

## VECTOR-VALUED MEASURE AND BOUNDED VARIATION IN HILBERT SPACE

D. A. EDWARDS

**1. Introduction.** The object of this paper is to exhibit the relation between two different constructions of vector-valued measure in Hilbert space due respectively to Gelfand [3] and Cramér [1].

Let  $X$  be a real Hilbert space with zero element  $\theta$  and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the ring of bounded Borel subsets of the real line  $R^1$ . A function  $Z(\cdot): \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X$  will be called a *vector-valued measure* if

(i) 
$$Z(\Phi) = \theta,$$

where  $\Phi$  is the empty set, and

(ii) 
$$Z\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z(E_n)$$

whenever the  $E_n$  are disjoint sets of  $\mathcal{B}$  with a bounded union, the series on the right being strongly convergent. It follows at once that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z(E_n)$  in fact converges unconditionally (see Hildebrandt [6]). If  $z(\cdot): R^1 \rightarrow X$  is now defined by

(1) 
$$z(0) = \theta$$

(2) 
$$z(b) - z(a) = Z(E) \quad \text{when} \quad E = (a, b),$$

then:

- ( $\alpha$ ) for each fixed  $y \in X$  the real-valued function  $(z(\cdot), y)$  is of bounded variation on every bounded interval of  $R^1$ ;
- ( $\beta$ )  $z(\cdot)$  is everywhere strongly continuous-to-the-right.

Conversely, if  $z: R^1 \rightarrow X$  is a given function which has the properties ( $\alpha$ ) and ( $\beta$ ), then there exists a unique vector-valued measure  $Z(\cdot): \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X$  satisfying (2). These results are due, essentially, to Gelfand [3].

On the other hand, Cramér [1] has considered a function  $z: R^1 \rightarrow X$  together with its covariance function  $\varrho: R^2 \rightarrow R^1$  defined by

$$\varrho(t, s) \equiv (z(t), z(s)).$$

Cramér's argument establishes a result which can be stated in the following form. If  $z$  satisfies  $(\beta)$  and also

$(\alpha')$   $\varrho$  is of Vitali bounded variation on every bounded square,

then there exists a unique vector-valued measure  $Z(\cdot): \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X$  satisfying (2). The main result of the present paper is that condition  $(\alpha)$  is strictly weaker than  $(\alpha')$ . Some related but elementary theorems are also included for the sake of completeness.

**2. Bounded variation.**  $z$  is said to be of *Dunford bounded variation* (BV(D)) on the bounded interval  $[a, b]$  when and only when there is a finite real constant  $K(a, b)$  such that, if  $k \geq 1$  and  $a \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_{2k} \leq b$ , then

$$\left\| \sum_{r=1}^k (z(t_{2r}) - z(t_{2r-1})) \right\| \leq K(a, b).$$

We state without proof a theorem of Gelfand [3] and Dunford [2].

**THEOREM 1.**  $z$  satisfies condition  $(\alpha)$  if and only if it is of BV(D) on every bounded interval of  $R^1$ .

A function  $\varphi: R^2 \rightarrow R^1$  is said to be of *Fréchet bounded variation* (BV(F)) on the bounded rectangle  $H = [a, b] \times [c, d]$  when and only when there is a finite real constant  $K(H)$  such that, if  $p \geq 1$  and  $q \geq 1$  and

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} a \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_{p+1} \leq b, \\ c \leq s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_{q+1} \leq d, \end{cases}$$

and if

$$(4) \quad \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i = \pm 1, & i = 1, 2, \dots, p, \\ \eta_j = \pm 1, & j = 1, 2, \dots, q, \end{cases}$$

then

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^q \varepsilon_i \eta_j \Delta_{ij} \varphi \right| \leq K(H),$$

where

$$\Delta_{ij} \varphi \equiv \varphi(t_{i+1}, s_{j+1}) - \varphi(t_i, s_{j+1}) - \varphi(t_{i+1}, s_j) + \varphi(t_i, s_j).$$

If a finite real constant  $M(H)$  exists such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^q |\Delta_{ij} \varphi| \leq M(H)$$

whenever conditions (3) are satisfied ( $p \geq 1, q \geq 1$ ) then  $\varphi$  is said to be of *Vitali bounded variation* (BV(V)) on  $H$ . An immediate and well known consequence of these two definitions is that BV(V) implies BV(F).

**THEOREM 2.**  $z$  satisfies condition  $(\alpha)$  if and only if its covariance function  $\varrho$  is of  $BV(F)$  on every bounded rectangle.

