $x \in E$.*

- (1) *If $x_\lambda \downarrow$, then $x_\lambda \downarrow x$ if and only if $(x, x') = \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (x_\lambda, x')$ for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$.*
- (2) *If $x_\lambda \uparrow$, then $x_\lambda \uparrow x$ if and only if $(x, x') = \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (x_\lambda, x')$ for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$.*

PROOF. We prove part (1) where $x_\lambda \downarrow$; part (2) follows from this.

If $x_\lambda \downarrow x$, so that $x_\lambda - x \downarrow 0$, and if $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$, then, by definition, $(x_\lambda - x, x') \downarrow 0$. Hence $(x_\lambda, x') \downarrow (x, x')$, so that, in particular, $(x, x') = \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (x_\lambda, x')$.

Conversely, suppose that $(x, x') = \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (x_\lambda, x')$ for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$.

With $\lambda \in \Lambda$ fixed, we then have $(x, x') \leq (x_\lambda, x')$, or $(x - x_\lambda, x') \leq 0$, for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$. Since E is normal, we conclude that $x \leq x_\lambda$. Hence x is a lower bound of $\{x_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$.

If $\tilde{x}$ is a lower bound of $\{x_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$, and if $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$ is fixed, then certainly $(\tilde{x}, x') \leq (x_\lambda, x')$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Hence $(\tilde{x}, x') \leq \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (x_\lambda, x')$. Since the right hand side of this inequality equals (x, x') by assumption, we have $(\tilde{x}, x') \leq (x, x')$ for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$. Since E is normal, we see that $\tilde{x} \leq x$.

We conclude that $x = \bigwedge \{x_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$. Hence $x_\lambda \downarrow x$. $\square$

A similar proof establishes the following.

Proposition 3.9. *Let E be a σ -normal partially ordered vector space. Suppose that $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence in E , and that $x \in E$.*

- (1) *If $x_n \downarrow$, then $x_n \downarrow x$ if and only if $(x, x') = \inf_{n \geq 1} (x_n, x')$ for all $x' \in (E_c^\sim)^+$.*
- (2) *If $x_n \uparrow$, then $x_n \uparrow x$ if and only if $(x, x') = \sup_{n \geq 1} (x_n, x')$ for all $x' \in (E_c^\sim)^+$.*

As mentioned in the introduction of this section, the partially ordered vector spaces that are both normal and monotone complete are a convenient context for a vector-valued Riesz representation theorems. Therefore, we include a number of examples.

Proposition 3.10. *A Banach lattice with order continuous norm is a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space.*

PROOF. The space E is Dedekind complete since the norm is order continuous (see [3, Corollary 4.10]). Hence E is certainly monotone complete. It follows easily from the fact that $E^\sim = E^*$ and the order continuity of the norm that $E^\sim = E_n^\sim$. Hence $E_n^\sim = E^*$. Since E^* separates the points of E , Lemma 3.7 shows that E is normal. $\square$

Proposition 3.11. *Let E be a partially ordered vector space with a generating positive cone, let F be a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and let V be a linear subspace of $L(E, F)$ that contains $L_r(E, F)$.*

Then V is a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space.

PROOF. Proposition 3.1 shows that V is monotone complete. In order to prove that it is normal, we define, for $x \in E^+$ and $x' \in (F_n^\sim)^+$, the linear functional $\varphi_{x,x'} : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $(T, \varphi_{x,x'}) = (Tx, x')$ for $T \in V$. Then $\varphi_{x,x'}$ is evidently positive. We claim that it is order continuous. To see this, fix $x \in E$ and $x' \in (F_n^\sim)^+$, and suppose that $T_\lambda \downarrow 0$ in V . By Proposition 3.1, this implies that $T_\lambda x \downarrow 0$. Since x' is order continuous, it then follows that $(T_\lambda x, x') \downarrow 0$. Hence $\varphi_{x,x'}$ is order continuous, and we conclude that $\varphi_{x,x'} \in (V_n^\sim)^+$. Finally, suppose that $T \in V$ is such that $(T, \varphi_{x,x'}) \geq 0$ for all $x \in E^+$ and $x' \in (F_n^\sim)^+$. Since F is normal, this implies that $Tx \geq 0$ for all $x \in E^+$. Hence $T \geq 0$. This proves that V is normal. $\square$

The following example is a continuation of Proposition 3.2.

Proposition 3.12. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space, and let L be a weakly closed complex linear subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Let L_{sa} be the real vector space that consists of the self-adjoint elements of L , supplied with the partial ordering that is inherited from the usual partial ordering on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{sa}$. Then L_{sa} is a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space.*

PROOF. In view of Proposition 3.2, we need to prove only that L_{sa} is normal. To this end, we define, for $x \in \mathcal{H}$, the linear functional $\varphi_x : L_{sa} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $(T, \varphi_x) = \langle Tx, x \rangle$ for $T \in L_{sa}$; here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product on $\mathcal{H}$. Then φ_x is clearly positive. We claim that φ_x is order continuous. To see this, suppose that $T_\lambda \downarrow 0$. By Proposition 3.2, this implies that $\text{SOT-}\lim_\lambda T_\lambda = 0$. In particular, we have $(T_\lambda, \varphi_x) = \langle T_\lambda x, x \rangle \downarrow 0$. Hence φ_x is order continuous, and we conclude that $\varphi_x \in (V_n^\sim)^+$. Finally, suppose that $T \in L_{sa}$ is such that $(T, \varphi_x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Hence $\langle Tx, x \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$, so that $T \geq 0$. This proves that L_{sa} is normal. $\square$

Propositions 3.10 to 3.12 can be combined in various ways. The following immediate result seems worth recording explicitly.

Theorem 3.13. *Let E be a partially ordered vector space with a generating positive cone.*

If F is a Banach lattice with order continuous norm, and if V is a linear subspace of $L(E, F)$ that contains $L_r(E, F)$, then V is a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space. In particular, $L_r(E)$ is a normal and Dedekind complete Riesz space for every Banach lattice E with order continuous norm.

If L is a weakly closed subspace of the linear operators on a complex Hilbert space, with self-adjoint part L_{sa} , and if V is a linear subspace of $L(E, L_{sa})$ that contains $L_r(E, L_{sa})$, then V is a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space. In particular, $L_r(L_{sa})$ is a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space.

§4. Partially ordered algebras

In this section, we establish some basic facts about partially ordered algebras. They will form the context for an abstract existence theorem for spectral measures representing positive homomorphisms from $C_c(X)$ or $C_0(X)$ into such algebras (see Theorem 15.1), that can later be specialised to (positive) representations on KB-spaces or Hilbert spaces (see Theorems 15.2 and 15.3).

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an associative algebra that is also a partially ordered vector space. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is an *partially ordered algebra* if $ab \in \mathcal{A}^+$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^+$. We do not suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ has an identity element or, if so, that the identity element is positive.

If $\mathcal{A}$ is a partially ordered algebra, then we shall say that the multiplication in $\mathcal{A}$ is *σ -monotone continuous* if, whenever $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{A}^+$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$ are such that $a_n \uparrow a$, then $ba_n \uparrow ba$ and $a_n b \uparrow ab$ for all $b \in \mathcal{A}^+$. The multiplication is *monotone continuous* if, whenever $\{a_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^+$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$ are such that $a_\lambda \uparrow a$, then $ba_\lambda \uparrow ba$ and $a_\lambda b \uparrow ab$ for all $b \in \mathcal{A}^+$.

Remark 4.1. Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ is a Riesz algebra. Then the multiplication in $\mathcal{A}$ is σ -monotone continuous (resp. monotone continuous) in our sense if and only if, for all $b \in \mathcal{A}$, the multiplication operators $a \mapsto ba$ and $a \mapsto ab$ are σ -order continuous (resp. order continuous) operators on $\mathcal{A}$ in the sense of [28, p. 123]. This is an easy consequence of the fact that $\mathcal{A}^+$ generates $\mathcal{A}$ and the observation that linear combinations of positive operators that are order continuous in the sense of [28, p. 123] are again order continuous in the same sense.

The following easy observation is convenient.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a partially ordered algebra such that multiplication is monotone continuous.*

If $\{a_{\lambda_1}\}_{\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1}, \{b_{\lambda_2}\}_{\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2} \subset \mathcal{A}^+$, and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^+$ are such that $a_{\lambda_1} \uparrow a$ and $b_{\lambda_2} \uparrow b$, then $a_{\lambda_1} b_{\lambda_2} \uparrow ab$.

If $\{a_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}, \{b_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \subset \mathcal{A}^+$, and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^+$ are such that $a_\lambda \uparrow a$ and $b_\lambda \uparrow b$, then $a_\lambda b_\lambda \uparrow ab$.

If the multiplication is σ -monotone continuous the analogous statements for the term-wise product of two sequences are true.

PROOF. We cover the general and the sequential case both statements at the same time.

Let $\{a_{\lambda_1}\}_{\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1}$ and $\{b_{\lambda_2}\}_{\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2}$ be increasing nets (possibly increasing sequences) in $\mathcal{A}^+$, and let $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^+$ be such that $a_{\lambda_1} \uparrow a$ and $b_{\lambda_2} \uparrow b$. Certainly $a_{\lambda_1} b_{\lambda_2} \leq ab$ for all $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2$. Suppose that $u \in E$ is such that $a_{\lambda_1} b_{\lambda_2} \leq u$ for all $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2$. Then the (σ) -monotone order continuity of the left multiplication in $\mathcal{A}$ implies that $a_{\lambda_1} b \leq u$ for all $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1$, and the (σ) -monotone continuity of the right multiplication then shows that $ab \leq u$. Hence $a_{\lambda_1} b_{\lambda_2} \uparrow ab$.

Let $\{a_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}, \{b_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \subset \mathcal{A}^+$ be increasing nets (possibly sequences) in $\mathcal{A}^+$, and let $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^+$ be such that $a_\lambda \uparrow a$ and $b_\lambda \uparrow b$. Certainly $a_\lambda b_\lambda \leq ab$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Suppose that $u \geq a_\lambda b_\lambda$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. If $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda$, then there exists $\lambda_3 \in \Lambda$ such that $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_3$ and $\lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3$. This implies that $a_{\lambda_1} b_{\lambda_2} \leq a_{\lambda_3} a_{\lambda_3} \leq u$. As in the first part of the proof, the (σ) -monotone order continuity of the multiplication in $\mathcal{A}$ then yields that $u \geq ab$. Hence $a_\lambda b_\lambda \uparrow ab$. $\square$

We include two important classes of partially ordered algebras with monotone continuous multiplication.

Proposition 4.3. *Let E be a Banach lattice with order continuous norm. Then every regular operator on E is order continuous, and $L_r(E)$ is a normal and Dedekind complete Riesz algebra with monotone continuous multiplication.*

PROOF. To see that every regular operator on E is order continuous, it suffices to show this for a positive operator T on E . If $0 \leq x_\lambda \uparrow x$, then $x_\lambda \rightarrow x$ in norm since the norm is order continuous. Then $Tx_\lambda \rightarrow Tx$ in norm. As is well known, the fact that $Tx_\lambda \uparrow$ then implies that $Tx_\lambda \uparrow Tx$. Hence T is order continuous.

Suppose that $T \in L_r(E)^+$ and that $0 \leq S_\lambda \uparrow S$ in $L_r(E)$. If $x \in E^+$, then $0 \leq S_\lambda x \uparrow Sx$, and the order continuity of T implies that $TS_\lambda x \uparrow TSx$. Hence $TS_\lambda \uparrow TS$ in $L_r(E)$, so that the left multiplication in $L_r(E)$ is monotone order continuous. Furthermore, since $Tx \geq 0$ for $x \geq 0$, we have $S_\lambda Tx = S_\lambda(Tx) \uparrow S(Tx) = STx$ for $x \geq 0$. Hence $S_\lambda T \uparrow ST$ in $L_r(E)$, so that the right multiplication in $L_r(E)$ is monotone order continuous.

We know from Theorem 3.13 that $L_r(E)$ is a Dedekind complete Riesz space. $\square$

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space, and let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a commutative von Neumann algebra. Let $\mathcal{A}_{sa}$ be the real vector space that consists of the self-adjoint elements of $\mathcal{A}$, supplied with the partial ordering that is inherited from the usual partial ordering on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{sa}$. Then $\mathcal{A}_{sa}$ is a normal and Dedekind complete Riesz algebra with monotone continuous multiplication.*

PROOF. There exists a compact Hausdorff space X such that $\mathcal{A}$ is isomorphic to $C(X, \mathbb{C})$ as a C^* -algebra. It is then clear that $\mathcal{A}_{sa}$ is an algebra, and that it is a Riesz space. We know from Proposition 3.12 that it is normal and monotone complete.

We turn to the multiplication. Suppose that $T \in \mathcal{A}_{sa}^+$ and that $0 \leq S_\lambda \uparrow S$ in $\mathcal{A}_{sa}$. Then $S = \text{SOT-}\lim_\lambda S_\lambda$ by Proposition 3.2, and this implies that $TS = \text{SOT-}\lim_\lambda TS_\lambda$. Since $0 \leq TS_\lambda \uparrow TS$ (this is clear in the $C(X, \mathbb{C})$ -model), Proposition 3.2 implies that $TS_\lambda \uparrow TS$ in $\mathcal{A}_{sa}$. A similar argument shows that $S_\lambda T \uparrow ST$ in $\mathcal{A}_{sa}$. Hence the multiplication in $\mathcal{A}_{sa}$ is monotone order continuous. $\square$

§5. Positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measures

This section is concerned with the basics of the theory of measures with values in the extended positive cone $\overline{E}^+$ of a partially ordered vector space E .

A *measurable space* is a pair (X, Ω) , where X is a set and Ω is an algebra of subsets of X ; i.e. Ω is a non-empty collection of subsets of X that is closed under taking complements and under taking finite unions. For the moment, we can still work with algebras of subsets, rather than σ -algebras. The elements of Ω are the *measurable subsets* of X .

The σ -additivity of a measure $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$ requires that $\mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mu(A_n)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$, whenever $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is pairwise disjoint sequence in Ω such that $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n \in \Omega$. For a measure μ taking values in a vector space E that need not have a topology, such a requirement involving a series is meaningless. If E is a partially ordered vector space and μ is suppose to be positive, however, the requirement for the real-valued case can be rewritten in a way that does admit a generalisation. Indeed, if μ takes values in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$, then one can equivalently require that $\mu(A) = \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$. Since this involves only finite sums, this solves the convergence issue, but now one will want to guarantee that the supremum in the right hand side always exists: the topological requirement has to be replaced by an order completeness requirement. The natural minimal way to ensure this is by supposing that E is σ -monotone complete.

The following definition is, therefore, a natural one. We recall that the extension $\overline{E}$ of a partially ordered vector space E has been introduced in Section 2.

Definition 5.1. Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, and let E be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space. A *positive $\bar{E}$ -valued measure* is a map $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow \bar{E}^+$ such that:

- (1) $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$;
- (2) whenever $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a pairwise disjoint sequence in Ω with $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n \in \Omega$, then

$$(5.1) \quad \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right) = \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)$$

in $\bar{E}$.

Since the partial sums form an increasing sequence in $\bar{E}$ as a consequence of $\mu(\Omega) \subseteq \bar{E}^+$, it follows from part (1) of Lemma 2.5 that, for a given enumeration of the A_n , the right hand side of equation (5.1) always exists in $\bar{E}$. A moment's thought shows that this supremum is actually independent of the choice for the enumeration.

A quadruple (X, Ω, μ, E) , where X is a set, Ω is an algebra of subsets of X , E is a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow \bar{E}^+$ is a positive $\bar{E}$ -valued measure, will be called a *measure space*.

In view of the motivation above, we shall refer to the property under part (2) of Definition 5.1 as the σ -additivity of μ .

If $\mu(X) \in E$, then we say that μ is *finite*, or that it is *E-valued*. It will follow from part (2) of Lemma 5.4 that then $\mu(A) \in E^+$ for all $A \in \Omega$. If μ is not finite, i.e. if $\mu(X) = \infty$, then it is said to be *infinite*.

A measurable subset A of X is σ -finite if there exists a sequence $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in Ω such that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n$ and $\mu(A_n) \in E^+$ for all $n \geq 1$. If X is σ -finite, then we say that μ is a σ -finite measure.

A *null set* is a measurable subset of X with measure zero. A measure space is called *complete* if a subset of a null set is still a measurable subset. It will follow from part (2) of Lemma 5.4 that a measurable subset of a null set is again a null set.

A property that a point x in X may or may not have is said to hold μ -almost everywhere, or to hold for μ -almost all x in X , if the subset of X consisting of those points that do not have this property is contained in a null set. It is not required that this subset of exceptional points be measurable. If the measure is clear from the context, we shall simply write that the property holds almost everywhere, or that it holds for almost all x in X .

Before we proceed with the general theory, let us consider two particular contexts that we have in mind if E happens to be a space of operators. They show that, in various practical situations, our ordered requirement for the σ -additivity of a measure is the same as the classical σ -additivity in the strong operator topology for spectral measures.

Lemma 5.2. Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, let E be Dedekind complete Banach lattice, let $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow L_r(E)^+$ be a set map such that $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$, and let $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \Omega$ be such that $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n \in \Omega$.

- (1) If $\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)x = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mu(A_n)x$ in the norm topology on E for all $x \in E$, then $\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right) = \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)$ in $L_r(E)$.
- (2) If $\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right) = \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)$ in $L_r(E)$ and if the norm on E is σ -order continuous, then $\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)x = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mu(A_n)x$ in the norm topology of E for all $x \in E$.

PROOF. We prove part (1). If $x \in E^+$, then $\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)x \uparrow$. Since this increasing sequence is norm convergent, its norm limit is also its supremum, i.e. $\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)x \uparrow \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mu(A_n)x = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)x$. This shows that $\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n) \uparrow \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)$.

We prove part (2). Let $x \in E^+$. Since $\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n) \uparrow \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)$, we have $\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)x \uparrow \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)x$. Since the norm is σ -order continuous, we see that $\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)x = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mu(A_n)x$ in the norm topology of E . By linearity, this is then also true for arbitrary $x \in E$. $\square$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space, and let L be a weakly closed complex linear subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Let L_{sa} be the real vector space that consists of the self-adjoint elements of L , supplied with the partial ordering that is inherited from the usual partial ordering on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\text{sa}}$.*

Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, and let $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow L_{\text{sa}}^+$ be a set map such that $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$, and let $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \Omega$ be such that $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n \in \Omega$.

Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) $\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right) = \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)$ in L_{sa} ;
- (2) $\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)x = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mu(A_n)x$ in the norm topology of $\mathcal{H}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

PROOF. It is immediate from Proposition 3.2 that part (1) implies part (2).

We prove that part (2) implies part (1). For each $N \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)x, x \right\rangle &= \sum_{n=1}^N \langle \mu(A_n)x, x \rangle \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty \langle \mu(A_n)x, x \rangle \\ &= \left\langle \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mu(A_n)x, x \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)x, x \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We thus see that $\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)$ for all $N \geq 1$. Since $\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n) \uparrow$, Proposition 3.2 shows that the sequence has a supremum in L_{sa} , and that this supremum is also its SOT-limit. It is obvious from the validity of part (2) that this SOT-limit is $\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right)$. $\square$

We shall now collect a few basic facts, all to be expected, in the following result.

Lemma 5.4. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space.*

- (1) *If $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \Omega$ are pairwise disjoint measurable sets, then $\mu\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(A_i)$ in $\bar{E}$.*
- (2) *If $A_1, A_2 \in \Omega$ and $A_1 \subseteq A_2$, then $\mu(A_1) \leq \mu(A_2)$ in $\bar{E}$.*
- (3) *If $A_1, A_2 \in \Omega$, then $\mu(A_1) + \mu(A_2) = \mu(A_1 \cap A_2) + \mu(A_1 \cup A_2)$ in $\bar{E}$.*
- (4) *If $A_1, A_2 \in \Omega$, $A_1 \supseteq A_2$, and $\mu(A_2) \in E$, then $\mu(A_1 \setminus A_2) = \mu(A_1) - \mu(A_2)$ in $\bar{E}$.*
- (5) *If $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence in Ω with $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n \in \Omega$, then*

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n),$$

in $\bar{E}$.

PROOF. Part (1) follows from the definitions when choosing $A_k = \emptyset$ for $k \geq n+1$.

Part (2) is immediate from Part (1).

For part (3), we use the disjoint decomposition $A_1 = (A_1 \cap A_2) \cup (A_1 \setminus A_2)$ and part (1) to see that

$$\mu(A_1) = \mu(A_1 \cap A_2) + \mu(A_1 \setminus A_2).$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mu(A_2) = \mu(A_2 \cap A_1) + \mu(A_2 \setminus A_1).$$

Hence

$$\mu(A_1) + \mu(A_2) = 2\mu(A_1 \cap A_2) + \mu(A_1 \setminus A_2) + \mu(A_2 \setminus A_1).$$

Since $A_1 \cap A_2$, $A_1 \setminus A_2$, and $A_2 \setminus A_1$ are pairwise disjoint, and since their union equals $A_1 \cup A_2$, part (1) shows that the right hand side of the above equation equals $\mu(A_1 \cap A_2) + \mu(A_1 \cup A_2)$, as required.

For part (4), we use part (1) to see that $\mu(A_1) = \mu(A_2) + \mu(A_1 \setminus A_2)$. Since $\mu(A_2) \in E$, it has an inverse $-\mu(A_2)$ in the semigroup $\bar{E}$, and adding this inverse to both sides yields that $\mu(A_1 \setminus A_2) = \mu(A_1) - \mu(A_2)$, as required.

For part (5), we let $\tilde{A}_1 = A_1$ and $\tilde{A}_n = A_n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} A_k$ for $n \geq 2$. Then, using part (2), we see that

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{A}_n\right) = \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(\tilde{A}_n) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n).$$

□

We continue with a first rudimentary form of the monotone convergence theorem (Theorem 9.9).

Proposition 5.5. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space.*

If $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is an increasing sequence in Ω such that $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \Omega$, then $\mu(A_n) \uparrow \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right)$ in $\bar{E}$.

Note that, since $\mu(A_n) \uparrow$ in $\bar{E}$, $\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$ does indeed exist in $\bar{E}$ by part (1) of Lemma 2.5.

PROOF. Let us first suppose that $\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) \in E$. In that case, $\mu(A_n) \in E$ for all $n \geq 1$. Set $\tilde{A}_1 := A_1$ and $\tilde{A}_n := A_n \setminus A_{n-1}$ for $n \geq 2$. Then $\{\tilde{A}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a pairwise disjoint sequence in Ω such that $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{A}_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \Omega$. Since $\mu(\tilde{A}_n) = \mu(A_n) - \mu(A_{n-1})$ for $n \geq 2$ by part (4) of Lemma 5.4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) &= \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{A}_n\right) \\ &= \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(\tilde{A}_n) \\ &= \bigvee_{N=2}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(\tilde{A}_n) \\ &= \bigvee_{N=2}^{\infty} \left[\mu(A_1) + \sum_{n=2}^N (\mu(A_n) - \mu(A_{n-1})) \right] \\ &= \bigvee_{N=2}^{\infty} \mu(A_N) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n).$$

If $\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) = \infty$, then certainly

$$\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) \geq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right).$$

On the other hand, by the monotonicity of the measure, we obviously have $\mu(A_n) \leq \mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n)$ for all $n \geq 1$. Hence also

$$\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right)$$

in $\overline{E}$. □

Naturally, Proposition 5.5 implies the usual counterpart for decreasing sequences of measurable subsets; it is a rudimentary form of the dominated convergence theorem (Theorem 9.13).

Proposition 5.6. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space.*

If $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a decreasing sequence in Ω with $\mu(A_1) \in E$ such that $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \Omega$, then $\mu(A_n) \downarrow \mu\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right)$ in E .

PROOF. Set $A := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$. Since $A_1 \setminus A_n \uparrow \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (A_1 \setminus A_n) = A_1 \setminus A$, Proposition 5.5, combined with part (4) of Lemma 5.4 and part (6) of Lemma 2.3, shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A_1) &= \mu(A) + \mu(A_1 \setminus A) = \mu(A) + \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_1 \setminus A_n) = \mu(A) + \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} (\mu(A_1) - \mu(A_n)) \\ &= \mu(A) + \mu(A_1) + \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} (-\mu(A_n)) = \mu(A) + \mu(A_1) - \bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) \end{aligned}$$

in $\overline{E}$. Since $\mu(A_1)$ and $\bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$ have an inverse in $\overline{E}$, terms can be cancelled to conclude that $\bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) = \mu(A)$. □

The final result of this section is a generalisation of the Borel-Cantelli lemma. We refer to [6, Exercise 1.2.89] for this classical result for a probability measure. Note, however, that our measure need not be finite. This is the reason of the appearance of a finiteness condition in part (2) that is automatically satisfied for probability measures.

Lemma 5.7 (Borel-Cantelli lemma). *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, and let $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in Ω . Suppose that $B_k := \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} A_n \in \Omega$ for all $k \geq 1$, and that $B := \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} A_n \in \Omega$.*

- (1) *If $\bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n) \in E$, then $\mu(B) = 0$.*
- (2) *If $\mu((\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) \setminus B) \in E$, then $\mu(B) \geq x$ in $\overline{E}$ for all $x \in E$ with the property that $\mu(A_n) \geq x$ for all $n \geq 1$.*

Note that in part (2) it is not asserted that $\mu(B)$ is finite.

PROOF. We start by proving part (1). It is clear from the fact that $B \subseteq B_k$ and Lemma 5.4 that

$$(5.2) \quad \mu(B) \leq \mu(B_k) \leq \bigvee_{N=k}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k}^N \mu(A_n)$$

in $\bar{E}$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Furthermore, for all $k \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n) &= \bigvee_{N=k}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n) \\ &= \bigvee_{N=k}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{k-1} \mu(A_n) + \sum_{n=k}^N \mu(A_n) \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{k-1} \mu(A_n) + \bigvee_{N=k}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k}^N \mu(A_n) \end{aligned}$$

in $\bar{E}$. Since $\bigvee_{N=k}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k}^N \mu(A_n)$ is finite for all $k \geq 2$, combination with equation (5.2) yields that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{k-1} \mu(A_n) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n) - \mu(B)$$

in $\bar{E}$ for all $k \geq 2$. Hence

$$\bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n) - \mu(B)$$

in $\bar{E}$. Since $\bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)$ is finite, we see that $\mu(B) \leq 0$, and we conclude that $\mu(B) = 0$.

We turn to part (2). Since clearly $\mu(B_k) \geq \mu(A_k) \geq x$ for all $k \geq 1$, we have

$$(5.3) \quad \bigwedge_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_k) \geq x,$$

where we note that the infimum in the left hand side exists since $\mu(B_k) \downarrow$.

Since $B_k \setminus B \downarrow \emptyset$ and since $\mu(B_1 \setminus B) = \mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \setminus B) \in E$ by assumption, Proposition 5.6 implies that

$$(5.4) \quad \bigwedge_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_k \setminus B) = 0.$$

Combining equations (5.3) and (5.4) with part (2) of Lemma 2.4, we see that

$$\mu(B) = \mu(B) + \bigwedge_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_k \setminus B) = \bigwedge_{k=1}^{\infty} (\mu(B) + \mu(B_k \setminus B)) = \bigwedge_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_k) \geq x$$

in $\bar{E}$. □

§6. Positive $\bar{E}$ -valued outer measures

In the proof of one of the Riesz representation theorems (Theorem 12.3), we shall use an outer measure and the ensuing measure on the σ -algebra of measurable subsets in the vector-valued context. The present section contains the relevant material, which is a modest modification of that for the real case in [2, Section 11].

Throughout this section, X is a set and E is a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space.

We begin with the definition of a positive $\bar{E}$ -valued outer measure.

Definition 6.1. A map $\mu^* : 2^X \rightarrow \overline{E}^+$ is called a *positive $\overline{E}$ -valued outer measure* if

- (1) $\mu^*(\emptyset) = 0$;
- (2) $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(B)$ for all $A, B \in 2^X$ such that $A \subseteq B$;
- (3) for every sequence $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of subsets of X ,

$$\mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu^*(A_n).$$

The combination of the parts (1) and (3) shows that μ^* is not only σ -sub-additive, but also finitely sub-additive.

Definition 6.2. A subset A of X is called μ^* -*measurable* if, for all $B \subseteq X$,

$$(6.1) \quad \mu^*(B) = \mu^*(B \cap A) + \mu^*(B \cap A^c).$$

We let Ω denote the collection of all μ^* -measurable subsets of X . Obviously, $\emptyset, X \in \Omega$ and equally obviously Ω is invariant under taking complements. We shall proceed to show that Ω is a σ -algebra, and that the restriction of μ^* to Ω is a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure.

Lemma 6.3. Let A_1, A_2 be subsets of X such that $A_1 \in \Omega$ and $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$. Then, for any subset B of X ,

$$\mu^*(B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)) = \mu^*(B \cap A_1) + \mu^*(B \cap A_2).$$

PROOF. Using that A_1 is μ^* -measurable and that $(A_1 \cup A_2) \cap A_1^c = A_2$, we see that, for any $B \subseteq X$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)) &= \mu^*([B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)] \cap A_1) + \mu^*([B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)] \cap A_1^c) \\ &= \mu^*(B \cap A_1) + \mu^*(B \cap A_2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Applying Lemma 6.3 for $B = X$ yields the following.

Corollary 6.4. Let A_1, A_2 be subsets of X such that $A_1 \in \Omega$ and $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$. Then $\mu^*(A_1 \cup A_2) = \mu^*(A_1) + \mu^*(A_2)$.

The following result shows that, also in the vector-valued context, everything is as expected.

Theorem 6.5. Let X be a set, let E be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and let $\mu^* : 2^X \rightarrow \overline{E}^+$ be a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued outer measure.

Then the set Ω of μ^* -measurable subsets of X is a σ -algebra. Furthermore, the restriction of μ^* to Ω is a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure on Ω .

PROOF. We start by proving that Ω is a σ -algebra. We have already observed that $\emptyset \in \Omega$ and that Ω is invariant under taking complements, so it remains to be shown that Ω is invariant under taking countable unions.

We show first that Ω is invariant under taking finite unions. Let A_1, A_2 in Ω . Set $A := A_1 \cup A_2$. Using the μ^* -measurability of A_1 for the first and the fourth equality, and that of A_2 for the third equality, we have, for any $B \subseteq X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(B \cap A) + \mu^*(B \cap A^c) &= \mu^*([B \cap A] \cap A_1) + \mu^*([B \cap A] \cap A_1^c) \\ &\quad + \mu^*([B \cap A^c] \cap A_1) + \mu^*([B \cap A^c] \cap A_1^c) \\ &= \mu^*(B \cap A_1) + \mu^*([B \cap A_1^c] \cap A_2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \mu^*(\emptyset) + \mu^*([B \cap A_1^c] \cap A_2^c) \\
 & = \mu^*(B \cap A_1) + \mu^*(B \cap A_1^c) \\
 & = \mu^*(B).
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence $A_1 \cup A_2 \in \Omega$, as desired. It follows that Ω is closed under taking finite unions.

Now suppose that $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence in Ω . We are to show that $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n$ is μ^* -measurable. Replacing A_n with $A_n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^n A_k$ for $n \geq 2$, which we now already know to be μ^* -measurable, we may and shall suppose that the A_n are pairwise disjoint. Set $F := \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n$, and $F_N := \bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n$ for $N \geq 1$; then the F_N are μ^* -measurable. Using the μ^* -measurability of F_N in the first step, the monotonicity of μ^* in the second step, and Lemma 6.3 and the fact that Ω is closed under taking finite unions in the third step, we see that, for all $N \geq 1$ and $B \subseteq X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu^*(B) & = \mu^*(B \cap F_N) + \mu^*(A \cap F_N^c) \\
 & \geq \mu^*(B \cap F_N) + \mu^*(A \cap F^c) \\
 & = \sum_{n=1}^N \mu^*(B \cap A_n) + \mu^*(A \cap F^c).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for each $N \geq 1$, combination with the σ -sub-additivity of μ^* implies that, for any $B \subseteq X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu^*(B) & \geq \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu^*(B \cap A_n) + \mu^*(B \cap F^c) \\
 & \geq \mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty (B \cap A_n)\right) + \mu^*(B \cap F^c) \\
 & = \mu^*(B \cap F) + \mu^*(B \cap F^c) \\
 & \geq \mu^*(B).
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence $F \in \Omega$, as desired.

We shall now show that μ^* is σ -additive on Ω . Let $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a pairwise disjoint sequence in Ω . The monotonicity of μ^* and the finite additivity of μ^* on Ω that follows from Corollary 6.4 show that, for all $N \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right) & \geq \mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n\right) \\
 & = \sum_{n=1}^N \mu^*(A_n).
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n\right) \geq \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu^*(A_n)$. Since the reverse inequality holds by the σ -sub-additivity of μ^* , we see that μ^* is σ -additive on Ω . $\square$

The following basic property carries over as well.

Lemma 6.6. *Let A be a subset of X such that $\mu^*(A) = 0$. Then A is μ^* -measurable.*

PROOF. If $\mu^*(A) = 0$, then, for any subset B of X ,

$$\mu^*(B) \leq \mu^*(B \cap A) + \mu^*(B \cap A^c) \leq \mu^*(A) + \mu^*(B) = \mu^*(B).$$

$\square$

§7. Measures on locally compact Hausdorff spaces

The uniqueness part of the classical Riesz representation involves the notion of regular Borel measures. There may be several measures on the Borel σ -algebra of a locally compact Hausdorff space X that represent a given positive linear map $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, but there is only one that is a regular Borel measure. In our vector-valued context, we shall have similar results, stating that there is a measure with certain regularity properties that represents a positive linear map $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ for a partially ordered vector space E , and that it is the unique representing measure within the class of measures that also have these regularity properties. In this section, we shall investigate such properties. The situation is somewhat more involved than for the real case.

If X is a locally compact Hausdorff space, then we let $\mathcal{B}$ denote its Borel σ -algebra, i.e. $\mathcal{B}$ is the σ -algebra that is generated by the open subsets of X .

If E is a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space, then we shall let $M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ denote the collection of all positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measures $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{E}^+$.

We shall distinguish the following regularity properties.

Definition 7.1. Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and let $\mu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$. Then μ is called:

- (1) a *Borel measure (on X)* if $\mu(K) \in E$ for all compact subset K ;
- (2) *inner regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}$* if $\mu(A) = \bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \}$ in $\overline{E}$;
- (3) *weakly inner regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}$* if $\mu(A) = \bigvee \{ \mu(A \cap K) : K \text{ is compact} \}$ in $\overline{E}$;
- (4) *outer regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}$* if $\mu(A) = \bigwedge \{ \mu(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \}$ in $\overline{E}$;
- (5) a *regular Borel measure (on X)* if μ is a Borel measure on X that is inner regular at all open subsets of X and outer regular at all Borel sets;
- (6) a *quasi-regular Borel measure (on X)* if it is a Borel measure on X that is inner regular at all open subsets of X and weakly inner regular at all Borel sets.

Note that the three subsets of E occurring in the above definitions are all directed in the appropriate directions, so that the two suprema and the infimum exist in $\overline{E}$ as a consequence of the monotone completeness of E ; σ -monotone completeness would not have sufficed here. In the sequel, there will be similar cases where the fact that a set is directed guarantees that a supremum or infimum exists, but we refrain from observing this explicitly each and every time.

To be entirely consistent with earlier terminology, it would be necessary to speak of, for example, a quasi-regular positive $\overline{E}$ -valued Borel measure, but it seems clearer to shorten the terminology somewhat in this particular context, it being understood that the measure takes values in $\overline{E}^+$ for some fixed monotone complete partially ordered vector space E or, for finite measures, in E^+ .

We let Υ denote the collection of relatively compact open subsets of X , i.e. the collection of open subsets of X with compact closure. Then Υ is closed under finite intersections and finite unions. Since every relatively compact open subset of X is contained in a compact one, and every compact subset of X is contained in a relatively compact open set, it is easy to see that μ is weakly inner regular at a Borel set A if and only if $\mu(A) = \bigvee \{ \mu(A \cap V) : V \in \Upsilon \}$ in $\overline{E}$.

The next small result relates the two regularity properties of a quasi-regular Borel measure.

Lemma 7.2. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a monotone complete partially ordered vector space, let $\mu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$, and let $A \in \mathcal{B}$. If μ is inner regular at A , then μ is weakly inner regular at A .*

PROOF. Using the inner regularity of μ at A in the first step, we merely need note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(A) &= \bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\ &\leq \bigvee \{ \mu(A \cap K) : K \text{ is compact} \} \\ &\leq \mu(A).\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 7.3. The terminology ‘quasi-regular’ is admittedly not very descriptive, but it is hard to find a more appealing nomenclature. It is also used in [24, p. 108] as well as in [26, p. 195] by the same author. It denotes different notions in these two papers, and these are also both different from ours.

We shall write $M_B(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ for the Borel measures on X , $M_{rB}(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ for the regular Borel measures on X , $M_{qrB}(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ for the quasi-regular Borel measures on X , $M_{rB}(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$ for the finite regular (Borel) measures on X , and $M_{qrB}(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$ for the finite quasi-regular (Borel) measures on X . Every finite measure is, of course, a Borel measure.

If U is an open subset of X , then U is a locally compact Hausdorff space in the induced topology. We shall denote its Borel σ -algebra by $\mathcal{B}_U$. It is then easy to see that $\mathcal{B}_U = \{B \in \mathcal{B} : B \subseteq U\}$, so that we can identify $\mathcal{B}_U$ with a subset of $\mathcal{B}$. If $\mu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$, then we let μ_U denote the restriction of μ to the subset $\mathcal{B}_U$ of $\mathcal{B}$. It is then a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure on $\mathcal{B}_U$.

We collect a few technical observations in the following result. The proofs are elementary.

Lemma 7.4. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a monotone complete partially ordered vector space, let $\mu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$, and let U be an open subset of X .*

- (1) *If μ is a Borel measure on X , then μ_U is a Borel measure on U .*
- (2) *If μ is inner regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}_U$, then so is μ_U ; and conversely.*
- (3) *If μ is outer regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}_U$, then so is μ_U ; and conversely.*
- (4) *If μ is a Borel measure on X and if $U \in \Upsilon$, then μ_U is a finite Borel measure on U .*
- (5) *If μ is a Borel measure on U for all $U \in \Upsilon$, then μ is a finite Borel measure on U for all $U \in \Upsilon$.*

The following is then clear.

Lemma 7.5. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space and let E be a monotone complete partially ordered vector space.*

If $\mu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ is a regular Borel measure on X , then, for all open subsets U of X , μ_U is a regular Borel measure on U .

If $E = \mathbb{R}$, then every regular Borel measure on X is inner regular at the σ -finite Borel sets; see [13, Proposition 7.5]. If E is normal, an analogous result holds in our case for Borel sets of finite measure. The step from the case of finite measure to the σ -finite case as in the proof of [13, Proposition 7.5] uses the linear ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ and does not seem to have an obvious analogue in the general situation.

Proposition 7.6. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and let $\mu \in M_{\text{rB}}(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$.*

Then μ is inner regular at all Borel sets of finite measure.

PROOF. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $\mu(A) \in E$. We are to prove that

$$\mu(A) = \bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \}.$$

It is clear that $\mu(A)$ is an upper bound of $\{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \}$. Using the normality of E , we shall show that it is the least upper bound.

Choose and fix $x' \in (E_n^-)^+$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.

Since $\mu(A) \in E$, the outer regularity of μ at A can be written as

$$\mu(A) = \bigwedge \{ \mu(V) : V \text{ is open, } A \subseteq V, \text{ and } \mu(V) \in E \}.$$

Proposition 3.8 then shows that

$$(\mu(A), x') = \inf \{ (\mu(V), x') : V \text{ is open, } A \subseteq V, \text{ and } \mu(V) \in E \}.$$

We can then choose and fix an open subset V such that $A \subseteq V$, $\mu(V) \in E$, and

$$(\mu(V), x') < (\mu(A), x') + \varepsilon/3.$$

Using the outer regularity of μ at $V \setminus A$, which also has finite measure, we can likewise choose and fix an open subset W such that $V \setminus A \subseteq W$, $\mu(W) \in E$, and

$$(\mu(W), x') < (\mu(V \setminus A), x') + \varepsilon/3.$$

By replacing W with the open subset $W \cap V$ we may and shall suppose that $W \subseteq V$. We have

$$(\mu(W), x') < (\mu(V \setminus A), x') + \varepsilon/3 = (\mu(V), x') - (\mu(A), x') + \varepsilon/3 < 2\varepsilon/3.$$

Using the inner regularity of μ at the open subset V and the normality of E , an application of Proposition 3.8 enables us to choose and fix a compact subset K_1 such that $K_1 \subseteq V$ and

$$(\mu(V), x') < (\mu(K_1), x') + \varepsilon/3.$$

Set $K_2 := K_1 \setminus W$. Then K_2 is compact and

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 &= K_1 \cap W^c \\ &\subseteq K_1 \cap (V \setminus A)^c \\ &= (K_1 \cap V^c) \cup (K_1 \cap A) \\ &= K_1 \cap A \\ &\subseteq A. \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} V \setminus K_2 &= V \cap (K_1^c \cup W) \\ &= (V \cap K_1^c) \cup (V \cap W) \\ &= (V \setminus K_1) \cup W. \end{aligned}$$

Combining all of the above, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu(A) - \mu(K_2), x') &= (\mu(A \setminus K_2), x') \\ &\leq (\mu(V \setminus K_2), x') \\ &= (\mu[(V \setminus K_1) \cup W], x') \\ &\leq (\mu(V \setminus K_1), x') + (\mu(W), x') \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= (\mu(V), x') - (\mu(K_1), x') + (\mu(W), x') \\
 &< \varepsilon + 2\varepsilon/3 \\
 &= \varepsilon.
 \end{aligned}$$

All in all, we have found a compact subset K_2 of A (depending on x' and ε) such that $(\mu(A), x') < (\mu(K_2), x') + 3\varepsilon$. Hence we conclude, for our fixed $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$, that

$$(\mu(A), x') = \sup \{ (\mu(K), x') : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \}.$$

Since this is true for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$, an appeal to Proposition 3.8 completes the proof. $\square$

We can use this to prove our next result.

