

Finite-dimensionality in the non-commutative Choquet boundary

Raphaël Clouâtre

University of Manitoba

CMS Summer meeting
Operator algebras and applications
June 8, 2021

Based on joint work with Ian Thompson.

Residual finite-dimensionality

Definition

A C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is an isometric $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

Residual finite-dimensionality

Definition

A C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is an isometric $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

Theorem

The following statements are equivalent.

- \mathfrak{A} is RFD.

Residual finite-dimensionality

Definition

A C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is an isometric $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

Theorem

The following statements are equivalent.

- \mathfrak{A} is RFD.
- *The finite-dimensional irreducible $*$ -representations are dense in the spectrum of \mathfrak{A} .*

Residual finite-dimensionality

Definition

A C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is an isometric $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

Theorem

The following statements are equivalent.

- \mathfrak{A} is RFD.
- *The finite-dimensional irreducible $*$ -representations are dense in the spectrum of \mathfrak{A} .*
- *Every $*$ -representation of \mathfrak{A} can be approximated pointwise in the SOT by finite-dimensional $*$ -representations. (Exel–Loring 1992)*

The non self-adjoint world

Definition

A (not necessarily self-adjoint) operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is a completely isometric homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

The non self-adjoint world

Definition

A (not necessarily self-adjoint) operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is a completely isometric homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

If \mathcal{A} is RFD and $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is a completely contractive representation, can π be approximated by finite-dimensional representations?

The non self-adjoint world

Definition

A (not necessarily self-adjoint) operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is a completely isometric homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

If \mathcal{A} is RFD and $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is a completely contractive representation, can π be approximated by finite-dimensional representations? Approximated in what sense?

The non self-adjoint world

Definition

A (not necessarily self-adjoint) operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is a completely isometric homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

If \mathcal{A} is RFD and $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is a completely contractive representation, can π be approximated by finite-dimensional representations? Approximated in what sense?

Is $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ also RFD?

The non self-adjoint world

Definition

A (not necessarily self-adjoint) operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is a completely isometric homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

If \mathcal{A} is RFD and $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is a completely contractive representation, can π be approximated by finite-dimensional representations? Approximated in what sense?

Is $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ also RFD?

Example

Let \mathcal{A} be a finite-dimensional operator algebra.

The non self-adjoint world

Definition

A (not necessarily self-adjoint) operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is a completely isometric homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

If \mathcal{A} is RFD and $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is a completely contractive representation, can π be approximated by finite-dimensional representations? Approximated in what sense?

Is $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ also RFD?

Example

Let \mathcal{A} be a finite-dimensional operator algebra. Then, $C^*_{\max}(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD (C.-Ramsey 2018), but it can happen that $C^*_{\min}(\mathcal{A})$ has simply no finite-dimensional *-representations.

The non self-adjoint world

Definition

A (not necessarily self-adjoint) operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **residually finite-dimensional** (RFD) if there is a completely isometric homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{M}_{n_{\lambda}}$.

If \mathcal{A} is RFD and $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is a completely contractive representation, can π be approximated by finite-dimensional representations? Approximated in what sense?

Is $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ also RFD?

Example

Let \mathcal{A} be a finite-dimensional operator algebra. Then, $C^*_{\max}(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD (C.-Ramsey 2018), but it can happen that $C^*_{\min}(\mathcal{A})$ has simply no finite-dimensional *-representations.

The choice of representation of \mathcal{A} matters!

The minimal representation: the C^* -envelope

$\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ unital operator algebra

The minimal representation: the C^* -envelope

$\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ unital operator algebra

non-commutative Choquet boundary of \mathcal{A} : collection of **boundary representations for \mathcal{A}**

The minimal representation: the C^* -envelope

$\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ unital operator algebra

non-commutative Choquet boundary of \mathcal{A} : collection of boundary representations for \mathcal{A} (i.e irreducible $*$ -representations of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ with a certain unique extension property with respect to \mathcal{A})

The minimal representation: the C^* -envelope

$\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ unital operator algebra

non-commutative Choquet boundary of \mathcal{A} : collection of boundary representations for \mathcal{A} (i.e irreducible $*$ -representations of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ with a certain unique extension property with respect to \mathcal{A})

$$C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) = C^*(\mathcal{A}) / \left(\bigcap_{\pi \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})} \ker \pi \right)$$

