A NON SMOOTH EXPONENTIAL*

Esteban Andruchow

Instituto de Ciencias – Univ. Nac. de Gral. Sarmiento
Argentina

Abstract

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a type II_1 von Neumann algebra, τ a trace in $\mathcal{M}$, and $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ the GNS Hilbert space of τ. If $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$ is the completion of the set $\mathcal{M}_{sa}$ of selfadjoint elements, then each element $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$ gives rise to a selfadjoint unbounded operator L_ξ on $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$. In this note we show that the exponential $exp : L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+ \to L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, $exp(\xi) = e^{iL_\xi}$ is continuous but non diferentiable. The same holds for the Cayley transform $C(\xi) = (L_\xi - i)(L_\xi + i)^{-1}$. We also show that the unitary group $U_\mathcal{M} \subset L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ with the strong operator topology, is not an embedded submanifold of $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, in any way which makes the product $(u,w) \mapsto uw$ $(u,w \in U_\mathcal{M})$ a differentiable map.

Keywords: unitary group, non commutative integration.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a type II_1 von Neumann algebra with a faithful and normal tracial state τ. Let $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ be the Hilbert space obtained by completion of $\mathcal{M}$ with the norm $\|x\|_2 = \tau(x^*x)^{1/2}$. By Segal's theory of abstract integration [3], any element $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ can be regarded as a (possibly unbounded) operator L_ξ on $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, affiliated to $\mathcal{M}$, as follows (see [1]). Let J be the antiunitary involution of $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, which on the dense subspace $\mathcal{M} \subset L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ is just the involution * of $\mathcal{M}$, and for $m \in \mathcal{M}$ consider the linear map $m \mapsto Jm^*J\xi$. This map is a closable operator, and L_ξ is its closure.

The elements $m \in \mathcal{M}$ will be considered as operators acting by left multiplication on $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, when regarded as *elements* of $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, they will be denoted by $\vec{m}$.

An interesting fact [3] is that if ξ satisfies $J\xi = \xi$, then the associated operator L_ξ is selfadjoint. Let us denote by $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+ = \{\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau) : J\xi = \xi\}$. Clearly $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$ is a real Hilbert space, and the inner product of $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ is real and symmetric when restricted to $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$. Indeed, $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$ is the completion of the set $\mathcal{M}_{sa}$ of selfadjoint elements of $\mathcal{M}$, and if $\vec{m_1}, \vec{m_2} \in \mathcal{M}_{sa}$, then $< \vec{m_1}, \vec{m_2} >= \tau(m_2m_1) = \tau(m_1m_2) =< \vec{m_2}, \vec{m_1} >$.

In this note we consider the map

$$exp : L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+ \to U_\mathcal{M}\vec{1} \subset L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau),\ exp(\xi) = e^{iL_\xi}\vec{1},$$

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 46L51, 58B10, 58B25.

where $U_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the unitary group of $\mathcal{M}$, and $U_{\mathcal{M}}\vec{1}$ is just the same set regarded as a subset of $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, which induces on $U_{\mathcal{M}}$ a metric topology equivalent to the strong operator topology. In what follows we identify $U_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $U_{\mathcal{M}}\vec{1}$.

We prove that the map *exp* is continuous but non smooth, in fact, non differentiable. We consider the Cayley transform

$$C : L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+ \to U_{\mathcal{M}} \subset L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau),\ C(\xi) = (L_\xi - i)(L_\xi + i)^{-1}\vec{1},$$

which is also continuous and non differentiable.

The unitary group $U_{\mathcal{M}}$ in the strong operator topology can be embedded in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ as a complete topological group. The group operations are clearly continuous in the L^2-metric, and $U_{\mathcal{M}} \subset L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ is closed. We finish this note by proving that it cannot be embedded as a differentiable Banach-Lie group.

2 Non regularity of *exp* and C

Let us see first that these maps are continuous. The following lemma will be useful. It relates the L^2 topology with the generalization of the strong topology to unbounded operators. Our reference on this subject is [2].