If  $z$  has the property  $(\alpha)$  then for each bounded interval  $[a, b]$  and each fixed  $y \in X$  there is a constant  $A(y; a, b)$  such that

$$\left| \left( \sum_{i=1}^p \varepsilon_i (z(t_{i+1}) - z(t_i)), y \right) \right| \leq A(y; a, b) < \infty$$

whenever the  $t_i$  and  $\varepsilon_i$  satisfy (3) and (4). Hence, by uniform boundedness, there is a constant  $A(a, b)$  such that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^p \varepsilon_i (z(t_{i+1}) - z(t_i)) \right\| \leq A(a, b) < \infty.$$

Similarly,

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^q \eta_j (z(s_{j+1}) - z(s_j)) \right\| \leq A(c, d) < \infty$$

when the  $s_j$  and  $\eta_j$  satisfy (3) and (4). And so, using Schwarz's inequality,

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^q \varepsilon_i \eta_j \Delta_{ij} \varrho \right| \leq A(a, b) A(c, d) < \infty.$$

Conversely, if  $\varrho$  is of  $BV(F)$  on every bounded rectangle  $H$ , then on putting  $H = [a, b]^2$ ,  $p = q$ ,  $\eta_i = \varepsilon_i$  and  $s_i = t_i$  (all  $i$ ) it is clear that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^p \varepsilon_i (z(t_{i+1}) - z(t_i)) \right\|^2 \leq K(H) < \infty,$$

and hence that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p |(z(t_{i+1}) - z(t_i), y)| \leq \|y\| (K(H))^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This completes the proof.

**COROLLARY 1.** If  $z$  satisfies condition  $(\alpha')$  then it satisfies  $(\alpha)$ .

**COROLLARY 2.**  $z$  is of  $BV(D)$  on every bounded interval if and only if its covariance  $\varrho$  is of  $BV(F)$  on every bounded rectangle.

**COROLLARY 3.** If  $\varrho: R^2 \rightarrow R^1$  is a covariance function and is of  $BV(F)$  on  $[a, b]^2$  then  $\varrho(\cdot, s)$  ( $\equiv \varrho(s, \cdot)$ ) is of bounded variation on  $[a, b]$  for each fixed  $s \in [a, b]$ .

These results all have natural and immediate extensions to the case in which  $X$  is a complex Hilbert space.

**3. A counter-example.** Any function  $\varphi: R^2 \rightarrow R^1$  which is of  $BV(V)$  on a given rectangle is also of  $BV(F)$  on that rectangle. On the other hand,

Littlewood [7] has shown how to construct a function which is of  $BV(F)$  but not of  $BV(V)$  on a given rectangle. In the light of the theorems of § 2 it is natural to ask whether it is possible to construct a *covariance* function which is of  $BV(F)$ , without being of  $BV(V)$ , on some rectangle. A strongly continuous function  $z$  whose covariance  $\varrho$  has this property is now constructed using an adaptation of the method of Littlewood [7].

**THEOREM 3.** *There exists a vector-valued function  $z$  defined on  $[0, 1]$  and such that:*

- (i) *the range of  $z$  spans a separable real Hilbert space  $X_0$ ;*
- (ii)  *$z$  is strongly continuous on  $[0, 1]$ ;*
- (iii)  *$z$  is of  $BV(D)$  on  $[0, 1]$  (and hence  $\varrho$  is of  $BV(F)$  on  $[0, 1]^2$ );*
- (iv)  *$\varrho$  is not of  $BV(V)$  on  $[0, 1]^2$ .*

Let  $[a_{mn}]$  be the real symmetric matrix defined by

$$\left. \begin{aligned} a_{nn} &= 0, \\ a_{mn} &= \frac{\sin \frac{1}{2}\pi(m-n)}{m-n}, \quad m \neq n. \end{aligned} \right\} m, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

Schur [10] has shown that for any real sequence  $\{\xi_n\}$

$$\left| \sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{n=1}^N a_{mn} \xi_m \xi_n \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}\pi \sum_{m=1}^N \xi_m^2 \quad \text{for } N = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

Using a well known theorem of Hellinger and Toeplitz [5] it follows that  $[a_{mn}]$  is the matrix of a bounded self-adjoint operator  $A$  in the space  $L_2$  of real sequences  $x = \{\xi_n\}$  which are such that

$$\|x\| \equiv \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \xi_n^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

Moreover,  $A$  has a non-empty spectrum which is a subset of the interval  $[-\frac{1}{2}\pi, \frac{1}{2}\pi]$ . Consequently the operator  $B = \frac{1}{2}\pi I + A$ , where  $I$  is the identity operator, is bounded ( $\|B\| \leq \pi$ ), self-adjoint and non-negative definite. Now let

$$u_n = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{2}} \log(n+1)}, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots,$$

so that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n^2 < \infty$ ; and let  $c_{mn} = b_{mn} u_m u_n$  for  $m, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , where  $[b_{mn}]$  is the matrix of  $B$ . If

$$M = \pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n^2$$

then

$$0 \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{mn} \varepsilon_m \varepsilon_n \leq M,$$

and

$$\left| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{mn} \varepsilon_m \eta_n \right| \leq M,$$

whenever  $-1 \leq \varepsilon_m \leq 1$ ,  $-1 \leq \eta_n \leq 1$  for all  $m$  and  $n$ , the double sum being taken in the Pringsheim sense. In particular  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{mn}$  converges. However, it can be shown by a straightforward application of the method used on p. 214 of Hardy, Littlewood and Pólya [4] that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |c_{mn}| = \infty.$$

Lastly it is easily shown that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{mn}^2 < \infty,$$

and so  $[c_{mn}]$  is the matrix of a bounded self-adjoint non-negative definite operator in  $L_2$ .