Corollary 7.7. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and let $\mu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E^+})$ be such that, for all $U \in \Upsilon$, the restricted measure μ_U is a regular Borel measure on U .*

Suppose that A is a Borel set such that μ is weakly inner regular at A .

Then μ is inner regular at A .

PROOF. If $U \in \Upsilon$, then $A \cap U \in \mathcal{B}_U$ has finite measure. Hence an application of Proposition 7.6 to the regular Borel measure μ_U on U shows that

$$\mu(A \cap U) = \bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \cap U \}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu(A) &= \bigvee \{ \mu(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \cap U \text{ for some } U \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \}
 \end{aligned}$$

in $\overline{E}$. The last equation holds since the local compactness of X implies that, for any compact subset K with $K \subseteq A$, there exists a relatively compact open subset U such that $K \subseteq U$, and then $K \subseteq A \cap U$. $\square$

This has the following consequence.

Corollary 7.8. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and let $\mu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E^+})$ be such that, for all $U \in \Upsilon$, the restricted measure μ_U is a regular Borel measure on U .*

- (1) *If μ is weakly inner regular at all Borel sets, then μ is inner regular at all Borel sets.*
- (2) *If μ is a finite measure that is weakly inner regular at all Borel sets, then μ is both inner regular and outer regular at all Borel sets.*

PROOF. Part (1) is immediate from Corollary 7.7. In part (2), the inner regularity of μ at all Borel sets is clear from part (1). For the outer regularity, let $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Then the inner regularity of μ at A^c yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu(A) &= \mu(X) - \mu(A^c) \\
 &= \mu(X) - \bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A^c \} \\
 &= \mu(X) - \bigvee \{ \mu(X) - \mu(K^c) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A^c \} \\
 &= \bigwedge \{ \mu(K^c) : K \text{ is compact and } A \subseteq K^c \}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \bigwedge \{ \mu(U) : U \text{ is open and } A \subseteq U \} \\ &\geq \mu(A). \end{aligned}$$

Hence μ is outer regular at A . □

§8. Cones of measures

If X is a locally compact Hausdorff space, then the Banach lattice of real-valued signed regular Borel measures on X is isometrically lattice isomorphic to the norm dual of $C_0(X)$. In our case, if E is, for example, a Dedekind complete Riesz space, then one would like to be able to analogously identify the Riesz space of all regular maps from $C_0(X)$ into E with a Riesz space of sufficiently regular E -valued measures on the Borel σ -algebra of X . An attempt to establish such a result is not undertaken in the present body of work, but in this section we lay the foundations for further research in that direction by studying the properties of naturally occurring cones of measures. In Section 8.1 we start with measures on abstract spaces, and in Section 8.2 we specialise to measures on locally compact Hausdorff spaces.

8.1. Cones of general measures

If (X, Ω) is a measurable space and E is a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space, then we let $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$ denote the collection of all positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measures on Ω , and we write $M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ for the subset of finite measures. We define a partial ordering on $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$ and $M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ by saying that $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ when $\mu_1(A) \leq \mu_2(A)$ in $\overline{E}$ for all $A \in \Omega$. Then $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$ has a largest element, namely the measure μ such that $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\mu(A) = \infty$ if $A \in \Omega$ and $A \neq \emptyset$. If $M(X, \Omega, E^+) \neq \{0\}$, then $M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ does not have a largest element. The zero measure is the smallest element of both $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$ and $M(X, \Omega, E^+)$.

We collect a few basic properties of $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$ and $M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ in our next result.

Theorem 8.1. *Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, and let E be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space.*

- (1) *For $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$, define $\mu + \nu, r\mu : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{E}^+$ by*

$$\begin{aligned} (r\mu)(A) &:= r\mu(A), \\ (\mu + \nu)(A) &:= \mu(A) + \nu(A) \end{aligned}$$

for $A \in \Omega$.

Then $\mu + \nu, r\mu \in M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$. Furthermore, $\mu + \nu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ if and only if $\mu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ and $\nu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$, and, for $r > 0$, $r\mu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ if and only if $\mu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$.

- (2) *Suppose that E is actually Dedekind complete.*

- (a) *For all μ and ν in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$, the supremum $\mu \vee \nu$ in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$ exists. Moreover, we have*

$$(\mu \vee \nu)(A) = \bigvee \{ \mu(B) + \nu(A \setminus B) : B \in \Omega \text{ and } B \subseteq A \}$$

in $\overline{E}$ for all $A \in \Omega$. Furthermore, $\mu \vee \nu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ if and only if $\mu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ and $\nu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$.

- (b) For all $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$, the infimum $\mu \wedge \nu$ in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$ exists. Moreover, we have

$$(\mu \wedge \nu)(A) = \bigwedge \{ \mu(B) + \nu(A \setminus B) : B \in \Omega \text{ and } B \subseteq A \}$$

in $\overline{E}$ for all $A \in \Omega$. The measure $\mu \wedge \nu$ is finite.

- (c) For all $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$, we have

$$\mu \vee \nu + \mu \wedge \nu = \mu + \nu.$$

The Dedekind completeness of E ensures that the suprema and infima occurring in part (2) exist in $\overline{E}$; see part (3) of Lemma 2.5.

PROOF. Using part (7) of Lemma 2.3 (resp. part (2) of Lemma 2.4), one sees easily that $r\mu \in M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$ (resp. $\mu + \nu \in M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$). The statements about finiteness are obvious.

We turn to part (2), where we assume that E is Dedekind complete.

We start with part (2.a) concerning $\mu \vee \nu$. For this, we define a set map $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{E}^+$ by

$$(8.1) \quad \xi(A) := \bigvee \{ \mu(B) + \nu(A \setminus B) : B \in \Omega \text{ and } B \subseteq A \}.$$

We shall verify that ξ is a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure, i.e. that $\xi \in M(X, \Omega, \overline{E}^+)$.

It is clear that $\xi(\emptyset) = 0$.

Furthermore, ξ is monotone. Indeed, suppose that $A_1, A_2 \in \Omega$ and that $A_1 \subseteq A_2$. If $B \in \Omega$ is such that $B \subseteq A_1$, then $B \subseteq A_2$, and $\nu(A_1 \setminus B) \leq \nu(A_2 \setminus B)$. It follows from this that $\xi(A_1) \leq \xi(A_2)$.

We shall now establish the finite additivity of ξ . Suppose that $A_1, A_2 \in \Omega$ and that $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$. Then the measurable subsets B of $A_1 \cup A_2$ are precisely the subsets of the form $B_1 \cup B_2$, where $B_1, B_2 \in \Omega$ are such that $B_1 \subseteq A_1$ and $B_2 \subseteq A_2$. Using part (1) of Lemma 2.4 in the penultimate step, we therefore see that

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(A_1 \cup A_2) &= \bigvee \{ \mu(B) + \nu((A_1 \cup A_2) \setminus B) : B \in \Omega, B \subseteq A_1 \cup A_2 \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ \mu(B_1 \cup B_2) + \nu((A_1 \cup A_2) \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)) : B_1, B_2 \in \Omega, B_1 \subseteq A_1, B_2 \subseteq A_2 \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ \mu(B_1) + \mu(B_2) + \nu(A_1 \setminus B_1) + \nu(A_2 \setminus B_2) : B_1, B_2 \in \Omega, B_1 \subseteq A_1, B_2 \subseteq A_2 \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ \mu(B_1) + \nu(A_1 \setminus B_1) : B_1 \in \Omega, B_1 \subseteq A_1 \} \\ &\quad + \bigvee \{ \mu(B_2) + \nu(A_2 \setminus B_2) : B_2 \in \Omega, B_2 \subseteq A_2 \} \\ &= \xi(A_1) + \xi(A_2). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that ξ is finitely additive.

We shall now show that ξ is σ -additive. Let $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a pairwise disjoint sequence in Ω such that $A := \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n$ is measurable. Since $A \supseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n$ for each $N \geq 1$, and since we already know that ξ is monotone and finitely additive, we see that $\xi(A) \geq \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \xi(A_n)$. We need to establish the reverse inequality. For every $B \in \Omega$ with $B \subseteq A$, we have, using part (2) of Lemma 2.4 in the third step,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B) + \nu(A \setminus B) &= \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty (A_n \cap B)\right) + \nu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty (A_n \setminus B)\right) \\ &= \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n \cap B) + \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \nu(A_n \setminus B) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N (\mu(A_n \cap B) + \nu(A_n \setminus B)) \\
&= \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N (\mu(A_n \cap B) + \nu(A_n \setminus (A_n \cap B))) \\
&\leq \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \xi(A_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\xi(A) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \xi(A_n)$, as required. This concludes the proof of the fact that $\xi \in M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$.

It remains to show that ξ is the least upper bound of $\{\mu, \nu\}$ in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$. By taking $B = \emptyset$ and $B = A$ in equation (8.1) it follows that $\xi \geq \nu$ and $\xi \geq \mu$. If $\xi' \in M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$ is any upper bound of $\{\mu, \nu\}$, and if $A \in \Omega$, then, for all $B \in \Omega$ such that $B \subseteq A$,

$$\xi'(A) = \xi'(B) + \xi'(A \setminus B) \geq \mu(B) + \nu(A \setminus B),$$

which implies that $\xi'(A) \geq \xi(A)$. Hence $\xi' \geq \xi$. This concludes the proof that $\xi = \mu \vee \nu$. The statement about finiteness is obvious.

We turn to part (2.b) concerning $\mu \wedge \nu$, where μ and ν are both finite. For this, we define the set map $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{E^+}$ by

$$(8.2) \quad \rho(A) := \bigwedge \{ \mu(B) + \nu(A \setminus B) : B \in \Omega \text{ and } B \subseteq A \}.$$

Then ρ takes only finite values, $\rho(\emptyset) = 0$, and ρ is monotone again. To see the latter, suppose that $A_1, A_2 \in \Omega$ and that $A_1 \subseteq A_2$. If $B \in \Omega$ is such that $B \subseteq A_2$, then $A_1 \setminus (B \cap A_1) \subseteq A_2 \setminus B$. Note that

$$\mu(A_1 \cap B) + \nu(A_1 \setminus (A_1 \cap B)) \leq \mu(B) + \nu(A_2 \setminus B).$$

Since $A_1 \cap B \subseteq A_1$, it follows from this that $\rho(A_1) \leq \rho(A_2)$.

An argument completely analogous to that for $\mu \vee \nu$ shows that ρ is finitely additive. It remains to show that ρ is σ -additive.

As a preparation, we demonstrate that ρ has the usual behaviour for a decreasing sequence of measurable sets. Let $\{B_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \Omega$ be a sequence in Ω such that $B_n \downarrow \emptyset$. We claim that $\rho(B_n) \downarrow 0$. To see this, note that $\rho(B_n) \leq \mu(B_n) + \nu(B_n)$. Since μ and ν are both finite, Proposition 5.6 shows that $\mu(B_n) \downarrow 0$ and $\nu(B_n) \downarrow 0$. Part (2) of Lemma 2.4 then yields that $\mu(B_n) + \nu(B_n) \downarrow 0$, and we conclude that $\rho(B_n) \downarrow 0$, as desired.

Suppose now that $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a pairwise disjoint sequence in Ω such that $A := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ is measurable. Set $B_1 := A_1$ and $B_N := A \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{N-1} A_n$ for $N \geq 2$. Then $B_N \downarrow \emptyset$, so $\rho(B_N) \downarrow 0$ by what we have just seen. Since ρ is finitely additive, and since $A = B_{N+1} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n$ is a disjoint union for $N \geq 1$, we see that

$$\rho(A) = \rho(B_{N+1}) + \sum_{n=1}^N \rho(A_n)$$

for $N \geq 1$, so that

$$\rho(A) - \rho(B_{N+1}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \rho(A_n)$$

for $N \geq 1$. Taking the supremum on each side, we have, since $-\rho(B_{N+1}) \uparrow 0$, that

$$\rho(A) = \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \rho(A_n).$$

Hence ρ is σ -additive.

The proof that ρ equals the infimum of $\{\mu, \nu\}$ is analogous to that above showing that ξ is the infimum of $\{\mu, \nu\}$.

We turn to part (2.c), where we suppose that μ and ν are both finite. We shall show that $\mu \vee \nu + \mu \wedge \nu = \mu + \nu$. Let $A \in \Omega$. Then, for all $B \in \Omega$ such that $B \subseteq A$, we have

$$\mu(B) + \nu(A \setminus B) + (\mu \vee \nu)(A) \geq \mu(B) + \nu(A \setminus B) + \mu(A \setminus B) + \nu(B) = \mu(A) + \nu(A).$$

Taking the infimum over all such B , we get

$$(\mu \wedge \nu)(A) + (\mu \vee \nu)(A) \geq \mu(A) + \nu(A).$$

Likewise, if $B \in \Omega$ and $B \subseteq A$, then

$$(\mu \wedge \nu)(A) + \mu(B) + \nu(A \setminus B) \leq \mu(A \setminus B) + \nu(B) + \mu(B) + \nu(A \setminus B) = \mu(A) + \nu(A),$$

and taking supremum over such B shows that

$$(\mu \wedge \nu)(A) + (\mu \vee \nu)(A) \leq \mu(A) + \nu(A).$$

Hence $\mu \vee \nu + \mu \wedge \nu = \mu + \nu$. □

Corollary 8.2. *Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, and let E be a Dedekind complete partially ordered vector space.*

Then $M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ is a lattice cone, and $\mu \vee \nu + \mu \wedge \nu = \mu + \nu$ for all $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \Omega, E^+)$.

The lattice operations in $M(X, \Omega, E^+)$ agree with those in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$.

Remark 8.3. For $E = \mathbb{R}$, it is a consequence of [2, Theorem 26.1]—stated in the context where Ω is a σ -algebra—that $M(X, \Omega, \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ is a lattice cone. The infimum of two possibly infinite measures μ and ν always exists in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ and is again given by the right hand side of equation (8.2). Contrary to the real case, part (2) of Theorem 8.1 asserts the existence of the infimum only if both measures are finite. When attempting to prove this for possibly infinite measures, the following problem was encountered. Suppose that, for $n \geq 1$, subsets $S_n \subseteq \overline{E^+}$ with infima ℓ_n are given such that $\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N s_n = \infty$ for all choices for $s_n \in S_n$. Is it then true that $\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \ell_n = \infty$? For spaces where this holds, $\mu \wedge \nu$ also exists for infinite μ and ν , and it is given by the right hand side of equation (8.2). For $E = \mathbb{R}$, this is indeed the case. Arguing by contradiction, suppose that $\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \ell_n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_n$ is finite. Then all ℓ_n are finite. For each n , we choose $s_n \in S_n$ such that $s_n \leq \ell_n + 1/2^n$. Then $\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N s_n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} s_n \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\ell_n + 1/2^n) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_n$ is finite. This is a contradiction, so that $\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \ell_n$ is infinite. There seems to be no reason, however, why this property should hold in general. The above proof for $\mathbb{R}$ makes use of its one-dimensionality and the notion of a convergent series, and it does not seem to generalise naturally to other classes of spaces, especially infinite-dimensional ones.

We regard this once more as an illustration that one should be rather careful when surmising that results from the real case generalise to the vector-valued case, even when they seem to be of a purely order-theoretic nature.

We have the following upward order completeness result; the sequential case for $E = \mathbb{R}$ is [2, Theorem 26.2]. We are not aware of a downward version for $E = \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 8.4. Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, and let E be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space.

If $\{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is an increasing sequence in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$, then the set function μ , defined by

$$\mu(A) = \bigvee \{ \mu_n(A) : n \geq 1 \}$$

for $A \in \Omega$, is a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure, and $\mu_n \uparrow \mu$ in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$.

Suppose that E is actually monotone complete, and that $\{\mu_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is an increasing net in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$. Then the set function μ , defined by

$$\mu(A) = \bigvee \{ \mu_\lambda(A) : \lambda \in \Lambda \}$$

for $A \in \Omega$, is a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure, and $\mu_\lambda \uparrow \mu$ in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$.

It may look strange that the sequences and nets are not required to be bounded from above, since this is a consequence of the conclusion. Since $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$ has a largest element this is, however, actually always the case.

PROOF. We prove both statements at the same time. Let $\{\mu_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be an increasing net (possibly an increasing sequence) in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$, and define $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{E^+}$ by

$$\mu(A) = \bigvee \{ \mu_\lambda(A) : \lambda \in \Lambda \}$$

for $A \in \Omega$. Note that the supremum exists in $\overline{E}$, as a consequence of either part (1) or part (3) of Lemma 2.5.

Clearly $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\mu_\lambda(A) \leq \mu(A)$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $A \in \Omega$. Since the μ_λ are monotone, so is μ . Furthermore, part (2) of Lemma 2.4 implies that the finite additivity of the μ_λ is inherited by μ .

Suppose that $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a pairwise disjoint sequence in Ω such that $A := \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n$ is measurable. Then, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$,

$$\mu_\lambda(A) = \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu_\lambda(A_n) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n).$$

Hence $\mu(A) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)$. On the other hand, μ is monotone and finitely additive, so, for all $N \geq 1$, we have $\mu(A) \geq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)$. Hence also $\mu(A) \geq \bigvee_{N=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)$. We conclude that μ is σ -additive. Now that we know that $\mu \in M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$, it is evident that μ is the supremum of the μ_λ in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$. $\square$

Combining the previous results, we have the following order completeness property. The asymmetry between the finite and the infinite case regarding the upper bounds is again not really there, since $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$ has a largest element.

Corollary 8.5. Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, and let E be a Dedekind complete partially ordered vector space. Suppose that $\{\mu_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is an arbitrary non-empty subset of $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$.

Then $\bigvee \{ \mu_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda \}$ exists in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$.

If there exists a finite measure μ such that $\mu_\lambda \leq \mu$ for all λ , then $\bigvee \{ \mu_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda \}$ is a finite measure.

PROOF. Let Φ denote the collection of finite subsets of Λ . For $\phi \in \Phi$, set $\mu_\phi := \bigvee_{\lambda \in \phi} \mu_\lambda$; this supremum exists in view of Theorem 8.1. The sets $\{\mu_\phi : \phi \in \Phi\}$ and $\{\mu_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ evidently have the same upper bounds in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$. Since $\{\mu_\phi : \phi \in \Phi\}$ is upward directed,

Theorem 8.4 shows that it has a least upper bound in $M(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$; this is then also the least upper bound of $\bigvee \{\mu_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$.

The final statement is clear. $\square$

8.2. Cones of measures on locally compact Hausdorff spaces

The results on the existence of the supremum and infimum of two measures in Theorem 8.1 and Corollary 8.2 apply to $M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E^+})$ and $M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$. We shall now show that the various regularity properties are preserved under the cone and lattice operations. The supremum and infimum of two measures in Lemmas 8.6 to 8.9 are those in $M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E^+})$ from Theorem 8.1.

Lemma 8.6. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let E be a Dedekind complete partially ordered vector space.*

If $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E^+})$ are Borel measures and if $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then $\mu + \nu$, $r\mu$, and $\mu \vee \nu$ are Borel measures.

If $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$ are Borel measures, then $\mu \wedge \nu$ is a Borel measure.

PROOF. Since $\mu \vee \nu \leq \mu + \nu$ and, for finite μ and ν , also $\mu \wedge \nu \leq \mu$, this is all clear. $\square$

Lemma 8.7. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let E be a Dedekind complete partially ordered vector space.*

If $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E^+})$ are inner regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and if $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then $\mu + \nu$, $r\mu$, and $\mu \vee \nu$ are inner regular at A .

If $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$ are inner regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}$, then $\mu \wedge \nu$ is inner regular at A .

PROOF. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that μ and ν are inner regular at A .

For the sum, we have, using part (1) of Lemma 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\mu + \nu)(A) &= \mu(A) + \nu(A) \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu(K_1) : K_1 \text{ is compact and } K_1 \subseteq A \} \\
 &\quad + \bigvee \{ \nu(K_2) : K_2 \text{ is compact and } K_2 \subseteq A \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu(K_1) + \nu(K_2) : K_i \text{ is compact and } K_i \subseteq A \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \} \\
 &\leq \bigvee \{ \mu(K_1 \cup K_2) + \nu(K_1 \cup K_2) : K_i \text{ is compact and } K_i \subseteq A \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu(K) + \nu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ (\mu + \nu)(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &\leq (\mu + \nu)(A).
 \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\mu + \nu$ is inner regular at A .

The statement concerning $r\mu$ is immediate from part (7) of Lemma 2.4.

We turn to $\mu \vee \nu$.

Suppose that $(\mu \vee \nu)(A) = \infty$. Since $\mu \vee \nu \leq \mu + \nu$, we see that also $\mu(A) + \nu(A) = \infty$. So at least one of $\mu(A)$ and $\nu(A)$ equals ∞ ; suppose that $\mu(A) = \infty$. Then

$$\bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} = \infty.$$

Using $\mu \vee \nu \geq \mu$ we then also have that

$$\bigvee \{ \mu \vee \nu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} = \infty.$$

Hence $\mu \vee \nu$ is inner regular at A .

Suppose that $(\mu \vee \nu)(A)$ is finite. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\leq (\mu \vee \nu)(A) - \bigvee \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &= \bigwedge \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(A) - (\mu \vee \nu)(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &= \bigwedge \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(A \setminus K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &\leq \bigwedge \{ \mu(A \setminus K) + \nu(A \setminus K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &= \bigwedge \{ (\mu + \nu)(A) - (\mu + \nu)(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &= (\mu + \nu)(A) - \bigvee \{ (\mu + \nu)(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &= 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality holds since we already know that $\mu + \nu$ is inner regular at A . This shows that $\mu \vee \nu$ is inner regular at A .

We turn to $\mu \wedge \nu$ for $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$. Using Theorem 8.1 and the inner regularity of $\mu + \nu$ at A that we have already demonstrated, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\mu \wedge \nu)(A) &\geq \bigvee \{ (\mu \wedge \nu)(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ (\mu + \nu)(K) - (\mu \vee \nu)(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &\geq \bigvee \{ \mu + \nu(K) - (\mu \vee \nu)(A) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ (\mu + \nu)(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} - (\mu \vee \nu)(A) \\
 &= (\mu + \nu)(A) - (\mu \vee \nu)(A) \\
 &= (\mu \wedge \nu)(A).
 \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\mu \wedge \nu$ is inner regular at A . □

Lemma 8.8. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space and let E be a Dedekind complete partially ordered vector space.*

If $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$ are outer regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and if $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then $\mu + \nu$, $r\mu$, and $\mu \vee \nu$ are outer regular at A .

If $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$ are outer regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}$, then $\mu \wedge \nu$ is outer regular at A .

PROOF. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that μ and ν are outer regular at A .

For the sum, first suppose that $(\mu + \nu)(A) = \mu(A) + \nu(A) = \infty$. Then at least one of $\mu(A)$ and $\nu(A)$ equals ∞ ; suppose that $\mu(A) = \infty$. Then

$$\bigwedge \{ \mu(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \} = \infty.$$

That is, $\mu(V) = \infty$ for all open subsets V such that $A \subset V$. Then certainly $(\mu + \nu)(V) = \infty$ for such V , so that

$$\bigwedge \{ (\mu + \nu)(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \} = \bigwedge \{ \infty \} = \infty.$$

This shows that $\mu + \nu$ is outer regular at A .

Suppose that $(\mu + \nu)(A)$ is finite. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\mu + \nu)(A) &= \mu(A) + \nu(A) \\
 &= \bigwedge \{ \mu(V_1) : V_1 \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V_1 \} + \bigwedge \{ \nu(V_2) : V_2 \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V_2 \}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bigwedge \{ \mu(V_1) + \nu(V_2) : V_i \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V_i \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \} \\
&\geq \bigwedge \{ \mu(V_1 \cap V_2) + \nu(V_1 \cap V_2) : V_i \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V_i \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \} \\
&= \bigwedge \{ \mu(V) + \nu(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \} \\
&= \bigwedge \{ (\mu + \nu)(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \} \\
&\geq (\mu + \nu)(A).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\mu + \nu$ is outer regular at A .

The statement concerning $r\mu$ is immediate from part (7) of Lemma 2.4.

We turn to $\mu \vee \nu$.

Suppose that $(\mu \vee \nu)(A) = \infty$. Since $(\mu \vee \nu)(A) \leq \mu(A) + \nu(A)$, at least one of $\nu(A)$ and $\nu(A)$ equals ∞ ; suppose that $\mu(A) = \infty$. Then the outer regularity of μ implies that $\mu(V) = \infty$ for all open subsets V such that $A \subseteq V$. Since $(\mu \vee \nu)(V) \geq \mu(V) = \infty$ for such V , we see that

$$\bigwedge \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \} = \bigwedge \{ \infty \} = \infty.$$

Hence $\mu \vee \nu$ is outer regular at A .

Suppose that $(\mu \vee \nu)(A)$ is finite. Since $(\mu \vee \nu)(A) \geq \mu(A)$ and $(\mu \vee \nu)(A) \geq \nu(A)$, $\nu(A)$ and $\nu(A)$ are then also finite. The outer regularity of $\mu + \nu$ then implies that there exists an open subset V_0 such that $A \subseteq V_0$ and such that $(\mu + \nu)(V_0)$ is finite. Now that we have located an open neighbourhood V_0 of A such that $(\mu + \nu)(V_0)$ is finite, equivalently, $(\mu \vee \nu)(V_0)$ is finite. Using outer regularity of $\mu + \nu$ in the fourth step, we see that,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \bigvee \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(V_0) : V_0 \supseteq A, V_0 \text{ is open and } (\mu \vee \nu)(V_0) \in E \} - (\mu \vee \nu)(A) \\
&= \bigvee \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(V_0 \setminus A) : V_0 \supseteq A, V_0 \text{ is open and } (\mu \vee \nu)(V_0) \in E \} \\
&\leq \bigvee \{ (\mu + \nu)(V_0 \setminus A) : V_0 \supseteq A, V_0 \text{ is open and } (\mu + \nu)(V_0) \in E \} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We therefore see that

$$(\mu \vee \nu)(A) = \bigwedge \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \}.$$

We conclude that $\mu \vee \nu$ is outer regular at A .

We turn to $\mu \wedge \nu$ for $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$. Using Theorem 8.1 and the outer regularity of $\mu + \nu$ at A that we have already demonstrated, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mu \wedge \nu)(A) &\leq \bigwedge \{ (\mu \wedge \nu)(U) : U \text{ is open and } A \subseteq U \} \\
&= \bigwedge \{ (\mu + \nu)(U) - (\mu \vee \nu)(U) : U \text{ is open and } A \subseteq U \} \\
&\leq \bigwedge \{ \mu + \nu(U) - (\mu \vee \nu)(A) : U \text{ is open and } A \subseteq U \} \\
&= \bigwedge \{ (\mu + \nu)(U) : U \text{ is open and } A \subseteq U \} - (\mu \vee \nu)(A) \\
&= (\mu + \nu)(A) - (\mu \vee \nu)(A) \\
&= (\mu \wedge \nu)(A).
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\mu \wedge \nu$ is outer regular at A .

□

Lemma 8.9. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let E be a Dedekind complete partially ordered vector space.*

If $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E^+})$ are weakly inner regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and if $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then $\mu + \nu$, $r\mu$, and $\mu \vee \nu$ are weakly inner regular at A .

If $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$ are weakly inner regular at $A \in \mathcal{B}$, then $\mu \wedge \nu$ is weakly inner regular at A .

PROOF. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that μ and ν are weakly inner regular at A .

For the sum, we have, using part (1) of Lemma 2.4 and the fact that Υ is closed under finite unions,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu + \nu)(A) &= \mu(A) + \nu(A) \\ &= \bigvee \{ \mu(A \cap U_1) : U_1 \in \Upsilon \} + \bigvee \{ \nu(A \cap U_2) : U_2 \in \Upsilon \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ \mu(A \cap U_1) + \nu(A \cap U_2) : U_i \in \Upsilon \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \} \\ &\leq \bigvee \{ \mu(A \cap (U_1 \cup U_2)) + \nu(A \cap (U_1 \cup U_2)) : U_i \in \Upsilon \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ (\mu + \nu)(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &\leq (\mu + \nu)(A). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\mu + \nu$ is weakly inner regular at A .

The statement concerning $r\mu$ is immediate from part (7) of Lemma 2.4.

We turn to $\mu \vee \nu$.

Suppose that $(\mu \vee \nu)(A) = \infty$. Since $\mu \vee \nu \leq \mu + \nu$, we see that also $\mu(A) + \nu(A) = \infty$. So at least one of $\mu(A)$ and $\nu(A)$ equals ∞ ; suppose that $\mu(A) = \infty$. Then

$$\bigvee \{ \mu(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} = \infty.$$

Using $\mu \vee \nu \geq \mu$ we then also have that

$$\bigvee \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} = \infty.$$

Hence $\mu \vee \nu$ is weakly inner regular at A .

Suppose that $(\mu \vee \nu)(A)$ is finite. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (\mu \vee \nu)(A) - \bigvee \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &= \bigwedge \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(A) - (\mu \vee \nu)(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &= \bigwedge \{ (\mu \vee \nu)(A \setminus U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &\leq \bigwedge \{ \mu(A \setminus U) + \nu(A \setminus U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &= \bigwedge \{ (\mu + \nu)(A) - (\mu + \nu)(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &= (\mu + \nu)(A) - \bigvee \{ (\mu + \nu)(U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality holds since we already know that $\mu + \nu$ is weakly inner regular at A . This shows that $\mu \vee \nu$ is weakly inner regular at A .

We turn to $\mu \wedge \nu$ for $\mu, \nu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$. Using Theorem 8.1 and the fact that $\mu + \nu$ is weakly inner regular at A that we have already demonstrated, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu \wedge \nu)(A) &\geq \bigvee \{ (\mu \wedge \nu)(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ (\mu + \nu)(A \cap U) - (\mu \vee \nu)(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &\geq \bigvee \{ \mu + \nu(A \cap U) - (\mu \vee \nu)(A) : U \in \Upsilon \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \bigvee \{ (\mu + \nu)(A \cap U) : U \in \mathcal{T} \} - (\mu \vee \nu)(A) \\
 &= (\mu + \nu)(A) - (\mu \vee \nu)(A) \\
 &= (\mu \wedge \nu)(A).
 \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\mu \wedge \nu$ is weakly inner regular at A . □

The following is immediate from Lemmas 8.6 to 8.9.

Theorem 8.10. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let E be a monotone complete partially ordered vector space.*

Then $M_{rB}(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ and $M_{qB}(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ are cones.

Furthermore, if E is Dedekind complete then the supremum of two measures in any of these two cones exists and equals the supremum of the two measures in $M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ from Theorem 8.1. Moreover, $M_{rB}(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ and $M_{qB}(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ are lattice cones. The supremum (resp. the infimum) of two measures in any of these two cones equals their supremum (resp. their infimum) in $M(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ from Theorem 8.1.

Remark 8.11. For $E = \mathbb{R}$, if μ and ν are real-valued σ -finite regular Borel measures on X , it is stated in [2, Theorem 28.5] that the right hand side of equation (8.2) is again a regular Borel measure on X . Hence the real-valued σ -finite regular Borel measures on X form a lattice cone. In Theorem 8.10, this is, for general E , asserted only for the finite regular Borel measures.

§9. Integration with respect to a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure

In this section, we start by introducing the integral with respect to positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measures, and conclude by establishing three basic convergence theorems: the monotone convergence theorem (Theorem 9.9), Fatou's lemma (Theorem 9.12), and the dominated convergence theorem (Theorem 9.13). Each of these has the corresponding theorem for $E = \mathbb{R}$ as a special case.

As mentioned in Section 1, Wright was the first to establish an integration theory in a related context in [24], but we go a bit further than the results in [24].

9.1. Integrals

Consider a measure space (X, Ω, μ, E) , where Ω is a σ -algebra, E is a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{E}^+$ is a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure. In this section, we shall introduce an integral of real-valued functions corresponding to these data. For some of the convergence theorems involving non-negative functions, such as the monotone convergence theorem, it is, in fact, more convenient (even more natural) to work with functions taking values in the extended positive real numbers. This will, therefore, be our starting point.

Also introducing some notation, we start with the usual definitions and elementary results, referring to e.g. [5, p. 49-52] for details.

We supply $\mathbb{R}^+$ with the topology of the one-point compactification of $\mathbb{R}^+$. Then a function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is measurable if $f^{-1}(A) \in \Omega$ for every Borel subset A of $\mathbb{R}^+$. One can equivalently require that $\{x \in X : f(x) \geq r\} \in \Omega$, that $\{x \in X : f(x) > r\} \in \Omega$, that $\{x \in X : f(x) \leq r\} \in \Omega$.

Ω , or, finally, that $\{x \in X : f(x) < r\} \in \Omega$ for all (finite) $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$. It is (already) here that we use that Ω is not just an algebra, but actually a σ -algebra. If f takes only finite values, then f is measurable if and only if $f^{-1}(A) \in \Omega$ for every Borel subset A of $\mathbb{R}^+$.

We let $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ denote the set of measurable functions $f : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$. Then $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ is a lattice cone, and $f \underline{g} \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ for all $f, g \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$; here the operations are defined pointwise in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$. If $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence in $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$, then $\inf_{n \geq 1} f_n$, $\sup_{n \geq 1} f_n$, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n$, and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n$ are all measurable; here again the operations are defined pointwise in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$. We shall write $f_n \uparrow$ if $f_n(x) \uparrow$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ for all $x \in X$. Since the function $f : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$, defined by $f(x) = \sup_{n \geq 1} f_n(x)$ for $x \in X$, is then actually measurable, it is the supremum of the f_n in $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$. We can thus write $f_n \uparrow f$ to express a pointwise condition, while at the same time being consistent with our earlier notations.

An element φ of $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ is an *elementary function* if it takes only finitely many values, which are all finite. It can be written (generically non-uniquely) as a finite sum $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \chi_{A_i}$ for some $r_1, \dots, r_n \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \Omega$. Here the r_i are all finite, but it is allowed that $\mu(A_i) = \infty$ for some of the A_i . We let $\mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ denote the set of elementary functions. It is a lattice cone.

If $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \chi_{A_i}$ is an elementary function, where the A_i are pairwise disjoint, then we define its (order) integral, which is an element of E^+ , by

$$\int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu := \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mu(A_i),$$

where $r_i \mu(A_i)$ refers to the action of the semigroup $\mathbb{R}^+$ as semigroup homomorphisms of $\overline{E}$. We have added a superscript to indicate that the integral that we shall introduce for more general functions is defined using order properties. In contexts where E is also a Banach space, integrals with respect to vector-valued measures can be defined using norm convergence; this notation keeps the distinction clear.

The facts that μ is finitely additive and that $\mathbb{R}^+$ acts as semigroup homomorphisms on $\overline{E}$ imply that the integral does not depend on the choice for the pairwise disjoint A_i ; the proof is exactly as for [5, Lemma 10.2]. These two facts, combined with the fact that $(rs)x = r(sx)$ for all $r, s \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $x \in \overline{E}$, also yield the following, where the equalities and the inequality are in $\overline{E}$. At this stage, Ω can actually still be just an algebra.

Lemma 9.1. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space. Let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$, and let $r \geq 0$. Then:*

- (1) $\int_X^\circ r\varphi \, d\mu = r \int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu$;
- (2) $\int_X^\circ (\varphi + \psi) \, d\mu = \int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu + \int_X^\circ \psi \, d\mu$;
- (3) if $\varphi \leq \psi$, then $\int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu \leq \int_X^\circ \psi \, d\mu$.

It follows from this that, for $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$, $\int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mu(A_i)$ whenever $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \chi_{A_i}$ for not necessarily disjoint $A_i \in \Omega$. The proofs for all this are exactly as in [5, p. 55–56].

We shall define the (order) integral of an arbitrary $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ in the usual way. In order to know that it is well-defined, we need the following preparatory result. The proof is rather analogous to that of [5, Theorem 11.1], but we still include it since it illustrates how the Archimedean property of E underlies the well-definedness of the integral.

Lemma 9.2. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ and let $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ be such that $\varphi_n \uparrow$ and $\varphi \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \varphi_n$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$. Then*

$$\int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu \leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu$$

in $\overline{E}$.

PROOF. We can write $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^m r_i \chi_{A_i}$ for some $r_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $A_i \in \Omega$. Let ε be fixed such that $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. For $n \geq 1$, set $B_n := \{x \in X : \varphi_n(x) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(x)\}$. Then B_n is measurable and $B_n \uparrow X$, since $\varphi \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \varphi_n$ and $\varphi_n \uparrow$. This implies that $B_n \cap A_i \uparrow A_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and then Proposition 5.5 shows that $\mu(A_i \cap B_n) \uparrow \mu(A_i)$ in $\overline{E}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Since $\varphi_n \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\chi_{B_n}\varphi$, Lemma 9.1 shows that

$$(9.1) \quad \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \int_X^\circ \chi_{B_n} \varphi \, d\mu$$

for $n \geq 1$. Furthermore,

$$\int_X^\circ \chi_{B_n} \varphi \, d\mu = \int_X^\circ \sum_{i=1}^m r_i \chi_{B_n} \chi_{A_i} \, d\mu = \int_X^\circ \sum_{i=1}^m r_i \chi_{B_n \cap A_i} \, d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^m r_i \mu(B_n \cap A_i).$$

Since $B_n \cap A_i \uparrow A_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, part (7) of Lemma 2.3 and part (2) of Lemma 2.4 then yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \chi_{B_n} \varphi \, d\mu &= \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \sum_{i=1}^m r_i \mu(B_n \cap A_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m r_i \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \mu(B_n \cap A_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m r_i \mu(A_i) = \int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with equation (9.1), we see that

$$\bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu.$$

in $\overline{E}$. If $\int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu = \infty$, then we take $\varepsilon = 1/2$ to see that $\bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu = \infty$; we then have equality in the lemma. If $\int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu$ is finite, then we can write

$$\bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu - \int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu \geq -\varepsilon \int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu.$$

Since this is true for every ε such that $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, this implies that

$$\bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu - \int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu \geq -\bigwedge_{k=2}^\infty \frac{1}{k} \int_X^\circ \varphi \, d\mu.$$

Since E is Archimedean, the right hand side is zero. This concludes the proof. $\square$

Supposing that Ω is a σ -algebra, let $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$. Then (see e.g. [8, proof of Proposition 2.1.7]) there exists a sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $\varphi_n \uparrow f$; if f is

bounded we may choose the φ_n such that, in addition $\varphi_n \rightarrow f$ uniformly on X . We define the (order) integral of f , which is an element of $\overline{E}^+$, by

$$\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu := \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu.$$

Since $\int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu \uparrow$, the σ -monotone completeness of E guarantees that this supremum exists in $\overline{E}$; see part (1) of Lemma 2.5. In order to show that this definition is independent of the choice for the sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, let $\{\psi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ be a second sequence such that $\psi_n \uparrow f$. Then $\varphi_k \leq f = \sup_{n \geq 1} \psi_n$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ pointwise for all $k \geq 1$, so that Lemma 9.2 shows that $\int_X^\circ \varphi_k \, d\mu \leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \psi_n \, d\mu$ in $\overline{E}$. Hence $\bigvee_{k=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \varphi_k \, d\mu \leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \psi_n \, d\mu$ in $\overline{E}$. The reverse inequality is likewise true, and we conclude that $\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ is well-defined as an element of $\overline{E}^+$.

The integral has the usual properties. We include the proofs, which are completely analogous to that for the real case, for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 9.3. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra, let $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$, and let $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then:*

- (1) $\int_X^\circ (r_1 f_1 + r_2 f_2) \, d\mu = r_1 \int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu + r_2 \int_X^\circ f_2 \, d\mu$ in $\overline{E}$;
- (2) If $f_1 \leq f_2$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ pointwise, then $\int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu \leq \int_X^\circ f_2 \, d\mu$ in $\overline{E}$.

PROOF. Choose a sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $\varphi_n \uparrow f_1$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ pointwise, and a sequence $\{\psi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $\psi_n \uparrow f_2$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ pointwise. Then $r_1 \varphi_n + r_2 \psi \uparrow r_1 f + r_2 f$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ pointwise, so that part (1) follows from the definition of the integral, combined with part (7) of Lemma 2.3 and part (2) of Lemma 2.4.

Since, for all $n \geq 1$, $\varphi_n \leq f_2 = \sup_{n \geq 1} \psi_n$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ pointwise, Lemma 9.2 yields that $\int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu \leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \psi_n \, d\mu = \int_X^\circ f_2 \, d\mu$. Hence $\int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu \leq \int_X^\circ f_2 \, d\mu$, which is part (2). $\square$

Lemma 9.4. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra, and let $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ be such that $\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ is finite. Then:*

- (1) f is almost everywhere finite;
- (2) the subset $\{x \in X : f(x) > 0\}$ is σ -finite.

PROOF. We prove part (1). For $n \geq 1$, set $A_n := \{x \in X : f(x) \geq n \text{ in } \overline{\mathbb{R}^+}\}$. Then $n \chi_{A_n} \leq f$, so that $n\mu(A_n) = \int_X^\circ n \chi_{A_n} \, d\mu \leq \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ by part (2) of Lemma 9.3. Hence $\mu(A_n) \leq 1/n \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ for all $n \geq 1$. From $\{x \in X : f(x) = \infty\} = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty A_n$, we see that $\mu\{x \in X : f(x) = \infty\} \leq 1/n \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ for all $n \geq 1$. Since $\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ is finite, the Archimedean property of E then implies that $\mu\{x \in X : f(x) = \infty\} \leq 0$, which shows that $\mu\{x \in X : f(x) = \infty\} = 0$.

For part (2), set $B_n := \{x \in X : f(x) \geq 1/n\}$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ for $n \geq 1$. Then one sees similarly that $\mu(B_n) \leq n \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$, which is finite. Since $\{x \in X : f(x) > 0\} = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty B_n$, part (2) is clear. $\square$

Lemma 9.5. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu = 0$;
- (2) $f(x) = 0$ for almost all $x \in X$

PROOF. Choose a sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $\varphi_n \uparrow f$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ pointwise.