The minimal representation: the C^* -envelope

$\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ unital operator algebra

non-commutative Choquet boundary of \mathcal{A} : collection of boundary representations for \mathcal{A} (i.e irreducible $*$ -representations of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ with a certain unique extension property with respect to \mathcal{A})

$$C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) = C^*(\mathcal{A}) / \left(\bigcap_{\pi \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})} \ker \pi \right)$$

This is the smallest C^* -algebra that a copy of \mathcal{A} can generate (Arveson, Hamana, Muhly–Solel, Ditschel–McCullough, Davidson–Kennedy).

The minimal representation: the C^* -envelope

$\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ unital operator algebra

non-commutative Choquet boundary of \mathcal{A} : collection of **boundary representations for \mathcal{A}** (i.e irreducible $*$ -representations of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ with a certain unique extension property with respect to \mathcal{A})

$$C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) = C^*(\mathcal{A}) / \left(\bigcap_{\pi \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})} \ker \pi \right)$$

This is the smallest C^* -algebra that a copy of \mathcal{A} can generate (Arveson, Hamana, Muhly–Solel, Ditschel–McCullough, Davidson–Kennedy).

The **boundary representations** for \mathcal{A} form a dense subset of the spectrum of $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$.

The minimal representation: the C^* -envelope

$\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ unital operator algebra

non-commutative Choquet boundary of \mathcal{A} : collection of **boundary representations for \mathcal{A}** (i.e irreducible $*$ -representations of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ with a certain unique extension property with respect to \mathcal{A})

$$C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) = C^*(\mathcal{A}) / \left(\bigcap_{\pi \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})} \ker \pi \right)$$

This is the smallest C^* -algebra that a copy of \mathcal{A} can generate (Arveson, Hamana, Muhly–Solel, Ditschel–McCullough, Davidson–Kennedy).

The **boundary representations** for \mathcal{A} form a dense subset of the spectrum of $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$.

Consequence: if lots of boundary representations for \mathcal{A} are finite-dimensional, then $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ should be RFD.

The minimal representation: the C^* -envelope

$\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ unital operator algebra

non-commutative Choquet boundary of \mathcal{A} : collection of boundary representations for \mathcal{A} (i.e irreducible $*$ -representations of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ with a certain unique extension property with respect to \mathcal{A})

$$C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) = C^*(\mathcal{A}) / \left(\bigcap_{\pi \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})} \ker \pi \right)$$

This is the smallest C^* -algebra that a copy of \mathcal{A} can generate (Arveson, Hamana, Muhly–Solel, Ditschel–McCullough, Davidson–Kennedy).

The boundary representations for \mathcal{A} form a dense subset of the spectrum of $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$.

Consequence: if lots of boundary representations for \mathcal{A} are finite-dimensional, then $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ should be RFD.

Main question

Let \mathcal{A} be a unital operator algebra such that $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD. Does there exist a finite-dimensional boundary representation for \mathcal{A} ?

Isolated points in the spectrum

\mathcal{A} unital operator algebra such that $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD

Isolated points in the spectrum

\mathcal{A} unital operator algebra such that $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD

Inside of the spectrum $\widehat{C_e^*(\mathcal{A})}$, the following two sets are dense:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{[\pi] : \pi \text{ is a boundary representation for } \mathcal{A}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F} = \{[\pi] : \pi \text{ is finite-dimensional}\}.$$

Isolated points in the spectrum

\mathcal{A} unital operator algebra such that $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD

Inside of the spectrum $\widehat{C_e^*(\mathcal{A})}$, the following two sets are dense:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{[\pi] : \pi \text{ is a boundary representation for } \mathcal{A}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F} = \{[\pi] : \pi \text{ is finite-dimensional}\}.$$

Do they overlap?

Isolated points in the spectrum

\mathcal{A} unital operator algebra such that $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD

Inside of the spectrum $\widehat{C_e^*(\mathcal{A})}$, the following two sets are dense:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{[\pi] : \pi \text{ is a boundary representation for } \mathcal{A}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F} = \{[\pi] : \pi \text{ is finite-dimensional}\}.$$

Do they overlap?