Now let  $X$  be a given real separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space and let  $\{\varphi_n\}$  be a c.o.n.s. for  $X$ . Then there is a unique bounded operator  $C$  in  $X$  such that

$$(\varphi_m, C\varphi_n) = c_{mn} \quad \text{for } m, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

But  $C$  is also self-adjoint and non-negative definite and hence (see e.g. Riesz and Nagy [9]) there is a bounded self-adjoint operator  $T$  in  $X$  such that  $T^2 = C$ . Now let  $x_n = T\varphi_n$  for  $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} (x_m, x_n) &= (T\varphi_m, T\varphi_n) \\ &= (\varphi_m, T^2\varphi_n) \\ &= (\varphi_m, C\varphi_n) \\ &= c_{mn}, \quad m, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $t_1 = 0$ ,  $t_{m+1} = t_m + 2^{-m}$  for  $m = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , and define  $z(\cdot)$  on  $[0, 1]$  as follows. Let  $z(t_1) = \theta$ ,  $z(t_{m+1}) \equiv z(t_m) + x_m$  and let  $z(\cdot)$  be linear in each of the intervals  $[t_m, t_{m+1}]$ . Then, since

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{mn}$$

converges,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=m}^{m+p} x_i \right\|^2 = \sum_{i=m}^{m+p} \sum_{j=m}^{m+p} c_{ij} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m, p \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence  $\{z(t_n)\}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $X$  and we can, and do, define  $z(1) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z(t_n)$ . Then  $z(\cdot)$  plainly satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.

To prove (iii) it is enough, by Theorems 1 and 2 to show that  $z$  satisfies  $(\alpha)$ . Now

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon_n x_n \right\|^2 = \sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{n=1}^N c_{mn} \varepsilon_m \varepsilon_n \leq M \quad \text{for } N = 1, 2, 3, \dots,$$

whenever  $\varepsilon_n = \pm 1$  for all  $n$ . For any fixed  $y \in X$  it now follows, on taking  $\varepsilon_n = \text{sgn}(x_n, y)$  for each  $n$ , that

$$\sum_{n=1}^N |(x_n, y)| = \left| \left( \sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon_n x_n, y \right) \right| \leq M^{\frac{1}{2}} \|y\|, \quad N = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

Consequently, for each  $y \in X$ ,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |(x_n, y)| < \infty.$$

But if  $p \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_{p+1} \leq 1$  then

$$\sum_{j=1}^p |(z(s_{j+1}) - z(s_j), y)| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |(x_n, y)| < \infty.$$

$z$  therefore satisfies the condition  $(\alpha)$ .

Finally,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N |(z(t_{i+1}) - z(t_i), z(t_{j+1}) - z(t_j))| = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N |c_{ij}| \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence the covariance  $\varrho$  of  $z$  is not of  $BV(V)$  on  $[0, 1]^2$ ; and so the proof of Theorem 3 is complete.

The use of covariance functions of  $BV(V)$  in the theory of stochastic processes was introduced by Loève [8] and continued by Cramér [1], whose main theorem subsumed some of Loève's work; and it now seems desirable that this theorem in turn should be generalized by using Fréchet instead of Vitali bounded variation. A proof that such a generalization is possible will be given in a forthcoming paper, and it is clear from the theorems of the present paper that this extension will, in a certain sense, be the ultimate form of Cramér's theorem.

Mr. D. G. Kendall suggested to me the problem which has led to the present paper, and I cannot forgo the pleasure of thanking him here for his encouragement and advice during its preparation.

## REFERENCES

1. H. Cramér, *A contribution to the theory of stochastic processes*, Proceedings of the 2nd Berkeley symposium on math. statistics and probability 1950, 329–339.
2. N. Dunford, *Uniformity in linear spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 44 (1938), 305–356.
3. I. Gelfand, *Abstrakte Funktionen und lineare Operatoren*, Rec. Math. Moscou, N. S. 4 (1938), 235–284.
4. G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge, 1934.
5. E. Hellinger and O. Toeplitz, *Grundlagen für eine Theorie der unendlichen Matrizen*, Math. Annalen 69 (1910), 289–330.
6. T. H. Hildebrandt, *On unconditional convergence in normed vector spaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 46 (1940), 959–962.
7. J. E. Littlewood, *On bounded bilinear forms in an infinite number of variables*, Quart. J. Math. (2) 1 (1930), 164–174.
8. M. Loève, *Fonctions aléatoires du second ordre*. Appendix to P. Lévy, *Processus stochastiques et mouvement brownien*, Paris, 1948.
9. F. Riesz and B. Sz.-Nagy, *Leçons d'analyse fonctionnelle*, Budapest, 1952.
10. I. Schur, *Bemerkungen zur Theorie der beschränkten Bilinearformen mit unendlich vielen Veränderlichen*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 140 (1911), 1–28.

ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD, ENGLAND