Suppose that part (1) holds. Then part (2) of Lemma 9.3 shows that $\int_X^\circ \varphi_n d\mu = 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. For the elementary functions φ_n , however, it is a direct consequence of the definition of their integrals that then $\mu(\{x \in X : \varphi_n(x) \neq 0\}) = 0$. Since $\{x \in X : f(x) \neq 0\}$ can be written as the union $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \{x \in X : \varphi_n(x) \neq 0\}$, the σ -sub-additivity of μ then implies that $\mu(\{x \in X : f(x) \neq 0\}) = 0$. Hence part (1) implies part (2).

Suppose that part (2) holds. Since $0 \leq \varphi_n(x) \leq f(x)$ for all $x \in X$, we see that $\varphi_n(x) = 0$ for almost all $x \in X$. For the elementary functions φ_n , however, it is a direct consequence of the definition of their integrals that then $\int_X^\circ \varphi_n d\mu = 0$ for all n . Since $\int_X^\circ \varphi_n d\mu \uparrow \int_X^\circ f d\mu$, it follows that $\int_X^\circ f d\mu = 0$. Hence part (2) implies part (1). $\square$

Corollary 9.6. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra. Let $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ and suppose that $f_1(x) = f_2(x)$ for almost all $x \in X$. Then $\int_X^\circ f_1 d\mu = \int_X^\circ f_2 d\mu$ in $\overline{E}$.*

PROOF. Set $A := \{x \in X : f_1(x) \neq f_2(x)\}$. Then (X, Ω) is a measurable subset of measure zero. There exists $g \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ such that $f_1 = g + f_1 \chi_A$ and $f_2 = g + f_2 \chi_A$. Then Lemma 9.3 and Lemma 9.5 show that $\int_X^\circ f_1 d\mu$ and $\int_X^\circ f_2 d\mu$ are both equal to $\int_X^\circ g d\mu$. $\square$

A function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable if $f^{-1}(A)$ is a measurable subset of X for every Borel subset A of $\mathbb{R}$. If $f(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$, then f is measurable in the present sense precisely if it is measurable in the earlier sense as a map from X into $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$. We shall write $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R})$ for the Riesz space of all such finite-valued measurable functions and $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ for its positive cone of all positive measurable functions. Set

$$\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}) := \{f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}) : f(x) = 0 \text{ for almost all } x \in X\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is an order ideal in $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R})$ and, by Lemma 9.5, we also have that $\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}) = \{f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}) : \int_X^\circ |f| d\mu = 0\}$.

We let $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ denote the set of all $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R})$ such that $\int_X^\circ |f| d\mu$ is finite, and write $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$ for the set of all positive measurable f with finite integral. Obviously, $\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is an order ideal in $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$. It is clear from the triangle inequality in $\mathbb{R}$ and Lemma 9.3 that $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is a vector space under pointwise operations. It also follows from Lemma 9.3 and the fact that $f^+, f^- \leq |f| \leq f^+ + f^-$ that $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ if and only if $f^+ \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ and $f^- \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$. In particular, $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+) - \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$. Since $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is a vector space, the reverse inclusion likewise holds, and we see that $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+) - \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$.

If $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$, we choose $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $f = f_1 - f_2$, and we define the (order) integral of f as $\int_X^\circ f d\mu := \int_X^\circ f_1 d\mu - \int_X^\circ f_2 d\mu$, it is an element of E . Invoking Lemma 9.3, the usual arguments show that this is well-defined, and that it defines a linear map.

If $f \in \mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$, then also $f^+, f^- \in \mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$. Lemma 9.5 and the linearity of the integral then show that $\int_X^\circ f d\mu = 0$.

We collect a few basic properties in the following result.

Proposition 9.7. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra.*

- (1) $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is an order ideal in the Riesz space $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R})$. As a consequence, it is a σ -Dedekind complete Riesz space.
- (2) $\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is a σ -order ideal in $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.

- (3) $\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu = 0$ for all $f \in \mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.
 (4) If $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ and $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\int_X^\circ (r_1 f_1 + r_2 f_2) \, d\mu = r_1 \int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu + r_2 \int_X^\circ f_2 \, d\mu$.
 (5) If $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ and $f_1 \leq f_2$ almost everywhere, then $\int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu \leq \int_X^\circ f_2 \, d\mu$.

PROOF. It is clear from the above that $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is a sublattice of $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R})$. That it is actually also a solid subset follows from Lemma 9.3. The σ -Dedekind completeness of $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R})$ is then inherited by its order ideal $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.

In part (2), we have observed earlier that $\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is an order ideal in $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$. Suppose that $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ has a supremum f in the enveloping lattice. Replacing the sequence with the sequence $f_1, f_1 \vee f_2, f_1 \vee f_2 \vee f_3, \dots$, we may suppose that the sequence is increasing pointwise. Set $g(x) := \sup_{n \geq 1} f_n(x)$ for $x \in X$. Then $f \geq g \geq 0$ pointwise and $g \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R})$. On the other hand, the monotone convergence theorem (Theorem 9.9) will show that $\int_X^\circ g \, d\mu = 0$. Since $g \geq 0$, Lemma 9.5 implies that $g \in \mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$. Since f is the least upper bound of the f_n in $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$, we must have $f \leq g$ pointwise. We see that $f - g$ is an element of $\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$, and conclude that $\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is a σ -order ideal in $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.

The parts (3) and (4) have already been observed.

In part (5), we may, by redefining f_1 and f_2 to be zero at a set of measure zero, suppose that $f_1 \leq f_2$ pointwise. In that case, if $f_1 \leq f_2$, then $f_2 = f_1 + (f_2 - f_1)$ with $f_2 - f_1 \geq 0$. The additivity of the integral, which is positive on $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$, then shows that $\int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu \leq \int_X^\circ f_2 \, d\mu$. $\square$

We shall now introduce the generalisation of the classical L^1 -space to the vector-valued case.

Since $\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is an order ideal in $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$, the quotient space

$$L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}) := \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}) / \mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$$

is again a Riesz space when the quotient is supplied with the partial ordering that is defined by the image of the positive cone $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ under the quotient map. Furthermore, the quotient map is then a Riesz homomorphism. We shall write $[f]$ for the image of $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ under the quotient map.

In view of part (3) of Proposition 9.7, we can define an (order) integral on $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ by setting $\int_X^\circ [f] \, d\mu := \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ for $[f] \in L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$. This integral is then linear, positive, and it is faithful on the positive cone $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$ of $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.

Recall that a Riesz space is said to be *order separable*, or to *have the countable sup-property*, if every non-empty subset that has a supremum contains an at most countably infinite subset that has the same supremum.

Theorem 9.8. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra.*

Then the quotient map from $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ onto $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is a σ -order continuous Riesz homomorphism, and the map that sends $[f] \in L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ to $\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu \in E$ is well-defined, linear, and positive on $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$. It is faithful on the positive cone $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$ of $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.

If E is order separable and monotone complete, then $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is a Dedekind complete Riesz space. In that case, if S is a subset of $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ that is bounded from above and that is closed under taking finite suprema, and if $\tilde{f} \in L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is such that $[\tilde{f}] = \bigvee \{[f] : [f] \in S\}$,

then

$$(9.2) \quad \int_X^\circ \tilde{f} \, d\mu = \bigvee \left\{ \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu : f \in L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}) \text{ and } [f] \in S \right\}.$$

PROOF. Since we know from part (2) of Proposition 9.7 that $\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is a σ -order ideal in $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$, it follows from [19, Theorem 18.11] that the quotient map is σ -order continuous.

The basic properties of the integral have already been observed.

We shall now suppose that E is order separable and monotone complete, and proceed to show that $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ is then Dedekind complete. Equation (9.2) will be established during the proof.

Let S be a non-empty subset of $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$ that is bounded from above by $[g]$ for some $g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$. In order to show that its supremum exists, we may suppose that S is closed under taking finite suprema. Since the subset $\{\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu : f \in S\}$ of E is bounded from above by $\int_X^\circ g \, d\mu$, it has a supremum e in E . By the order separability of E , there exists a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $[f_n] \in S$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $e = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu$. Using that the quotient map is a Riesz homomorphism and that S is closed under taking finite suprema, one easily sees that the sequence $f_1, f_1 \vee f_2, f_1 \vee f_2 \vee f_3, \dots$ has the same properties. By passing to this new sequence we may and shall assume that also $f_n(x) \uparrow$ for every $x \in X$. Set $\tilde{f}(x) := \bigvee_{n \geq 1} f_n(x)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ for $x \in X$. The monotone convergence theorem (see Theorem 9.9) shows that $\int_X^\circ \tilde{f} \, d\mu = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu = e$. Since this is finite, Proposition 9.11 shows that $\tilde{f}$ is almost everywhere finite. By redefining $\tilde{f}$ and all f_n to be zero at the measurable subset of X where $\tilde{f}$ equals ∞ , we obtain a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$ and $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $[f_n] \in S$ for all $n \geq 1$, $f_n \uparrow \tilde{f}$ pointwise, and $\int_X^\circ \tilde{f} \, d\mu = e$.

We claim that $[\tilde{f}]$ is the supremum of S in $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.

In order to show that $[\tilde{f}]$ is an upper bound of S , let $[f] \in S$. Then $[f \vee f_n] = [f] \vee [f_n] \in S$ for all $n \geq 1$, so that $\int_X^\circ f \vee f_n \, d\mu \leq e$. Since $f \vee f_n \uparrow f \vee \tilde{f}$ pointwise, we can use the monotone convergence theorem in the second step to see that

$$\begin{aligned} e &\geq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ f \vee f_n \, d\mu \\ &= \int_X^\circ f \vee \tilde{f} \, d\mu \\ &\geq \int_X^\circ \tilde{f} \, d\mu \\ &= e. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\int_X^\circ f \vee \tilde{f} - \tilde{f} \, d\mu = 0$. Since $f \vee \tilde{f} - \tilde{f} \geq 0$, and since the integral is faithful on $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$, this shows that $[f] \vee [\tilde{f}] - [\tilde{f}] = [f \vee \tilde{f} - \tilde{f}] = 0$. Hence $[\tilde{f}] \geq [f]$.

In order to show that $[f]$ is the least upper bound of S , suppose that $[g]$ is any upper bound of S in $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$. Then certainly $[g] \geq [f_n]$ for all $n \geq 1$, i.e. $g(x) \geq f_n(x)$ for almost all $x \in X$. Collecting the countably infinitely many exceptional sets into one measurable subset of measure zero, we see that $g(x) \geq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty f_n(x) = \tilde{f}(x)$ for almost all $x \in X$. Hence $[g] \geq [\tilde{f}]$.

This concludes the proof of the Dedekind completeness of $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ and equation (9.2). $\square$

9.2. Convergence theorems

We shall now establish the three basic convergence theorems in the partially ordered vector-valued context.

The monotone convergence theorem can be proved in the usual way.

Theorem 9.9 (Monotone convergence theorem). *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra. Let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ be such that $f_n(x) \uparrow f(x)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ for almost all $x \in X$. Then*

$$\int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu \uparrow \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

in $\overline{E}$.

PROOF. In view of Lemma 9.5, we can, by redefining all f_n and f to be zero at a measurable subset of measure 0, suppose that $f_n(x) \uparrow f(x)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ for all $x \in X$. For each $n \geq 1$, let $\{\varphi_i^n\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $\varphi_i^n \uparrow f_n$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ pointwise as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Set $\psi_n := \bigvee_{i=1}^n \varphi_i^n$ for $n \geq 1$. Then $\psi_n \in \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $\psi_n \uparrow f$ in $\overline{E}$ pointwise. Hence $\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \psi_n \, d\mu$ by definition. On the other hand, since, for all $n \geq 1$, $\psi_n \leq f_n$ in $\overline{E}$ pointwise, we have $\int_X^\circ \psi_n \, d\mu \leq \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu$ for all $n \geq 1$. Hence $\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu \leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu$ in $\overline{E}$. Since the reverse inequality is clear, the proof is complete. $\square$

Just as Proposition 5.5 implies Proposition 5.6, Theorem 9.9 implies our next result. It is a special case of the dominated convergence theorem; see part (4) of Theorem 9.13.

Corollary 9.10. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra. Let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ be such that $f_n(x) \downarrow f(x)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ for almost all $x \in X$. If $\int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu$ is finite, then*

$$\int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu \downarrow \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

in E .

PROOF. In view of 9.4 and Corollary 9.6, we can, after redefining all f_n and f to be zero at a suitable measurable subset of measure zero, suppose that the f_n have finite values and that $f_n \downarrow f$ pointwise. Then the functions $f_1 - f_n$ are well-defined elements of $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$. Since $\int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu$ is also finite for all n , we have $\int_X^\circ (f_1 - f_n) \, d\mu = \int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu - \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu$ for all $n \geq 1$. Similarly, $\int_X^\circ (f_1 - f) \, d\mu = \int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu - \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$. Since $(f_1 - f_n) \uparrow (f_1 - f)$, an application of Theorem 9.9 shows that $(\int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu - \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu) \uparrow (\int_X^\circ f_1 \, d\mu - \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu)$ in E . We conclude that $\int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu \downarrow \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$. $\square$

A combination of Lemma 9.4 and Theorem 9.9 yields the following.

Proposition 9.11. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra. Let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ be such that $f_n(x) \uparrow f(x)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ for almost all $x \in X$, and suppose that $\bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu$ is finite. Then $\{x \in X : \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty f_n(x) = \infty\}$ is a measurable subset of X of measure zero.*

As in the case where $E = \mathbb{R}$, Fatou's lemma is a consequence of the monotone convergence theorem.

Theorem 9.12 (Fatou's lemma). *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra and E is σ -Dedekind complete.*

If $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence in $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$, then

$$\int_X \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n \, d\mu \leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty \int_X f_k \, d\mu$$

in $\bar{E}$.

The σ -Dedekind completeness is necessary to guarantee that $\bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty \int_X f_k \, d\mu$ exists for all $n \geq 1$.

PROOF. For $n \geq 1$, set $g_n = \inf_{k \geq n} f_k$. Then $0 \leq g_n \leq f_k$ all $k \geq n$, so that Lemma 9.3 implies that

$$(9.3) \quad \int_X g_n \, d\mu \leq \bigwedge_{k \geq n} \int_X f_k \, d\mu$$

in $\bar{E}$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Applying Theorem 9.9 to the increasing sequence $g_n \uparrow \liminf_{n \geq 1} f_n$, and using equation (9.3), we then see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n \, d\mu &= \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X g_n \, d\mu \\ &\leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty \int_X f_k \, d\mu \end{aligned}$$

in $\bar{E}$.

□

As in the real case, the dominated convergence theorem follows from Fatou's lemma.

Theorem 9.13 (Dominated convergence theorem). *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra and E is σ -Dedekind complete.*

Let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R})$, and let $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R})$ be such that $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ for almost all x in X .

If there exists $g \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$ such that $\int_X g \, d\mu$ is finite, and such that, for all $n \geq 1$, $|f_n(x)| \leq g(x)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ for almost all x in X , then:

- (1) $f_n \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ for all $n \geq 1$;
- (2) $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$;
- (3) $\bigwedge_{n=1}^\infty \bigvee_{k=n}^\infty \int_X |f_k - f| \, d\mu = 0$;
- (4)

$$\int_X f \, d\mu = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty \int_X f_k \, d\mu = \bigwedge_{n=1}^\infty \bigvee_{k=n}^\infty \int_X f_k \, d\mu.$$

PROOF. In view of Lemma 9.5, we may, by redefining all f_n , f , and g to be zero at a measurable subset of measure zero, suppose that $g \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$, that $|f_n(x)| \leq g(x)$ for all $x \in X$, and that $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ for all $x \in X$. Since then also $|f|(x) \leq g(x)$ for all $x \in X$, part (1) of Proposition 9.7 shows that the f_n and f are in $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.

We turn to part (3). Since $2g - |f_n - f| \geq 0$ pointwise, Theorem 9.12 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X^\circ 2g \, d\mu &= \int_X^\circ \liminf_{n \geq 1} (2g - |f_n - f|) \, d\mu \\ &\leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty \int_X^\circ (2g - |f_n - f|) \, d\mu \\ &= \int_X^\circ 2g \, d\mu - \bigwedge_{n=1}^\infty \bigvee_{k=n}^\infty \int_X^\circ |f_n - f| \, d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality is valid since $\int_X^\circ (g - |f_n - f|) \, d\mu$, $\int_X^\circ g \, d\mu$, and $\int_X^\circ |f_n - f| \, d\mu$ all lie in the finite order interval $[0, 2 \int_X^\circ g \, d\mu]$ of E . Cancelling the finite element $\int_X^\circ 2g \, d\mu$, we see that $\bigwedge_{n=1}^\infty \bigvee_{k=n}^\infty \int_X^\circ |f_n - f| \, d\mu \leq 0$. Since the reverse inequality is obvious, the proof of part (3) is complete.

We turn to part (4).

Since $g + f_n \geq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$, Fatou's lemma shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X^\circ (g + f) \, d\mu &= \int_X^\circ \liminf_{n \geq 1} (g + f_n) \, d\mu \\ &\leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty \int_X^\circ (g + f_n) \, d\mu \\ &= \int_X^\circ g \, d\mu + \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

from which we see that

$$(9.4) \quad \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu \leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu.$$

Since $g - f_n \geq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$, Fatou's lemma shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X^\circ (g - f) \, d\mu &= \int_X^\circ \liminf_{n \geq 1} (g - f_n) \, d\mu \\ &\leq \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \bigwedge_{k=n}^\infty \int_X^\circ (g - f_n) \, d\mu \\ &= \int_X^\circ g \, d\mu - \bigwedge_{n=1}^\infty \bigvee_{k=n}^\infty \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

from which we see that

$$(9.5) \quad \bigwedge_{n=1}^\infty \bigvee_{k=n}^\infty \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu \leq \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu.$$

Combining equations (9.4) and (9.5) with Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{k=n}^{\infty} \int_X^{\circ} f_n d\mu \leq \int_X^{\circ} f d\mu \leq \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigwedge_{k=n}^{\infty} \int_X^{\circ} f_n d\mu \leq \bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{k=n}^{\infty} \int_X^{\circ} f_n d\mu,$$

which completes the proof of part (4). $\square$

§10. Positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measures arising from densities

As in the real case, given a measure μ and $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$, one can canonically construct a new measure from these data. In this section, we investigate the preservation of regularity of measures on locally compact Hausdorff spaces under the process. This will be an important ingredient when showing that finite measures representing positive algebra homomorphism from $C_c(X)$ into partially ordered algebras are actually spectral measures; the latter notion will be introduced in Definition 11.3.

The first part of this section will still be in the context of an arbitrary measure space.

Proposition 10.1. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$. For $A \in \Omega$, set*

$$\mu^f(A) := \int_X^{\circ} \chi_A f d\mu.$$

Then $\mu^f : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{E^+}$ is a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure, which is finite if and only if $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.

If $A \subseteq X$ is a μ -null set, then A is a μ^f -null set.

If $g \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$, then

$$(10.1) \quad \int_X^{\circ} g d\mu^f = \int_X^{\circ} g f d\mu$$

in $\overline{E}$.

PROOF. It is clear that μ^f is a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued measure, since the monotone convergence theorem (Theorem 9.9) shows that it is σ -additive. It is likewise clear that it is a finite measure if and only if $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$, and that μ -null sets are μ^f -null sets.

For equation (10.1), consider $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$. Choose a representation $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \chi_{A_i}$ with $r_1, \dots, r_n \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \Omega$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X^{\circ} \varphi d\mu^f &= \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mu^f(A_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \int_X^{\circ} \chi_{A_i} f d\mu \\ &= \int_X^{\circ} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \chi_{A_i} \right) f d\mu \\ &= \int_X^{\circ} \varphi f d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes equation (10.1) for $g \in \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$. For general $g \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega; \overline{\mathbb{R}^+})$, we choose a sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $\varphi_n(x) \uparrow g(x)$ for every x in X . Then $\int_X^\circ \varphi_n d\mu^f \uparrow \int_X^\circ g d\mu^f$ in $\overline{E}$ by definition, whereas $\int_X^\circ \varphi_n f d\mu \uparrow \int_X^\circ g f d\mu$ by Theorem 9.9. Hence equation (10.1) holds for g . $\square$

We shall use the following two results in the context of locally compact Hausdorff spaces. The density f is now supposed to be bounded.

Lemma 10.2. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra. Let $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ and let $\{S_i : i \in I\}$ be a subset of Ω such that $\bigwedge \{\mu(S_i) : i \in I\} = 0$ in $\overline{E}$. Then $\bigwedge \{\mu^f(S_i) : i \in I\} = 0$ in $\overline{E}$.*

PROOF. It is clear that $\mu^f(S_i) \leq \|f\| \mu(S_i)$ in $\overline{E}$ for all $i \in I$. The statement then follows from part (7) of Lemma 2.3. $\square$

Lemma 10.3. *Let (X, Ω, μ, E) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra and E is a monotone complete partially ordered vector space. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega, \overline{E^+})$, and let $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$. Suppose that $A \in \Omega$ is such that $\mu(A)$ is finite.*

- (1) *If $\{A_i : i \in I\}$ is a subset of Ω that is upward directed and such that $A_i \subseteq A$ for all $i \in I$ and*

$$\mu(A) = \bigvee \{\mu(A_i) : i \in I\}$$

in $\overline{E}$, then

$$\mu^f(A) = \bigvee \{\mu^f(A_i) : i \in I\}.$$

in $\overline{E}$.

- (2) *If $\{A_i : i \in I\}$ is a subset of Ω that is downward directed and such that $A \subseteq A_i$ for all $i \in I$ and*

$$\mu(A) = \bigwedge \{\mu(A_i) : i \in I\}$$

in $\overline{E}$, then

$$\mu^f(A) = \bigwedge \{\mu^f(A_i) : i \in I\}$$

in $\overline{E}$.

PROOF. We prove part (1). We have

$$\mu(A) = \bigvee \{\mu(A_i) : i \in I\}.$$

in $\overline{E}$. Since $\mu(A)$ and then also all $\mu(A_i)$ are finite, part (5) of Lemma 2.3 and part (4) of Lemma 5.4 show that

$$\bigwedge \{\mu(A \setminus A_i) : i \in I\} = 0.$$

in $\overline{E}$. Applying Lemma 10.2, we find that

$$\bigwedge \{\mu^f(A \setminus A_i) : i \in I\} = 0$$

in $\overline{E}$. Since $\mu^f(A)$ and all $\mu^f(A_i)$ are finite, part (6) of Lemma 2.3 and part (4) of Lemma 5.4 show that

$$\mu^f(A) = \bigvee \{\mu^f(A_i) : i \in I\}$$

in $\overline{E}$.

We prove part (2). We have

$$\mu(A) = \bigwedge \{\mu(A_i) : i \in I\}$$

in $\bar{E}$. Since $\mu(A)$ is finite, part (5) of Lemma 2.3 and part (4) of Lemma 5.4 show that

$$\bigwedge \{ \mu(A_i \setminus A) : i \in I \} = 0$$

in $\bar{E}$. Applying Lemma 10.2, we find that

$$\bigwedge \{ \mu^f(A_i \setminus A) : i \in I \} = 0$$

in $\bar{E}$. Since $\mu^f(A)$ is finite, part (6) of Lemma 2.3 and part (4) of Lemma 5.4 show that

$$\mu^f(A) = \bigwedge \{ \mu^f(A_i) : i \in I \}$$

in $\bar{E}$. □

We shall now apply the transition from μ to μ^f in the context of a locally compact Hausdorff space X with Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$, a monotone complete partially ordered vector space E , and a positive $\bar{E}$ -valued measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow E^+$. For $E = \mathbb{R}$, if $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a regular Borel measure and if $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is integrable, then $\mu^f : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is again a regular Borel measure; see [14, p. 220, Exercise 8]. The rest of this section is concerned with the vector-valued analogue of this phenomenon. These results are a key ingredient later on when establishing that a (sufficiently regular) finite measure representing a positive algebra homomorphism from $C_c(X)$ into partially ordered algebras is actually a spectral measure; see Theorem 15.1.

The following result for finite measures is obvious from Lemma 10.3.

Corollary 10.4. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a monotone complete partially ordered vector space, let $\mu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$, and let $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$.*

- (1) *If μ is a finite regular Borel measure on X , then so is μ^f .*
- (2) *If μ is a finite quasi-regular Borel measure on X , then so is μ^f .*

We turn to the case where μ need not be finite.

Lemma 10.5. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a monotone complete partially ordered vector space, let $\mu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, \bar{E}^+)$, let $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$, and let $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Set $S := \{x \in X : f(x) > 0\}$.*

- (1) *Suppose that at least one of the following is satisfied:*
 - (a) *$\mu(A)$ is finite and μ is inner regular at A ;*
 - (b) *$\mu(S)$ is finite and μ is inner regular at $A \cap S$.**Then μ^f is inner regular at A .*
- (2) *If $\mu(A)$ is finite and μ is outer regular at A , then μ^f is outer regular at A .*
- (3) *Suppose that at least one of the following is satisfied:*
 - (a) *$\mu(A)$ is finite and μ is weakly inner regular at A ;*
 - (b) *$\mu(S)$ is finite and μ is weakly inner regular at $A \cap S$.**Then μ^f is weakly inner regular at A .*

PROOF. We prove part (1). The case where $\mu(A)$ is finite is immediate from part (1) of Lemma 10.3. In the second case, we note that obviously $\mu^f(A) = \mu^f(A \cap S)$. Since $A \cap S \subseteq S$ has finite μ -measure, we see, using what we have just established for $A \cap S$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^f(A) &= \mu^f(A \cap S) \\ &= \bigvee \{ \mu^f(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \cap S \} \\ &\leq \bigvee \{ \mu^f(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \mu^f(A).$$

Hence μ^f is inner regular at A .

Part (2) is immediate from part (2) of Lemma 10.3.

We prove part (3). As with part (1), the case where $\mu^f(A)$ is finite is immediate from part (1) of Lemma 10.3. In the second case, we note again that $\mu^f(A) = \mu^f(A \cap S)$, and that $A \cap S \subseteq S$ has finite μ -measure. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^f(A) &= \mu^f(A \cap S) \\ &= \bigvee \{ \mu^f((A \cap S) \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &\leq \bigvee \{ \mu^f(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &\leq \mu^f(A). \end{aligned}$$

Hence μ^f is weakly inner regular at A . □

Our next result, again for possibly infinite measures, involves the restriction of measures to open subsets. If U is an open subset of X and if $f \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$, then it is easy to see that, as in the real case,

$$(10.2) \quad \int_U f|_U d\mu_U = \int_X \chi_U f d\mu.$$

Indeed, this holds for characteristic functions, then for elementary functions, and then for f by the definition of the integral. Replacing f with $\chi_A f$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}_U$, this yields that $(\mu_U)^{f|_U}(A) = \mu^f(A)$, so that $(\mu_U)^{f|_U} = (\mu^f)_U$. We shall write μ_U^f for this common resulting measure on $\mathcal{B}_U$.

Theorem 10.6. *Suppose that E is a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space. Let $\mu \in M(X, \mathcal{B}, E^+)$ be such that:*

- (1) μ is a quasi-regular Borel measure on X ;
- (2) μ_U is a regular Borel measure on U for all $U \in \Upsilon$.

Let $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$ be such that the subset $\{x \in X : f(x) > 0\}$ of X has finite μ -measure. Then:

- (1) μ^f is a quasi-regular Borel measure on X that is inner regular at all Borel sets;
- (2) μ_U^f is a finite regular Borel measure on U for all $U \in \Upsilon$.

It follows from Corollary 7.8 that μ itself is also inner regular at all Borel sets, and from Lemma 7.4 that the μ_U are also finite measures for $U \in \Upsilon$. These are the properties that are inherited by μ^f .

PROOF. We start by proving that μ^f is a quasi-regular Borel measure.

If K is compact, then K is contained in a relatively compact open subset U of X . Since μ_U is a finite measure, $\mu(K)$ is finite. Since f is bounded, it is then clear that $\mu^f(K)$ is finite. Hence μ^f is a Borel measure.

Since μ is weakly inner regular at all Borel sets, we know from Corollary 7.8 that μ is inner regular at all Borel sets. In particular, if $A \in \mathcal{B}$, then μ is inner regular at $A \cap \{x \in X : f(x) > 0\}$. Lemma 10.5 then shows that μ^f is inner regular at A . Hence μ^f is inner regular at all Borel sets; in particular, μ^f is inner regular at all open subsets of X .

Let $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Since μ is weakly inner regular at all Borel sets, it is, in particular, weakly inner regular at $A \cap \{x \in X : f(x) > 0\}$. Lemma 10.5 then shows that μ^f is weakly inner regular at A . Hence μ^f is weakly inner regular at all Borel sets.

This concludes the proof of part (1).

Since the μ_U for $U \in \Upsilon$ are all finite regular Borel measures, Corollary 10.4 shows that the $(\mu_U)^{f|_U}$ are finite regular Borel measures. Since $(\mu_U)^{f|_U} = \mu_U^f$, this establishes part (2). $\square$

Remark 10.7. The subtle point in Theorem 10.6 is the inner regularity of μ^f . This ultimately rests on Proposition 7.6, which uses the normality of E . Hence it is for the inner regularity that the normality of E is used.

§11. Positive measures with values in partially ordered algebras

In this section, we consider measures with values in partially ordered algebras. We study how these behave under left and right multiplication with a fixed positive element, and, in the context of a measure on a locally compact Hausdorff space, how regularity properties are inherited by the multiplied measures. The notion of a spectral measure with values in a partially ordered algebra is also introduced, and it is shown that the positive linear maps that these represent are positive algebra homomorphisms.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered algebra, and let $\mu : 2^X \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a set map. For $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$, we define $\mu_a, \mu_{\cdot a} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^+$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_a(A) &= a \cdot \mu(A), \\ \mu_{\cdot a}(A) &= \mu(A) \cdot a.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 11.1. *Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, where Ω is a σ -algebra. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a σ -monotone complete partially ordered algebra and that multiplication in $\mathcal{A}$ is σ -monotone continuous. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \Omega, \mathcal{A}^+)$, and let $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$.*

- (1) *The set maps μ_a and $\mu_{\cdot a}$ are positive $\mathcal{A}$ -valued measures. If $A \in \Omega$ is a μ -nullset, then it is a μ_a -nullset and a $\mu_{\cdot a}$ -nullset.*
- (2) *If $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$, then $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu_a; \mathbb{R})$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu_{\cdot a}; \mathbb{R})$, and*

$$(11.1) \quad \begin{aligned}\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu_a &= a \cdot \left(\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu \right), \\ \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu_{\cdot a} &= \left(\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu \right) \cdot a\end{aligned}$$

in $\mathcal{A}$.

PROOF. Part (1) is clear from the definitions; the σ -monotone continuity of the multiplication in E guarantees that μ_a and $\mu_{\cdot a}$ are again σ -additive. In part (2), we cover the case for μ_a ; the argument for $\mu_{\cdot a}$ is similar. It is clear from the definitions that equation (11.1) holds for characteristic functions of measurable subsets, and then it holds for elementary functions. If $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$, we choose a sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $\varphi_n \uparrow f$ pointwise. Then the definition of the integral implies that

$$\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu_a = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu_a = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty a \cdot \left(\int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu \right) = a \cdot \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, d\mu = a \cdot \left(\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu \right),$$

where the penultimate inequality is validated by the fact that left multiplication in E is σ -monotone continuous. This shows that $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+) \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu_a; \mathbb{R}^+)$, and that equation (11.1) holds for $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$. For the general case, the proof follows by splitting $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$ into its positive and negative parts. $\square$

For later use, we record the following obvious facts in the context of locally compact Hausdorff spaces.

Lemma 11.2. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let $\mathcal{A}$ be a monotone complete partially ordered algebra with monotone continuous multiplication, let $\mu \in \mathbf{M}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A}^+)$, let $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$, and let $A \in \mathcal{B}$.*

- (1) *If μ is inner regular at A , then so are μ_a and $\mu_{\cdot a}$.*
- (2) *If μ is outer regular at A , then so are μ_a and $\mu_{\cdot a}$.*
- (3) *If μ is weakly inner regular at A , then so are μ_a and $\mu_{\cdot a}$.*
- (4) *If μ is a regular Borel measure, then so are μ_a and $\mu_{\cdot a}$;*
- (5) *If μ is a quasi-regular Borel measure, then so are μ_a and $\mu_{\cdot a}$.*

In later sections, our interest will be in the existence of algebra-valued measures that have a special property. As a prelude, we already introduce the pertinent notion in the present section, and give a few elementary properties.

Definition 11.3. Let (X, Ω) be a measure space, where Ω is a σ -algebra, and Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered algebra. A positive $\mathcal{A}$ -valued measure $P : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^+$ is called a *spectral measure* if

$$(11.2) \quad P(A_1 \cap A_2) = P(A_1)P(A_2)$$

for all $A_1, A_2 \in \Omega$.

If $\mathcal{A}$ has a unit element e , it is not required that $P(X) = e$.

By definition, a spectral measure is always finite. The reason for this is the following. Any reasonable multiplicative structure on $\overline{\mathcal{A}^+}$ would be such that $0 \cdot \infty = 0$ and $a \cdot \infty = \infty$ for all $a > 0$. If P is not finite, then $P(X) = \infty$. In that case, if $A \in \Omega$, then $P(A) = P(A \cap X) = P(A)P(X) = P(A) \cdot \infty$. It follows that either $P(A) = 0$ or $P(A) = \infty$. Such degenerate measures are hardly of interest.

The following is clear.

Lemma 11.4. *Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, where Ω is a σ -algebra, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered algebra. If $P : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^+$ is a spectral measure, then $\{P(A) : A \in \Omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^+$ is an ordered commutative multiplicative semigroup that consists of positive idempotents in $\mathcal{A}$. It has an identity element $P(X)$, which is also its largest element; 0 is its smallest element. If $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$, then $P(A_1)P(A_2) = 0$.*

Lemma 11.5. *Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, where Ω is a σ -algebra, let $\mathcal{A}$ be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered algebra such that multiplication is σ -order continuous, and let $P : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^+$ be a spectral measure.*

If $f, g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R}^+)$, then $fg \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R}^+)$, and

$$(11.3) \quad \int_X^\circ fg \, dP = \int_X^\circ f \, dP \cdot \int_X^\circ g \, dP.$$

PROOF. It is an immediate consequence of the definition of the integral of elementary functions and equation (11.2) that equation (11.3) holds for $f, g \in \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$. For general $f, g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R}^+)$, we choose sequences $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty, \{\psi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{E}(X, \Omega; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $\varphi_n \uparrow f$ and $\psi_n \uparrow g$. Then $\varphi_n \psi_n \uparrow fg$. Using Lemma 4.2 and the definition of the order integral, we see that

$$\int_X^\circ fg \, dP \uparrow \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \psi_n \, dP = \int_X^\circ \varphi_n \, dP \cdot \int_X^\circ \psi_n \, dP \uparrow \int_X^\circ f \, dP \cdot \int_X^\circ g \, dP.$$

□

The following is now clear from Lemma 11.5, Proposition 9.7, and Theorem 9.8.

Theorem 11.6. *Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, where Ω is a σ -algebra, let $\mathcal{A}$ be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered algebra such that multiplication is σ -order continuous, and let $P : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^+$ be a spectral measure.*

(1) *The space $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R})$ is a σ -Dedekind complete Riesz algebra, and*

$$(11.4) \quad \int_X^\circ fg \, dP = \int_X^\circ f \, dP \cdot \int_X^\circ g \, dP.$$

for $f, g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R})$.

The σ -order ideal $\mathcal{N}(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R})$ in $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R})$ is also an algebra ideal.

(2) *The space $L^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R})$ is a Riesz algebra, and the quotient map from the Riesz algebra $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R})$ to $L^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R})$ is a σ -order continuous Riesz algebra homomorphism.*

(3) *The map that sends $[f] \in L^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R})$ to $\int_X^\circ f \, dP \in \mathcal{A}$ is a well-defined positive algebra homomorphism from $L^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R})$ into $\mathcal{A}$. It is faithful on the positive cone $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^+)$ of $L^1(X, \Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.*

(4) *If $\mathcal{A}$ is order separable and monotone complete, then $L^1(X, \Omega, P; \mathbb{R})$ is Dedekind complete.*

§12. Riesz representation theorem for $C_c(X)$: normed case

In this section, we present our first generalisation of the classical Riesz representation theorem for $C_c(X)$, where X is a locally compact Hausdorff space. Let us recall the theorem for convenience.

Theorem 12.1 (Riesz representation theorem for $C_c(X)$; real case). *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a positive linear functional. Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure μ on X such that*

$$T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

for all f in $C_c(X)$.

The measure μ is finite if and only if T is continuous with respect to the supremum norm topology on $C_c(X)$.

Theorem 12.3 shows that, apart from the equivalence statement about continuity and finiteness of the measure, this can be generalised to a larger class of normed partially ordered vector spaces.

We introduce the following usual notation.

Definition 12.2. If X is a locally compact Hausdorff space and S is an subset of X , then we shall write $f \prec S$ to denote that $f \in C_c(X)$, that $0 \leq f(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in X$, and that $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq S$. We shall write $S \prec f$ to denote that $f \in C_c(X)$, that $0 \leq f(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in X$, and that $f(x) = 1$ for all $s \in S$.

Theorem 12.3 (Riesz representation theorem for $C_c(X)$; normed case). *Let E be a monotone complete partially ordered vector space that is also a normed space. Suppose that E has the following properties:*

- (1) *If $x_\lambda \downarrow 0$ in E , then $\|x_\lambda\| \rightarrow 0$;*
- (2) *If $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset E^+$ is such that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \|x_n\| < \infty$, then $\bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \sum_{n=1}^N x_n$, which exists in $\overline{E}$, is actually finite.*
- (3) *If $x \in E$ is such that $(x, x') \geq 0$ for all norm bounded positive σ -order continuous linear functionals on E , then $x \in E^+$.*

Let X be a non-empty locally compact Hausdorff space, and let $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ be a positive linear map.

Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{E^+}$ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

If V is a non-empty open subset of X , then

$$(12.1) \quad \mu(V) = \bigvee \{T(f) : f \prec V\}$$

in $\overline{E}$.

If K is a compact subset of X , then

$$(12.2) \quad \mu(K) = \bigwedge \{T(f) : K \prec f\}$$

in $\overline{E}$.

Consequently, μ is a finite measure if and only if $\{T(f) : f \in C_c(X)^+, \|f\| \leq 1\}$ is order bounded in E ; this is automatically the case if X is compact.

If μ is a finite measure and if the norm of E is monotone on E^+ , then T is continuous with respect to the norm topologies on $C_c(X)$ (supremum norm) and E .

Let us mention explicitly that under (1) it is not required that $\|x_\lambda\| \downarrow 0$.

In the context of a normed Riesz space E , the requirement under (2) is the so-called Riesz-Fischer property. It characterises the Banach lattices among the normed Riesz spaces; see [29, Theorem 16.2].

Before we embark on the lengthy proof, let us note that the real numbers evidently satisfy all requirements in the theorem, so that it contains the classical theorem as a special case (one has to use the fact that a norm bounded subset of the real numbers is order bounded to obtain the full equivalence between continuity of T and the finiteness of the measure in Theorem 12.1).

More generally, every Banach lattice with order continuous norm satisfies the requirements in the theorem. Indeed, the first requirement is satisfied by definition, and the second one is a consequence of the well-known fact that the sum of a convergent series with positive terms in a normed Riesz space is also the supremum of the sequence of its partial sums; see

e.g. [29, Theorem 15.3]. The third requirement follows from Proposition 3.10 and its proof, where it was also observed that a Banach lattice with order continuous norm is Dedekind complete.

The global layout of the following proof of Theorem 12.3 is modelled after that of [2, Theorem 28.3] for the real case; the part where it is established that the measure as constructed actually represents the positive linear map is essentially that of [8, Proposition 7.2.11] for the real case. Although our statement is a little stronger, the proof of equation (12.2) is essentially that of the corresponding statement in the real case in [13, Theorem 7.2].

The arguments in the proof rather strongly resemble those for the real case, but there are certainly modifications. The proof that the set map μ^* in the proof below is an outer measure requires a special argument in the vector-valued case. Furthermore, we shall use the fact that the space is Archimedean a few times; in the real case it is not always so obvious in the various proofs in the literature that this is a property of the real numbers that is crucial for the proof. For example, the part of the proof of [13, Theorem 7.2] where it is shown that the measure represents the integral concludes with an argument invoking the lattice structure of $\mathbb{R}$. That does not apply in the more general context, and one could, therefore, argue that it is the ‘wrong’ argument and that the Archimedean property of $\mathbb{R}$ should have been used instead. Even though this adaptation is easily implemented, this shows once more that it is easy to go astray when thinking that a proof for the real case ‘can obviously be generalised’. One has to go over each detail again.

PROOF OF THEOREM 12.3. We define a set map $\mu^* : 2^X \rightarrow \bar{E}$ as follows. Set $\mu(\emptyset) := 0$, and set

$$(12.3) \quad \mu(V) := \bigvee \{ T(f) : f \prec V \}$$

in $\bar{E}$ for all non-empty open subsets of X . Note that the set in the right hand side of this equation is upward directed as a consequence of the positivity of T , so that the supremum indeed exists in $\bar{E}$. Indeed, if $f_1, f_2 \prec V$, then $f_1 \vee f_2 \prec V$, and $T(f_1 \vee f_2) \geq T(f_1)$ and $T(f_1 \vee f_2) \geq T(f_2)$.

Evidently, $\mu(V) \geq 0$ for all open subsets V of X , and $\mu(V_1) \leq \mu(V_2)$ if V_1 and V_2 are open subsets of X such that $V_1 \subseteq V_2$.