Our approach is to try to identify isolated points in $\widehat{C_e^*(\mathcal{A})}$, which would then lie in $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{F}$.

Non-commutative peaking behaviour

$\pi : C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ irreducible $*$ -representation

Non-commutative peaking behaviour

$\pi : C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ irreducible $*$ -representation

π is a **strongly peaking representation** if there is $T \in \mathbb{M}_n(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}))$ such that

$$\|\pi^{(n)}(T)\| > \sup_{\sigma \neq \pi} \|\sigma^{(n)}(T)\|.$$

Non-commutative peaking behaviour

$\pi : C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ irreducible $*$ -representation

π is a **strongly peaking representation** if there is $T \in M_n(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}))$ such that

$$\|\pi^{(n)}(T)\| > \sup_{\sigma \neq \pi} \|\sigma^{(n)}(T)\|.$$

Theorem (C.–Thompson 2021)

Assume that $C_e^(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD. Then, strongly peaking representations are necessarily finite-dimensional boundary representations for \mathcal{A} .*

Non-commutative peaking behaviour

$\pi : C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ irreducible $*$ -representation

π is a **strongly peaking representation** if there is $T \in \mathbb{M}_n(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}))$ such that

$$\|\pi^{(n)}(T)\| > \sup_{\sigma \neq \pi} \|\sigma^{(n)}(T)\|.$$

Theorem (C.-Thompson 2021)

Assume that $C_e^(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD. Then, strongly peaking representations are necessarily finite-dimensional boundary representations for \mathcal{A} .*

π is a **locally peaking representation for \mathcal{A}** if there is $T \in \mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$\|\pi^{(n)}(T)\| > \|P_{F^{(n)}} \sigma^{(n)}(T)|_{F^{(n)}}\|$$

for every $\sigma \neq \pi$ and every finite-dimensional subspace F .

Non-commutative peaking behaviour

$\pi : C_e^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ irreducible $*$ -representation

π is a **strongly peaking representation** if there is $T \in \mathbb{M}_n(C_e^*(\mathcal{A}))$ such that

$$\|\pi^{(n)}(T)\| > \sup_{\sigma \neq \pi} \|\sigma^{(n)}(T)\|.$$

Theorem (C.–Thompson 2021)

Assume that $C_e^(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD. Then, strongly peaking representations are necessarily finite-dimensional boundary representations for \mathcal{A} .*

π is a **locally peaking representation for \mathcal{A}** if there is $T \in \mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$\|\pi^{(n)}(T)\| > \|P_{F^{(n)}} \sigma^{(n)}(T)|_{F^{(n)}}\|$$

for every $\sigma \neq \pi$ and every finite-dimensional subspace F .

Theorem (C.–Thompson 2021)

Locally peaking representations for \mathcal{A} are boundary representations for \mathcal{A} .

Detecting locally peaking representations

Theorem (Glicksberg 1962)

Let X be a compact metric space, and let $\mathcal{A} \subset C(X)$ be a unital norm-closed subalgebra which separates the points. Let $E \subset X$ be a closed subset. The following statements are equivalent.

- There is a function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f = 1$ on E and $|f(x)| < 1$ for every $x \in X \setminus E$.
- Viewed as an element in $C(X)^{**}$, we have $\chi_E \in \mathcal{A}^{\perp\perp}$.

Detecting locally peaking representations

Theorem (Glicksberg 1962)

Let X be a compact metric space, and let $\mathcal{A} \subset C(X)$ be a unital norm-closed subalgebra which separates the points. Let $E \subset X$ be a closed subset. The following statements are equivalent.

- There is a function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f = 1$ on E and $|f(x)| < 1$ for every $x \in X \setminus E$.
- Viewed as an element in $C(X)^{**}$, we have $\chi_E \in \mathcal{A}^{\perp\perp}$.

There is a non-commutative analogue of this theorem, where points correspond to irreducible $*$ -representations.

Detecting locally peaking representations

Theorem (Glicksberg 1962)

Let X be a compact metric space, and let $\mathcal{A} \subset C(X)$ be a unital norm-closed subalgebra which separates the points. Let $E \subset X$ be a closed subset. The following statements are equivalent.