For an arbitrary subset A of X , we set

$$(12.4) \quad \mu^*(A) := \bigwedge \{ \mu(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \}.$$

in $\bar{E}$. Note that the set in the right hand side of this equation is downward directed, so that the infimum indeed exists in $\bar{E}$. Indeed, if V_1, V_2 are open subsets of X such that $A \subseteq V_1, V_2$, then $A \subseteq V_1 \cap V_2$, and $\mu^*(V_1 \cap V_2) \leq \mu^*(V_1)$ and $\mu^*(V_1 \cap V_2) \leq \mu^*(V_2)$ as a consequence of the monotonicity of μ on the open subsets of X that we have already observed. This monotonicity on the open subsets of X also shows that $\mu(V) = \mu^*(V)$ for all open subsets V of X . If V is an open subset of X , we shall write $\mu(V)$ for this common element of $\bar{E}^+$.

Evidently, $\mu^*(A) \geq 0$ for all subsets A of X , and $\mu^*(A_1) \leq \mu^*(A_2)$ if A_1 and A_2 are subsets of X such that $A_1 \subseteq A_2$.

The first main step in the proof consists of showing that μ^ is an outer measure.*

We shall now proceed to show this.

Since $\mu^*(\emptyset) = 0$ and since the monotonicity of μ^* has already been established, we are left with the σ -sub-additivity.

We first establish the σ -sub-additivity of μ^* for open subsets of X , on which it coincides with μ . Let $\{V_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of open subsets of X . Then $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty V_n$ is open, and we are to

show that $\mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} V_n) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(V_n)$ in $\bar{E}$. In doing so, we may and shall suppose that all V_n are non-empty.

Suppose that $f \prec \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} V_n$. Since $\text{supp}(f)$ is compact, there exists $m \geq 1$ such that $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^m V_n$. Then [21, Theorem 2.13] furnishes $f_1, \dots, f_m$ in $C_c(X)$ such that $f_n \prec V_n$ for $n = 1, \dots, m$ and $\sum_{n=1}^m f_n(x) = 1$ for all $x \in \text{supp}(f)$. Then clearly $f \leq \sum_{n=1}^m f_n$, so

$$T(f) \leq \sum_{n=1}^m T(f_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^m \mu(V_n) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(V_n).$$

in $\bar{E}$. This is true for all $f \prec \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} V_n$, so we have

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} V_n\right) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(V_n)$$

in $\bar{E}$. Hence μ^* is σ -sub-additive on the open subsets of X .

We shall now establish the σ -sub-additivity of μ^* for arbitrary subsets of X .

Let $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be sequence of subsets of X . We are going to show that $\mu^*(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu^*(A_n)$ in $\bar{E}$. In doing so, we may and shall suppose that

$$x := \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n)$$

is actually an element of E . Then $\mu^*(A_n)$ is also finite for $n \geq 1$, so that, by part (3) of Lemma 2.3,

$$\mu^*(A_n) = \bigwedge \{ \mu(V) : V \text{ is open, } A_n \subseteq V, \text{ and } \mu(V) \in E \}.$$

That is, $(\mu(V) - \mu^*(A_n)) \downarrow 0$ as V runs over the open neighbourhoods of A_n . By requirement (1) in the theorem, we also have $\|\mu(V) - \mu^*(A_n)\| \rightarrow 0$.

After these preparations, we fix a norm bounded positive σ -order continuous linear functional x' on E and $\varepsilon > 0$.

For each $n \geq 1$, we can then find an open neighbourhood V_n of A_n such that $\mu(V_n)$ is finite and $\|\mu(V_n) - \mu^*(A_n)\| < \varepsilon/2^n$. As a consequence of requirement (2), we can set

$$y := \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N (\mu(V_n) - \mu^*(A_n))$$

as an element of E .

Let $N \geq 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(V_n) \right] - x &\leq \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(V_n) - \sum_{n=1}^N \mu^*(A_n) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N (\mu(V_n) - \mu^*(A_n)) \\ &\leq y, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(V_n) \leq x + y.$$

We conclude that $\bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(V_n)$ is finite, and that

$$\bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(V_n) \leq x + y.$$

Since $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} V_n$, we then see, using the monotonicity of μ^* and the σ -sub-additivity of μ on the open subsets of X , that

$$\mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) \leq \mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} V_n\right) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} V_n\right) \leq \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(V_n) \leq x + y.$$

In particular, $\mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right)$ is finite. Hence we see, using the σ -order continuity of x' in the second step, that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right), x'\right) &\leq (x + y, x') \\ &= (x, x') + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\mu(V_n) - \mu^*(A_n), x') \\ &\leq (x, x') + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|\mu(V_n) - \mu^*(A_n)\| \|x'\| \\ &\leq (x, x') + \varepsilon \|x'\|. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we conclude that

$$\left(\mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right), x'\right) \leq (x, x').$$

Since this is true for all norm bounded positive σ -order continuous linear functionals x' , requirement (3) implies that

$$\mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) \leq x = \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n).$$

We have now shown that μ^* is an outer measure.

The next step is to show that every Borel set is μ^ -measurable. The fact that the restriction of μ^* to the Borel σ -algebra is a regular Borel measure will simultaneously be established during the process.*

This step is itself broken up into a number of intermediate results.

We claim that $\mu^(K)$ is finite for every compact subset K of X .*

To see this, suppose that K is a compact subset X . Using [20, Theorem 2.7], we can choose a relatively open subset V of X such that $K \subseteq V$. By Urysohn's Lemma (see [20, Theorem 2.12]), there exists $g \in C_c(X)$ such that $\bar{V} \prec g$. From this, we see that

$$\mu^*(K) \leq \mu^*(V) = \mu(V) = \bigvee \{T(f) : f \prec V\} \leq T(g),$$

so that $\mu^*(K)$ is finite.

We claim that μ^ is finitely additive on the compact subsets of X .*

To see this, it is sufficient to show that $\mu^*(K_1 \cup K_2) \geq \mu^*(K_1) + \mu^*(K_2)$ for any two disjoint compact subsets K_1 and K_2 of X . Since X is a Hausdorff space, there exist open subsets U_1 and U_2 of X such that $K_1 \subseteq U_1$, $K_2 \subseteq U_2$, and $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$. Let V be an arbitrary open neighbourhood

of $K_1 \cup K_2$. Then $K_1 \subseteq V \cap U_1$, $K_2 \subseteq V \cap U_2$, and $(V \cap U_1) \cap (V \cap U_2) = \emptyset$. The latter disjointness implies that $f_1 + f_2 \prec V$ whenever $f_1 \prec V \cap U_1$ and $f \prec V \cap U_2$. Using this, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(K_1) + \mu^*(K_2) &\leq \mu(V \cap U_1) + \mu(V \cap U_2) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \bigvee \{T(f_i) : f_i \prec V \cap U_i\} \\ &= \bigvee \{T(f_1) + T(f_2) : f_1 \prec V \cap U_1 \text{ and } f_2 \prec V \cap U_2\} \\ &= \bigvee \{T(f_1 + f_2) : f_1 \prec V \cap U_1 \text{ and } f_2 \prec V \cap U_2\} \\ &\leq \bigvee \{T(f) : f \prec V\} \\ &= \mu(V). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the defining equation (12.4), we see that $\mu^*(K_1) + \mu(K_2) \leq \mu^*(K_1 \cup K_2)$, as required.

We claim that $\mu^(\text{supp}(f)) \geq T(f)$ whenever $f \prec X$.*

Indeed, if V is any open neighbourhood of $\text{supp}(f)$, then $f \prec V$, so that $T(f) \leq \mu(V)$. Recalling the defining equation (12.4), we can see that $\mu^*(\text{supp}(f)) \geq T(f)$, as required.

We claim that

$$(12.5) \quad \mu(V) = \bigvee \{\mu^*(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq V\}$$

in $\bar{E}$ for every open subset V of X .

To see this, we may suppose that $V \neq \emptyset$. In that case, using the previous result and the monotonicity of μ^* , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(V) &= \bigvee \{T(f) : f \prec V\} \\ &\leq \bigvee \{\mu^*(\text{supp } f) : f \prec V\} \\ &\leq \bigvee \{\mu^*(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq V\} \\ &\leq \mu^*(V) \\ &= \mu(V). \end{aligned}$$

This establishes our claim.

We claim that $\mu^(K \cup V) = \mu^*(K) + \mu(V)$ whenever K is a compact subset of X , V is an open subset of X , and $K \cap V = \emptyset$.*

To see this, we use equation (12.5) and the finite additivity of μ^* on the compact subsets of X to justify that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(K \cup V) &\leq \mu^*(K) + \mu(V) \\ &= \mu^*(K) + \bigvee \{\mu^*(K_V) : K_V \text{ is compact and } K_V \subseteq V\} \\ &= \bigvee \{\mu^*(K) + \mu^*(K_V) : K_V \text{ is compact and } K_V \subseteq V\} \\ &= \bigvee \{\mu^*(K \cup K_V) : K_V \text{ is compact and } K_V \subseteq V\} \\ &\leq \mu^*(K \cup V). \end{aligned}$$

This establishes our claim.

We claim that every Borel set is μ^ -measurable.*

To see this, it is sufficient to show that every open subset of X is μ^* -measurable. Let V be an open subset of X . In order to show that V is μ^* -measurable, it is sufficient to show that $\mu^*(A) \geq \mu^*(A \cap V) + \mu^*(A \cap V^c)$ whenever A is a subset of X such that $\mu^*(A)$ is finite.

We first show this if A is an open subset of X . In that case, let K be a compact subset of $A \cap V$. Then $A = K \cup (A \setminus K)$ as a disjoint union. Since $A \setminus K$ is an open subset of X , our previous result shows that

$$\mu(A) = \mu^*(K) + \mu(A \setminus K).$$

Since $A \cap V^c \subseteq A \cap K^c$, this implies that

$$\mu^*(K) + \mu^*(A \cap V^c) \leq \mu^*(K) + \mu(A \setminus K) = \mu(A).$$

Using equation (12.5) for the open subset $A \cap V$ of X , we see that

$$\mu(A \cap V) + \mu^*(A \cap V^c) \leq \mu(A)$$

for all open subsets A of X , as desired.

Suppose now that A is an arbitrary subset of X such that $\mu^*(A)$ is finite. If U is an open neighbourhood of A such that $\mu(U)$ is finite, then, using what we have just established in the first step, we see that

$$\mu(U) \geq \mu(U \cap V) + \mu^*(U \cap V^c) \geq \mu^*(A \cap V) + \mu^*(A \cap V^c).$$

Since this is evidently also true if $\mu(U) = \infty$, the defining equation (12.4), shows that

$$\mu^*(A) \geq \mu^*(A \cap V) + \mu^*(A \cap V^c).$$

This concludes the proof that all Borel sets are μ^* -measurable.

In the remainder of the proof, we shall write μ for the restriction of μ^ to the Borel σ -algebra of X .*

We have already seen that μ is finite on the compact subsets of X . Furthermore, inner regularity at all open subsets of X was established in equation (12.5), and outer regularity at all Borel sets was built in by the defining equation (12.4).

Hence μ is a regular Borel measure on X .

Equation (12.1) is simply the defining equation (12.3).

We shall now establish equation (12.2).

For this, we need a preparatory result that we shall also use in the sequel of the proof.

We claim that $\mu(K) \leq T(f)$ whenever K is a compact subset of X and $f \in C_c(X)$ is such that $\chi_K \leq f$.

To see this, fix ε such that $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, and set $U_\varepsilon = \{x \in X : f(x) > 1 - \varepsilon\}$. Then U_ε is open and $K \subseteq U_\varepsilon$. If $g < U_\varepsilon$, then $g \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{-1}f$, so that

$$\mu(K) \leq \mu(U_\varepsilon) = \bigvee \{T(g) : g < U_\varepsilon\} \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{-1}T(f).$$

Hence $\mu(K) \leq T(f) + \varepsilon\mu(K)$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\mu(K)$ is finite and E is Archimedean, this implies that $\mu(K) \leq T(f)$.

Continuing with the proof of equation (12.2), we see from what we have just demonstrated that $\mu(K) \leq \bigwedge \{T(f) : K < f\}$. In order to establish the reverse inequality, let V be an open neighbourhood of K . By Urysohn's Lemma (see [21, Theorem 2.7]), there exists a function f such that $K < f < V$. Then $\mu(V) \geq T(f)$. Equation (12.4) then implies that

$$\mu(K) = \bigwedge \{\mu(V) : V \text{ is open and } K \subseteq V\} \geq \bigwedge \{T(f) : K < f\}.$$

This concludes the proof of equation (12.2).

We shall now show that $T(f) = \int_X f d\mu$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

For this, we need a final preparatory result.

We claim that $\mu(K) \geq T(f)$ whenever K is a compact subset of X and $f \in C_c(X)$ is such that $0 \leq f \leq \chi_K$.

To see this, let V be an open neighbourhood of K . Then $f \prec V$, so that $\mu(V) \geq T(f)$ by the defining equation (12.3), and then $\mu(K) \geq T(f)$ by the defining equation (12.4).

Continuing with the proof that $T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$, we note that we may clearly suppose that $f \in C_c(X)^+$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. For all $n \geq 1$, define $f_n : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f_n(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } f(x) \leq (n-1)\varepsilon; \\ f(x) - (n-1)\varepsilon & \text{if } (n-1)\varepsilon < f(x) \leq n\varepsilon; \\ \varepsilon & \text{if } n\varepsilon < f(x). \end{cases}$$

A moment's thought shows that $f_n \in C_c(X)^+$ and $f_n(X) \subseteq [0, \varepsilon]$ for all $n \geq 1$, and that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty f_n(x) = f(x)$, where the series is a finite sum for every $x \in X$. There exists $N \geq 1$ such that $f_n = 0$ for all $n > N$, so that actually $f = \sum_{n=1}^N f_n$ is a finite sum. We set $K_0 := \text{supp}(f)$ and $K_n := \{x \in X : f(x) \geq n\varepsilon\}$ for $n \geq 1$. Then $\varepsilon \chi_{K_n} \leq f_n \leq \varepsilon \chi_{K_{n-1}}$ for all $n \geq 1$. The first of these inequalities, written as $\chi_{K_n} \leq f_n/\varepsilon$, implies that $\mu(K_n) \leq T(f_n)/\varepsilon$ for $n \geq 1$ by one of the claims established above. The second of these inequalities, written as $f_n/\varepsilon \leq \chi_{K_{n-1}}$, implies that $\mu(K_{n-1}) \geq T(f_n)/\varepsilon$ for all $n \geq 1$ by our most recent auxiliary result. Thus we have $\varepsilon \mu(K_n) \leq T(f_n) \leq \varepsilon \mu(K_{n-1})$ for $n \geq 1$. It is evident from the monotonicity of the order integral that $\varepsilon \mu(K_n) \leq \int_X^\circ f_n \, d\mu \leq \varepsilon \mu(K_{n-1})$ for $n \geq 1$. Since $f = \sum_{n=1}^N f_n$, a summation of the inequalities shows that

$$\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^N \mu(K_n) \leq T(f) \leq \varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^N \mu(K_{n-1})$$

and that

$$\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^N \mu(K_n) \leq \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu \leq \varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^N \mu(K_{n-1}).$$

This implies that $T(f) - \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu \leq \varepsilon(\mu(K_0) - \mu(K_N)) \leq \varepsilon \mu(K_0) = \varepsilon \mu(\text{supp}(f))$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary and E is Archimedean, we see that $T(f) - \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu \leq 0$. The reverse inequality is likewise true by a similar argument, and we conclude that $T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$, as required.

We turn to the uniqueness of μ .

Suppose that μ' is another regular Borel measure on X such that $T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu'$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$. By regularity, it is sufficient to show that $\mu(K) = \mu'(K)$ for all compact subsets K of X .

Let V be an open neighbourhood of K . The Urysohn Lemma furnishes $f \in C_c(X)$ with $K \prec f \prec V$ (see [21, Theorem 2.13]), and then

$$\mu'(K) = \int_X^\circ \chi_K \, d\mu' \leq \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu' = T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu \leq \int_X^\circ \chi_V \, d\mu = \mu(V).$$

Using the outer regularity of μ at K , we see that $\mu'(K) \leq \mu(K)$. The reverse inequality likewise holds, and we conclude that μ is the unique regular Borel measure on X that represents T .

If the space X is compact, then $\{T(f) : f \in C_c(X)^+, \|f\| \leq 1\}$ is obviously order bounded in E , since it has $T(1)$ as an upper bound.

The statement concerning the continuity of T is obvious. □

We have the following consequence.

Theorem 12.4. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let E be a monotone complete partially ordered vector spaces with the properties (1), (2), and (3) in Theorem 12.3.*

If $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{E}^+$ is a positive $\overline{E}$ -valued regular Borel measure, define $T_\mu : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ by $T_\mu(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ for $f \in C_c(X)$.

Then the map $\mu \mapsto T_\mu$ is an order preserving cone isomorphism between the cone $M_{\text{rB}}(X, \mathcal{B}, \overline{E}^+)$ of positive $\overline{E}$ -valued regular Borel measures on X and $L_r(C_c(X), E)^+$ of positive linear operators from $C_c(X)$ into E .

PROOF. The combination of Theorems 8.10 and 12.3 shows that the map is a cone isomorphism, and clearly $T_\mu \leq T_\nu$ if $\mu \leq \nu$. Conversely, if $T_\mu \leq T_\nu$, then equation (12.1) shows that $\mu(V) \leq \nu(V)$ for all open subsets V of X . The outer regularity of μ and ν at all Borel sets then implies that $\mu \leq \nu$. $\square$

It is easy to give examples of positive linear maps $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ where Theorem 12.3 applies and where the representing measure μ is infinite. Indeed, let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space and let E be a Banach lattice with order continuous norm. Suppose that (ρ, e) is a pair where ρ is a regular Borel measure $\rho : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$, and where $e \in E^+ \setminus \{0\}$. Set $T_{\rho,e}(f) := \int_X f \, d\rho \cdot e$ for $f \in C_c(X)$. Then $T_{\rho,e} : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ is positive, and its representing measure $\mu_{\rho,e}$ is given by $\mu_{\rho,e}(A) = \rho(A) \cdot e$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Hence $\mu_{\rho,e}$ is infinite precisely if ρ is infinite. Although this yields examples where the representing measures are infinite, these are hardly interesting. However, one can use such operators as building blocks for others. Indeed, if $(\rho_1, e_1), \dots, (\rho_n, e_n)$ are n such pairs and ρ_1 is infinite, then $\bigvee_{i=1}^n T_{\rho_i, e_i} \in L_r(C_c(X), E)^+$, and its representing measure is again infinite. This is immediate from the fact that $\bigvee_{i=1}^n T_{\rho_i, e_i} \geq T_{\rho_1, e_1}$ and equation (12.1); one does not need Theorem 12.4 for this. Subsequently, one can take positive linear combinations of such finite suprema to obtain a non-zero cone of positive operators from $C_c(X)$ into E such that every non-zero element has an infinite representing measure.

§13. Riesz representation theorems for $C_c(X)$: normal case

In this section, we present two representation theorems for positive linear maps $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ in the case where E is a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space that need not be a normed space.

The idea is to use the classical Riesz representation theorem (which is now a special case of Theorem 12.3) as a stepping stone by invoking the positive order continuous linear functionals on E —of which there are sufficiently many by the normality of E .

Of course, linear functionals can act only on finite elements of $\overline{E}$, and this the reason that we first prove a representation theorem where the set $\{T(f) : f \prec X\}$ is supposed to be order bounded. This will serve to guarantee that everything in sight is a finite element of $\overline{E}$. It is thus that Theorem 13.4 for the finite case is established. The second representation theorem for the general case is then obtained from the finite case; see Theorem 13.5.

We shall have additional use for Theorem 13.4 for the finite case later on; see e.g. the proofs of Theorems 14.7 and 14.10.

We start by introducing a notation.

Suppose that (X, Ω) is a measurable space, that E is a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and that $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow E^+$ is a (finite-valued) set map. If $x' : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a positive linear functional, we define $\mu_{x'} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ by $\mu_{x'}(A) := (\mu(A), x')$ for $A \in \Omega$.

The following is immediate from the definitions and Proposition 3.9.

Lemma 13.1. *Let (X, Ω) be a measurable space, let E be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and let $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow E^+$ be a set map.*

- (1) *If $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow E^+$ is a measure, then $\mu_{x'} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a finite measure for all $x' \in (E_c^\sim)^+$.*
- (2) *If E is σ -normal, then the following are equivalent:*
 - (a) *$\mu : \Omega \rightarrow E^+$ is a finite measure;*
 - (b) *$\mu_{x'} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a finite measure for all $x' \in (E_c^\sim)^+$.*

Likewise, the following follows directly from the definitions and Proposition 3.8.

Lemma 13.2. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space with Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$, let E be normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and let $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow E^+$ be a set map.*

Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) *$\mu : \Omega \rightarrow E^+$ is a finite measure;*
- (2) *$\mu_{x'} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a finite measure for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$.*

If this is the case, then the following are equivalent for a Borel set A :

- (1) *$\mu : \Omega \rightarrow E^+$ is inner regular (resp. outer regular, resp. weakly inner regular) at A ;*
- (2) *$\mu_{x'} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is inner regular (resp. outer regular, resp. weakly inner regular) at A for all $x' \in E_n^\sim$.*

We shall have use for the following immediate consequence of the above two results. Of course, finite measures are always Borel measures, but we have still included the redundant adjective for reasons of uniformity.

Corollary 13.3. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space with Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$, let E be normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and let $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow E^+$ be a set map.*

Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) *$\mu : \Omega \rightarrow E^+$ is a finite regular (resp. quasi-regular) Borel measure on X ;*
- (2) *$\mu_{x'} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a finite regular (resp. quasi-regular) Borel measure on X for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$.*

After these preparations, we can now establish our first representation theorem for normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector spaces.

Theorem 13.4 (Riesz representation theorem for $C_c(X)$; finite normal case). *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space. Let $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ be a positive linear map such that $\{T(f) : f \in C_c(X)^+, \|f\| \leq 1\}$ is order bounded in E ; this is automatically the case if X is compact.*

Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{E^+}$ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$T(f) = \int_X^0 f \, d\mu$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

The measure μ is finite.

If V is a non-empty open subset of X , then

$$(13.1) \quad \mu(V) = \bigvee \{T(f) : f \prec V\}$$

in E .

If K is a compact subset of X , then

$$(13.2) \quad \mu(K) = \bigwedge \{ T(f) : K \prec f \}$$

in E .

PROOF. If the space X is compact, then $\{ T(f) : f \in C_c(X)^+, \|f\| \leq 1 \}$ is obviously order bounded in E , since it has $T(1)$ as an upper bound.

For a general locally compact space, suppose that $\{ T(f) : f \in C_c(X)^+, \|f\| \leq 1 \}$ is order bounded in E .

Motivated by the proof of Theorem 12.3, we define the set map $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow E^+$ by setting $\mu(\emptyset) := 0$,

$$(13.3) \quad \mu(V) := \bigvee \{ T(f) : f \prec V \}$$

in $\bar{E}$ for every non-empty open subset V of X , and

$$(13.4) \quad \mu(A) := \bigwedge \{ \mu(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \}$$

$$(13.5)$$

in $\bar{E}$ for every Borel set A . The remarks that were made in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 12.3 apply here as well, showing that both $\mu(V)$ and $\mu(A)$ are well-defined, and that the two definitions agree on the open subsets of X . It is clear from the hypotheses that $\mu(A)$ is, in fact, a finite element of $\bar{E}$ for every Borel set A , so that we can let linear functionals on E act on the range of μ .

We shall show that the set map μ has all required properties.

To this end, we define, for every $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$, the map $T_{x'} : C_c(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by setting

$$T_{x'}(f) := (T(f), x')$$

for $f \in C_c(X)$. Then $T_{x'}$ is a positive linear functional on $C_c(X)$. The classical Riesz representation theorem (the case where $E = \mathbb{R}$ in Theorem 13.4) informs us that, for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$, there exists a unique regular Borel measure $\nu_{x'} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$ such that

$$(13.6) \quad T_{x'}(f) = \int_X f \, d\nu_{x'}$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$. Since $\{ T_{x'}(f) : f \prec X \}$ is evidently order bounded in $\mathbb{R}$, Theorem 12.3 shows that $\nu_{x'}$ is, in fact, a finite regular Borel measure on X for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$.

For each $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$, we know from equation (12.1) that

$$\nu_{x'}(V) = \sup \{ T_{x'}(f) : f \prec V \}$$

for all non-empty open subsets V of X . On the other hand, we see from the defining equation (13.3) that

$$\mu_{x'}(V) = \sup \{ T_{x'}(f) : f \prec V \}$$

for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$ and all non-empty open subsets V of X . Hence $\mu_{x'}(V) = \nu_{x'}(V)$ for all non-empty open subsets V of X and all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$; this is trivially true for the empty subset.

Furthermore, the outer regularity of $\nu_{x'}$ means that

$$\nu_{x'}(A) = \inf \{ \nu_{x'}(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \}.$$

Using the defining equation (13.3) and what we have just observed for the open subsets of X , we therefore see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{x'}(A) &= \inf \{ \mu_{x'}(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \} \\ &= \inf \{ \nu_{x'}(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \} \\ &= \nu_{x'}(A).\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\mu_{x'} = \nu_{x'}$ for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$. Since we know that $\nu_{x'}$ is a regular Borel measure on X for all x' , it now follows from Corollary 13.3 that μ is a regular Borel measure on X .

It is clear from equation (13.3) that μ is a finite measure.

Equation (13.1) holds by construction.

If K is a compact subset of X , then equation (12.2) shows that

$$\mu_{x'}(K) = \nu_{x'}(K) = \bigwedge \{ T_{x'}(f) : K \prec f \}.$$

It then follows from Proposition 3.8 that

$$\mu(K) = \bigwedge \{ T(f) : K \prec f \},$$

which is equation (13.2).

Let $f \in C_c(X)^+$, and choose a sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathcal{E}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $\varphi_n \uparrow f$ in E pointwise. Fix $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$. Using the definition and equation (13.6), where we already know that $\mu_{x'} = \nu_{x'}$, we see that

$$\int_X^\circ \varphi_n d\mu_{x'} \uparrow \int_X^\circ f d\mu_{x'} = T_{x'}(f).$$

On the other hand, it is clear from the definition of the integral of elementary functions that

$$\int_X^\circ \varphi_n d\mu_{x'} = \left(\int_X^\circ \varphi_n d\mu, x' \right)$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Since $\int_X^\circ \varphi_n d\mu \uparrow \int_X^\circ f d\mu$ by definition, the σ -order continuity of x' therefore implies that

$$\int_X^\circ \varphi_n d\mu_{x'} = \left(\int_X^\circ \varphi_n d\mu, x' \right) \uparrow \left(\int_X^\circ f d\mu, x' \right).$$

We conclude that $T_{x'}(f) = \left(\int_X^\circ f d\mu, x' \right)$. Since this holds for all $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$ and E is normal, it follows that $T(f) = \int_X^\circ f d\mu$ for all $f \in C_c(X)^+$. By linearity, this is then also true for general $f \in C_c(X)$.

The uniqueness of μ as an a priori possibly infinite regular Borel measure representing T follows as in the conclusion of the proof of Theorem 12.3. $\square$

We can now also obtain a representation theorem when $\{T(f) : f \prec X\}$ need not be order bounded. The idea is to start by using Theorem 13.4 locally. If $U \in \mathcal{T}$ (that is: if U is an open relatively compact subset of X), then there exists $f \in C_c(X)$ such that $\bar{U} \prec \tilde{f}$. This implies that $f \leq \tilde{f}$ whenever $f \prec U$, so that $T(f) \leq T(\tilde{f})$ whenever $f \prec U$. We are now in the finite case that is covered by Theorem 13.4, so that there exists a unique regular Borel measure μ_U on U such that $T(f) = \int_U^\circ f d\mu_U$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$ that are supported in U . These local measures μ_U on U can then seen to be the restrictions of a global measure on X using a technique that is also employed in [26, proof of Theorem 1].

The details are contained in the proof of the following theorem.

Theorem 13.5 (Riesz representation theorem for $C_c(X)$; normal case). *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space, and let $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ be a positive linear map.*

Then there exists a unique measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{E}^+$ such that:

- (1) *For every $U \in \Upsilon$, the restriction μ_U of μ to $\mathcal{B}_U$ is a regular Borel measure on U ;*
- (2) *μ is weakly inner regular at all Borel sets;*
- (3) *$T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$.*

This measure μ is a quasi-regular Borel measure.

If $\tilde{\mu}$ is a regular Borel measure on X such that $T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$, then $\tilde{\mu} \geq \mu$, and $\tilde{\mu}$ and μ agree at all open subsets of X , at all compact subsets of X , at all Borel sets with finite $\tilde{\mu}$ -measure, and at all Borel sets with infinite μ -measure.

As a consequence of the last part: if A is a Borel set such that $\tilde{\mu}(A) \neq \mu(A)$, then A is neither open nor compact, $\tilde{\mu}(A) = \infty$, and $\mu(A)$ is finite. It also follows that, if T is represented by a finite regular Borel measure $\tilde{\mu}$, then it must be the case that $\tilde{\mu} = \mu$.

PROOF. The uniqueness is easily taken care of. For this, we note that, for a non-empty open subset U of X , we may canonically view $C_c(U)$ as a subset of $C_c(X)$. Indeed, if $f \in C_c(U)$, then we can extend f canonically to a continuous compactly supported function on X by setting $f(x) := 0$ for all $x \in X$ such that $x \notin U$. Then equation (10.2) shows that $T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu = \int_X^\circ \chi_U f \, d\mu = \int_U^\circ f \, d\mu_U$ for all $f \in C_c(U)$. Since μ_U is supposed to be a regular Borel measure on U , the uniqueness statement in Theorem 13.4 implies that μ_U is uniquely determined. Since μ is weakly inner regular at all Borel sets, i.e. since

$$\mu(A) = \bigvee \{ \mu(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} = \bigvee \{ \mu_U(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \},$$

for every Borel set A , we see that μ itself is unique.

This proof of the uniqueness also shows how to find μ , as follows. If $U \in \Upsilon$, then, as explained preceding the theorem, there exists a unique regular Borel measure μ_U on U such that $T(f) = \int_U^\circ f \, d\mu_U$ for all $f \in C_c(U)$.

We shall now patch these μ_U together to obtain a measure on X .

As a preparation for this, we note the following.

If $U, V \in \Upsilon$ and $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$, then the restriction of μ_U to $U \cap V$ is a regular Borel measure on $U \cap V$ that represents the restriction of T to $C_c(U \cap V)$. Since the same holds for μ_V , the uniqueness statement of Theorem 13.4 shows that the restrictions of μ_U and μ_V to $U \cap V$ coincide.

We can now define a set function on $\mathcal{B}$ that will turn out to have the desired properties. If A is Borel set, we set

$$(13.7) \quad \mu(A) := \bigvee \{ \mu_U(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \}$$

in $\overline{E}$. The supremum in the right hand side of this equation exists in $\overline{E}$, since the set is upward directed. Indeed, if $U, V \in \Upsilon$, then $\mu_U(A \cap U) = \mu_{U \cup V}(A \cap U) \leq \mu_{U \cup V}(A \cap (U \cup V))$, and likewise $\mu_V(A \cap V) \leq \mu_{U \cup V}(A \cap (U \cup V))$.

We claim that $\mu(A) = \mu_{U_0}(A)$ whenever A is a Borel set and $U_0 \in \Upsilon$ is such that $A \subseteq U_0$.

To see this, note that certainly $\mu(A) \geq \mu_{U_0}(A \cap U_0) = \mu_{U_0}(A)$. Furthermore, if $U \in \Upsilon$, then $\mu_U(A \cap U) = \mu_U(A \cap U_0 \cap U) = \mu_{U_0}(A \cap U_0 \cap U) \leq \mu_{U_0}(A)$. This implies that $\mu(A) \leq \mu_{U_0}(A)$. We conclude that $\mu(A) = \mu_{U_0}(A)$, as required.

We shall now show that μ is a measure.

It is clear that $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$. The first step towards σ -additivity is to show that μ is finitely additive. Let A and B be disjoint Borel sets. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu(A \cup B) &= \bigvee \{ \mu_U((A \cup B) \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu_U((A \cap U) \cup (B \cap U)) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu_U(A \cap U) + \mu_U(B \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &\leq \mu(A) + \mu(B) \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu_U(A \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} + \bigvee \{ \mu_V(B \cap V) : V \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu_U(A \cap U) + \mu_V(B \cap V) : U, V \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu_{U \cup V}(A \cap U) + \mu_{U \cup V}(B \cap V) : U, V \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu_{U \cup V}((A \cap U) \cup (B \cap V)) : U, V \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &\leq \bigvee \{ \mu_{U \cup V}((A \cup B) \cap (U \cup V)) : U, V \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &= \bigvee \{ \mu_U((A \cup B) \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\
 &= \mu(A \cup B).
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that μ is finitely additive.

Now that we know that μ is finitely additive, the σ -additivity is easily seen to be consequence of the fact that $\mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) = \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$ for every increasing sequence $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of Borel sets; we shall now show this. Using Proposition 5.5, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) &= \bigvee \left\{ \mu_U\left(\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) \cap U\right) : U \in \Upsilon \right\} \\
 &= \bigvee \left\{ \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_U(A_n \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \right\} \\
 &= \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\bigvee \{ \mu_U(A_n \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \right) \\
 &= \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n),
 \end{aligned}$$

as required.

This concludes the proof that μ is a measure.

The measure μ is weakly inner regular at all Borel sets.

Since we know that the restrictions of μ to the $U \in \Upsilon$ are the μ_U , this is clear from equation (13.7).

It is now easy to show that $T(f) = \int_X^{\circ} f \, d\mu$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

Indeed, one can choose $U \in \Upsilon$ such that $f \in C_c(U)$. Since we have already observed that the restriction of μ to U is μ_U , we see that $\int_X^{\circ} f \, d\mu = \int_U^{\circ} f \, d\mu_U$, and $\int_U^{\circ} f \, d\mu_U = T(f)$ by construction.

The measure μ is a Borel measure.

Since every compact subset of X is contained in a relatively open compact subset of X , and since μ_U is a finite measures for all $U \in \Upsilon$, this is clear.

The measure μ is inner regular at all open sets.

Let V be an open subset of X . Using that, for each $U \in \Upsilon$, μ_U is inner regular at all open subsets of U , we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(V) &= \bigvee \{ \mu_U(V \cap U) : U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &= \bigvee_{U \in \Upsilon} \{ \bigvee \{ \mu_U(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq V \cap U \} \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ \mu_U(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq V \cap U \text{ for some } U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq V \cap U \text{ for some } U \in \Upsilon \} \\ &\leq \bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq V \} \\ &\leq \mu(V).\end{aligned}$$

Since μ is a Borel measure that is inner regular at all open subsets of X and weakly inner regular at all Borel sets, it is a quasi-regular Borel measure.

We turn to the remaining statements.

Suppose that $\tilde{\mu}$ is a regular Borel measure that also represents T . Then, for all $u \in \Upsilon$, $\tilde{\mu}_U$ is a regular Borel measure that represents the restriction of T to $C_c(U)$. By uniqueness, we see that $\tilde{\mu}_U = \mu_U$ for all $U \in \Upsilon$. This implies that $\tilde{\mu}$ and μ agree at all compact subsets of X and then, by inner regularity, also at all open subsets of X . Knowing this, and using the outer regularity of $\tilde{\mu}$, we see that, for a Borel set A ,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu}(A) &= \bigwedge \{ \tilde{\mu}(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \} \\ &= \bigwedge \{ \mu(V) : V \text{ is open and } A \subseteq V \} \\ &\geq \mu(A),\end{aligned}$$

so that $\tilde{\mu} \geq \mu$.

Clearly, if $\mu(B) = \infty$, then $\tilde{\mu}(B) = \infty$ as well.

Finally, suppose A is a Borel set such that $\tilde{\mu}(A)$ is finite. Using Proposition 7.6 in the second step, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(A) &\leq \tilde{\mu}(A) \\ &= \bigvee \{ \tilde{\mu}(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ \mu(K) : K \text{ is compact and } K \subseteq A \} \\ &\leq \mu(A).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mu(A) = \tilde{\mu}(A)$. □

Remark 13.6. The representation theorem for the normed case (Theorem 12.3) and the representation theorem (Theorem 13.5) for the normal case both have their virtues. For example, the theorem for the normed case does not apply to ℓ^∞ , since it does not have order continuous norm. On the other hand, the normal representation theorem *does* apply to ℓ^∞ , since the space is Dedekind complete and the coordinate functionals are order continuous linear functionals that separate the points. If both theorems apply, as is e.g. the case for Banach lattices with order continuous norms, then the normed representation theorem (asserting that there is a representing regular Borel measure) gives a stronger conclusion than the normal representation theorem (asserting that there is a representing quasi-regular Borel measure).

§14. Riesz representation theorems for $C_0(X)$

In this section, we consider representation theorems for positive linear maps $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow E$ that are defined on $C_0(X)$ rather than on $C_c(X)$.

As a motivation for our approach, let us recall the classical theorem for $E = \mathbb{R}$ on the existence of a representing measure, formulated a little sharper than is usually done. We do not include the customary statement about the norm, since such investigations are outside the current body of work.

Theorem 14.1 (Riesz representation theorem for $C_0(X)$; real case). *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a positive linear functional. Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure μ on X such that*

$$(14.1) \quad T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

for all f in $C_c(X)$. This measure is finite, and equation (14.1) also holds for all $f \in C_0(X)$.

This is easily derived from Theorem 12.1, the classical representation theorem for $C_c(X)$. Indeed, since $C_0(X)$ is a Banach lattice and T is positive, T is continuous. Then so is its restriction to $C_c(X)$, and in that case Theorem 12.1 asserts that the unique representing regular Borel measure for $C_c(X)$ is finite. This implies that $C_0(X) \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu; \mathbb{R})$, so that we can define a map $f \mapsto \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ from $C_0(X)$ into $\mathbb{R}$. This positive linear map is continuous, and it agrees with the continuous map $f \mapsto T(f)$ on the dense subspace $C_c(X)$ of $C_0(X)$. Hence they coincide, and we conclude that equation (14.1) holds for all $f \in C_0(X)$.

The important ingredient in the above argument is the automatic continuity of positive linear maps from Banach lattices into normed Riesz spaces. We can also use this in a more general context. Here is a first example.

Lemma 14.2. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a normed Riesz space, and let $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow E$ be a positive linear map. Suppose that there exists a measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \bar{E}^+$ such that*

$$(14.2) \quad T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

for all f in $C_c(X)$ and such that $C_0(X) \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.

Then equation (14.2) also holds for all $f \in C_0(X)$.

PROOF. The map $f \mapsto \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ is a positive linear map from $C_c(X)$ into E . Hence it is continuous. Since $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ is likewise continuous, and since the two maps agree on $C_c(X)$, they are equal. $\square$

Looking at our representation theorems, there is one in which normed spaces (possibly normed Riesz spaces) figure, namely, Theorem 12.3. Lemma 14.2 makes clear that it is relevant to point out cases in which we know a priori that the representing measure for $C_c(X)$ from Theorem 12.3 is finite, i.e. that $\{T(f) : f \prec X\}$ is order bounded, once we have the extra information that T is the restriction of a positive linear map defined on $C_0(X)$. This is indeed possible, as is shown by the following result. It includes Theorem 14.1 as a special case.

We recall (see [3, p. 232]) that a Banach lattice is a *KB-space* if every increasing norm bounded net in the positive cone is norm convergent. As is well known, the norm limit is then

also the supremum of the net. In particular, every increasing norm bounded net in the positive cone of a KB-space is order bounded.

Furthermore, a KB-space satisfies all requirements in Theorem 13.5. Indeed, it has order continuous norm (see e.g. [23, Theorem 7.1]), so that it is Dedekind complete (see e.g. [3, Corollary 4.10]). The fact that it is a Banach space, together with the fact that a norm limit of an increasing sequence in a Banach lattice is also its supremum, shows that the second requirement is fulfilled. The third follows immediately from the normality of every Banach lattice with order continuous norm (see Proposition 3.10).

After these observations, the next result is easily proved.

Theorem 14.3. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a KB-space, and let $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow E$ be a positive linear map.*

Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{E^+}$ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$(14.3) \quad T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

The measure μ is finite, and equation (14.3) also holds for all $f \in C_0(X)$.

If V is a non-empty open subset of X , then

$$\mu(V) = \bigvee \{ T(f) : f \prec V \}$$

in E .

If K is a compact subset of X , then

$$\mu(K) = \bigwedge \{ T(f) : K \prec f \}$$

in E .

PROOF. As observed preceding the theorem, Theorem 12.3 can be applied. The measure μ that is obtained satisfies $\mu(X) = \{ T(f) : f \in C_c(X)^+, \|f\| \leq 1 \}$. Since T is positive, it is continuous, so that the set $\{ T(f) : f \in C_c(X)^+, \|f\| \leq 1 \}$ is norm bounded. Since it is also upward directed, as a consequence of the positivity of T , the remarks preceding the theorem show that it is order bounded. We conclude that μ is a finite measure, and then Lemma 14.2 applies to show that equation (14.3) is valid for all $f \in C_0(X)$. $\square$

We turn to the normal spaces, where we have Theorem 13.4 to start from. As we shall see, we shall actually obtain a generalisation of Theorem 14.3. For the normal spaces, we need the following companion result of Lemma 14.2.

Lemma 14.4. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space such that the positive linear functionals separate the points of E , and let $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow E$ be a positive linear map. Suppose that there exists a measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{E^+}$ such that*

$$(14.4) \quad T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

for all f in $C_c(X)$ and such that $C_0(X) \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu; \mathbb{R})$.

Then equation (14.4) also holds for all $f \in C_0(X)$.

PROOF. Fix a positive linear functional x' on E . Then the maps $f \mapsto (T(f), x')$ and $f \mapsto (\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu, x')$ are both positive linear functionals on the Banach lattice $C_0(X)$. Hence they are continuous. Since they agree on the dense subspace $C_c(X)$ of $C_0(X)$, they are equal. We conclude that $(T(f), x') = (\int_X^\circ f \, d\mu, x')$ for all $f \in C_0(X)$ and all positive linear functionals on E . Since the latter separate the points of E , it follows that $T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$ for all $f \in C_0(X)$. $\square$

Completely analogous to the above line of reasoning for normed spaces, it is, in view of Lemma 14.4, relevant to point out cases where we know a priori that the representing measure for $C_c(X)$ in Theorem 13.4 is finite, i.e. that $\{T(f) : f \prec X\}$ is order bounded, once we have the extra information that T is the restriction of a positive linear map defined on $C_0(X)$.

This is indeed possible again. For this, we recall two definitions.

Firstly, the norm on a Banach lattice is said to be a *Levi norm* if every norm bounded increasing net in the positive cone has a supremum.

Secondly, a Riesz space is called *perfect* if the natural Riesz homomorphism from E into $(E_n^\sim)_n$ is a surjective isomorphism. The relevance of these spaces for us lies in the following alternate characterisation due to Nakano; see [3, Theorem 1.71].

Theorem 14.5. *A Riesz space E is a perfect Riesz space if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

- (1) E is normal;
- (2) whenever an increasing net $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ in E^+ is such that $\sup(x_\lambda, x') < \infty$ for each $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$, then this net has a supremum in E .

The class of spaces for which we have a priori boundedness is a variation on Nakano's characterisation of the perfect Riesz spaces. Let us say that a Riesz space is *quasi-perfect* if the two following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) E is normal;
- (2) whenever an increasing net $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ in E^+ is such that $\sup(x_\lambda, x') < \infty$ for each $x' \in (E^\sim)^+$, then this net has a supremum in E .

Clearly, a quasi-perfect Riesz space is Dedekind complete.

Lemma 14.6. *The following inclusions between classes of Riesz spaces hold.*

- (1) Every KB-space is a normal Banach lattice space with a Levi norm;
- (2) Every normal Banach lattice with a Levi norm is a quasi-perfect Riesz space;
- (3) Every KB-space is a perfect Riesz space.
- (4) Every perfect Riesz space is a quasi-perfect Riesz space.

Consequently, all KB-spaces, all normal Banach lattices with a Levi norm, and all perfect Riesz spaces are quasi-perfect Riesz spaces.

PROOF. We prove part (1). As noted earlier, a KB-space has order continuous norm, so that it is normal. If $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a norm bounded increasing net in the positive cone of a KB-space, then it is norm convergent. As mentioned earlier, the norm limit of the net is then also the supremum of the net.

We prove part (2). Suppose that $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is an increasing net in the positive cone of a normal Banach lattice E with a Levi norm such that $\sup(x_\lambda, x') < \infty$ for each $x' \in (E^\sim)^+$. Then $\{(x_\lambda, x') : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is bounded in $\mathbb{R}$ for every $x' \in E^\sim = E^*$. We conclude that $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is norm bounded. Since the norm is supposed to be a Levi norm, the increasing net $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ has a supremum in E .

We prove part (3). As noted above, a KB-space is normal. Suppose that $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is an increasing net in the positive cone of a KB-space E such that $\sup(x_\lambda, x') < \infty$ for each $x' \in (E_n^\sim)^+$. This implies that the set $\{(x_\lambda, x') : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is bounded in $\mathbb{R}$ for every $x' \in E_n^\sim = E^*$, where the latter equality holds because E has order continuous norm. We conclude that $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is norm bounded. Since the space is a KB-space, the increasing net $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ has a norm limit in E , and this norm limit is then also the supremum of the net.

Part (4) is clear. $\square$

We can now establish the analogue of Theorem 14.3 for normal spaces.

Theorem 14.7. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a quasi-perfect Riesz space (such as a KB-space, a normal Banach lattice with a Levi norm, or a perfect Riesz space), and let $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow E$ be a positive linear map.*

Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{E^+}$ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$(14.5) \quad T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

The measure μ is finite, and equation (14.5) also holds for all $f \in C_0(X)$.

If V is a non-empty open subset of X , then

$$\mu(V) = \bigvee \{T(f) : f \prec V\}$$

in E .

If K is a compact subset of X , then

$$\mu(K) = \bigwedge \{T(f) : K \prec f\}$$

in E .

PROOF. Since E is normal and monotone complete, Theorem 13.4 applies, and then Lemma 14.4 implies that it is sufficient to show that the set $\{T(f) : f \prec X\}$ is order bounded. To see this, we consider, for each $x' \in (E^\sim)^+$, the map $f \mapsto (T(f), x')$ from $C_0(X)$ to $\mathbb{R}$. Since $C_0(X)$ is a Banach lattice, the positivity of the map implies that it is norm bounded. Since the set $\{T(f) : f \prec V\}$ is upward directed, the fact that E is quasi-perfect now implies that this set has a supremum in E . Consequently, it is order bounded. $\square$

Theorem 14.7 has a consequence that will become important later on when considering representations of $C_0(X)$ on KB-spaces. We need a preparatory result that seems worth recording explicitly.

Proposition 14.8. *Let E be a KB-space. Then the regular norm on $L_r(E)$ is a Levi norm.*

PROOF. Suppose that $0 \leq \{S_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \uparrow$ in $L_r(E)$ is a net that is bounded in the regular norm, which coincides with the operator norm on these positive operators. Choose $M \geq 0$ such that $\|S_\lambda\| \leq M$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. If $x \in E^+$, then $\{S_\lambda x\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is an increasing net in E^+ . Furthermore, we have $\|S_\lambda x\| \leq M\|x\|$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Since E is a KB-space, the supremum of the increasing norm bounded positive net $\{S_\lambda x\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ exists in E . Then Proposition 3.1 shows that the net $\{S_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ has a supremum in $L_r(E)$. $\square$

If E is a KB-space, then Theorem 3.13 shows that the order continuity of the norm on E implies that $L_r(E)$ is a normal partially ordered vector space. Since we have established in

Proposition 14.8 that the regular norm on $L_r(E)$ is a Levi norm, Theorem 14.7 applies to the partially ordered vector space $L_r(E)$ and yields the following.

Theorem 14.9. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a KB-space, and let $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow L_r(E)$ be a positive linear map.*

Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{L_r(E)}_+$ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$(14.6) \quad T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

The measure μ is finite, and equation (14.6) also holds for all $f \in C_0(X)$.

If V is a non-empty open subset of X , then

$$\mu(V) = \bigvee \{ T(f) : f \prec V \}$$

in E .

If K is a compact subset of X , then

$$\mu(K) = \bigwedge \{ T(f) : K \prec f \}$$

in E .

We conclude this section with a result for partially ordered vector spaces of operators on a Hilbert space. It has some interest of its own, and will become important later on when considering representations of (the complexification of) $C_0(X)$ on Hilbert spaces.

Theorem 14.10. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space, and let L be a weakly closed complex linear subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ that contains the identity operator I on $\mathcal{H}$. Let L_{sa} be the real vector space that consists of the self-adjoint elements of L , supplied with the partial ordering that is inherited from the usual partial ordering on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{sa}$. Let $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow L_{sa}$ be a positive linear map.*

Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{L_{sa}}_+$ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$(14.7) \quad T(f) = \int_X^\circ f \, d\mu$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

The measure μ is finite, and equation (14.7) also holds for all $f \in C_0(X)$.

If V is a non-empty open subset of X , then

$$\mu(V) = \bigvee \{ T(f) : f \prec V \}$$

in E .

If K is a compact subset of X , then

$$\mu(K) = \bigwedge \{ T(f) : K \prec f \}$$

in E .

PROOF. We claim that T is continuous. To see this, let $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ denote the complex-valued continuous functions on X that vanish at infinity. Then T extends to a linear map from $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ that is positive again. Since positive linear maps between complex C^* -algebras are continuous (see [22, p. 194]), our claim follows.

If A is a positive operator on a Hilbert space, then $A \leq \|A\|I$. Hence $T(f) \leq \|T\|I$ whenever $f \prec X$. Since $I \in L_{sa}$, this shows that $\{T(f) : f \prec X\}$ is order bounded in L_{sa} . Theorem 13.4 applies and shows that a measure μ exists that has all the properties in the theorem, except that we still need to show that equation (14.7) holds for all $f \in C_0(X)$.

For this, we consider, for $x \in \mathcal{H}$, the linear maps $f \rightarrow \langle T(f)x, x \rangle$ and $f \rightarrow \langle (\int_X^0 f d\mu) \cdot x, x \rangle$ from $C_0(X)$ into $\mathbb{R}$. Being positive, they are continuous. Since they agree on $C_c(X)$, they are equal. Hence $\langle T(f)x, x \rangle = \langle (\int_X^0 f d\mu) \cdot x, x \rangle$ for all $f \in C_0(X)$ and $x \in \mathcal{H}$. This implies that equation (14.7) holds for all $f \in C_0(X)$. $\square$

§15. Positive representations of $C_c(X)$ and $C_0(X)$

In this section, we are concerned with a positive algebra homomorphism π from $C_c(X)$ or $C_0(X)$ into a partially ordered algebra. We know from earlier work that, under conditions, π has a representing measure since it is a positive linear map. The fact that π preserves multiplication is then enough to guarantee that, if it is finite, the representing measure is actually a spectral measure.

Specialising to the case where $\mathcal{A}$ is an algebra of operators, we shall see how two results in the literature that look similar, but that do not appear to be very strongly related, are actually both consequences of the following abstract result.

Conforming to the usual notation for spectral measures in the literature, we shall now denote our representing measures with P .

Theorem 15.1 (Spectral measures for positive homomorphisms of $C_c(X)$ and $C_0(X)$ into algebras). *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a normal and monotone complete partially ordered algebra with monotone continuous multiplication.*

Let $\pi : C_c(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a positive algebra homomorphism, and suppose that the subset $\{\pi(f) : f \in C_c(X)^+, \|f\| \leq 1\}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is order bounded; this is automatically the case if X is compact.

Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure $P : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{A}^+}$ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$(15.1) \quad \pi(f) = \int_X^0 f dP$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

The measure P is a spectral measure.

If π is the restriction of a positive algebra homomorphism $\pi : C_0(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, then equation (15.1) also holds for $f \in C_0(X)$.

If V is a non-empty open subset of X , then

$$(15.2) \quad P(V) = \bigvee \{ \pi(f) : f \prec V \}$$

in $\mathcal{A}$.

If K is a compact subset of X , then

$$(15.3) \quad P(K) = \bigwedge \{ \pi(f) : K \prec f \}$$

in $\mathcal{A}$.

The map π extends to a positive algebra homomorphism from $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R})$ into $\mathcal{A}$, denoted by π again, by setting $\pi(f) := \int_X^0 f dP$ for $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R})$.

For $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$, the following are equivalent:

- (1) $a\pi(f) = \pi(f)a$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$;
- (2) $aP(A) = P(A)a$ for all Borel sets A ;
- (3) $a\pi(f) = \pi(f)a$ for all $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R})$.

PROOF. An application of Theorem 13.4 gives all statements in the theorem, except that the finite regular Borel measure $P : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^+$ supplied by it is a spectral measure, that it will also represent π on the larger space $C_0(X)$, that the extended map to $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R})$ is a positive homomorphism, and that the commutativity statements are valid. We shall now show these four extra components.

We start with the fact that P is a spectral measure. For this, we need a few preparations.

Firstly, if $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$, then we define

$$P^\varphi(A) := \int_X^\circ \chi_A \varphi \, dP$$

for $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Then Proposition 10.1 implies that $P^\varphi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^+$ is a finite positive measure and that

$$(15.4) \quad \int_X^\circ \psi \, dP^\varphi = \int_X^\circ \varphi \psi \, dP$$

for all $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$. Corollary 10.4 shows that P^φ is a finite regular Borel measure again.

Secondly, if $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$, then we define

$$P_{\int_X^\circ \varphi \, dP} (A) := \left(\int_X^\circ \varphi \, dP \right) \cdot P(A)$$

for $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Then Lemma 11.1 implies that $P_{\int_X^\circ \varphi \, dP} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a finite positive measure, and that

$$(15.5) \quad \int_X^\circ \psi \, dP_{\int_X^\circ \varphi \, dP} = \int_X^\circ \varphi \, dP \cdot \int_X^\circ \psi \, dP$$

for all $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, Lemma 11.2 shows that $P_{\int_X^\circ \varphi \, dP}$ is a finite regular Borel measure again.

Thirdly, we claim that $P(A)P(B) = P(B)P(A)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$.

To see this, let $g \in C_c(X)$, and let V be a non-empty open subset of X . Then equation (15.2), together with the monotone continuity of the left and right multiplications, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(g)P(V) &= \pi(g) \bigvee \{ \pi(f) : f \prec V \} = \bigvee \{ \pi(g)\pi(f) : f \prec V \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ \pi(gf) : f \prec V \} = \bigvee \{ \pi(fg) : f \prec V \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ \pi(f)\pi(g) : f \prec V \} = \bigvee \{ \pi(f) : f \prec V \} \pi(g) \\ &= P(V)\pi(g). \end{aligned}$$

A similar argument then shows that $P(U)P(V) = P(V)P(U)$ for all open subsets U and V of X . The outer regularity of P can subsequently be used to conclude that $P(V)P(B) = P(B)P(V)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and all open subsets V of X , and then once more to see that $P(A)P(B) = P(B)P(A)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$.

Fourthly, we claim that $\int_X^\circ \varphi \, dP \cdot \int_X^\circ \psi \, dP = \int_X^\circ \psi \, dP \cdot \int_X^\circ \varphi \, dP$ for all φ and ψ in $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R})$.

Indeed, for $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{E}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$ this follows from what we have just noted. This, together with the definition of the order integral and Lemma 4.2, implies the validity for $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R}^+)$; the general case then follows.

After these preparations, we can now start with the actual argument. It relies heavily on the uniqueness statement in Theorem 13.4.

We claim that $P_{\int_X^\circ f dP} = P^f$ for all $f \in C_c(X)^+$.

To see this, let $g \in C_c(X)$. Using equation (15.5) in the first step, the multiplicativity of π in the third (this is actually the only place where it is used when showing that P is spectral), and equation (15.4) in the fifth, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X^\circ g dP_{\int_X^\circ f dP} &= \int_X^\circ f dP \cdot \int_X^\circ g dP \\ &= \pi(f)\pi(g) \\ &= \pi(fg) \\ &= \int_X^\circ fg dP \\ &= \int_X^\circ g dP^f. \end{aligned}$$

Since $P_{\int_X^\circ f dP}$ and P^f are both regular Borel measures, an appeal to the uniqueness part of Theorem 13.4 establishes our claim.

We claim that $\int_X^\circ fg dP = \int_X^\circ f dP \cdot \int_X^\circ g dP$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$ and $g \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$.

To see this, we may suppose that $f \in C_c(X)^+$. Using equation (15.4) in the first step, our previous claim in the second, and equation (15.5) in the third, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X^\circ fg dP &= \int_X^\circ g dP^f \\ &= \int_X^\circ g dP_{\int_X^\circ f dP} \\ &= \int_X^\circ f dP \cdot \int_X^\circ g dP. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that $P_{\int_X^\circ f dP} = P^f$ for all $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$.

To see this, let $g \in C_c(X)$. Using equation (15.5) in the first step, the fact that $\int_X^\circ f dP$ and $\int_X^\circ g dP$ commute in the second, and our previous claim in the third, see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X^\circ g dP_{\int_X^\circ f dP} &= \int_X^\circ f dP \cdot \int_X^\circ g dP \\ &= \int_X^\circ g dP \cdot \int_X^\circ f dP \\ &= \int_X^\circ fg dP \\ &= \int_X^\circ g dP^f. \end{aligned}$$

Since $P \int_X^\circ f \, dP$ and P^f are both regular Borel measures, an appeal to the uniqueness part of Theorem 13.4 establishes our claim.

We claim that $\int_X^\circ f g \, dP = \int_X^\circ f \, dP \int_X^\circ g \, dP$ for all $f, g \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$.

To see this, we may suppose that $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$. Using equation (15.4) in the first step, our previous claim in the second, and equation (15.5) in the third, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X^\circ f g \, dP &= \int_X^\circ g \, dP^f \\ &= \int_X^\circ g \, dP \int_X^\circ f \, dP \\ &= \int_X^\circ f \, dP \cdot \int_X^\circ g \, dP. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that P is a spectral measure.

This follows from our previous claim, when applied to the characteristic functions of two Borel sets A and B .

If $\pi : C_c(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is the restriction of a positive algebra homomorphism $\pi : C_0(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, then equation (15.1) also holds for $f \in C_0(X)$.

This is immediate from Lemma 14.4.

The extended map $\pi : \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a positive homomorphism.

This is clear from Theorem 11.6.

We turn to the commutativity statements.

These are easily taken care of, and do not rely on the fact that P is a spectral measure.

We show that part (1) implies part (2). Since both left and right multiplication in $\mathcal{A}$ are monotone continuous, it follows from the explicit expression for $P(V)$ that $aP(V) = P(V)a$ for all open subsets V of X . The outer regularity of P and the monotone order continuity of left and right multiplication in $\mathcal{A}$ then imply that $aP(A) = P(A)a$ for all Borel sets A .

We show that part (2) implies part (3). It is immediate that $a \cdot \int_X^\circ \varphi \, dP = \int_X^\circ \varphi \, dP \cdot a$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$, and then the definition of the order integral, combined with the σ -monotone continuity of the left and right multiplication in $\mathcal{A}$, implies that $a \cdot \int_X^\circ f \, dP = \int_X^\circ f \, dP \cdot a$ for all $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R}^+)$. The case for general $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R})$ follows.

It is clear that part (3) implies part (1). □

We shall now specialise to cases where $\mathcal{A}$ is an algebra of operators.

As a preparation, let us recall the following. Suppose that A is a normed algebra, and that π is a bounded representation of A on a normed space E . Then the representation is said to be *non-degenerate* if E is the closed linear span of the elements $\pi(a)x$ for $a \in A$ and $x \in E$. If A has a bounded left approximate identity, then it is not difficult to see that there is a largest invariant subspace of E such that the restricted representation of A on this subspace is non-degenerate. This subspace is closed; in fact, it is the closed linear span of the elements $\pi(a)x$ for $a \in A$ and $x \in E$. We shall call this subspace the *non-degenerate component* of E , and denote it by E_{nd} . If, moreover, A is a Banach algebra and E is a Banach space, then the Cohen-Hewitt factorisation theorem [7, Theorem 10, p. 61], shows that, actually, $E_{\text{nd}} = \{ \pi(a)x : a \in A, x \in E \}$.

15.1. Positive representations of $C_0(X)$ on KB-spaces

In the case of positive representations of $C_0(X)$ on KB-spaces, we have the following.

Theorem 15.2 (Existence of spectral measures for positive representations of $C_0(X)$ on KB-spaces). *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let E be a KB-space, and let $\pi : C_0(X) \rightarrow L_r(E)$ be a positive algebra homomorphism.*

Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure $P : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{L_r(E)^+}$ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$(15.6) \quad \pi(f) = \int_X^{\circ} f \, dP$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

The measure P is a spectral measure, and equation (15.6) also holds for $f \in C_0(X)$.

If V is a non-empty open subset of X , then

$$(15.7) \quad P(V) = \bigvee \{ \pi(f) : f \prec V \}$$

in $L_r(E)$.

If K is a compact subset of X , then

$$(15.8) \quad P(K) = \bigwedge \{ \pi(f) : K \prec f \}$$

in $L_r(E)$.

The map π extends to a positive algebra homomorphism from $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R})$ into $L_r(E)$, denoted by π again, by setting $\pi(f) := \int_X^{\circ} f \, dP$ for $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{R})$.

For $S \in L_r(E)$, the following are equivalent:

- (1) $S\pi(f) = \pi(f)S$ for all $f \in C_0(X)$;
- (2) $S\pi(f) = \pi(f)S$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$;
- (3) $SP(A) = P(A)S$ for all Borel sets A ;
- (4) $S\pi(f) = \pi(f)S$ for all $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$.

The positive projection $P(X)$ projects E onto E_{nd} . Hence the representation $\pi : C_0(X) \rightarrow L_r(E)$ is non-degenerate if and only if $P(X) = I$.

PROOF. This is immediate from the combination of Theorem 14.3, Proposition 4.3, and Theorem 15.1, except for the statement about commutants (which are no longer only for positive elements of the algebra) and the image of $P(X)$. We shall now establish these.

We start with the statements about commutants.

It is clear that part (1) implies part (2).

We show that part (2) implies part (3).

To see this, we employ an argument that relies on the uniqueness statement in the Riesz representation theorem again. It can also be found in e.g. [12]. We define, for $x \in E^+$ and $x' \in (E^*)^+$, the map $P_{x,x'} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by setting $P_{x,x'}(A) := (P(A)x, x')$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Using Proposition 3.1 and the σ -order continuity of x' , it is then easy to see that $P_{x,x'}$ is a real-valued positive measure. Using Proposition 3.1 and the order continuity of x' , it is also easy to see that $P_{x,x'}$ is a real-valued positive regular Borel measure. Furthermore, it follows from Proposition 3.1, the definition of the order integral, equation (15.6), and the σ -order continuity of x' that

$$(15.9) \quad (\pi(f)x, x') = \int_X f \, dP_{x,x'}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$.

After this, we extend our definition of $P_{x,x'} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to arbitrary $x \in E$ and $x' \in E^*$ by setting $P_{x,x'}(A) := (P(A)x, x')$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}$ again. Since E and E^* are generated by their positive cones, the previous remarks imply that $P_{x,x'}$ is a signed regular Borel measure, and that equation (15.9) also holds for all $x \in E$, $x' \in E^*$, and $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$.

If $S \in L_r(E)$ commutes with $\pi(f)$ for all $f \in C_c(X)$, then

$$(S\pi(f)x, x') = (\pi(f)x, S'x') = \int_X f \, dP_{x,S'x'}$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$, $x \in E$ and $x' \in E^*$. On the other hand,

$$(S\pi(f)x, x') = (\pi(f)Sx, x') = \int_X f \, dP_{Sx,x'}$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$, $x \in E$ and $x' \in E^*$. The uniqueness part of the classical Riesz representation theorem then shows that $P_{x,S'x'} = P_{Sx,x'}$ for all $x \in E$ and $x' \in E^*$, i.e. that $(SP(A), x') = (P(A)Sx, x')$ for all $x \in E$, $x' \in E^*$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}$. This implies that $SP(A) = P(A)S$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}$.

We show that part (3) implies part (4). For this, we note that $\pi : \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L_r(E)$, being a positive linear map between Banach lattices, is automatically continuous when $L_r(E)$ is supplied with the regular norm. Since $\mathcal{E}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+) - \mathcal{E}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)$ is norm dense in $\mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$, $\pi((\mathcal{E}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+) - \mathcal{E}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)))$ is dense in $\pi(\mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}))$ in the regular norm. The continuity of multiplication in $L_r(E)$ then shows that part (3) implies part (4).

Is is trivial that part (4) implies part (1).

We shall now establish that $P(X)$ projects E onto its non-degenerate component.

Suppose that $x \in E_{\text{nd}}$. Then there exists $f \in C_0(X)$ and $y \in E$ such that $x = \pi(f)y$. This implies that $P(X)x = \pi(\mathbf{1})\pi(f)y = \pi(\mathbf{1} \cdot f)y = \pi(f)y = x$. Hence $E_{\text{nd}} \subseteq P(X)E$.

Conversely, let $x \in E$ and suppose that $x \in P(X)E$, i.e. suppose that there exists $y \in E$ such that $x = P(X)y$. Then the fact that $P(X)$ is a strong operator limit of operators of the form $\pi(f)$ for $f \prec X$, shows that x is the norm limit of elements of the form $\pi(f)y$ for $f \prec X$. Since these are all in E_{nd} and E_{nd} is closed, we see that $x \in E_{\text{nd}}$. Hence $P(X)E \subseteq E_{\text{nd}}$. $\square$

We shall now comment on the relation between the present Theorem 15.2 and [12, Theorem 5.6], where the existence of spectral measures representing positive representations of $C_0(X)$ on a KB-space E is also asserted.

In [12], a spectral measure on a locally compact Hausdorff space is a map $Q : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow L_r(E)^+$ such that:

- (1) $Q(\emptyset) = 0$;
- (2) $Q(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n)x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Q(A_n)x$ for every $x \in E$ and every pairwise disjoint sequence $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathcal{B}$;
- (3) $Q(A_1 \cap A_2) = Q(A_1)Q(A_2)$ for all $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}$.

For $x \in E$ and $x' \in E^*$, we can then define $Q_{x,x'} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by setting

$$Q_{x,x'}(A) := (Q(A)x, x')$$

for $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $Q_{x,x'}$ is a signed measure.

Such a spectral measure Q defines a linear map

$$\pi_Q : (\mathcal{E}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+) - \mathcal{E}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}^+)) \rightarrow L_r(E)$$

in the obvious way, and [12, Theorem 4.1] shows that π_Q extends by norm continuity to a positive representation $\pi : \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L_r(E)$ of $\mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$ on E . For $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$, $\pi_Q(\varphi)$ is then the unique element of $L_r(E)$ such that

$$(\pi_Q(\varphi)x, x') = \int_X \varphi \, dQ_{x, x'}$$

for all $x \in E^+$ and $x' \in (E^*)^+$.

Then [12, Theorem 5.6] asserts that, if $\pi : C_0(X) \rightarrow L_r(E)$ is a positive representation of $C_0(X)$ on a KB-space E , there exists a unique spectral measure Q on X such that $\pi_Q = \pi$ and such that $Q_{x, x'}$ is a signed regular real-valued Borel measures on X for all $x \in E$ and $x' \in E^*$.

Since our measure P from the present Theorem 15.2 has the properties in the previous paragraph, the spectral measures P from Theorem 15.2 and Q from [12, Theorem 5.6] coincide.

As a consequence, we see that P is σ -additive in the strong operator topology. This, however, was also a priori clear from Lemma 5.2: for a Banach lattices E with order continuous norm, the σ -additivity of an $L_r(E)$ -valued measure in our ordered sense and that in the sense of the strong operator topology coincide.

It is instructive to compare the proofs of Theorem 15.2 and of [12, Theorem 2.1].

Our approach towards Theorem 15.2 is via an existence result for spectral measures corresponding to positive homomorphisms from $C_0(X)$ into partially order algebras. This is an order-theoretical approach, and the spectral measure is obtained directly, without a detour via $\mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$ as in the proof of [12, Theorem 2.1].

The proof of [12, Theorem 2.1] follows more classical lines, and is as follows. Suppose that $\pi : C_0(X) \rightarrow L_r(E)$ is a positive representation of $C_0(X)$ on a KB-space E . For $x \in E$ and $x' \in E^*$, the classical Riesz representation theorem supplies a regular signed Borel measure $\mu_{x, x'}$ such that

$$(\pi(f)x, x') = \int_X f \, d\mu_{x, x'}.$$

for all $f \in C_0(X)$. For every $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$, the bilinear form $[\cdot, \cdot]_\varphi$ on $E \times E^*$, defined by

$$[x, x']_\varphi := \int_X \varphi \, d\mu_{x, x'},$$

is then bounded. Therefore, there exist a bounded operator $\tilde{\pi}(\varphi) : E \rightarrow E^{**}$ such that $(\tilde{\pi}(\varphi)x, x') = [x, x']_\varphi$ for all $x \in E$ and $x' \in E^*$. The fact that E is a band in E^{**} (this characterises the KB-spaces among the Banach lattices) is then used to see that $\tilde{\pi}(\varphi)$ actually maps E into itself (as embedded in E^{**}). Subsequently, one shows that the map $\tilde{\pi} : \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L_r(E)$ that is thus obtained is a positive algebra homomorphism; it extends π by construction. The spectral measure is then finally found by setting $P(A) := \tilde{\pi}(\chi_A)$ for a Borel set A . This approach involves a detour via $\mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}; \mathbb{R})$. The order-theoretical component in this proof is much more limited; one could say that it is primarily a Banach space approach.

15.2. Representations of $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ on Hilbert spaces

In this section, we let $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ denote the continuous complex-valued functions on a locally compact Hausdorff space X that vanish at infinity. We shall consider representations of the (complex) C^* -algebra $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ on complex Hilbert spaces. For these, we have the following result. Its formulation uses a few self-evident notations, and an implicit definition of the order integral of complex-valued functions by considering their real and imaginary parts.

Theorem 15.3 (Existence of spectral measures for representations of $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ on Hilbert spaces). *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space, let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space, and let $\pi : C_0(X, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a $*$ -homomorphism.*

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the commutative von Neumann algebra that is generated by $\pi(C_0(X, \mathbb{C}))$, supplied with the partial ordering that is inherited from the usual partial ordering on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{\text{sa}}$.

Then there exists a unique regular Borel measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{sa}}^+$ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of X such that

$$(15.10) \quad \pi(f) = \int_X^{\circ} f \, d\mu$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$.

The measure P is a spectral measure, and equation (15.10) also holds for all $f \in C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$.

For $f \in C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$, $\pi(f)$ is the unique element of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that

$$(15.11) \quad \langle \pi(f)x, y \rangle = \int_X f \, dP_{x,y}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, where the complex-valued regular Borel measure $P_{x,y} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is defined, for $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, by setting $P_{x,y}(A) := \langle P(A)x, y \rangle$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}$.

If V is a non-empty open subset of X , then

$$\mu(V) = \bigvee \{ T(f) : f \prec V \}$$

in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{sa}}$.

If K is a compact subset of X , then

$$\mu(K) = \bigwedge \{ T(f) : K \prec f \}$$

in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{sa}}$.

The map π extends to an involutive algebra homomorphism from $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{C})$ into $\mathcal{A}$, denoted by π again, by setting $\pi(f) := \int_X^{\circ} f \, dP$ for $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{B}, P; \mathbb{C})$.

For $S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the following are equivalent:

- (1) $S\pi(f) = \pi(f)S$ for all $f \in C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$;
- (2) $S\pi(f) = \pi(f)S$ for all $f \in C_c(X, \mathbb{C})$;
- (3) $SP(A) = P(A)S$ for all Borel sets A ;
- (4) $S\pi(f) = \pi(f)S$ for all $f \in \mathcal{B}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{C})$.

The orthogonal projection $P(X)$ projects $\mathcal{H}$ onto $\mathcal{H}_{\text{nd}}$. Hence the representation $\pi : C_0(X, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is non-degenerate if and only if $P(X) = I$.

PROOF. Most of the statements are immediate from a combination of Theorem 14.10, Proposition 4.4, and Theorem 15.1, combined with complex or sesquilinear extension. The remaining ones are established by routine verification, using the $P_{x,y}$ in a fashion analogous to the use of the $P_{x,x'}$ in the proof of Theorem 15.2. $\square$

Remark 15.4. Let us make a few comments on the theorem.

- (1) Using the $P_{x,y}$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, one easily shows, similarly as for Theorem 15.2, that the spectral measure P coincides with the one in the literature for non-degenerate representations (see e.g. [14, Corollary 1.55], where it is supposed that π is non-degenerate). Consequently, P is then σ -additive in the strong operator topology, but we also already knew this from Lemma 5.3.

- (2) The familiar statement that the $P(A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}$ are in the bicommutant of $\pi(C_0(X, \mathbb{C}))$ is immediate from the theorem, since

$$P(\Omega) \subset P(\Omega)'' = (P(\Omega)')' = (\pi(C_0(X, \mathbb{C})))' = \pi(C_0(X, \mathbb{C}))''.$$

- (3) Via the present approach, it is immediate that the $P(A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}$ are in $\mathcal{A}$. In more classical approaches, it is shown that the $P(A)$ are in the bicommutant of $\pi(C_0(X, \mathbb{C}))$, and von Neumann's bicommutant theorem is then needed to show that they are in $\mathcal{A}$.
- (4) We are not aware of a reference for the explicit expressions for the spectral measures of open and compact subsets of X as strong operator limits as they follow from the theorem.
- (5) In the literature, spectral measures with values in the orthogonal projections on a Hilbert space are supposed to be such that the projection corresponding to the entire underlying point set is the identity map. One then needs the assumption that a representation of $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ be non-degenerate to ensure that the associated spectral measure has this property. Our treatment shows that one need not work with such 'unital' spectral measures or non-degenerate representations.

Bibliography of Chapter I

- [1] Y.A. Abramovich and C.D. Aliprantis. *An invitation to operator theory*, volume 50 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [2] C.D. Aliprantis and O. Burkinshaw. *Principles of real analysis*. North-Holland Publishing Co., New York-Amsterdam, 1981.
- [3] C.D. Aliprantis and O. Burkinshaw. *Positive operators*. Springer, Dordrecht, 2006. Reprint of the 1985 original.
- [4] C.D. Aliprantis and R. Tourky. *Cones and duality*, volume 84 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007.
- [5] H. Bauer. *Measure and integration theory*, volume 26 of *de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2001.
- [6] V.I. Bogachev. *Measure theory. Vol. I*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007.
- [7] F.F. Bonsall and J. Duncan. *Complete normed algebras*, volume 80 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1973.
- [8] D.L. Cohn. *Measure theory*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1993. Reprint of the 1980 original.
- [9] J.B. Conway. *A course in functional analysis*, volume 96 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1990.
- [10] T. Coquand. A note on measures with values in a partially ordered vector space. *Positivity*, 8(4):395–400, 2004.
- [11] K.R. Davidson. *C*-algebras by example*, volume 6 of *Fields Institute Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
- [12] M. de Jeu and F. Ruoff. Positive representations of $C_0(X)$, I. *Ann. Funct. Anal.*, 7(1):180–205, 2016.
- [13] G.B. Folland. *Real analysis. Modern techniques and their applications*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1999.
- [14] G.B. Folland. *A course in abstract harmonic analysis*. Textbooks in Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, second edition, 2016.
- [15] R.V. Kadison. Order properties of bounded self-adjoint operators. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 2:505–510, 1951.
- [16] S.S. Khurana. Lattice-valued Borel measures. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, 6(2):377–382, 1976.
- [17] S.S. Khurana. Lattice-valued Borel measures. II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 235:205–211, 1978.
- [18] Z. Lipecki. Riesz type representation theorems for positive operators. *Math. Nachr.*, 131:351–356, 1987.
- [19] W.A.J. Luxemburg and A.C. Zaanen. *Riesz spaces. Vol. I*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-London; American Elsevier Publishing Co., New York, 1971.
- [20] W. Rudin. *Principles of mathematical analysis*. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Auckland-Düsseldorf, third edition, 1976.
- [21] W. Rudin. *Real and complex analysis*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, third edition, 1987.
- [22] M. Takesaki. *Theory of operator algebras. I*, volume 124 of *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002. Reprint of the first (1979) edition.
- [23] W. Wnuk. *Banach lattices with order continuous norms*. Polish Scientific Publishers PWN, Warsaw, 1999.
- [24] J.D.M. Wright. Stone-algebra-valued measures and integrals. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 19:107–122, 1969.
- [25] J.D.M. Wright. The measure extension problem for vector lattices. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 21(4):65–85, 1971.
- [26] J.D.M. Wright. Vector lattice measures on locally compact spaces. *Math. Z.*, 120:193–203, 1971.
- [27] J.D.M. Wright. Measures with values in a partially ordered vector space. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 25:675–688, 1972.
- [28] A.C. Zaanen. *Riesz spaces. II*, volume 30 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1983.
- [29] A.C. Zaanen. *Introduction to operator theory in Riesz spaces*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.

Chapter II

Simultaneous power factorization

This chapter has been published in Positivity 21 (2017), 633-672 (Special Issue for Ordered Banach Algebras) as: M. de Jeu and X. Jiang, "Simultaneous power factorization in modules over Banach algebras".

Abstract

Let A be a Banach algebra with a bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, let π be a continuous representation of A on a Banach space X , and let S be a non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S . If S is bounded, or if $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative, then we show that there exist $a \in A$ and maps $x_n : S \rightarrow X$ for $n \geq 1$ such that $s = \pi(a^n)x_n(s)$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $s \in S$. The properties of $a \in A$ and the maps x_n , as produced by the constructive proof, are studied in some detail. The results generalize previous simultaneous factorization theorems as well as Allan and Sinclair's power factorization theorem. In an ordered context, we also consider the existence of a positive factorization for a subset of the positive cone of an ordered Banach space that is a positive module over an ordered Banach algebra with a positive bounded left approximate identity. Such factorizations are not always possible. In certain cases, including those for positive modules over ordered Banach algebras of bounded functions, such positive factorizations exist, but the general picture is still unclear. Furthermore, simultaneous pointwise power factorizations for sets of bounded maps with values in a Banach module (such as sets of bounded convergent nets) are obtained. A worked example for the left regular representation of $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ and unbounded S is included.

§1. Introduction and overview

Let A be a real or complex Banach algebra with a bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, and let π be a continuous representation of A on a Banach space X . Let $s \in X$, and let $\epsilon > 0$. In an anticipating notation, the Cohen factorization theorem (see [4] for the original case where $X = A$) states that, if $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$, then there exist $a \in A$ and $x_1(s) \in X$ such that $s = \pi(a)x_1(s)$ and $\|s - x_1(s)\| < \epsilon$. This result has been generalized in two different directions. First of all, there are results that are concerned with simultaneously factoring all elements s of a subset S of X that need not be a singleton. In that case, one wants to establish the existence of $a \in A$ and a map $x_1 : S \rightarrow X$ such that $s = \pi(a)x_1(s)$ for all $s \in S$, together with some additional properties of a and x_1 . This is possible, for example, if S is bounded and such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S ; see e.g. [9, Theorem 17.1]. According to [9, p. 251], this line of research started with Ovaert (see [12]) and Craw (see [6]). In [9, Section 17], such results are called ‘multiple factorizations’, but we prefer ‘simultaneous factorizations’. The term ‘multiple factorizations’ is a bit ambiguous, since it could also be felt to be related to the second type of generalization of Cohen’s original result, namely, the power factorization as established by Allan and Sinclair in [1]. Here S consists of one element s such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ again, but this time the existence is established of $a \in A$ and, for all $n \geq 1$, an element $x_n(s)$ of X such that $s = \pi(a^n)x_n(s)$, together with some additional (and now more sophisticated) properties of a and the elements $x_n(s)$ for $n \geq 1$.

We refer to [7], [9], [10], and [13] for a further description of the historical development concerning factorizations and additional references, including those for actions of Fréchet algebras on Fréchet spaces.

In this paper, we combine these two types of generalizations. If $S \subset X$ is such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , and if S is bounded or $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative, then, according to our main result Theorem 4.4, there exist $a \in A$ and maps $x_n : S \rightarrow X$ for $n \geq 1$ such that $s = \pi(a^n)x_n(s)$ for all $s \in S$ and $n \geq 1$. We shall refer to this as a simultaneous power factorization. We are not aware of previous simultaneous factorization results where S need not be bounded. It should be noted here, however, that it was already observed for pointwise power factorization in [1, p. 32-33] that the situation where $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative is more manageable than the general case.

Theorem 4.4 also contains several additional properties of a and the maps x_n for $n \geq 1$, including ones that have those as already known for the simultaneous non-power and the pointwise power factorizations described above as special cases.

The proof of Theorem 4.4 is an adaptation of the proof of [1] from the case of one point to that of a set. This makes the proof, which in [1] is already a considerably more sophisticated version of Cohen’s original technically ingenious proof, perhaps still a little bit more demanding to verify. We have, therefore, tried to be rather precise in our argumentation.

We have also tried to distil some non-obvious information concerning the form of the resulting factorization. These facts are by-products of the proof, which is constructive. In view of the size of the current proof, and the resulting degree of (in)accessibility thereof, it is hardly attractive any more for a reader to inspect the proof, and decide whether a certain statement is implicitly also proven. We thought, therefore, that it would be better to do a precise bookkeeping along the way, and, in the end, include all these by-products in this one main result Theorem 4.4.

This paper is organized as follows.

Section 2 contains a few conventions and some notation.

Section 3 is concerned with the condition that $\lim_{\lambda} \pi(e_{\lambda})s = s$ uniformly on S . Later on, we shall need to know how this behaves under various operations on S . We also investigate how this property depends on the choice of $\{e_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, and we introduce a basic example, namely, the left regular representation of $C_0(\mathbb{R})$, that will be the subject of Section 7. Results such as Proposition 3.8 will look familiar to the reader who has seen earlier proofs of factorization theorems. It seemed inevitable to give the proof, since we need it in greater generality than is available in the literature, and since we also need to do our bookkeeping. In compensation, some preparatory results (Lemma 3.5 and Corollary 3.6) are established in a greater generality that could have applications in other contexts.

Section 4 is the heart of the paper. After two preparatory results under different hypotheses but with identical conclusions (Proposition 4.2 for bounded S and Proposition 4.3 for commutative $\{e_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$), the main result Theorem 4.4 on simultaneous power factorization can be established. Spread over several remarks, this section also contains a discussion of the result, including its relation to the literature. One point should be noted here, and that is the absence of the unitization of A . This seems to be ubiquitous in the existing proofs of factorizations, but there is no actual need for this. Its only role in the existing proofs is to be available as a unital superalgebra B of A with the property that a given continuous representation of A extends to a continuous unital representation of B . Any other unital superalgebra with this property will do equally well, and this means that the choice of this superalgebra can be adapted to the situation at hand. As it turns out, some superalgebras can then be more equal than others, and this freedom of choice of B has therefore been incorporated into the structure. In Section 5, we shall benefit from this; see e.g. Remark 5.6 and, in particular, Theorem 5.7.

Section 5 is concerned with positive factorizations. It contains a further refinement (Theorem 5.3) of Theorem 4.4; see Remark 5.4 for an explanation why it is a refinement and not a special case. The questions to be considered are quite natural. For example, restricting ourselves to positive pointwise non-power factorization: if A is an ordered Banach algebra with a positive bounded left approximate identity $\{e_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, if π is a positive representation of A on an ordered Banach space X , and if s is an element of the positive cone X^+ of X such that $\lim_{\lambda} \pi(e_{\lambda})s = s$, do there exist $a \in A^+$ and $x_1(s) \in A^+$ such that $s = \pi(a)x_1(s)$? As we shall see, such $a \in A^+$ exists whenever the positive cone A^+ of A is closed, but it may be impossible (the example is due to Rudin; see [16]) to arrange that $x_1(s) \in X^+$. There is presently no clear-cut answer available that distinguishes between possibility and impossibility, but it seems as if the built-in freedom concerning the superalgebra B could be of some use here. A positive simultaneous power factorization result for ordered Banach algebras of bounded functions, Theorem 5.7, can be established precisely because of this freedom.