- There is a function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f = 1$ on E and $|f(x)| < 1$ for every $x \in X \setminus E$.
- Viewed as an element in $C(X)^{**}$, we have $\chi_E \in \mathcal{A}^{\perp\perp}$.

There is a non-commutative analogue of this theorem, where points correspond to irreducible $*$ -representations.

Theorem (Hay 2007, Read 2011, C.-Thompson 2021)

Let $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ be a separable and norm-closed unital subalgebra. Let π be an irreducible finite-dimensional $*$ -representation of $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$. If $\mathfrak{s}_\pi \in \mathcal{A}^{\perp\perp}$, then π is a locally peaking representation for \mathcal{A} .

Detecting locally peaking representations

Theorem (Glicksberg 1962)

Let X be a compact metric space, and let $\mathcal{A} \subset C(X)$ be a unital norm-closed subalgebra which separates the points. Let $E \subset X$ be a closed subset. The following statements are equivalent.

- There is a function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f = 1$ on E and $|f(x)| < 1$ for every $x \in X \setminus E$.
- Viewed as an element in $C(X)^{**}$, we have $\chi_E \in \mathcal{A}^{\perp\perp}$.

There is a non-commutative analogue of this theorem, where points correspond to irreducible $*$ -representations.

Theorem (Hay 2007, Read 2011, C.-Thompson 2021)

Let $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H})$ be a separable and norm-closed unital subalgebra. Let π be an irreducible finite-dimensional $*$ -representation of $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$. If $\mathfrak{s}_\pi \in \mathcal{A}^{\perp\perp}$, then π is a locally peaking representation for \mathcal{A} .

The converse fails, even for strongly peaking representations for \mathcal{A} .

The extremal case: C^* -liminality

Recall: a unital C^* -algebra is said to be **liminal** (or CCR) if all its irreducible $*$ -representations are finite-dimensional.

The extremal case: C^* -liminality

Recall: a unital C^* -algebra is said to be **liminal** (or CCR) if all its irreducible $*$ -representations are finite-dimensional.

We say that a unital operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **C^* -liminal** if every boundary representations for \mathcal{A} on $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is finite-dimensional.

The extremal case: C^* -liminality

Recall: a unital C^* -algebra is said to be **liminal** (or CCR) if all its irreducible $*$ -representations are finite-dimensional.

We say that a unital operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **C^* -liminal** if every boundary representations for \mathcal{A} on $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is finite-dimensional.

Is $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ liminal in this case?

The extremal case: C^* -liminality

Recall: a unital C^* -algebra is said to be **liminal** (or CCR) if all its irreducible $*$ -representations are finite-dimensional.

We say that a unital operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **C^* -liminal** if every boundary representations for \mathcal{A} on $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is finite-dimensional.

Is $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ liminal in this case?

Theorem (C.-Thompson 2021)

Let \mathcal{A} be a unital operator algebra. Consider the following statements.

- 1 The algebra \mathcal{A} is C^* -liminal.
- 2 Every matrix state of \mathcal{A} is locally finite-dimensional.
- 3 The algebra $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD.

Then, we have $(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3)$. Moreover, $(3) \not\Rightarrow (2)$.

The extremal case: C^* -liminality

Recall: a unital C^* -algebra is said to be **liminal** (or CCR) if all its irreducible $*$ -representations are finite-dimensional.

We say that a unital operator algebra \mathcal{A} is **C^* -liminal** if every boundary representations for \mathcal{A} on $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is finite-dimensional.

Is $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ liminal in this case?

Theorem (C.-Thompson 2021)

Let \mathcal{A} be a unital operator algebra. Consider the following statements.

- 1 The algebra \mathcal{A} is C^* -liminal.
- 2 Every matrix state of \mathcal{A} is locally finite-dimensional.
- 3 The algebra $C_e^*(\mathcal{A})$ is RFD.

Then, we have (1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3). Moreover, (3) $\not\Rightarrow$ (2).

A standard example of a non-liminal RFD C^* -algebra is $C^*(\mathbb{F}_2)$ (Choi 1980). For $\mathcal{A} = \text{Alg}(I, u, v)$, all irreducible $*$ -representations are boundary representations, so that \mathcal{A} is not C^* -liminal.

Thank you!