Section 6 combines the main result Theorem 4.4 with an idea on the use of auxiliary Banach modules that, according to [9, p. 251], goes back to Collins and Summer (see [5]) and Rieffel (see [14]). The most general set-up seems to be as in Theorem 6.1, which is a simultaneous pointwise power factorization for sets of maps with values in a Banach module. This can then be specialized to e.g. sets of bounded continuous functions or sets of bounded convergent nets.

In Section 7, we return to the example of the left regular representation of $C_0(\mathbb{R})$. For a concretely given unbounded S , we know from Theorem 5.7 that a positive simultaneous power factorization is possible. Since the characteristic features of such an actually possible factorization have been included in Theorem 4.4, it should be doable to find a concrete factorization, starting from the Ansatz as provided by Theorem 4.4. With some perseverance, this can indeed be carried out.

§2. Conventions and notation

In this short section, we establish our conventions and notation.

Our algebras and vector spaces can be over the real or complex numbers, unless otherwise stated.

The set of invertible elements of a unital algebra A is denoted by $\text{Inv}(A)$. A net $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ in an associative algebra A is said to be commutative if $e_\lambda e_{\lambda'} = e_{\lambda'} e_\lambda$ for all $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$. The unit element of a unital normed algebra is assumed to have norm 1. A representation of a unital algebra on a vector space is not required to be unital.

An ordered vector space X is a vector space that is ordered (also in the complex case) by a positive convex cone $X^+ \subset X$. The cone X^+ need not be proper; in particular, it can be the whole space. The cone need not be generating. If the vector space is normed, it need not be closed.

An ordered algebra A is an algebra that is ordered (also in the complex case) by a positive convex algebra cone A^+ . Again, A^+ need not be proper, or be generating, or—if applicable—be closed. The unit element of a unital ordered algebra is assumed to be positive.

A positive representation of an ordered algebra A on an ordered vector space X is a representation π of A on X such that $\pi(a)x \in X^+$ for all $a \in A^+$ and $x \in X^+$. One could perhaps say that X is then a positive A -module; there is no fixed terminology yet.

We shall be working with norm topologies only. A bounded subset of a normed space is a norm bounded subset, and a continuous map between normed spaces is continuous for the norm topologies. If X is a normed space, then $\mathcal{B}(X)$ denotes the bounded operators on X . A representation π of an algebra A on a normed space X maps A into $\mathcal{B}(X)$. In line with our conventions, it is said to be continuous if it is a continuous map between the normed spaces A and $\mathcal{B}(X)$.

If $\pi : A \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(X)$ is a continuous representation of a normed algebra A on a normed space X , then the essential subspace X_e of X is defined as

$$X_e = \overline{\text{Span}\{\pi(a)x : a \in A, x \in X\}}.$$

Then X_e is clearly invariant under $\pi(A)$, so that X_e affords a continuous representation of A on X_e . The representation is said to be non-degenerate if $X_e = X$. If A has a bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, then it is easily seen that

$$X_e = \{x \in X : \lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)x = x\}.$$

Although we shall occasionally speak of a Banach module over a Banach algebra, we shall usually speak of a representation of a Banach algebra on a Banach space, and—with the left regular representation and Section 7 as only possible exceptions—we shall also include the corresponding symbol in the notation. Since the norm of the representation repeatedly appears in the estimates, this seems to be a natural choice so as to avoid keep introducing the constant in the bilinear pairing between the algebra and the space time and time again.

If Ω is a topological space, then $C_c(\Omega)$, $C_0(\Omega)$, and $C_b(\Omega)$ denote the continuous functions on Ω that have compact support, that vanish at infinity, and that are bounded, respectively.

§3. Uniform convergence on subsets of Banach modules

As a preparation for the main development, and as general background, this section contains a number of results revolving around the condition that $\lim_{\lambda} \pi(e_{\lambda})s = s$ uniformly on S . Here, as elsewhere in this paper, π is a continuous representation of a normed algebra A on a normed space X with non-empty subset S , and $\{e_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is an approximate left identity of A . We also introduce a basic example in the context of the left regular representation of $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ that will be taken up in detail in Section 7 again.

The first result to be mentioned is standard, and can e.g. be found in the literature as [9, Lemma 17.2]. We include the proof for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 3.1. *Let A be a normed algebra that has a bounded left approximate identity $\{e_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, let π be a continuous representation of π on a normed space X , and let S be a totally bounded subset of X_e . Then $\lim_{\lambda} \pi(e_{\lambda})s = s$ uniformly on S .*

PROOF. If $\pi = 0$, then $X_e = \{0\}$, in which case the result is trivial. So let us assume that $\pi \neq 0$. Let $M \geq 1$ be a bound for $\{e_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Since S is totally bounded, there exist $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X_e$ such that $S \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{x \in X : \|x - x_i\| < \min(\epsilon/(3\|\pi\|M), \epsilon/3)\}$. Choose $\lambda' \in \Lambda$ such that $\|\pi(e_{\lambda})x_i - x_i\| < \epsilon/3$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\lambda \geq \lambda'$. If $s \in S$, there exists i_0 such that $\|s - x_{i_0}\| < \min(\epsilon/(3\|\pi\|M), \epsilon/3)$. We now see that, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ and $s \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi(e_{\lambda})s - s\| &\leq \|\pi(e_{\lambda})(s - x_{i_0})\| + \|\pi(e_{\lambda})x_{i_0} - x_{i_0}\| + \|x_{i_0} - s\| \\ &< \|\pi\| \cdot M \cdot \epsilon/(3\|\pi\|M) + \epsilon/3 + \epsilon/3 \\ &= \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

Quite the opposite of the situation in Lemma 3.1, subsets S with the property that $\lim_{\lambda} \pi(e_{\lambda})s = s$ uniformly on S can also be unbounded. This is shown by the following example, which will be continued in Example 3.4, and which will be considered in detail in Section 7.

Example 3.2. Let $A = C_0(\mathbb{R})$, and consider the continuous left regular representation of A . For every integer $n \geq 1$, we choose a function $e_n \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ that takes values in $[0, 1]$, equals 1 on $[-n, n]$, and equals 0 on $(-\infty, -n-1] \cup [n+1, \infty)$. Then $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is easily seen to be a bounded approximate identity for A .

Choose $f_0 \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ such that $f_0(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and such that $\|f_0\| > 1$. Let

$$S = \{f \in C_0(\mathbb{R})^+ : f(t) \leq f_0(t) \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } f_0(t) \leq 1\}.$$

Then S is non-empty and unbounded, because it contains functions with arbitrarily large norms that have compact supports in the non-empty open set $\{t \in \mathbb{R} : f_0(t) > 1\}$.

We claim that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|e_n f - f\| = 0$ uniformly for $f \in S$. Indeed, if $\epsilon > 0$ is given, then we choose n_0 so large that both $\{t \in \mathbb{R} : f_0(t) > 1\} \subset [-n_0, n_0]$ and $0 \leq f_0(t) < \epsilon/2$ for all t such that $|t| \geq n_0$. Let $n \geq n_0$ and let $f \in S$. If $|t| \leq n_0$, then $|t| \leq n$, so we have $|e_n(t)f(t) - f(t)| = |f(t) - f(t)| = 0$. If $|t| > n_0$, then $f_0(t) \leq 1$, so, using the definition of S , we see that $0 \leq f(t) \leq f_0(t) < \epsilon/2$. This implies that $|e_n(t)f(t) - f(t)| \leq 2f_0(t) < \epsilon$. Therefore, $\|e_n f - f\| < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq n_0$ and $f \in S$, and our claim has been established.

One might wonder to which extent the property that $\lim_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S depends on the particular choice of the bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$. If S is bounded, then it does not: it is an intrinsic property of S . This is implied by the following result.

Lemma 3.3. *Let A be a normed algebra, let $\{e'_\mu\}_{\mu \in M}$ be a net in A , let X be a normed space, let π be a continuous representation of A on X , and let S be a bounded non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\mu \pi(e'_\mu)s = s$ uniformly on S . Suppose that $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a bounded left approximate identity for A . Then also $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S .*

PROOF. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Using the boundedness of $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, we can choose $\mu_0 \in M$ such that both $\|\pi(\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|e_\lambda\|)\pi(e'_{\mu_0})s - s\| < \epsilon/3$ and $\|\pi(e'_{\mu_0})s - s\| < \epsilon/3$ for all $s \in S$. Using the boundedness of S , we see that there exists λ_0 such that $\|\pi\| \|e_\lambda e'_{\mu_0} - e'_{\mu_0}\| (\sup_{s \in S} \|s\|) < \epsilon/3$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. Then, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ and $s \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi(e_\lambda)s - s\| &\leq \|\pi(e_\lambda - e_\lambda e'_{\mu_0})s\| + \|\pi(e_\lambda e'_{\mu_0} - e'_{\mu_0})s\| + \|\pi(e'_{\mu_0})s - s\| \\ &\leq \|\pi\| \|e_\lambda\| \|s - \pi(e'_{\mu_0})s\| + \|\pi\| \|e_\lambda e'_{\mu_0} - e'_{\mu_0}\| \|s\| + \epsilon/3 \\ &< \epsilon/3 + \epsilon/3 + \epsilon/3 \\ &= \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

It would be very nice if a similar result were true for unbounded S , for the following reason. It is known, as a consequence of Sinclair's work on analytic semigroups in Banach algebras, that every separable Banach algebra with a bounded two-sided approximate identity, as well as every Banach algebra with a sequential bounded two-sided approximate identity, has a commutative bounded two-sided sequential approximate identity (even one that is bounded by 1 in an equivalent algebra norm); see [7, Corollary 2.9.43], [9, Theorem 3.5], or [13, Corollary 5.3.4]. Consequently, commutative bounded (left) approximate identities are in no short supply. A result similar to Lemma 3.3 for unbounded S would, therefore, allow us in a considerable number of cases to transfer the uniform convergence for a given bounded left approximate identity to such a commutative bounded (left) approximate identity, and subsequently Theorem 4.4 could then be applied. All in all, a result for unbounded S similar to Lemma 3.3 would imply that the conclusions of Theorem 4.4 would hold in quite a few cases, regardless of the original $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ being commutative or S being bounded.

It is, therefore, relevant to note that it can actually occur that $\lim_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S for one bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of A , whereas this fails for another bounded left approximate identity. This is already possible for a commutative algebra, as is shown in the following example, which is a continuation of Example 3.2.

Example 3.4. We consider the left regular representation of $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ and the unbounded subset S as in Example 3.2 again. For every integer $n \geq 1$, we choose a function $e'_n \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ that takes values in $[0, 1]$, equals $1 - 1/n$ on $[-n, n]$, and equals 0 on $(-\infty, -n-1] \cup [n+1, \infty)$. We claim that $\{e'_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a bounded approximate identity for $C_0(\mathbb{R})$. To see this, let $\epsilon > 0$ and $f \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ be given. We choose $n_0 \geq 1$ such that both $\|f\|/n_0 < \epsilon$ and $|f(t)| < \epsilon/2$ for all t such that $|t| \geq n_0$. Now let $n \geq n_0$. If $|t| \leq n$, then $|e'_n(t)f(t) - f(t)| = |f(t)/n| \leq \|f\|/n \leq \|f\|/n_0 < \epsilon$. If $|t| > n$, then $|t| > n_0$, and in that case $|e'_n(t)f(t) - f(t)| \leq 2|f(t)| < \epsilon$. This shows that $\|e'_n f - f\| < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq n_0$, and our claim has been established.

However, it is not true that $\lim_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \pi(e'_n)s = s$ uniformly on S . In fact, it is even true that $\sup_{f \in S} \|e'_n f - f\| = \infty$ for all sufficiently large n . To see this, we choose n_0 such that $\{t \in \mathbb{R} : f_0(t) > 1\} \subset [-n_0, n_0]$. Let $n \geq n_0$. If $f \in C_c(\mathbb{R})$ is supported in $\{t \in \mathbb{R} : f_0(t) > 1\}$, then $f \in S$. Furthermore, $\|e'_n f - f\| = \sup_{|t| \leq n_0} |e'_n(t)f(t) - f(t)| = \sup_{|t| \leq n_0} |f(t)|/n = \|f\|/n$. Since $\|f\|$ can be arbitrarily large, this shows that $\sup_{f \in S} \|e'_n f - f\| = \infty$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Consequently, the convergence on S using the e'_n is pointwise, but not uniform.

Our next two results, Lemmas 3.5 and its Corollary 3.6, will be applied only in the context of Proposition 3.8. In the literature, the pertinent statements in that proposition are proved in that particular context, but the underlying phenomenon is more general. It seems worthwhile to make it explicit.

Lemma 3.5. *Let B be a unital Banach algebra, let $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be a bounded net in B of bound $M \geq 1$, let $\eta > 0$, and suppose that $f : \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < M + \eta\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic with $f(1) = 1$. Then $\{f(e_\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a bounded net in B , and, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $f(e_\lambda)$ is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by e_λ .*

Furthermore, if X is a normed space, if π is a continuous unital representation of B on X , and if S is a non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , then $\lim_\lambda \pi(f(e_\lambda))s = s$ uniformly on S .

In Lemma 3.5, $f(e_\lambda)$ is defined using the Maclaurin series of f . If $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$, then this agrees with the holomorphic functional calculus, since the spectrum of e_λ is contained in the domain of f for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. If $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$, then it is tacitly assumed that $f(z) \in \mathbb{R}$ if $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|z| < M + \eta$. The same remarks apply to Corollary 3.6 below.

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.5. Let $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n z^n$ be the Maclaurin series of f , which is absolutely convergent if $|z| < M + \eta$.

It is clear that $\|f(e_\lambda)\| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\alpha_n| M^n$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, so that $\{f(e_\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a bounded net in B . It is likewise clear that, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $f(e_\lambda)$ is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by e_λ . Since $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n = f(1) = 1$, we have, for all $s \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\pi(f(e_\lambda))s - s\| &= \left\| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \pi(e_\lambda^n)s - s \right\| \\
 &= \left\| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \pi(e_\lambda^n)s - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n s \right\| \\
 &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\alpha_n| \|\pi(e_\lambda^n - 1_B)s\| \\
 &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n| \|\pi((e_\lambda^{n-1} + \dots + e_\lambda + 1_B)(e_\lambda - 1_B))s\| \\
 &\leq \|\pi\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n| (M^{n-1} + \dots + M + 1) \|\pi(e_\lambda - 1_B)s\| \\
 &\leq \|\pi\| \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n |\alpha_n| M^{n-1} \right) \|\pi(e_\lambda)s - s\|,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the fact that $M \geq 1$ was used in the final step. Since the Maclaurin series of f' is absolutely convergent in M , we see that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n |\alpha_n| M^{n-1} < \infty$. Combining this with the assumption that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , the statement in the lemma follows. $\square$

Corollary 3.6. *Let A be a Banach subalgebra of the unital Banach algebra B , and suppose that A contains a left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ for itself of bound $M \geq 1$. Let $\eta > 0$, and suppose that $f : \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < M + \eta\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic with $f(1) = 1$. Then $\{f(e_\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a bounded net in B such that $\lim_\lambda f(e_\lambda)a = a$ for all $a \in A$. For all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $f(e_\lambda)$ is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by e_λ .*

Furthermore, if X is a normed space, if π is a continuous unital representation of B on X , and if S is a non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , then $\lim_\lambda \pi(f(e_\lambda))s = s$ uniformly on S .

If $A \neq \{0\}$, then it is automatic that $M \geq 1$. The requirement that $M \geq 1$ is necessary to be able to include the case of the zero Banach subalgebra, because also in that case one needs $f(1)$ to be defined in the statement of the corollary. The same remark applies to several results in the sequel.

PROOF OF COROLLARY 3.6. We apply Lemma 3.5 in two contexts: first in that of the left regular representation of B , where we take all singleton subsets of A for S , and then in that of the given representation π of B on X . $\square$

Our next result is also concerned with preservation of uniform convergence. It will be needed in the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Lemma 3.7. *Let A be a normed subalgebra of the normed algebra B , and suppose that A contains a bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ for itself. Let X be a normed space, and let π be a continuous representation of B on X . Suppose that S is a bounded non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , and that $b \in B$ is such that $be_\lambda \in A$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)\pi(b)s = \pi(b)s$ uniformly on S .*

PROOF. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Choose a bound $M \geq 1$ for $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and a bound M' for S . Choose $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$ such that $\|\pi\|M\|b\|\|\pi(e_{\lambda_0})s - s\| < \epsilon/3$ for all $s \in S$. There exists $\lambda' \in \Lambda$ such that $\|\pi\|\|e_\lambda be_{\lambda_0} - be_{\lambda_0}\|M' < \epsilon/3$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$, since $be_{\lambda_0} \in A$. Then, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ and $s \in S$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi(e_\lambda)\pi(b)s - \pi(b)s\| &= \|\pi(e_\lambda b - b)s\| \\ &\leq \|\pi(e_\lambda b - e_\lambda be_{\lambda_0})s\| + \|\pi(e_\lambda be_{\lambda_0} - be_{\lambda_0})s\| \\ &\quad + \|\pi(be_{\lambda_0} - b)s\| \\ &\leq \|\pi\|M\|b\|\|s - \pi(e_{\lambda_0})s\| + \|\pi\|\|e_\lambda be_{\lambda_0} - be_{\lambda_0}\|M' \\ &\quad + \|\pi\|\|b\|\|\pi(e_{\lambda_0})s - s\| \\ &< \epsilon/3 + \epsilon/3 + \epsilon/3 \\ &= \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Finally, we arrive at the main proposition in the current section. It will play a key role in the sequel. The use of the meromorphic function $z \mapsto (1 - r + rz)^{-1}$ is a common occurrence in the literature on factorization theorems, and it goes back to Cohen's original paper [4].

Proposition 3.8. *Let A be a Banach subalgebra of the unital Banach algebra B , and suppose that A contains a left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ for itself of bound $M \geq 1$. Choose r such that $0 < r < (M + 1)^{-1}$, and let*

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{1 - r + rz} \quad \left(z \in \mathbb{C}, |z| < \frac{1}{r} - 1 \right).$$

Then $\{f(e_\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a bounded net in B such that $\lim_\lambda f(e_\lambda)a = a$ for all $a \in A$. For every $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $f(e_\lambda)$ is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by e_λ ,

$$(3.1) \quad \|f(e_\lambda)\| \leq (1 - r - rM)^{-1},$$

$f(e_\lambda)$ is invertible in B , and

$$(3.2) \quad f(e_\lambda)^{-1} = (1 - r)1_B + re_\lambda.$$

Furthermore, if X is a normed space, if π is a continuous unital representation of B on X , and if S is a non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , then, for all $j \geq 1$, $\lim_\lambda \pi(f(e_\lambda)^j)s = s$ uniformly on S . If, in addition, S is bounded, and if $b \in B$ is such that $be_\lambda \in A$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, then, for all $j \geq 1$, $\lim_\lambda \pi(f(e_\lambda)^j)\pi(b)s = \pi(b)s$ uniformly on S .

PROOF. The pole of f in the complex plane is located in $1/r - 1 > M$, so that Corollary 3.6 applies. This shows that $\{f(e_\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a bounded net in B such that $\lim_\lambda f(e_\lambda)a = a$ for all $a \in A$, and that, for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $f(e_\lambda)$ is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by e_λ .

Furthermore, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z| < 1/r - 1$, we have

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{1-r} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{r}{r-1} \right)^n z^n,$$

so that, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$,

$$\|f(e_\lambda)\| \leq \frac{1}{1-r} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{r}{1-r} \right)^n M^n = (1 - r - rM)^{-1}.$$

Since f has no zero on its domain, it is clear from the properties of the functional calculus that all $f(e_\lambda)$ are invertible in B with inverses as in (3.2).

Corollary 3.6 applies to f^j for all $j \geq 1$, and this shows that, for all $j \geq 1$, $\lim_\lambda \pi(f(e_\lambda)^j)s = \lim_\lambda \pi(f^j(e_\lambda))s = s$ uniformly on S whenever $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S .

If S is bounded, if $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , and if $b \in B$ is such that $be_\lambda \in A$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, then Lemma 3.7 shows that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s' = s'$ uniformly on $S' := \pi(b)S$. Applying what we have just proved to S' , we conclude that, for all $j \geq 1$, $\lim_\lambda \pi(f(e_\lambda)^j)\pi(b)s = \pi(b)s$ uniformly on S . This completes the proof. $\square$

§4. Simultaneous power factorization

This section contains the central result of the paper, which is Theorem 4.4. In that theorem, it is assumed that the subset S is bounded or that the bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of A is commutative. The conclusions of the theorem are the same in both cases. In fact, the proof of the theorem covers both cases at the same time, because it relies on the identical parts (1) through (6) in Proposition 4.2 (for the case of bounded S) and Proposition 4.3 (for the case of commutative $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$). The proofs of the two propositions, however, are different. We shall now establish these two preparatory results, and we start with the bounded case. For this, we first record an algebraic identity, which was used implicitly in [1, proof of Theorem 1]. The elementary proof is omitted.

Lemma 4.1. *Let R be a unital ring. Then, for all $a, b \in R$ and $n \geq 1$,*

$$a^n - b^n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a^{n-1-i}(a-b)b^i.$$

Proposition 4.2. *Let A be a Banach subalgebra of the unital Banach algebra B , and suppose that A contains a left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ for itself of bound $M \geq 1$. Let X be a normed space, and let π be a continuous unital representation of B on X . Suppose that S is a bounded non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S .*

Choose r such that $0 < r < (M + 1)^{-1}$, and put $\Delta = (1 - r - rM)^{-1} + 1 > 1$.

Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$ and for every sequence $\{j_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of strictly positive integers, there exist sequences $\{b_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ in B and $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \{e_\lambda\}$ such that

- (1) $b_0 = 1_B$, and $b_k \in \text{Inv}(B)$ for all $k \geq 0$;
- (2) $\|b_k^{-1}\| \leq \Delta^k$ for all $k \geq 0$;
- (3) $\|\pi(b_k^{-j})s - \pi(b_{k-1}^{-j})s\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2^k}$ for all $k \geq 1$, $j = 1, \dots, j_k$, and $s \in S$;
- (4) $b_k = (1 - r)^k 1_B + \sum_{i=1}^k r(1 - r)^{i-1} u_i$ for all $k \geq 0$;
- (5) for all $k \geq 0$, b_k^{-1} is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$;
- (6) there exists a chain $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3 \leq \dots$ in Λ such that $u_k = e_{\lambda_k}$ for all $k \geq 1$. If Λ does not have a largest element, one can require that $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 < \dots$

PROOF. We shall use an inductive procedure to construct sequences $\{b_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ and $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfying (1) through (6). During this construction, part (6) is then to be interpreted as a requirement for all indices that have been considered so far.

As a preparation, we apply Proposition 3.8 with our chosen r . The properties of the net $\{f(e_\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ in B that is now available will be used repeatedly in the current proof.

We start the induction with $k = 0$. In that case, we need to find only b_0 , and we choose $b_0 = 1_B$. Clearly the parts (1), (2), (4), and (5) are then satisfied; the parts (3) and (6) are not applicable for $k = 0$.

We turn to $k = 1$. Proposition 3.8 asserts that, for all $j \geq 1$, $\lim_\lambda \pi(f(e_\lambda)^j)s = s$ uniformly on S . Since, for $k = 1$ (in fact, for each $k \geq 1$), part (3) involves only finitely many values of j , there exists $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda$ such that $\|\pi(f(e_{\lambda_1})^j)s - s\| < \epsilon/2$ for all $j = 1, \dots, j_1$ and $s \in S$. We choose $b_1 = f(e_{\lambda_1})^{-1}$ and $u_1 = e_{\lambda_1}$. Since $b_0 = 1_B$, part (3) is now clear. Part (1) is obviously satisfied, and part (2) follows from (3.1), which yields that even $\|b_1^{-1}\| \leq (1 - r - rM)^{-1} = \Delta - 1$. Since (3.2) shows that $b_1 = (1 - r)1_B + e_{\lambda_1}$, part (4) is satisfied. Proposition 3.8 yields part (5), and part (6) is trivially satisfied when only one index greater than or equal to 1 has been considered thus far.

With an eye towards the proof of Proposition 4.3 below, we note that the boundedness of S has not been used so far.

We now assume that $k \geq 1$, and that $b_0, \dots, b_k$ and $u_1, \dots, u_k$ have been defined such that (1) through (5) hold, and such that (6) holds for all k_1, k_2 such that $1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq k$. This is true for $k = 0$ and $k = 1$. We shall proceed to find b_{k+1} and u_{k+1} . For this, we need a few preparations.

For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we define

$$(4.1) \quad g(\lambda) = (1 - r)^k 1_B + f(e_\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^k r(1 - r)^{i-1} u_i.$$

Using part (4) of the induction hypothesis, we see that

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \|g(\lambda) - b_k\| &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k r(1-r)^{i-1} (f(e_\lambda)u_i - u_i) \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k r(1-r)^{i-1} \|f(e_\lambda)u_i - u_i\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since there are only finitely many values of i in the summation in (4.2), and since $b_k \in \text{Inv}(B)$ by part (1) of the inductive hypothesis, we conclude from Proposition 3.8, using that $\text{Inv}(B)$ is open and that the inversion is continuous on $\text{Inv}(B)$, that there exists $\lambda' \in \Lambda$ such that both $g(\lambda) \in \text{Inv}(B)$ and

$$(4.3) \quad \|g(\lambda)^{-1}\| \leq \|b_k^{-1}\| + 1$$

for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$. Moreover, this can be so arranged that, for $\lambda \geq \lambda'$, $g(\lambda)^{-1}$ can be expressed as a Neumann series, making it clear that it is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by b_k^{-1} and $g(\lambda)$. Part (5) of the induction hypothesis, together with Proposition 3.8, then shows that $g(\lambda)^{-1}$ is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by $\{u_1, \dots, u_k, e_\lambda\}$.

For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we define

$$b(\lambda) = (1-r)^{k+1}1_B + \sum_{i=1}^k r(1-r)^{i-1}u_i + r(1-r)^k e_\lambda.$$

Since $f(e_\lambda)^{-1} = (1-r)1_B + r e_\lambda$ by (3.2), one sees easily that, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$,

$$(4.4) \quad b(\lambda) = f(e_\lambda)^{-1}g(\lambda).$$

Therefore, if $\lambda \geq \lambda'$, then $b(\lambda) \in \text{Inv}(B)$. Since then $b(\lambda)^{-1} = g(\lambda)^{-1}f(e_\lambda)$, we see from the corresponding statement for $g(\lambda)^{-1}$ and Proposition 3.8 that, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$, $b(\lambda)^{-1}$ is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by $\{u_1, \dots, u_k, e_\lambda\}$. Furthermore, using (3.1) and part (2) of the induction hypothesis, we have, for $\lambda \geq \lambda'$,

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|b(\lambda)^{-1}\| &\leq \|g(\lambda)^{-1}\| \|f(e_\lambda)\| \\ &\leq (\|b_k^{-1}\| + 1) \cdot \frac{1}{1-r-rM} \\ &\leq (\Delta^k + 1) \cdot \frac{1}{1-r-rM} \\ &< \frac{1}{1-r-rM} \Delta^k + \Delta \\ &< \frac{1}{1-r-rM} \Delta^k + \Delta^k \\ &= \Delta^{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Continuing our preparations, using Lemma 4.1, (4.5), and part (2) of the induction hypothesis, we see that, for all $j = 1, \dots, j_{k+1}$, $\lambda \geq \lambda'$, and $s \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-j})s - \pi(b_k^{-j})s\| &= \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \pi(b(\lambda)^{-(j-1-i)}) \pi([b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1}]b_k^{-i})s \right\| \\
 &\leq \|\pi\| \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \|b(\lambda)^{-1}\|^{j-1-i} \|\pi([b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1}]b_k^{-i})s\| \\
 &\leq \|\pi\| \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \Delta^{(k+1)(j-1-i)} \|\pi([b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1}]b_k^{-i})s\| \\
 (4.6) \quad &\leq \|\pi\| \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \Delta^{(k+1)(j-1)} \|\pi([b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1}]b_k^{-i})s\| \\
 &\leq \|\pi\| \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \Delta^{(k+1)(j_{k+1}-1)} \|\pi([b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1}]b_k^{-i})s\| \\
 &\leq \|\pi\| \Delta^{(k+1)(j_{k+1}-1)} \sum_{i=0}^{j_{k+1}-1} \|\pi([b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1}]b_k^{-i})s\|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if $\lambda \geq \lambda'$, $i = 0, \dots, j_{k+1} - 1$, and $s \in S$, then, using (4.4) and (4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\pi([b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1}]b_k^{-i})s\| &= \|\pi([g(\lambda)^{-1}f(e_\lambda) - b_k^{-1}]b_k^{-i})s\| \\
 (4.7) \quad &= \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1}f(e_\lambda)b_k^{-i} - g(\lambda)^{-1}b_k^{-i} + g(\lambda)^{-1}b_k^{-i} - b_k^{-1}b_k^{-i})s\| \\
 &\leq \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1})\| \|\pi(f(e_\lambda))\pi(b_k^{-i})s - \pi(b_k^{-i})s\| + \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})\pi(b_k^{-i})s\| \\
 &\leq \|\pi\|(\|b_k^{-1}\| + 1) \|\pi(f(e_\lambda))\pi(b_k^{-i})s - \pi(b_k^{-i})s\| + \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})\| \cdot K,
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$K = \sup\{\|\pi(b_k^{-i})s\| : i = 0, \dots, j_{k+1} - 1, s \in S\}.$$

We note that $K < \infty$ since S is bounded.

It follows from (4.2), Proposition 3.8, and the continuity of the inversion on $\text{Inv}(B)$ that

$$(4.8) \quad \lim_{\lambda \geq \lambda'} \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})\| \cdot K = 0.$$

Furthermore, part (5) of the induction hypothesis implies that $b_k^{-i}e_\lambda \in A$ for all $i = 0, \dots, j_{k+1} - 1$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Since S is bounded, Proposition 3.8 then shows that, for all $i = 0, \dots, j_{k+1} - 1$,

$$(4.9) \quad \lim_{\lambda} \|\pi(f(e_\lambda))\pi(b_k^{-i})s - \pi(b_k^{-i})s\| = 0$$

uniformly on S . It is now clear from (4.7), (4.8), and (4.9) that, for all $i = 0, \dots, j_{k+1} - 1$,

$$\lim_{\lambda \geq \lambda'} \|\pi([b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1}]b_k^{-i})s\| = 0$$

uniformly on S . Finally, (4.6) then shows that, for all $j = 1, \dots, j_{k+1}$,

$$\lim_{\lambda \geq \lambda'} \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-j})s - \pi(b_k^{-j})s\| = 0$$

uniformly on S . In particular, there exists $\lambda'' \geq \lambda'$ such that

$$\|\pi(b(\lambda'')^{-j})s - \pi(b_k^{-j})s\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2^{k+1}}$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, j_{k+1}$ and $s \in S$. It is clear that λ'' can also be chosen such that, in addition, $\lambda'' \geq \lambda_k$, or, if Λ does not have a largest element, such that $\lambda'' > \lambda_k$. The induction step in the construction is then completed by choosing $b_{k+1} = b(\lambda'')$ and $u_{k+1} = e_{\lambda''}$, and where the chain under part (6) is extended by adding $\lambda_{k+1} := \lambda''$.

□

As announced, the next result, is almost identical to Proposition 4.2. The only two differences are that $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is required to be commutative, but that S need not be bounded.

Proposition 4.3. *Let A be a Banach subalgebra of the unital Banach algebra B , and suppose that A contains a commutative left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ for itself of bound $M \geq 1$. Let X be a normed space, and let π be a continuous unital representation of B on X . Suppose that S is a non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S .*

Choose r such that $0 < r < (M + 1)^{-1}$, and put $\Delta = (1 - r - rM)^{-1} + 1 > 1$.

Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$ and for every sequence $\{j_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of strictly positive integers, there exist sequences $\{b_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ in B and $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \{e_\lambda\}$ such that

- (1) $b_0 = 1_B$, and $b_k \in \text{Inv}(B)$ for all $k \geq 0$;
- (2) $\|b_k^{-1}\| \leq \Delta^k$ for all $k \geq 0$;
- (3) $\|\pi(b_k^{-j})s - \pi(b_{k-1}^{-j})s\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2^k}$ for all $k \geq 1$, $j = 1, \dots, j_k$, and $s \in S$;
- (4) $b_k = (1 - r)^k 1_B + \sum_{i=1}^k r(1 - r)^{i-1} u_i$ for all $k \geq 0$;
- (5) for all $k \geq 0$, b_k^{-1} is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$;
- (6) there exists a chain $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3 \leq \dots$ in Λ such that $u_k = e_{\lambda_k}$ for all $k \geq 1$. If Λ does not have a largest element, one can require that $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 < \dots$.

PROOF. The proof is an adaptation of the inductive construction in the proof of Proposition 4.2.

As in that proof, we start by applying Proposition 3.8 with our chosen r , and we shall work with the net $\{f(e_\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ in B that is then available. Note that, as a consequence of Proposition 3.8, $f(e_\lambda)$ and $e_{\tilde{\lambda}}$ commute for all $\lambda, \tilde{\lambda} \in \Lambda$.

Exactly as in the proof of Proposition 4.2, we can find b_0 , b_1 , and u_1 such that parts (1) through (6) are satisfied for $k = 0$ and $k = 1$. Indeed, as was already remarked in that proof, for this to be possible the condition that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S is already sufficient; boundedness of S is not needed.

For the induction step, we assume that $k \geq 1$, and that $b_0, \dots, b_k$ and $u_1, \dots, u_k$ have been defined such that (1) through (5) hold, and such that (6) holds for all k_1, k_2 such that $1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq k$. This is true for $k = 0$ and $k = 1$. We shall proceed to find b_{k+1} and u_{k+1} .

As in the earlier proof, we define, for $\lambda \in \Lambda$,

$$(4.10) \quad g(\lambda) = (1 - r)^k 1_B + f(e_\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^k r(1 - r)^{i-1} u_i.$$

As previously, we have

$$\|g(\lambda) - b_k\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k r(1 - r)^{i-1} \|f(e_\lambda)u_i - u_i\|$$

for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, and from this we conclude again that there exists $\lambda' \in \Lambda$ such that, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$, $g(\lambda) \in \text{Inv}(B)$,

$$(4.11) \quad \|g(\lambda)^{-1}\| \leq \|b_k^{-1}\| + 1,$$

and $g(\lambda)^{-1}$ is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by $\{u_1, \dots, u_k, e_\lambda\}$. Note that the latter property, when combined with the commutativity of $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and part (5) of the induction hypothesis, implies that $g(\lambda)^{-1}$ and b_k^{-1} commute for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$. Alternatively, and more directly, this commuting property also follows from (4.10), Proposition 3.8, part (4) of the induction hypothesis, and the commutativity of $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$.

As earlier, we define, for $\lambda \in \Lambda$,

$$(4.12) \quad b(\lambda) = (1-r)^{k+1}1_B + \sum_{i=1}^k r(1-r)^{i-1}u_i + r(1-r)^k e_\lambda.$$

As earlier, if $\lambda \geq \lambda'$, then $b(\lambda) \in \text{Inv}(B)$, $b(\lambda)^{-1} = g(\lambda)^{-1}f(e_\lambda)$,

$$(4.13) \quad \|b(\lambda)^{-1}\| \leq \Delta^{k+1},$$

and $b(\lambda)^{-1}$ is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by $\{u_1, \dots, u_k, e_\lambda\}$. Note that the latter property, when combined with the commutativity of $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and part (5) of the induction hypothesis, implies that $b(\lambda)^{-1}$ and b_k^{-1} commute for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$. Alternatively, and more directly, this commuting property also follows from (4.12), part (4) of the induction hypothesis, and the commutativity of $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$.

We shall now exploit the various commuting properties in the estimates that are to follow below. It is at this point that the structure of the present proof begins to differ from that of the proof of Proposition 4.3.

For all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$, $j = 1, \dots, j_{k+1}$, and $s \in S$, we have, using Lemma 4.1 in the first step, the fact that $b(\lambda)^{-1}$ and b_k^{-1} commute in the second step, and (4.13) and part (2) of the induction hypothesis in the fifth step,

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-j})s - \pi(b_k^{-j})s\| &= \left\| \pi \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} b(\lambda)^{-(j-1-i)} (b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1}) b_k^{-i} \right) s \right\| \\ &= \left\| \pi \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} b(\lambda)^{-(j-1-i)} b_k^{-i} (b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1}) \right) s \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-(j-1-i)} b_k^{-i})\| \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})s\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \|\pi\| \|b(\lambda)^{-1}\|^{j-1-i} \|b_k^{-1}\|^i \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})s\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \|\pi\| \Delta^{(k+1)j-k-1-i} \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})s\| \\ &\leq j_{k+1} \|\pi\| \Delta^{(k+1)j_{k+1}-k-1} \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})s\|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ and $s \in S$,

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})s\| &= \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1}f(e_\lambda) - b_k^{-1})s\| \\ &\leq \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1}(f(e_\lambda) - 1_B))s\| + \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})s\|. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate both terms in (4.15) separately. For $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ and $s \in S$, we have, using (4.11),

$$\|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1}(f(e_\lambda) - 1_B))s\| \leq \|\pi\|(\|b_k^{-1}\| + 1)\|\pi(f(e_\lambda))s - s\|.$$

It then follows from Proposition 3.8 that

$$(4.16) \quad \lim_{\lambda \geq \lambda'} \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1}(f(e_\lambda) - 1_B))s\| = 0$$

uniformly on S .

The estimate for the second term in (4.15) is slightly more involved. For $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ and $s \in S$ we have, using that $g(\lambda)^{-1}$ commutes with b_k^{-1} in the first step, that $f(e_\lambda)$ commutes with u_i for $i = 1, \dots, k$ in the third step, and (4.11) in the fourth step,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})s\| &= \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1}b_k^{-1}(b_k - g(\lambda)))s\| \\ &= \|\pi\left(g(\lambda)^{-1}b_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k r(1-r)^{i-1}(u_i - f(e_\lambda)u_i)\right)s\| \\ (4.17) \quad &= \|\pi\left(g(\lambda)^{-1}b_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k r(1-r)^{i-1}u_i(1_B - f(e_\lambda))\right)s\| \\ &\leq \|\pi\|(\|b_k^{-1}\| + 1)\|b_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k r(1-r)^{i-1}u_i\| \|s - \pi(f(e_\lambda))s\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 3.8 for the last time, we can now conclude from (4.17) that

$$(4.18) \quad \lim_{\lambda \geq \lambda'} \|\pi(g(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})s\| = 0$$

uniformly on S . Combining (4.15), (4.16), and (4.18), we see that

$$(4.19) \quad \lim_{\lambda \geq \lambda'} \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-1} - b_k^{-1})s\| = 0$$

uniformly on S . Finally, combining (4.14) and (4.19), we conclude that, for all $j = 1, \dots, j_{k+1}$,

$$\lim_{\lambda \geq \lambda'} \|\pi(b(\lambda)^{-j})s - \pi(b_k^{-j})s\| = 0$$

uniformly on S . As in the conclusion of the proof of Proposition 4.2, this allows us to find b_{k+1} and u_{k+1} with the required properties. $\square$

We can now establish the main result of this paper. As mentioned earlier, its proof is based on the identical parts (1) through (6) of Propositions 4.2 and 4.3.

Theorem 4.4. *Let A be a Banach algebra that has a left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of bound $M \geq 1$, let X be a Banach space, and let π be a continuous representation of A on X . Let S be a non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , and suppose that S is bounded or that $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative.*

Choose a unital Banach superalgebra B of A such that π extends to a continuous unital representation, again denoted by π , of B on X .

Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$, every $\delta > 0$, every r such that $0 < r < (M+1)^{-1}$, every integer $n_0 \geq 1$, and every sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $(1, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \infty$, there exist $a \in A$ and maps $x_n : S \rightarrow X$ for $n \geq 1$ such that:

- (1) $s = \pi(a^n)x_n(s)$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $s \in S$;
- (2) $\|a\| \leq M$;
- (3) for all $n \geq 1$, x_n is a uniformly continuous homeomorphism of S onto $x_n(S)$, with the restricted map $\pi(a^n) : x_n(S) \rightarrow S$ as its inverse;

- (4) (a) $\|s - x_n(s)\| \leq \epsilon$ for all n such that $1 \leq n \leq n_0$ and for all $s \in S$;
 (b) $\|x_n(s)\| \leq \alpha_n^n \max(\|s\|, \delta)$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $s \in S$;
- (5) (a) if $s_1, s_2 \in S$ are such that $s_1 + s_2 \in S$, then $x_n(s_1 + s_2) = x_n(s_1) + x_n(s_2)$ for all $n \geq 1$;
 (b) if $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ and $s \in S$ are such that $\lambda s \in S$, then $x_n(\lambda s) = \lambda x_n(s)$ for all $n \geq 1$;
- (6) there exists a sequence $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ in $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \{e_\lambda\}$ such that:
 (a) $a = \sum_{i=1}^\infty r(1-r)^{i-1} u_i$ is an element of the closed convex hull of $\{u_i : i \geq 1\}$ in A ;
 (b) for every $k \geq 0$, the element $b_k = (1-r)^k 1_B + \sum_{i=1}^k r(1-r)^{i-1} u_i$ of B is an element of the convex hull of $\{1_B, u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ in B that is invertible in B , b_k^{-1} is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of B that is generated by $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$, and $x_n(s) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi(b_k^{-n})s$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $s \in S$;
 (c) there exists a chain $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3 \leq \dots$ in Λ such that $u_k = e_{\lambda_k}$ for all $k \geq 1$. If Λ does not have a largest element, one can require that $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 < \dots$;
- (7) (a) if S is bounded, then $x_n(S)$ is bounded for all $n \geq 1$;
 (b) if S is totally bounded, then $x_n(S)$ is totally bounded for all $n \geq 1$;
 (c) $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)x_n(s) = x_n(s)$ uniformly on S for all $n \geq 1$.

Remark 4.5. Before setting out on the proof, let us make a few comments.

- (1) Certainly a superalgebra B as in the theorem exists: the unitization of A , which is invariably used in the existing proofs of factorization theorems in the literature, is a possible choice. Hence a simultaneous power factorization also exists under the remaining hypotheses in the theorem, none of which involves B .

There may, however, be other superalgebras satisfying the mild extension condition in the theorem. As we shall see in Section 5, it is important to build this freedom of choice into the result. The reason is that part (6) (the only statement in which B figures again) is rather explicit about an actually possible form of a simultaneous power factorization. If, for a suitable choice of B , one has additional information about the elements b_k^{-n} , then one has additional information about an actually possible form of a simultaneous power factorization. See Remark 5.6 for such candidate alternate superalgebras, and Theorem 5.7 for an application of the current observation.

- (2) With some computational perseverance, the information as provided by part (6) could lead to an explicit simultaneous power factorization in a given context. After all, one only needs to find a suitable chain $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3 \dots$ in Λ . We shall carry out an example of such a construction of a factorization ‘by hand’ in Section 7.

The whole proof of Theorem 4.4 is, in fact, constructive, although to actually find a factorization in a concrete case one would perhaps rather start from the Ansatz as provided by part (6) than go through the estimates in the proof again.

- (3) Part (7) implies that the theorem can be applied repeatedly. As a consequence, if $p_1, \dots, p_t \geq 1$ is a given set of exponents, then there exist $a_1, \dots, a_t \in A$ and a uniformly continuous homeomorphism $x_{p_1, \dots, p_t} : S \rightarrow x_{p_1, \dots, p_t}(S)$ such that $s = \pi(a_1^{p_1} \cdots a_t^{p_t})x_{p_1, \dots, p_t}(s)$ for all $s \in S$. This is obtained by an application of the theorem to S for $n = p_1$, then to $x_{p_1}(S)$ for $n = p_2$, etc.
- (4) Suppose that Λ has a largest element λ_{la} . Since the proof of Theorem 4.4 essentially consists of repeatedly extending a chain in Λ by a sufficiently large element of Λ , the choice $\lambda_k = \lambda_{\text{la}}$ for all $k \geq 1$, implying that $u_k = e_{\lambda_{\text{la}}}$ for all $k \geq 1$, must give

a factorization satisfying parts (1) through (7). Indeed it does, and we shall now convince ourselves of this fact, which is still not entirely trivial.

First of all, it is easy to see that $e_{\lambda_{\text{la}}}$ must be a left identity element for A , and that $e_{\lambda_{\text{la}}}$ must act as the identity on S . Part (6a) stipulates that $a = e_{\lambda_{\text{la}}}$. An easy induction with respect to k shows that, with this choice of the u_i , we have the factorization

$$(4.20) \quad b_k = (1-r)^k 1_B + \sum_{i=1}^k r(1-r)^{i-1} e_{\lambda_{\text{la}}} = ((1-r)1_B + r e_{\lambda_{\text{la}}})^k$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Since $0 < r < (M+1)^{-1}$, $((1-r)1_B + r e_{\lambda_{\text{la}}})$ is invertible in B . Indeed,

$$(4.21) \quad ((1-r)1_B + r e_{\lambda_{\text{la}}})^{-1} = \frac{1}{1-r} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{r}{1-r} \right)^j e_{\lambda_{\text{la}}}^j,$$

where the series is absolutely convergent because $|rM/(1-r)| = rM/(1-r) < 1$ since $0 < r < (M+1)^{-1}$. Hence b_k is also invertible in B for all $k \geq 1$, as it should be according to part (6b). Furthermore, it follows from (4.21) that $((1-r)1_B + r e_{\lambda_{\text{la}}})^{-1}$ acts as the identity on S . The same is then true for b_k^{-n} for all $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$, in which case part (6b) insists that $x_n(s) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi(b_k^{-n})s = s$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $s \in S$. Since a acts as the identity on S , this is compatible with part (1), as it should be. A quick inspection now shows that, in fact, all properties in the parts (1) through (7) are satisfied.

The only case of true interest is, therefore, when Λ does not have a largest element, and part (6c) shows that one may then assume that $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots$

Similar remarks apply to Propositions 4.2 and 4.3.

- (5) A still more precise result is available as Theorem 5.3; see also Remark 5.4.
- (6) In the monograph [7, Theorem 2.9.24], a proof of the pointwise power factorization theorem is given under the assumption that the sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is increasing, but this extra condition is not necessary. Unfortunately, the proof in [7] has an error at one point: on page 313, line -6, the factorization of a_{k+1} is used to obtain a factorization of a_{k+1}^{-j} as $g(u_{k+1})^{-j} f(u_{k+1})^j$, but this is only sure when the algebra is commutative. The original proof of Allan and Sinclair is a little more complicated, but avoids this problem by using Lemma 4.1.

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.4. We may assume that $\delta \leq 1$ and that

$$(4.22) \quad \epsilon \leq \inf \{ \delta, (\alpha_n^n - 1)\delta : n \geq 1 \},$$

since the right hand side of this inequality is strictly positive due to the properties of $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

We start by choosing a strictly increasing sequence of integers $\{j_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that $j_1 \geq n_0$ and

$$(4.23) \quad \alpha_n \geq 1 + \|\pi\| \Delta^k$$

for all $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq j_k$; here $\|\pi\|$ is the norm of the representation of B on X . Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \infty$, this is possible. We can now apply Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 for our given ϵ and the sequence $\{j_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ as just constructed. This yields sequences $\{b_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ in B and $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ in $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \{e_{\lambda}\}$ with the properties in the parts (1) through (6) of these two propositions. In particular, part (6c) of the present theorem is satisfied.

Using the notation of these two propositions, we let $a = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r(1-r)^{i-1} u_i$, which is as required in part (6a) of the present theorem. This is indeed a well-defined element of A , since

$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|r(1-r)^{i-1}u_i\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r(1-r)^{i-1}M = M$. We also see that $\|a\| \leq M$, which is part (2) of the present theorem. Note that the parts (4) of the two propositions imply that

$$(4.24) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} b_k = a.$$

Fix $n \geq 1$. Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} j_k = \infty$, we can choose $k_0 \geq 1$ such that $1 \leq n \leq j_k$ for all $k \geq k_0$. The parts (3) of the two propositions then yield that $\|\pi(b_k^{-n})s - \pi(b_{k-1}^{-n})s\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2^k}$ for all $k \geq k_0$ and $s \in S$. A telescoping argument subsequently shows that

$$(4.25) \quad \|\pi(b_m^{-n})s - \pi(b_l^{-n})s\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2^l}$$

for all $m \geq l \geq k_0 - 1$ and $s \in S$. This implies that, for all $s \in S$, $\{\pi(b_k^{-n})s\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence in X . As X is now assumed to be a Banach space, we can define

$$(4.26) \quad x_n(s) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi(b_k^{-n})s$$

for $s \in S$. The ‘linearity’ of x_n in part (5) of the present theorem then follows from (4.26), and part (6b) of the present theorem now follows from (4.26) and the parts (5) of the two propositions. Since $s = \pi(b_k^n)[\pi(b_k^{-n})s]$ for all $k \geq 1$ and $s \in S$, we see from (4.24) and (4.26) that $s = \pi(a^n)x_n(s)$ for all $s \in S$, which is part (1) of the present theorem.

Continuing, we note that it follows from (4.25) that

$$(4.27) \quad \|x_n(s) - \pi(b_l^{-n})s\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2^l}$$

all $l \geq k_0 - 1$ and $s \in S$. Since, for all $l \geq k_0 - 1$, the map $s \mapsto \pi(b_l^{-n})s$ is uniformly continuous on S , we conclude from (4.27) that x_n , being a uniform limit of uniformly continuous maps on S , is uniformly continuous on S . Combining this with the already established relation in part (1), part (3) of the present theorem is now clear.

The parts (1), (2), (3), (5), and (6) of the present theorem have now been established, and we turn to part (4a).

If $1 \leq n \leq j_1$, then we can choose $k_0 = 1$ in the preceding argument, so that (4.27) holds for $l = k_0 - 1 = 0$. Since we also know from the parts (1) of the two propositions that $b_0 = 1_B$, we therefore see that

$$(4.28) \quad \|x_n(s) - s\| \leq \epsilon$$

for all $n = 1, \dots, j_1$ and $s \in S$. As $n_0 \leq j_1$ by the choice of j_1 , part (4a) of the present theorem has now been established.

We now consider part (4b) of the present theorem, and for this we distinguish two cases.

The first case is where $1 \leq n \leq j_1$. According to (4.28), we then know that $\|x_n(s)\| \leq \epsilon + \|s\|$ for all $s \in S$. We now distinguish two subcases. If $s \in S$ and $\|s\| \leq \delta$, then we have, for $n = 1, \dots, j_1$, using (4.22),

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_n(s)\| &\leq \epsilon + \|s\| \\ &\leq (\alpha_n^n - 1)\delta + \delta \\ &= \alpha_n^n \delta \\ &= \alpha_n^n \max(\|s\|, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

If $s \in S$ and $\|s\| > \delta$, then we have, for $n = 1, \dots, j_1$, using (4.22) again,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|x_n(s)\| &\leq \epsilon + \|s\| \\
 &\leq (\alpha_n^n - 1)\delta + \|s\| \\
 &< (\alpha_n^n - 1)\|s\| + \|s\| \\
 &= \alpha_n^n \|s\| \\
 &= \alpha_n^n \max(\|s\|, \delta).
 \end{aligned}$$

This establishes part (4b) for the first case, where $n = 1, \dots, j_1$. We turn to the second case, where $n > j_1$. Since $\{j_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ was chosen to be strictly increasing, there exists $k' \geq 1$ such that $j_{k'} + 1 \leq n \leq j_{k'+1}$. Since $n \geq j_{k'}$, we see from (4.23) that

$$(4.29) \quad \alpha_n \geq 1 + \|\pi\| \Delta^{k'}.$$

On the other hand, since $n \leq j_{k'+1}$ and $\{j_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is strictly increasing, we can use our argument above for the choice $k_0 = k' + 1$. Then (4.27) is valid for $l = (k' + 1) - 1 = k'$ and all $s \in S$, so that we see that, for all $s \in S$,

$$(4.30) \quad \|x_n(s) - \pi(b_{k'}^{-n})s\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2^{k'}}.$$

Using the parts (2) of the two propositions, (4.22), (4.29), and the fact that $\|\pi\| \geq 1$ because π is a unital representation of B , we conclude from (4.30) that, for all $s \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|x_n(s)\| &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2^{k'}} + \|\pi(b_{k'}^{-n})s\| \\
 &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2^{k'}} + \|\pi\|(\Delta^{k'})^n \|s\| \\
 &\leq \delta + \|\pi\| \Delta^{k'n} \|s\| \\
 &\leq \max(\|s\|, \delta) + \|\pi\| \Delta^{k'n} \max(\|s\|, \delta) \\
 &\leq (1 + \|\pi\| \Delta^{k'n}) \max(\|s\|, \delta) \\
 &\leq (1 + \|\pi\| \Delta^{k'})^n \max(\|s\|, \delta) \\
 &\leq \alpha_n^n \max(\|s\|, \delta).
 \end{aligned}$$

The second case, where $n > j_1$, has now been covered, and part (4b) of the present theorem has now been established.

Finally, we consider part (7) of the present theorem. Part (7a) is clear from part (4b). For part (7b), fix $n \geq 1$, and let $\eta > 0$ be given. Using (4.27), we can choose $l_0 \geq 1$ such that $\|x_n(s) - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| \leq \eta/3$ for all $s \in S$. If $X = \{0\}$, then all is clear. If $X \neq \{0\}$, then $\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n}) \neq 0$, and there exist $t \geq 1$ and $s_1, \dots, s_t \in S$ such that $S \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^t \{x \in X : \|x - s_i\| < \eta/(3\|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})\|)\}$. Let $s \in S$. Then $\|s - s_{i_0}\| < \eta/(3\|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})\|)$ for some i_0 such that $1 \leq i_0 \leq t$, and this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|x_n(s) - x_n(s_{i_0})\| &\leq \|x_n(s) - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| + \|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})(s - s_{i_0})\| + \|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s_{i_0} - x_n(s_{i_0})\| \\
 &< \eta/3 + \eta/3 + \eta/3 \\
 &= \eta.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence $x_n(S)$ is totally bounded.

For part (7c), fix $n \geq 1$, and let $\eta > 0$ be given. We first deal with the case where S is bounded. From (4.27), we see that there exists $l_0 \geq 1$ such that $\|\pi\|M\|x_n(s) - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| < \eta/3$

for all $s \in S$; this implies that $\|x_n(s) - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| < \eta/3$ for all $s \in S$. Since S is bounded, part (6b) of the present theorem and Lemma 3.7 imply that there exists $\lambda' \in \Lambda$ such that $\|\pi(e_\lambda)\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| < \eta/3$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ and $s \in S$. We then have, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ and $s \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi(e_\lambda)x_n(s) - x_n(s)\| &\leq \|\pi(e_\lambda)x_n(s) - \pi(e_\lambda)\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| \\ &\quad + \|\pi(e_\lambda)\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| \\ &\quad + \|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s - x_n(s)\| \\ &< \|\pi\|M\|x_n(s) - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| \\ &\quad + \|\pi(e_\lambda)\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| \\ &\quad + \|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s - x_n(s)\| \\ &< \eta/3 + \eta/3 + \eta/3 \\ &= \eta. \end{aligned}$$

If $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative, we start again by choosing $l_0 \geq 1$ such that $\|\pi\|M\|x_n(s) - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| < \eta/3$ for all $s \in S$, but now we observe that there exists λ' such that $\|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})\|\|\pi(e_\lambda)s - s\| < \eta/3$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$. We then have, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ and $s \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi(e_\lambda)x_n(s) - x_n(s)\| &\leq \|\pi(e_\lambda)x_n(s) - \pi(e_\lambda)\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| \\ &\quad + \|\pi(e_\lambda)\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| \\ &\quad + \|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s - x_n(s)\| \\ &\leq \|\pi\|M\|x_n(s) - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| \\ &\quad + \|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})\pi(e_\lambda)s - \pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s\| \\ &\quad + \|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})s - x_n(s)\| \\ &< \eta/3 + \|\pi(b_{l_0}^{-n})\|\|\pi(e_\lambda)s - s\| + \eta/3 \\ &< 2\eta/3 + \eta/3 \\ &= \eta. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 4.6. If S is bounded and $S \neq \{0\}$, then one can apply Theorem 4.4 with $\delta = \sup_{s \in S} \|s\|$ to see that a simultaneous power factorization is possible where

$$(4.31) \quad \|x_n(s)\| \leq \alpha_n^n \sup_{s \in S} \|s\|$$

for all $n \geq 1$ and $s \in S$; this is also possible if $S = \{0\}$. If S consists of one point, then one obtains the upper bounds that are already in [1, Theorem 1]. It can be argued, see [1, Remark (i) on p. 37], that these upper bounds are then essentially the best possible.

It should be mentioned here that, for bounded S , the variation of Theorem 4.4 where (4b) is replaced with (4.31) can also be obtained rather directly from the power factorization for one point (see [1, Theorem 1]) and inspection of the proof thereof. We shall now describe this. The argument, the idea of which will be generalized in Theorem 6.1, is a slightly improved version of the one given in [9, p. 115-116] resp. [13, proof of Corollary 5.2.3.(b)], where a simultaneous non-power factorization for bounded resp. compact S is established.

With the assumptions as in Theorem 4.4, we let $\tilde{X}$ be the space of all bounded uniformly continuous maps $f : S \rightarrow X$, supplied with the supremum norm. A moment's thought shows that $\tilde{X}$ is a Banach space under pointwise operations, and that there is a natural continuous representation of A on $\tilde{X}$ by pointwise action.

Define $\text{id}_S : S \rightarrow X$ by $\text{id}_S(s) = s$ for all $s \in S$. Then $\text{id}_S \in \tilde{X}$, since S is bounded. Furthermore, for $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we have

$$(4.32) \quad \|\tilde{\pi}(e_\lambda)\text{id}_S - \text{id}_S\| = \sup_{s \in S} \|\pi(e_\lambda)s - s\|.$$

Since we have assumed that $\lim_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , we see from (4.32) that id_S is in the essential subspace for the action of A on $\tilde{X}$ via $\tilde{\pi}$. Therefore, we can apply [1, Theorem 1] (and its proof), and this yields the variation of Theorem 4.4 where part (4b) has been replaced with (4.31).

The stronger pointwise estimates in part (4b), however, do not seem to be attainable in this fashion, and clearly this whole set-up breaks down if S is not bounded.

Remark 4.7. If $0 \notin \bar{S}$, then one can apply Theorem 4.4 with $\delta = \inf_{s \in S} \|s\| > 0$. In that case, part (4b) yields that

$$\|x_n(s)\| \leq \alpha_n^n \|s\|$$

for all $n \geq 1$ and $s \in S$. Hence the maps $x_n : S \rightarrow X$ are bounded (in the usual operator sense of the word) on S for all $n \geq 1$. It is natural to ask whether this could actually be valid for general S . The following example shows that this is not the case, not even for general commutative A and bounded S .

As in Examples 3.2 and 3.4, we consider $A = C_0(\mathbb{R})$ and the left regular representation of A , but now with a different S . Choose $f_0 \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ such that $f_0(t) > 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $S' = \{f \in C_0(\mathbb{R}) : 0 \leq f(t) \leq f_0(t) \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. We know from Example 3.2 that there exists a bounded left approximate identity $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ for $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|e_n f - f\| = 0$ uniformly for f in a subset S of $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ containing S' , so certainly this is true for S' . Hence Theorem 4.4 is applicable.

However, for every $n \geq 1$, there cannot exist $a \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$, $C > 0$, and a map $x_n : S' \rightarrow C_0(\mathbb{R})$ such that, for all $f \in S'$, $f = a^n x_n(f)$ and $\|x_n(f)\| \leq C \|f\|$. To see this, we argue by contradiction. Let us assume that these objects exist. First of all, since, in particular, $f_0 = a^n x_n(f_0)$, and since f_0 has no zeros, we see that a has no zeros. Thus $x_n(f) = a^{-n} f$ for all $f \in S'$. Fix $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and choose a non-zero $f_{t_0} \in S'$ such that $\|f_{t_0}\| = f_{t_0}(t_0)$; this is possible since f_0 is strictly positive in every point. Then

$$|a^{-n}(t_0)f_{t_0}(t_0)| = |[x_n(f_{t_0})](t_0)| \leq \|x_n(f_{t_0})\| \leq C \|f_{t_0}\| = C f_{t_0}(t_0).$$

Since $f_{t_0}(t_0) = \|f_{t_0}\| \neq 0$, we conclude that $|a^{-n}(t_0)| \leq C$ for all $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. This leads to $|a(t_0)| \geq C^{-1/n}$ for all $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, contradicting that $a \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$.

Remark 4.8. Part (7) of Theorem 4.4 shows that all sets $x_n(S)$ for $n \geq 1$ inherit crucial properties from S . The converse is also true. In fact, one single n (which we can take to be equal to 1) already suffices. More specifically, suppose that $S \subset X$ is such that there exist $a \in A$ as in part (6a) of Theorem 4.4, and a map $x_1 : S \rightarrow X$ such that $s = \pi(a)x_1(s)$ for all $s \in S$ and $\lim_{\lambda} \pi(e_\lambda)x_1(s) = x_1(s)$ uniformly on S . If $x_1(S)$ is bounded as in part (7a), or totally bounded as in part (7b), then the same holds for $S = \pi(a)(x_1(S))$. In order to show that the uniform convergence on S follows from part (7c), we distinguish two cases. If $x_1(S)$ is bounded, then the fact that $\|\pi(e_\lambda)s - s\| = \|\pi(e_\lambda)\pi(a)x_1(s) - \pi(a)x_1(s)\| \leq \|\pi\| \|e_\lambda a - a\| (\sup_{s \in S} \|x_1(s)\|)$

implies evidently that $\lim_{\lambda} \pi(e_{\lambda})s = s$ uniformly on S . If $\{e_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative, then we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi(e_{\lambda})s - s\| &= \|\pi(e_{\lambda})\pi(a)x_1(s) - \pi(a)x_1(s)\| \\ &= \|\pi(a)\pi(e_{\lambda})x_1(s) - \pi(a)x_1(s)\| \\ &\leq \|\pi(a)\| \|\pi(e_{\lambda})x_1(s) - x_1(s)\| \end{aligned}$$

in order to conclude that $\lim_{\lambda} \pi(e_{\lambda})s = s$ uniformly on S ; here part (6a) is used in the second step.

A similar observation, relating the possibility of simultaneous non-power factorization of a set, uniform convergence on the set, and uniform convergence on the factor set, can already be found for uniformly bounded subsets of X_e in [17, Theorem 2.1].

For the sake of completeness, we also include the following result, showing that a simultaneous power factorization can also be valid on subsets of X on which there need not be any uniform convergence at all.

Corollary 4.9. *Let A be a Banach algebra with a bounded left approximate identity of bound $M \geq 1$, and let π be a continuous representation of A on the Banach space X . Suppose that $S = \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} K_l$ is the countable union of non-empty compact subsets K_l of X_e . Then there exist $a \in A$ such that $\|a\| \leq M$, and, for all $n \geq 1$, a subset X_n of X_e such that $S = \pi(a^n)X_n$.*

For $n = 1$, this result (of which [9, Corollary 17.6] for countable subsets of X_e is then a special case) follows from the simultaneous non-power factorization for compact subsets of X_e via a concrete and simple transformation of the picture. We refer to [13, proof of Corollary 5.2.3.(a)] for details. The same concrete transformation gives the simultaneous power version in Corollary 4.9 as a result of Theorem 4.4. It is, therefore, possible to obtain estimates that are valid for the factorization in Corollary 4.9 from those in Theorem 4.4. For reasons of space, we refrain from going into this.

§5. Positive simultaneous power factorization

Let A be an ordered Banach algebra that has a positive left approximate identity $\{e_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, let X be an ordered Banach space, and let π be a positive continuous representation of A on X . In this context, it is natural to investigate the existence of a positive factorization. Restricting ourselves to the pointwise non-power case, we have the following question: if $s \in X_e^+$, do there always exist $a \in A^+$ and $x \in X^+$ such that $s = \pi(a)x$?

The answer to the question in this generality is negative. In fact, it can already fail for the left regular representation of A . It was remarked by Rudin (see [16]) that there exist positive elements of $L^1(\mathbb{R})^+$ that are not the convolution of two elements of $L^1(\mathbb{R})^+$: the convolution of two non-negative integrable functions is always lower semi-continuous, but there exist non-negative integrable functions that are not almost everywhere equal to a lower semi-continuous function. We refer to [15] for more (also historical) information concerning this matter and various factorization theorems, with special attention for factorization in abstract harmonic analysis.

In this section, we shall investigate the existence of positive factorizations as they can sometimes be derived from Theorem 4.4. Looking at Theorem 4.4, the positivity of a is hardly an issue. If $\{e_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is positive, and if A^+ is closed, then part (6a) of Theorem 4.4 shows that factorizations produced by Theorem 4.4 will always have positive a . The problem lies with the maps x_n for $n \geq 1$. Can we sometimes guarantee that $x_n(S) \subset X_e^+$ for $S \subset X^+$?

If one is prepared to be content with this property for the first finitely many values of n , then part (4a) of Theorem 4.4 gives an obvious sufficient condition. The following result is clear.

Theorem 5.1. *Let A be an ordered Banach algebra with a closed positive cone and a positive left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of bound $M \geq 1$, let X be an ordered Banach space, and let π be a positive continuous representation of A on X . Let S be a non-empty subset of X^+ such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , and suppose that S is bounded or that $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative.*

Assume, in addition, that there exists $\eta > 0$ such that, for all $s \in S$, $\{x \in X_e : \|x - s\| < \eta\} \subset X_e^+$.

Then, for every superalgebra B , ϵ such that $\epsilon < \eta$, δ , r , n_0 , and sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ as in Theorem 4.4, there exists a simultaneous power factorization as in that theorem for the restricted continuous representation π_e of A on the Banach space X_e with non-empty subset S of X_e , with the following additional statements:

- (8) $a \in A^+$;
- (9) $x_n(S) \subset X_e^+$ for all $n = 1, \dots, n_0$. More precisely: $\{x \in X_e : \|x - x_n(s)\| < \eta - \epsilon\} \subset X_e^+$ for all $n = 1, \dots, n_0$ and $s \in S$.

Remark 5.2.

- (1) Note that X^+ need to be closed in Theorem 5.1.
- (2) The result is only non-void if the interior of X_e^+ is non-empty. It is interesting to note that, in Rudin's (counter)example, the positive cone of the essential subspace of the ordered Banach space in question, i.e. $L^1(\mathbb{R})^+$, has empty interior. It is unclear to the authors whether this is actually somehow related to the failure of positive factorization for the left regular representation of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$.
- (3) The idea to use estimates as in part (4a) of Theorem 5.1 to obtain a positive factorization is by no means new. It was already observed by Cohen (see [4, p. 204]), using precisely this argument, that a strictly positive continuous function f on a compact group G is a convolution of a strictly positive element a of $L^1(G)$ and a strictly positive continuous function f_1 . This corresponds to an application of Theorem 5.1 to the action of $L^1(G)$ on $C(G)$ by convolution; the strict positivity of a follows from part (6a) of Theorem 4.4 once one notes that $L^1(G)$ has a strictly positive bounded left approximate identity (see [4, p. 203] for the easy argument). It is now also clear that, for $n_0 \geq 1$, one can, in fact, obtain finitely many factorizations $f = a^{*n} * f_n$ for $n = 1, \dots, n_0$, where $a \in L^1(G)$ and the $f_n \in C(G)$ are all strictly positive. This can even be achieved simultaneously for all f in a suitable subset (for example, a totally bounded subset) of $C(G)^+$ that is bounded below by a strictly positive constant function.

Part (6b) of Theorem 4.4 gives another sufficient condition for a positive simultaneous power factorization to exist, and this time such that x_n maps S into X_e^+ for all $n \geq 1$. Once one observes that the b_k in part (6b) are all positive if $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is positive, the following result is clear.

Theorem 5.3. *Let A be an ordered Banach algebra with a closed positive cone and a positive left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of bound $M \geq 1$, let X be an ordered Banach space with a closed positive cone, and let π be a positive continuous representation of A on X . Let S be a non-empty subset of X^+ such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , and suppose that S is bounded or that $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative.*

Suppose that there exists a unital ordered Banach superalgebra $B \supset A$ such that:

- (1) the restricted positive continuous representation π_e of A on X_e extends to a positive continuous unital representation of B on X_e ;
- (2) B^+ is inverse closed in B .

With this choice of B in Theorem 4.4, for every ϵ, δ, r, n_0 , and sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ as in that theorem, there exists a simultaneous power factorization as in that theorem for the restricted continuous representation π_e of A on the Banach space X_e with non-empty subset S of X_e , with the following additional statements:

- (8) $a \in A^+$;
- (9) $x_n(S) \subset X_e^+$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Remark 5.4.

- (1) One might be tempted to think of Theorem 5.3 as a special case of Theorem 4.4 in an ordered context, but actually it is not. It is more precise than the latter result, which it contains as a special case. Indeed, in the context of Theorem 4.4 one can introduce an ordering on A, B , and X by taking the spaces themselves as the positive cones. Then positivity of maps, closedness of positive cones and inverse closedness of algebra cones all become a triviality, and Theorem 5.3 is applicable. It then yields all conclusions in Theorem 4.4, and adds the then trivially true statements in the parts (8) and (9).
- (2) In this context, let us include the following small result, with as particular case that B^+ is inverse closed if squares in B are positive.

Let B be a unital ordered algebra with positive cone B^+ . If $b^{-2} \in B^+$ for all $b \in B^+ \cap \text{Inv}(B)$ (in particular: if $b^2 \in B^+$ for all $b \in B$), then B^+ is inverse closed in B .

PROOF. Suppose that $b \in B^+ \cap \text{Inv}(B)$. Then

$$b^{-1} = b^{-1}1_B = (b^{-1})^2b \geq 0.$$

□

The next desirable step would be to exhibit a class of ordered Banach algebras A such that an ordered superalgebra B as in Theorem 5.3 exists for all (or at least for a reasonably large class of) positive representations of A on ordered Banach spaces X . Rudin's example shows, however, that positive factorization already fails for the left regular representation of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$. Since $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is a commutative Banach lattice algebra, and since the left regular representation is even an isometric lattice homomorphism of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ into the regular operators on $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ (this is true for the left regular representation of $L^1(G)$ for an arbitrary locally compact group; see [2, Proposition 3.3]), the situation here is about as nice as one can get, apart, perhaps, from the positive cone of the representation space having empty interior. Possibly one should have modest expectations about such general theorems. Theorem 5.7 is a result in this direction, but the matter as a whole is still unclear and more research seems desirable.

A natural candidate for an ordered Banach superalgebra of A is its unitization in its natural ordering. Certainly, a positive representation of A extends to a positive representation of its unitization, but, as the next result shows, the positive cone of the unitization will hardly ever be inverse closed for ordered Banach algebras one is most likely to encounter in practice. The unitization of every non-zero Banach lattice algebra, for example, does not have this property. We recall that the positive cone of an ordered normed space X is said to be normal if there exists $\alpha \geq 0$ such that $\|x\| \leq \alpha\|y\|$ whenever $x, y \in X$ are such that $0 \leq x \leq y$.

Proposition 5.5. *Let A be a ordered Banach algebra with normal positive cone A^+ , and let B be its unitization with positive cone $B^+ = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \oplus A^+$. Then B^+ is inverse closed in B if and only if $A^+ = \{0\}$.*

PROOF. If $A^+ = \{0\}$, then clearly $B^+ = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is inverse closed in B . For the converse, let $a \in A^+$. Then $ta \in A^+$ for all $t \geq 0$, and $\|ta\| < 1$ for all sufficiently small $t \geq 0$. Hence, for all sufficiently small $t \geq 0$, $1 + ta \in B^+$ is invertible in B with inverse $(1 + ta)^{-1} = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-ta)^n$. Since $(1 + ta)^{-1} \in B^+$ by assumption, we see that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-ta)^n \geq 0$ for all sufficiently small $t \geq 0$. Hence $0 \leq ta \leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (-ta)^n$ for all sufficiently small $t \geq 0$. Since A^+ is normal, we know that there exists $\alpha \geq 0$ such that

$$\|ta\| \leq \alpha \left\| \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (-ta)^n \right\| \leq \alpha \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (t\|a\|)^n = \alpha \frac{t^2 \|a\|^2}{1 - t\|a\|}$$

for all sufficiently small $t \geq 0$. Hence

$$\|a\| \leq \alpha t \frac{\|a\|^2}{1 - t\|a\|}$$

for all sufficiently small $t > 0$, which implies that $a = 0$. $\square$

Remark 5.6. It is worthwhile to mention that there can be other natural candidates for unital Banach superalgebras in Theorem 5.3 to work with: the left centralizer algebra and the double centralizer algebra of A . According to [8, Theorem 4.1], a continuous non-degenerate representation π of a normed algebra A with a bounded approximate left identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ on a Banach space X gives rise to a continuous unital representation $\bar{\pi}$ of the left centralizer algebra $\mathcal{M}_\ell(A)$ of A on X that is compatible with the canonical homomorphism $\ell : A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\ell(A)$ as provided by the left regular representation of A , i.e. is such that $\pi = \bar{\pi} \circ \ell$. It is given by $\bar{\pi}(L) = \text{SOT} - \lim_\lambda \pi(L(e_\lambda))$ for $L \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(A)$. If A is an ordered Banach algebra, if $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is positive, if X is a Banach space with a closed positive cone, and if π is positive, then $\mathcal{M}_\ell(A)$ is an ordered Banach algebra and $\bar{\pi}$ is positive. One can now apply Theorem 4.4 to this context, where A is to be replaced with the closure $\overline{\ell(A)}$ of $\ell(A)$ in $\mathcal{M}_\ell(A)$, $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is to be replaced with $\{\ell(e_\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, B is chosen to be $\mathcal{M}_\ell(A)$, and π is to be replaced with $\bar{\pi}$. Theorem 4.4 will then produce a simultaneous power factorization of the form

$$(5.1) \quad s = \bar{\pi}(L^n) x_n(s)$$

for some $L \in \overline{\ell(A)}$. If $\ell(A)$ is closed in $\mathcal{M}_\ell(A)$ (e.g. if A also has a bounded right approximate identity), then $L = \ell(a)$ for some $a \in A$, and the factorization takes its usual form.

The point is that $\mathcal{M}_\ell(A)$ can have better properties than the unitization of A . More specifically: it can be the case that $\mathcal{M}_\ell(A)^+$ is inverse closed, whereas—see Proposition 5.5—the positive cone of the unitization of A quite often is not. In that case, Theorem 5.3 will produce a factorization as in (5.1) with $L \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(A)^+$. If ℓ is a bipositive topological embedding of A into $\mathcal{M}_\ell(A)$ (e.g. if A has a closed positive cone and if A also has a positive bounded right approximate identity), then $L = \ell(a)$ for some $a \in A^+$, and a positive simultaneous power factorization has been obtained.

The situation in the previous paragraph can actually occur. If $A = C_0(\Omega)$ for a locally compact Hausdorff space Ω , then we know from Proposition 5.5 that the positive cone of its unitization is not inverse closed. However, this is quite obviously the case for its centralizer algebra $C_b(\Omega)$. Hence we still have a positive simultaneous power factorization theorem for $C_0(\Omega)$.

Similar remarks apply to the double centralizer algebra of an ordered Banach algebra that has a closed positive cone, a positive bounded left approximate identity, and a positive bounded right approximate identity. In that case, [8, Theorem 4.5] can be used.

The preceding remark motivates the choice of the superalgebra B in the final result of this section. Strictly speaking, it has already been established in that remark, since, by the Gelfand-Naimark theorem, the algebra A in Theorem 5.7 below is isometrically and bipositively isomorphic to an algebra $C_0(\Omega)$ for some locally compact Hausdorff space Ω . As the proof below shows, one can also avoid invoking this representation theorem, and simply apply the observation that positive cones of unital algebras of functions are obviously inverse closed.

Theorem 5.7. *Let Ω be a non-empty set, and let A be an ordered Banach algebra of bounded functions on Ω , supplied with the supremum norm. Then A has a positive 1-bounded approximate identity.*

Let X be an ordered Banach space with a closed positive cone, and let π be a positive continuous representation of A on X . Let S be a non-empty subset of X^+ such that $\lim_{\lambda} \pi(e_{\lambda})s = s$ uniformly on S .

Let

$$B = \{ g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{F} : g \text{ is bounded and } gf \in A \text{ for all } f \in A \}.$$

be the normalizer of A in the bounded functions on Ω , supplied with the supremum norm. Then the unital ordered superalgebra B of A satisfies the hypotheses under (1) and (2) in Theorem 5.3.

Therefore, with this choice of B in Theorem 4.4, for every ϵ , δ , r , n_0 , and sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ as in that theorem, there exists a simultaneous power factorization as in that theorem for the restricted continuous representation π_e of A on the Banach space X_e with non-empty subset S of X_e , with the following additional statements:

- (8) $a \in A^+$;
- (9) $x_n(S) \subset X_e^+$ for all $n \geq 1$;
- (10) one can take $M = 1$ in part (2) of Theorem 4.4.

PROOF. If $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$, then A is a complex C^* -algebra, so that it has a 1-bounded positive approximate identity; see e.g. [11, Theorem 3.1.1]. If $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$, then we consider the algebra of complex functions $A_{\mathbb{C}} = A \oplus iA$, supplied with the supremum norm. This is a complex C^* -algebra, and a 1-bounded positive approximate identity for $A_{\mathbb{C}}$ is contained in A . We conclude that, in both cases, A has a 1-bounded positive approximate identity.

It is clear that B is a unital ordered Banach superalgebra of A . Since it contains A as a left ideal, and since A contains a positive left approximate identity for itself, we conclude from [8, Theorem 3.1] that the non-degenerate positive continuous representation of A on X_e extends (uniquely) to a positive continuous unital representation of B on X_e . Since we are working with functions, B^+ is trivially inverse closed in B . Hence the hypotheses in Theorem 5.3 are satisfied, and an application of this result completes the present proof. $\square$

§6. Simultaneous power factorization for sets of maps

According to [9, p. 251], Collins and Summer (see [5]) and Rieffel (see [14, proof of Lemma 1]) were the first to realize that it can sometimes be fruitful to introduce an auxiliary Banach module to solve a problem at hand. For example, if one wants to prove that a convergent sequence in a Banach module can be factored termwise, then this can be done by considering

the Banach space of all convergent sequences in the pertinent Banach space. This is a Banach module over the same algebra in a natural fashion, and an application of a factorization theorem in that context to the point corresponding to the original sequence will give what one wants. The argument in Remark 4.6 (and in the references given therein) is another application of this idea of introducing an auxiliary module.

We shall now apply this idea to Theorem 4.4, which allows us to obtain simultaneous pointwise power factorization theorems for sets of maps. The most general set-up, formulated with an otherwise unspecified Banach space X' , seems to be the following.

Theorem 6.1. *Let A be a Banach algebra that has a bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of bound $M \geq 1$, let X be a Banach space, and let π be a continuous representation of A on X . Let S be a non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , and suppose that S is bounded or that $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative.*

Let Ω be a non-empty set, and let X' be a Banach space of bounded maps from Ω into X , supplied with the supremum norm. Suppose that X' is invariant under the natural pointwise action of A on X -valued maps on Ω , so that there is a natural continuous representation π' of A on X' .

Choose a unital superalgebra B of A such that π' extends to a continuous unital representation, again denoted by π' , of B on X' .

Let S' be the set of all $f \in X'$ such that $f(\Omega) \subset S$.

With this choice of B in Theorem 4.4, for every ϵ, δ, r, n_0 , and sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ as in that theorem, there exists a simultaneous power factorization as in that theorem for the continuous representation π' of A on the Banach space X' with non-empty subset S' of X' .

PROOF. If S is bounded, then so is S' . Furthermore, if $f \in S'$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$, then we know $\|\pi'(e_\lambda)f - f\| = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \|\pi(e_\lambda)[f(\omega)] - f(\omega)\| \leq \sup_{s \in S} \|\pi(e_\lambda)s - s\|$. We conclude that $\lim_\lambda \|\pi'(e_\lambda)f - f\| = 0$ uniformly on S' . Therefore, Theorem 4.4 can be applied. $\square$

Naturally, one can always choose B to be the unitization of A .

For reasons of space, we refrain from translating all statements in Theorem 4.4 into the context of Theorem 6.1. Let us note, however, that one of the consequences is that there exist $a \in A$, and, for all $n \geq 1$, a map $x_n : S' \rightarrow X'$ such that $f(\omega) = \pi(a^n)([x_n(f)](\omega))$ for all $f \in S'$ and $\omega \in \Omega$.

Theorem 6.1 has several special cases. For general Ω , one can let X' be the space of all bounded maps $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$. If Ω is a topological space, one can consider all $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$ that are bounded and continuous. If Ω is a metric space, one can consider all $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$ that are bounded and uniformly continuous; this was done in Remark 4.6 for $\Omega = S$. Variations involving the vanishing of f at a subset of Ω and / or at infinity can also be incorporated. If Ω has a differentiable structure, versions for sets of bounded X -valued maps possessing a certain degree of smoothness can conceivably be established.

Another class of special cases of Theorem 6.1 occurs when we lay emphasis on an ordering that Ω can have, rather than a possible topology. In the spirit of results that are concerned with non-power factorization of one convergent sequence (see e.g. [3, Corollary 7.11], [9, Theorems 17.4 and 17.5], [13, Corollary 5.2.3.c and Corollary 5.2.4], and [14, proof of Lemma 1]), we have the following.

Theorem 6.2. *Let A be a Banach algebra that has a bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of bound $M \geq 1$, let X be a Banach space, and let π be a continuous representation of A on X . Let S be a non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S , and suppose that S is bounded or that $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative.*

Let Ω be a directed set, and let X' be the Banach space of all bounded convergent nets $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$, supplied with the supremum norm, or, alternatively, let X' be the Banach space of all bounded nets $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$ that converge to zero, supplied with the supremum norm; in the latter case, we assume that $0 \in \bar{S}$. Let π' be the natural continuous representation of A on X' by pointwise operations, and let S' be the set of all elements $\{f_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ of X' such that $f_\omega \in S$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$.

Choose a unital superalgebra B of A such that π' extends to a continuous unital representation, again denoted by π' , of B on X' .

With this choice of B in Theorem 4.4, for every ϵ, δ, r, n_0 , and sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ as in that theorem, there exists a simultaneous power factorization as in that theorem for the continuous representation π' of A on the Banach space X' with non-empty subset S' of X' .

As above, one can always choose B to be the unitization of A .

Again, we refrain from translating all statements in Theorem 4.4 to the context of Theorem 6.2. One of the consequences is that there exist $a \in A$, and, for all $n \geq 1$, a map $x_n : S' \rightarrow X'$ such that $f_\omega = \pi(a^n)x_n(f)_\omega$ for all $\{f_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega} \in S'$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. The point is, of course, that all nets $\{x_n(f)_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ for $f \in S'$ are automatically bounded and convergent (or bounded and convergent to zero) again, since they are elements of X' .

As a particular case, using Lemma 3.1, we see that there exists a simultaneous pointwise power factorization for all convergent nets $\{f_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ in a totally bounded subset S of X_e . A special case of this, in turn, occurs when $X = X_e$ and a convergent sequence $\{s_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$ in X is given. One can then take $\Omega = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $S = \{s_l : l \geq 1\}$. Since S is a totally bounded subset of X , we see, specializing still further to $n = 1$, that there exists $a \in A$ such that $s_l = \pi(a)s'_l$ for all $l \geq 1$, and where the convergent sequence $\{s'_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$ in X converges to zero if $\{s_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$ does. Thus the termwise non-power factorization results for sequences in the references prior to Theorem 6.2 are specializations of the theorem.

It is obvious how a similar device can be applied to Theorems 5.1, 5.3, and 5.7. Under the appropriate hypotheses, to be found in these theorems, ordered versions of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 can be established without any further actual proof being necessary. The results thus obtained assert the existence of a positive simultaneous pointwise power factorization (with various extra properties originating from Theorem 4.4) for sets of bounded maps (including sets of bounded convergent nets, and sets of bounded nets converging to zero) with values in a subset S of the positive cone of an ordered Banach space, where S is such that $\lim_\lambda \|e_\lambda s - s\| = 0$ uniformly on S for some positive bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of A , and where S is bounded or $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative. For reasons of space, we refrain from formulating the six ensuing results.

§7. Worked example

In this section, we shall show how the Ansatz in part (6) of Theorem 4.4 can be used in a concrete case to find an explicit positive simultaneous power factorization with all properties as in Theorem 4.4. One could say that, in this case, Theorem 4.4 is strictly speaking not needed, since the existence of the factorization follows 'by inspection'. In practice, however, one might not start any investigations into this direction at all, without the theoretical reassurance that the factorization is actually possible. At first sight, there seem to be (and there are) various technical difficulties to overcome when one wants to find an explicit factorization, and it is

not immediately obvious how to do this. If one did not know beforehand that success of the search is guaranteed, one might even consider such success unlikely.

Our example concerns the context of Examples 3.2 and 3.4, and Remark 4.7, where the (real or complex) ordered Banach algebra A is $C_0(\mathbb{R})$, and where π is the positive continuous left regular representation of A . As unital ordered Banach superalgebra of A we choose $B = C_b(\mathbb{R})$; its identity element is the constant function $\mathbf{1}$. Clearly, π extends to a positive continuous unital representations of $C_b(\mathbb{R})$ on $C_0(\mathbb{R})$, defined by pointwise multiplication again. We shall omit the symbol π from now on.

As in Example 3.2, we choose, for every integer $\nu \geq 1$, a function $e_\nu \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ that takes values in $[0, 1]$, equals 1 on $[-\nu, \nu]$, and equals 0 on $(-\infty, -\nu-1] \cup [\nu+1, \infty)$. Then $\{e_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^\infty$ is a positive 1-bounded approximate identity for A that is clearly commutative.

As in Example 3.2, we choose $f_0 \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ such that $f_0(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and such that $\|f_0\| > 1$, and we let

$$S = \{f \in C_0(\mathbb{R})^+ : f(t) \leq f_0(t) \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } f_0(t) \leq 1\}.$$

As already noted in Example 3.2, S is non-empty and unbounded, because it contains functions of arbitrarily large norm that have compact support in the non-empty open set $\{t \in \mathbb{R} : f_0(t) > 1\}$. It was shown in Example 3.2 that $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \|e_\nu f - f\| = 0$ uniformly for $f \in S$. Clearly, $S \subset C_0(\mathbb{R})^+$.

After these preliminary remarks and recollections, we see that Theorem 5.7 applies in this context. Hence a positive simultaneous power factorization for S exists, with all additional properties as in Theorem 4.4. Even for this simple example, this is a non-trivial statement. Disregarding everything else in Theorem 4.4, it is, in fact, not even immediately clear that a power factorization for f_0 alone exists, even though we know, of course, already much longer from [1, Theorem 1] that this is possible. Indeed, if f_0 has no zeros, and if $a \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ and $x_n(f_0) \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ for $n \geq 1$ are such that $f_0 = a^n x_n(f_0)$, then a cannot have any zeros either, and we must have that $x_n(f_0) = a^{-n} f_0$ for all $n \geq 1$. However, since a vanishes at infinity, $a^{-1}(t)$ diverges to infinity as $|t| \rightarrow \infty$. Since the rate of this divergence increases with n , it is not entirely obvious how one can guarantee that $a^{-n} f_0$ still vanishes at infinity for arbitrarily large n .

Fortunately, as noted in Remark 4.5, we know that a , and, in fact, the whole positive simultaneous power factorization, can be constructed using only the sequence $\{e_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^\infty$. More precisely, if we fix r such that $0 < r < 1/(1+1) = 1/2$, then, according to the parts (6a) and (6c) of Theorem 4.4, there exists a simultaneous power factorization as in Theorem 4.4, where a is of the form

$$(7.1) \quad a = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r(1-r)^{i-1} e_{\nu_i}$$

for a strictly increasing sequence $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$. Furthermore, the maps x_n for $n \geq 1$ can be chosen to be as in part (6b) of Theorem 4.4.

All in all, we merely need to find a suitable strictly increasing sequence $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, and we shall now embark on doing so. Our approach is to work with the Ansatz for a as in (7.1), and then go through the assertions in Theorem 4.4 one by one, each time requiring that it be satisfied with our choice of $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$. As we shall see, this will result in three conditions, all three of the form that each ν_i be larger than $N(i)$, where $\{N(i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a strictly increasing sequence of strictly positive integers. If these three conditions are all met, then the simultaneous power factorization exists with the corresponding a as in (7.1), and

with all properties as in Theorem 4.4. Since it is clearly possible to meet these three sufficient conditions simultaneously, this will give a demonstration ‘by hand’ of the existence of a positive simultaneous power factorization as in Theorem 5.7. Moreover, the lower bounds $N(i)$ will be defined explicitly in terms of the given function f_0 . In principle, this enables one to determine a completely explicit positive simultaneous power factorization for any concretely given f_0 .

We start by fixing r . Theorem 4.4 guarantees success if $0 < r < 1/2$, but as long as the statement in part (6b) of Theorem 4.4 on the b_k^{-1} being in a certain Banach subalgebra of $C_b(\mathbb{R})$ is not required to hold, the whole construction will actually work if $0 < r < 1$. We shall therefore fix $0 < r < 1$ for the time being, and assume that $0 < r < 1/2$ only when this particular statement in part (6b) is considered at the end of this example.

We need some preparations.

The graph of the strictly positive element a of $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ as in (7.1) resembles a two-dimensional step pyramid that is infinitely wide and that has countably many eroded steps at height $(1-r)^i$ for $i \geq 0$. More precisely, it follows from an easy pointwise calculation that

$$(7.2) \quad a(t) = 1 \quad \text{if } |t| \leq \nu_1,$$

$$(7.3) \quad a(t) = (1-r)^{i-1}(1-r+re_{\nu_i}(t)) \quad \text{if } i \geq 1 \text{ and } |t| \in [\nu_i, \nu_{i+1}],$$

and

$$(7.4) \quad a(t) = (1-r)^i \quad \text{if } i \geq 1 \text{ and } |t| \in [\nu_i + 1, \nu_{i+1}].$$

Since $(1-r)^{i-1}(1-r+re_{\nu_i}(t)) \geq (1-r)^{i-1}(1-r) = (1-r)^i$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have our basic equality

$$(7.5) \quad a^{-1}(t) = 1 \quad \text{if } |t| \leq \nu_1,$$

and basic inequalities

$$(7.6) \quad a^{-1}(t) \leq (1-r)^{-i} \quad \text{if } i \geq 1 \text{ and } |t| \in [\nu_i, \nu_{i+1}].$$

When multiplying with $a^{-n}(t)$ for a fixed $n \geq 1$, the troublesome blow-up factor $(1-r)^{-in}$ for $|t| \in [\nu_i + 1, \nu_{i+1}]$ becomes progressively worse as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Fortunately, it does so at a controlled rate, namely, exponentially in i . As we shall see, this allows us to remedy these blow-ups by letting the sequence ν_i tend to infinity quickly enough (relative to the decay of f_0), forcing that these exponential growths for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ are all countered by one super-exponential decay in the relevant estimates.

Let us define

$$x_n(f) = a^{-n}f$$

for $n \geq 1$ and $f \in S$.

The first thing to be taken care of is to ensure that $x_n(f) \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $f \in S$. For this, we select a strictly increasing sequence $\{N_1(i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of integers $N_1(i) \geq 1$ such that $0 \leq f_0(t) \leq e^{-i^2}$ for all t such that $|t| \geq N_1(i)$. We shall assume in the remainder of this example that $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is such that $\nu_i \geq N_1(i)$ for all $i \geq 1$. We claim that then $a^{-n}f \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $f \in S$. To see this, we fix $n \geq 1$ and $f \in S$. If $|t| \geq \nu_1$, there exists $i \geq 1$ such that $|t| \in [\nu_i, \nu_{i+1}]$. Then $|t| \geq \nu_i \geq N_1(i)$, so that $0 \leq f_0(t) \leq e^{-i^2} < 1$. In that case, we also

know that $0 \leq f(t) \leq f_0(t)$. Hence, for such t , we see from (7.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} |[x_n(f)](t)| &= |a^{-n}(t)f(t)| \\ &\leq (1-r)^{-in}f_0(t) \\ &\leq (1-r)^{-in}e^{-i^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$(7.7) \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (1-r)^{-in}e^{-i^2} = 0,$$

this implies that $x_n(f) \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$, as desired.

It is clear that $a \in C_0(\mathbb{R})^+$ and that $x_n(f) \in C_0(\mathbb{R})^+$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $f \in S$.

We shall now start investigating which further conditions on the sequence $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ are sufficient for our construction to satisfy the parts (1) through (6) of Theorem 4.4.

Part (1) of Theorem 4.4 is obviously satisfied, so that we do have a simultaneous power factorization. As already observed, this factorization is clearly positive.

Part (2) of Theorem 4.4 is true for all choices of $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$.

Turning to part (3) of Theorem 4.4, we claim that the maps $x_n : S \rightarrow C_0(\mathbb{R})$ are uniformly continuous on S for all $n \geq 1$. To see this, fix $n \geq 1$, and let $\eta > 0$ be given. Fix $i_0 \geq 1$ such that $2(1-r)^{-in}e^{-i^2} < \eta$ for all $i \geq i_0$. Now consider $f_1, f_2 \in S$. If $|t| \leq \nu_1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (7.8) \quad |[x_n(f_1) - x_n(f_2)](t)| &= |a^{-n}(t)[f_1(t) - f_2(t)]| \\ &= |f_1(t) - f_2(t)| \\ &\leq \|f_1 - f_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

If $|t| \geq \nu_{i_0}$, then there exists $i \geq i_0$ such that $|t| \in [\nu_i, \nu_{i+1}]$. Then $|t| \geq \nu_i \geq N_1(i)$, so that $0 \leq f_0(t) \leq e^{-i^2} < 1$. This implies that $0 \leq f_1(t), f_2(t) \leq f_0(t)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} (7.9) \quad |[x_n(f_1) - x_n(f_2)](t)| &= |a^{-n}(t)[f_1(t) - f_2(t)]| \\ &\leq (1-r)^{-in}|f_1(t) - f_2(t)| \\ &\leq 2(1-r)^{-in}f_0(t) \\ &\leq 2(1-r)^{-in}e^{-i^2} \\ &< \eta. \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining values of t , i.e. for t such that $|t| \in (\nu_1, \nu_{i_0})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (7.10) \quad |[x_n(f_1) - x_n(f_2)](t)| &= |a^{-n}(t)[f_1(t) - f_2(t)]| \\ &\leq \left(\max_{|t| \in [\nu_1, \nu_{i_0}]} a^{-n}(t) \right) \|f_1 - f_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (7.8), (7.9), and (7.10) that $\|x_n(f_1) - x_n(f_2)\| < \eta$ for all $f_1, f_2 \in S$ such that $\|f_1 - f_2\| < \eta / \max_{|t| \in [\nu_1, \nu_{i_0}]} a^{-n}(t)$. This establishes our claim concerning the uniform continuity in part (3) of Theorem 4.4. Since the inverse of x_n , i.e. the restriction of multiplication with a^n , is the restriction of a continuous map, $x_n : S \rightarrow x_n(S)$ is a homeomorphism for $n \geq 1$.

Turning to part (4a) of Theorem 4.4, let $\epsilon > 0$ and $n_0 \geq 1$ be given. We note that (7.7) implies that there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq [(1-r)^{-in} - 1]e^{-i^2} \leq K$$

for all $n = 1, \dots, n_0$ and $i \geq 1$. We now select a strictly increasing sequence $\{N_2(i)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of integers $N_2(i) \geq 1$ such that $0 \leq f_0(t) \leq (\epsilon/K)e^{-i^2}$ for all t such that $|t| \geq N_2(i)$. In addition to our first assumption, we shall assume in the remainder of this example that $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is such that $0 \leq f_0(t) \leq 1$ whenever $|t| \geq \nu_1$, and also such that $\nu_i \geq N_2(i)$ for all $i \geq 1$. We claim that then $\|f - x_n(f)\| \leq \epsilon$ for all $n = 1, \dots, n_0$ and $f \in S$. To see this, we fix $f \in S$ and n such that $1 \leq n \leq n_0$. If t is such that $|t| \leq \nu_1$, then $|a^{-n}(t)f(t) - f(t)| = |f(t) - f(t)| = 0$. For other values of t , there exists $i \geq 1$ such that $|t| \in [\nu_i, \nu_{i+1}]$. Since then $|t| \geq \nu_i \geq \nu_1$, we have $0 \leq f_0(t) \leq 1$, so that $0 \leq f(t) \leq f_0(t)$. Using this, and also that $0 \leq f_0(t) \leq (\epsilon/K)e^{-i^2}$ since $|t| \geq \nu_i \geq N_2(i)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - x_n(f)\|(t) &= |a^{-n}(t)f(t) - f(t)| \\ &= a^{-n}(t)f(t) - f(t) \\ &\leq [(1-r)^{-in} - 1]f(t) \\ &\leq [(1-r)^{-in} - 1]f_0(t) \\ &\leq [(1-r)^{-in} - 1]\frac{\epsilon}{K}e^{-i^2} \\ &\leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes our claim concerning part (4a) of Theorem 4.4.

We now turn to part (4b) of Theorem 4.4. Let $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset (1, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \infty$ and $\delta > 0$ be given; we may assume that $\delta \leq 1$. If $i \geq 1$ is fixed, then, since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \infty$, we can choose an integer $N'(i) \geq 1$ such that $0 \leq (1-r)^{-i} \leq \alpha_n$ for all $n \geq N'(i)$. We now select a strictly increasing sequence $\{N_3(i)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of integers $N_3(i) \geq 1$ such $(1-r)^{-in}f_0(t) \leq \alpha_n\delta$ for all $n = 1, \dots, N'(i) - 1$ and all t such that $|t| \geq N_3(i)$. In addition to our first and second assumption, we shall assume in the remainder of this example that $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is such that $0 \leq f_0(t) \leq \delta$ for all t such that $|t| \geq \nu_1$, and also such that $\nu_i \geq N_3(i)$ for all $i \geq 1$. We claim that then $\|x_n(f)\| \leq \alpha_n^n \max(\|f\|, \delta)$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $f \in S$. To see this, we fix $n \geq 1$ and $f \in S$. If $|t| \leq \nu_1$, then $a(t) = 1$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|[x_n(f)](t)\| &= |a^{-n}(t)f(t)| \\ &= f(t) \\ &\leq \|f\| \\ &\leq \max(\|f\|, \delta) \\ &< \alpha_n^n \max(\|f\|, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

If $|t| > \nu_1$, then there exists $i \geq 1$ such that $|t| \in [\nu_i, \nu_{i+1}]$. Then $|t| \geq \nu_i \geq \nu_1$, so that $0 \leq f_0(t) \leq \delta \leq 1$, implying that $0 \leq f(t) \leq f_0(t) \leq \delta$. We now distinguish between two cases how our fixed n can be related to $N'(i)$ for this particular i . If $n = 1, \dots, N'(i) - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|[x_n(f)](t)\| &= |a^{-n}(t)f(t)| \\ &\leq (1-r)^{-in}f(t) \\ &\leq (1-r)^{-in}f_0(t) \\ &\leq \alpha_n^n \delta \\ &\leq \alpha_n^n \max(\|f\|, \delta), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $|t| \geq \nu_i \geq N_3(i)$ in the fourth step. If $n \geq N'(i)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |[x_n(f)](t)| &= |a^{-n}(t)f(t)| \\ &\leq (1-r)^{-in}f(t) \\ &\leq \alpha_n^n f(t) \\ &\leq \alpha_n^n \delta \\ &\leq \alpha_n^n \max(\|f\|, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Our claim concerning part (4b) of Theorem 4.4 has now been established.

It is obvious that the ‘linearity’ of the maps x_n for $n \geq 1$ in part (5) of Theorem 4.4 holds.

We shall consider part (6) in a moment, but we treat part (7) of Theorem 4.4 first. The parts (7a) and (7b) are not applicable. Part (7c) is easily verified, once one notes that S is invariant under multiplication by e_ν for all $\nu \geq 1$. Fix $n \geq 1$. Using our observation in the final step, one can then write, for $f \in S$ and $\nu \geq 1$,

$$\|e_\nu x_n(f) - x_n(f)\| = \|e_\nu a^{-n}f - a^{-n}f\| = \|a^{-n}e_\nu f - a^{-n}f\| = \|x_n(e_\nu f) - x_n(f)\|.$$

Since $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} e_\nu f = f$ uniformly on S , and since we have also already established that x_n is uniformly continuous on S , we now see that $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} e_\nu x_n(f) = x_n(f)$ uniformly on S .

Finally, we turn to part (6) of Theorem 4.4. The parts (6a) and (6c) were built into our construction from the very start, and we are left with part (6b). For $k \geq 1$, let the element $b_k \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$ be defined by

$$(7.11) \quad b_k = (1-r)^k \mathbf{1} + \sum_{i=1}^k r(1-r)^{i-1} e_{\nu_i}.$$

The b_k agree with a on ever larger intervals. More precisely, an easy pointwise calculation and comparison of the results with (7.2), (7.3), and (7.4) yield that, for $k \geq 1$,

$$(7.12) \quad b_k(t) = a(t) \quad \text{if } |t| \leq \nu_{k+1},$$

and

$$(7.13) \quad b_k(t) = (1-r)^k \quad \text{if } |t| \geq \nu_{k+1}.$$

The b_k are clearly invertible in $C_b(\mathbb{R})$. We claim that $x_n(f) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} b_k^{-n} f$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $f \in S$. To see this, fix $n \geq 1$ and $f \in S$. We see from (7.3), (7.4), (7.12), and (7.13) that $a(t) = b_k(t)$ if $|t| \leq \nu_{k+1}$, and that $0 \leq a(t) \leq b_k(t)$ if $|t| \geq \nu_{k+1}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_n(f) - b_k^{-n} f\| &= \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |a^{-n}(t)f(t) - b_k^{-n}(t)f(t)| \\ (7.14) \quad &= \sup_{|t| \geq \nu_{k+1}} |a^{-n}(t)f(t) - b_k^{-n}(t)f(t)| \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{|t| \geq \nu_{k+1}} a^{-n}(t)f(t). \end{aligned}$$

Since we have already established that $a^{-n}f \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ under our first assumed condition on the sequence $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, it follows from (7.14) that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n(f) - b_k^{-n} f\| = 0$. This establishes our claim on pointwise convergence.

Our final task is now to establish that every b_k^{-1} is an element of the unital Banach subalgebra of $C_b(\mathbb{R})$ that is generated by $\mathbf{1}$ and $e_{\nu_1}, \dots, e_{\nu_k}$. A natural first attempt is to use

(7.11), and investigate whether

$$\|(1-r)^k \mathbf{1} - b_k\| < \|[(1-r)^k \mathbf{1}]^{-1}\|^{-1}.$$

This would imply what we want, but unfortunately this is equivalent to showing that

$$1 - (1-r)^k < (1-r)^k,$$

which, for every r such that $0 < r < 1$, is false if k is large enough. So we have to proceed differently.

To this end, we note that, not dissimilar from (4.20),

$$(7.15) \quad b_k = \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - r + r e_{v_i}).$$

Indeed, once one notices that $e_{v_i} e_{v_{i'}} = e_{v_i}$ if $i' \geq i$, it is easily established by induction (also similar to the induction that one uses to establish (4.20)) that the right hand side of (7.15) equals the right hand side of (7.11).

It is the factorization of b_k in (7.15) that enables us to show that every b_k^{-1} is in the Banach subalgebra as described, provided that we assume that $0 < r < 1/2$. Whereas the assumption that $0 < r < 1$ was sufficient so far, it is here, at the very end of this example, that we finally want to restrict r to the interval that is specified in Theorem 4.4. The reason is simply that, as in the proofs leading to Theorem 4.4, we want to be able to write down a Neumann series for the inverse of each factor $(1 - r + r e_{v_i})$ in (7.15). This will clearly imply that b_k^{-1} is in the Banach subalgebra as described. We now merely need to note that this can be done as

$$(1 - r + r e_{v_i})^{-1} = \frac{1}{1-r} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{r}{r-1} e_{v_i} \right)^j,$$

provided that $\|\frac{r}{r-1} e_{v_i}\| = \frac{r}{1-r} < 1$, i.e. provided that $r < 1/2$.

This concludes our example of the explicit construction of a positive simultaneous power factorization that has all properties as in Theorem 4.4.

Remark 7.1.

- (1) The restriction of the above factorization to the subset $\{f \in C_0(\mathbb{R}) : 0 \leq f(t) \leq f_0(t)\}$ of S is an explicit positive simultaneous power factorization for the order interval $[0, f_0]$ in $C_0(\mathbb{R})$. A similar construction will give an explicit simultaneous power factorization for all order intervals $[f_1, f_2]$ in $C_0(\mathbb{R})$.
- (2) It seems likely that it is possible to generalize the above example to $C_0(\Omega)$ for an arbitrary locally compact Hausdorff space Ω , possibly requiring a little extra technique. We leave it to the diligent reader to undertake such an endeavour.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Garth Dales and Miek Messerschmidt for helpful discussions.

Bibliography of Chapter II

- [1] G.R. Allan and A.M. Sinclair. Power factorization in Banach algebras with a bounded approximate identity. *Studia Math.*, 56(1):31–38, 1976.
- [2] W. Arendt. On the σ -spectrum of regular operators and the spectrum of measures. *Math. Z.*, 178(2):271–287, 1981.
- [3] F.F. Bonsall and J. Duncan. *Complete normed algebras*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1973. *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*, Band 80.
- [4] P.J. Cohen. Factorization in group algebras. *Duke Math. J.*, 26, 1959.
- [5] H.S. Collins and W.H. Summers. Some applications of Hewitt’s factorization theorem. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21:727–733, 1969.
- [6] I.G. Craw. Factorisation in Fréchet algebras. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 44:607–611, 1969.
- [7] H.G. Dales. *Banach algebras and automatic continuity*, volume 24 of *London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000. Oxford Science Publications.
- [8] S. Dirksen, M. de Jeu, and M. Wortel. Extending representations of normed algebras in Banach spaces. In *Operator structures and dynamical systems*, volume 503 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 53–72. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009.
- [9] R.S. Doran and J. Wichmann. *Approximate identities and factorization in Banach modules*, volume 768 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1979.
- [10] J. Kisyński. On Cohen’s proof of the factorization theorem. *Ann. Polon. Math.*, 75(2):177–192, 2000.
- [11] G.J. Murphy. *C^* -algebras and operator theory*. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1990.
- [12] J.-L. Ovaert. Factorisation dans les algèbres et modules de convolution. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 265:A534–A535, 1967.
- [13] Th.W. Palmer. *Banach algebras and the general theory of $*$ -algebras. Vol. I*, volume 49 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [14] M.A. Rieffel. On the continuity of certain intertwining operators, centralizers, and positive linear functionals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 20:455–457, 1969.
- [15] K.A. Ross. A trip from classical to abstract Fourier analysis. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 61(9):1032–1038, 2014.
- [16] W. Rudin. Factorization in the group algebra of the real line. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 43:339–340, 1957.
- [17] F.D. Sentiilles and D.C. Taylor. Factorization in Banach algebras and the general strict topology. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 142:141–152, 1969.

Summary

Positive representations of algebras of continuous functions

If X is a locally compact Hausdorff space, then a representation of the complex C^* -algebra $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is given by a spectral measure that takes its values in the orthogonal projections on $\mathcal{H}$. In an ordered context, it is natural to ask whether something similar is true for a positive representation of the algebra $C_0(X)$ (we suppose that the functions are real-valued now) on a partially ordered vector space E , and, more specifically, on a (real) Banach lattice E .

It is known from earlier work by de Jeu and Ruoff that there is indeed a spectral measure for a positive representation of $C_0(X)$ on E if E is a KB-space. The KB-spaces form a reasonably large class of spaces, including, for example, all reflexive Banach lattices. The proof of this result follows primarily a Banach space approach, but some of the formulas thus obtained indicate that there may be a much larger role for the ordering than is apparent from their work. One starts to wonder if it may also be possible to prove this result from a purely order-theoretic viewpoint.

This question is taken up in the first part of the thesis, and the answer is affirmative. While developing the necessary theory, we obtain a bit more than an alternate approach to an already known result in the particular context of KB-spaces. As it turns out, there is an abstract spectral theorem underlying both the classical result for spectral measures in the context of Hilbert spaces and that in the context of KB-spaces.

Our approach towards this underlying theorem is divided into three steps, each covering several sections.

Step one is of a preparatory nature. We collect a number of results on partially ordered vector spaces, with special attention to partially ordered vector spaces that are normal. A partially ordered vector space E is said to be normal if, for $x \in E$, the fact that $(x, x') \geq 0$ for all positive order continuous linear functionals on E , implies that $x \geq 0$. As will become clear later on, the (monotone complete) normal spaces form a class of spaces in the context of which Riesz representation theorems can be established.

The formulation of these representation theorems is in terms of measures with values in partially ordered vector spaces and of integrals of real-valued functions with respect to such measures. The material developed in this first step also provides the very framework that is necessary to be able to state these results. We introduce σ -additive measures with values in a σ -monotone complete partially ordered vector space, as well as (order) integrals with respect to such measures. We also establish the monotone convergence theorem, Fatou's lemma, and the dominated convergence theorem. All this specialises to the usual results from Lebesgue theory if the partially ordered vector space equals the real numbers.

Still primarily as a preparation for what is to come, we also include material on measures with values in partially ordered algebras, and on vector-valued measures on the Borel σ -algebra of a locally compact Hausdorff space that have certain regularity properties.

Step two is concerned with Riesz representation theorems that generalise the classical ones. We start with theorems for a positive linear map T from $C_c(X)$ to a partially ordered vector space E . Several representation theorems are then established. For example, if $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ is a positive linear map from $C_c(X)$ into a normal and monotone complete partially ordered vector space E , then—we omit the statements on regularity and uniqueness for the sake of simplicity—there exists a measure m on the Borel σ -algebra of X , with values in the extended positive cone of E , such that

$$T(f) = \int_X^o f \, dm$$

for all $f \in C_c(X)$. Here the superscript ‘o’ in the notation of the integral serves to denote that the integral is an order integral.

After that, we turn to a positive linear map $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow E$ that is defined on the larger space $C_0(X)$. If the measure that represents the restriction of T to $C_c(X)$ is finite, i.e. if the subset $\{T(f) : f \in C_c(X), 0 \leq f \leq 1\}$ is bounded from above in E , then it will usually also represent the map T on the whole of $C_0(X)$. Exploiting the fact that positive linear maps from the Banach lattice $C_0(X)$ into normed Riesz spaces are automatically norm continuous, we can point out a number of cases where this boundedness is automatic, such as where E is the partially ordered vector space of the regular operators on a KB-space. A number of representation theorems for the map T , as defined on the full space $C_0(X)$, thus result.

Step three consists of considering a positive algebra homomorphism π from $C_c(X)$ or $C_0(X)$ into a partially ordered algebra $\mathcal{A}$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is normal and monotone complete as a partially ordered vector space, then the results from the previous step provide a measure that represents π as a positive linear map. In this case, we know a bit more, namely, that the map π is also multiplicative. If the multiplication in $\mathcal{A}$ is monotone order continuous, it can then be shown that, if it is finite, the representing measure P (we switch to the customary notation here) for π is also spectral, i.e. that $P(A_1 \cap A_2) = P(A_1)P(A_2)$ for all Borel sets A_1 and A_2 . An abstract spectral theorem has thus been obtained for positive algebra homomorphisms from $C_c(X)$ into partially ordered algebras. The representing spectral measure P takes its values in the positive idempotents in $\mathcal{A}$.

As in the case of a positive linear map from $C_0(X)$ into a partially ordered vector space, the measure that represents the restriction to $C_c(X)$ of a positive algebra homomorphism π from $C_0(X)$ into $\mathcal{A}$ is often automatically finite, so that it is then a spectral measure that represents π on the whole algebra $C_0(X)$.

At the end of this step, we note that the algebra of regular operators on a KB-space fits into this picture, and that the same holds true for the algebra consisting of the self-adjoint elements of a commutative von Neumann algebra. The abstract spectral theorem is then seen to have the existence of a spectral measure in the two examples in the beginning of this summary as an immediate consequence.

There is earlier work, notably by J.D.M. Wright, on integration with respect to measures with values in partially ordered vector spaces, and on Riesz representation theorems formulated using the corresponding order integrals. A discussion of the relation between the present work and that in the literature is included.

Simultaneous power factorization

Let A be a Banach algebra with a bounded left approximate identity $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, let π be a continuous representation of A on a Banach space X , and let S be a non-empty subset of X such that $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniformly on S . If S is bounded, or if $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is commutative, then we show that there exist $a \in A$ and maps $x_n : S \rightarrow X$ for $n \geq 1$ such that $s = \pi(a^n)x_n(s)$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $s \in S$. The properties of $a \in A$ and the maps x_n , as produced by the constructive proof, are studied in some detail. The results generalize previous simultaneous factorization theorems as well as Allan and Sinclair's power factorization theorem.

In an ordered context, we also consider the existence of a positive factorization for a subset of the positive cone of an ordered Banach space that is a positive module over an ordered Banach algebra with a positive bounded left approximate identity. Such factorizations are not always possible. In certain cases, including those for positive modules over ordered Banach algebras of bounded functions, such positive factorizations exist, but the general picture is still unclear.

Furthermore, simultaneous pointwise power factorizations for sets of bounded maps with values in a Banach module (such as sets of bounded convergent nets) are obtained.

A worked example for the left regular representation of $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ and unbounded S is included.

Samenvatting

Positieve representaties van algebra's van continue functies

Als X een lokaal compacte Hausdorffruimte is, dan wordt een representatie van de complexe C^* -algebra $C_0(X, \mathbb{C})$ op een Hilbertruimte $\mathcal{H}$ gegeven door een spectraalmaat die waarden aanneemt in de orthogonale projecties in $\mathcal{H}$. In een geordende context is het een natuurlijke vraag of iets vergelijkbaars geldt voor een positieve representatie van de algebra $C_0(X)$ (we nemen nu aan dat de functies reëelwaardig zijn) op een partieel geordende vectorruimte E , en meer in het bijzonder op een (reëel) Banachrooster E .

Het is uit eerder werk van De Jeu en Ruoff bekend dat er inderdaad een spectraalmaat bestaat voor een positieve representatie van $C_0(X)$ op E als E een KB-ruimte is. De KB-ruimten vormen een redelijk grote klasse van ruimten die bijvoorbeeld de reflexieve Banachroosters bevat. Het bewijs van dit resultaat vindt overwegend via een Banachruimtebenadering plaats, maar enkele van de resultaten die op deze manier verkregen worden wijzen erop dat er wellicht een veel grotere rol voor de ordening bestaat dan uit hun werk duidelijk wordt. De vraag rijst of het wellicht mogelijk is om hun resultaat primair vanuit een ordetheoretische invalshoek te bewijzen.

Deze vraag wordt onderzocht in het eerste gedeelte van dit proefschrift, en het antwoord is bevestigend. Tijdens het ontwikkelen van de benodigde theorie verkrijgen we meer dan een alternatief bewijs voor een reeds bestaand resultaat in de specifieke context van KB-ruimten. Naar blijkt is er een abstracte spectraalstelling die ten grondslag ligt aan zowel het klassieke resultaat voor spectraalmaten in de context van Hilbertruimten als dat in de context van KB-ruimten.

Onze benadering van deze onderliggende stelling is verdeeld in drie stappen, die ieder verscheidene secties beslaan.

Stap een draagt een voorbereidend karakter. We behandelen een aantal resultaten over partieel geordende vectorruimten, met speciale aandacht voor partieel geordende vectorruimten die normaal zijn. Een partieel geordende vectorruimte E is normaal als, voor $x \in E$, het feit dat $(x, x') \geq 0$ voor alle positieve ordecontinue lineaire functionen op E impliceert dat $x \geq 0$. Zoals later duidelijk zal worden vormen de (monotoon volledige) normale ruimten een klasse van ruimten in de context waarvan Riesz representatiestellingen bewezen kunnen worden.

De formulering van deze representatiestellingen is in termen van maten met waarden in partieel geordende vectorruimten en van integralen van reëelwaardige functies met betrekking tot dergelijke maten. Het materiaal dat in deze eerste stap ontwikkeld wordt verschaft ook het begrippenkader dat nodig is om deze resultaten te kunnen formuleren. We introduceren σ -additieve maten met waarden in σ -monotoon volledige partieel geordende vectorruimten, evenals (orde-)integralen met betrekking tot dergelijke maten. We bewijzen

ook de monotone convergentiestelling, het lemma van Fatou en de gedomineerde convergentiestelling. Dit alles resulteert in de gebruikelijke Lebesguetheorie als de partieel geordende vectorruimten die van de reële getallen is.

Eveneens als een voorbereiding op wat later komt, nemen we ook materiaal op over maten met waarden in partieel geordende algebras, en over vectorwaardige maten op de Borel σ -algebra van een lokaal compacte Hausdorffruimte die zekere regulariteitseigenschappen hebben.

Stap twee heeft betrekking op Riesz representatiestellingen die generalisaties zijn van de klassieke resultaten. We beginnen met stellingen voor een positieve lineaire afbeelding T van $C_c(X)$ naar een partieel geordende vectorruimte E . Hiervoor worden verscheidenen representatiestellingen bewezen. Bijvoorbeeld, wanneer $T : C_c(X) \rightarrow E$ een positieve lineaire afbeelding is van $C_c(X)$ naar een normale en monotoon volledige partieel geordende vectorruimte E , dan—we gaan eenvoudigheidshalve voorbij aan de regulariteit en uniciteit—bestaat er een maat m op de Borel σ -algebra van X , met waarden in de uitgebreide positieve kegel van E , zodanig dat

$$T(f) = \int_X^o f \, dm$$

voor alle $f \in C_c(X)$. Het superscript 'o' in de notatie van de integraal dient om aan te geven dat het hier een orde-integraal betreft.

Hierna gaan we over op het geval van een positieve lineaire afbeelding $T : C_0(X) \rightarrow E$ die gedefinieerd is op de grotere ruimte $C_0(X)$. Wanneer de maat die de restrictie van T tot $C_c(X)$ representeert een eindige maat is, dat wil zeggen als $\{T(f) : f \in C_c(X), 0 \leq f \leq 1\}$ naar boven begrensd is in E , dan zal deze maat vaak ook de afbeelding T op de gehele ruimte $C_0(X)$ representeren. Gebruikmakend van het feit dat positieve lineaire afbeeldingen van het Banachrooster $C_0(X)$ naar genormeerde Rieszruimten automatisch normcontinu zijn, kunnen we een aantal gevallen identificeren waarin deze begrensdheid automatisch is, zoals wanneer E de partieel geordende vectorruimte is van reguliere operatoren op een KB-ruimte. Op deze manier wordt een aantal representatiestellingen voor de afbeelding T , zoals gedefinieerd op de hele ruimte $C_0(X)$, verkregen.

Stap drie bestaat uit de bestudering van een positief algebrahomomorfisme π van $C_c(X)$ of $C_0(X)$ naar een partieel geordende algebra $\mathcal{A}$. Wanneer $\mathcal{A}$ normaal en monotoon volledig is als partieel geordende vectorruimte, dan geven de resultaten uit de vorige stap een maat die π als positieve lineaire afbeelding representeert. In dit geval weten we iets meer, namelijk dat de afbeelding π ook multiplicatief is. Wanneer de vermenigvuldiging in $\mathcal{A}$ monotone ordecontinu is, dan kan er bewezen worden dat, indien hij eindig is, de representerende maat P (we gaan hier over op de gebruikelijke notatie) voor π ook nog spectraal is, dat wil zeggen dat $P(A_1 \cap A_2) = P(A_1)P(A_2)$ for all Borel sets A_1 and A_2 . Op deze manier wordt een abstracte spectraalstelling verkregen voor positieve algebra homomorfismen van $C_c(X)$ naar partieel geordende algebra's. De spectraalmaat P neemt dan waarden in de positieve idempotenten van $\mathcal{A}$.

Net als in het geval van een positieve lineaire afbeelding van $C_0(X)$ naar een partieel geordende vectorruimte, is ook hier de maat die de restrictie tot $C_c(X)$ van een positief algebra homomorfisme van $C_0(X)$ naar $\mathcal{A}$ representeert vaak automatisch eindig, in welk geval het een spectraalmaat is die π op de gehele algebra $C_0(X)$ representeert.

Aan het einde van deze stap merken we op dat de algebra van reguliere operatoren op een KB-ruimten in dit beeld past, net als de algebra van de zelfgeadjungeerde elementen van een commutatieve von Neumannalgebra. De abstracte spectraalstelling blijkt dan de

existentie van de spectraalmaat in de twee voorbeelden in het begin van deze samenvatting als onmiddellijk gevolg te hebben.

Er bestaat eerder werk, met name van J.D.M. Wright, over integratie met betrekking tot maten met waarden in partieel geordende vectorruimten, en over Riesz representatiestellingen die geformuleerd worden met behulp van de corresponderende orde-integralen. Er is een discussie van de relatie tussen het huidige werk en dat in de literatuur opgenomen.

Simultane machtsontbinding

Veronderstel dat A een Banachalgebra is met een begrensde linksbenadering van de identiteit $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, dat π een continue representatie van A op een Banachruimte X is, en dat S een niet-lege deelverzameling van X is zodanig dat $\lim_\lambda \pi(e_\lambda)s = s$ uniform op S . Indien S begrensd is, of indien $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ commutatief is, dan tonen we aan dat er een a in A bestaat en dat er afbeeldingen $x_n : S \rightarrow X$ voor $n \geq 1$ zijn, zodanig dat $s = \pi(a^n)x_n(s)$ voor alle $n \geq 1$ en $s \in S$. De eigenschappen van het element a van A en van de afbeeldingen x_n , zoals die uit het bewijs volgen, worden in enige mate van detail bestudeerd. De resultaten veralgemeniseren niet alleen voorgaande simultane ontbindingsstellingen, maar ook de machtsontbindingsstelling van Allan en Sinclair.

In een geordende context bestuderen we ook het bestaan van een positieve ontbinding van een deelverzameling van een geordende Banachruimte die een positief moduul is over een geordende Banachalgebra met een positieve linksbenadering van de identiteit. Dergelijke ontbindingen zijn niet altijd mogelijk. In bepaalde gevallen, inclusief die van positieve modulen over geordende Banachalgebra's van functies, bestaan dergelijke positieve ontbindingen wel, maar het algemene beeld is nog niet duidelijk.

Verder worden simultane puntsgewijze machtsontbindingen voor verzamelingen van begrensde afbeeldingen met waarden in een Banachmoduul (zoals verzamelingen van begrensde convergente netten) verkregen.

Er is een uitgewerkt voorbeeld voor de linksreguliere representatie van $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ en een onbegrensde deelverzameling S opgenomen.

Acknowledgements

This thesis is the academic product of my four years of PhD studies. It describes the research on which I worked during these years, and represents a small part of the process that took me from a Master of Science to a Doctor of Philosophy. Many people have contributed to this whole process.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Marcel de Jeu, who lead me into the world of ordered structures, which was a brand-new world to me. He has helped me to build up this new world in my mind and has guided me by asking me the right questions. It is always enjoyable to discuss mathematics with Marcel, as a single conversation across the table with him can be worth a month's study by myself. He always provides accurate feedback and also shows appreciation of my own work.

All the people who participated in the discussions on ideas that ultimately made their way into this document deserve my thanks. Special thanks go to Mehmet Orhon from the University of New Hampshire. By means of emails and discussions in Canada we have shared different views on and approaches of the positive representations of $C_0(X)$. Also, I would like to thank Garth Dales and Miek Messerschmidt for their helpful discussions on Chapter II.

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to the members of the Doctorate Committee, for the time they spent reading the manuscript and giving their judgement.

I thank China Scholarship Council (CSC) for the funding that provided me with the opportunity to meet academic experts.

Thanks to all my colleagues and friends at Leiden University. I am very grateful for having such a talented and friendly group in my life. I benefited from the open environment in Leiden, where I could always find people who were willing to listen to me and try their best to help me find the right way, no matter if it was about mathematics or about life.

Thanks to the people who contributed to my distractions: those with whom I did sports, watched movies, shared nice food, laughed and cried.

I thank my close friends who are always there when I need support, and who help me shape the path of my life.

My deepest gratitude goes to my family, who always give me encouragement and boundless love.

Curriculum Vitae

Xingni Jiang (or, following the Chinese convention, *Jiǎng Xīng Ní*) was born in Chengdu, People's Republic of China, on December 6, 1988. In 2007, she enrolled at Southwest Jiaotong University in Chengdu as an undergraduate student. From 2007 to 2011, she was a sevenfold recipient of a Scholarship for Undergraduate Students awarded by Southwest Jiaotong University. In 2011, she obtained her Bachelor's degree of Science in Probability and Statistics (cum laude), with a bachelor's thesis titled *A generalization of the Borel-Cantelli lemma and its applications*. In 2011, she received a Scholarship for Graduate Students from Southwest Jiaotong University and started her master's studies. In the same year, she won the second prize in the National Post-Graduate Mathematical Contest in Modelling in China. In 2012, she was awarded a National Scholarship for Graduate Students in China. In 2014, she received her Master's degree of Science in Probability and Statistics (cum laude), with a master's thesis titled *The central limit theorem and martingale approximations*. In 2014, she was awarded a 4 year scholarship by China Scholarship Council (CSC) to pursue her PhD studies at Leiden University under the supervision of dr. Marcel de Jeu. During this period, she attended and spoke at numerous functional analysis seminars in Leiden. She gave contributed talks at the international conference *Positivity IX* in Edmonton, Canada, in 2017, and at the *50th Anniversary Meeting of the North British Functional Analysis Seminar* in Edinburgh, United Kingdom, in 2018.

In October 2018 she will begin post-doctoral research at Sichuan University in Chengdu, China.