Lemma 2.1 *If a sequence ξ_n converges in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$ to ξ, then the operators L_{ξ_n} converge to L_ξ in the strong resolvent sense.*

Proof. Suppose that $\xi_n \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$ converges to ξ. Then for $m \in \mathcal{M}$, $L_{\xi_n} m\vec{1}$ converges to $L_\xi m\vec{1}$. Indeed, $L_{\xi_n} m\vec{1} = Jm^*J\xi_n \to Jm^*J\xi$ because Jm^*J is bounded, and this last vector equals $L_\xi m\vec{1}$. We claim that $\mathcal{M}\vec{1}$ is a common core for all (selfadjoint) operators of the form L_η, $\eta \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$. In that case, using VIII.25 of [2] it follows that L_{ξ_n} converges to L_ξ in the strong resolvent sense. Our claim follows using another result in [2], VIII.11: If A is a selfadjoint operator and $D \subset D(A)$ is a dense subspace which is invariant by the one parameter group e^{itA}, i.e. $e^{itA}(D) \subset D$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then D is a core for A. Now clearly $e^{itL_\eta} m\vec{1} \in \mathcal{M}\vec{1}$, because $e^{itL_\eta} \in \mathcal{M}$ for all t if $\eta \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$. It follows that $\mathcal{M}\vec{1}$ is a core for L_η. □

It shall be useful to have an alternative writing for C. Note that $(L_\xi - i)^{-1}$ and $(L_\xi + i)^{-1}$ commute, and that $(L_\xi - i)^{-1}(\xi - i\vec{1}) = \vec{1}$. Therefore $(L_\xi + i)^{-1}\vec{1} = (L_\xi - i)^{-1}(L_\xi + i)^{-1}(\xi - i\vec{1})$, and then

$$C(\xi) = (L_\xi + i)^{-1}(\xi - i\vec{1}),\quad \xi \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+.$$

Proposition 2.2 *The maps exp and C are continuous.*

Proof. If $\xi_n \to \xi$ in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$, then the resolvents $(L_{\xi_n} + i)^{-1}$ converge strongly to the resolvent $(L_\xi + i)^{-1}$. Note also that these operators are contractions. On the other hand $\xi_n - i\vec{1} \to \xi - i\vec{1}$ in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$. It follows that $C(\xi_n) = (L_{\xi_n} - i)^{-1}(\xi_n - i\vec{1})$ converge to $C(\xi)$. The same type of argument shows that the function *exp* is continuous. Indeed, if L_{ξ_n} converges to L_ξ in the strong resolvent sense, and f is a bounded continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$, then $f(L_{\xi_n}) \to f(L_\xi)$ strongly ([2], VII.20). Therefore $exp(\xi) = e^{iL_\xi}\vec{1}$ is continuous. □

Although these maps are not differentiable, they do have directional derivatives at the origin.

Lemma 2.3 *For all $\eta, v \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$, the curve $t \mapsto C(\eta + tv)$ is differentiable at $t = 0$, and*

$$\frac{d}{dt}C(\eta + tv)|_{t=0} = \frac{dC}{dv}(\eta) = -2i(L_\eta + i)^{-1}J(L_\eta - i)^{-1}Jv.$$

Proof. Note that

$$C(\eta + tv) - C(\eta) = (L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1}(\eta + tv - i\vec{1}) - (L_\eta + i)^{-1}(\eta - i\vec{1}).$$

The above sum can be decomposed in the following terms:

$$(L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1}(\eta + tv - i\vec{1}) - (L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1}(\eta - i\vec{1})$$

and

$$(L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1}(\eta - i\vec{1}) - (L_\eta + i)^{-1}(\eta - i\vec{1}).$$

We deal first with the first term, which equals

$$(L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1}(tv) = t(L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1}(v).$$

The second term equals

$$((L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1} - (L_\eta + i)^{-1})(\eta - i\vec{1}) = (L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1}[L_\eta + i - (L_{\eta+tv} + i)](L_\eta + i)^{-1}(\eta - i\vec{1}).$$

Note that this expression is well defined, since the vector $(L_\eta + i)^{-1}(\eta - i\vec{1}) = C(\eta) \in \mathcal{M}\vec{1}$ lies in the domain of any combination of the operators L_ν, $\nu \in L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)_+$. Moreover, it apparently equals

$$-t(L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1}L_v(L_\eta + i)^{-1}(L_\eta - i)\vec{1} = t(L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1}J(L_\eta + i)(L_\eta - i)^{-1}Jv.$$

Putting both terms together one has

$$\frac{C(\eta + tv) - C(\eta)}{t} = (L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1}(v - J(L_\eta + i)(L_\eta - i)^{-1}Jv).$$

If we let t tend to 0, then $\eta + tv \to \eta$ in $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)_+$ and $(L_{\eta+tv} + i)^{-1} \to (L_\eta + i)^{-1}$ strongly. Therefore the derivative of $C(\eta + tv)$ at $t = 0$ exists and equals

$$(L_{\eta+v} + i)^{-1}(v - J(L_\eta + i)(L_\eta - i)^{-1}Jv).$$

Finally, the vector $v - J(L_\eta + i)(L_\eta - i)^{-1}Jv$ can be written

$$v - J(L_\eta + i)(L_\eta - i)^{-1}Jv = J(1 - (L_\eta + i)(L_\eta - i)^{-1})Jv = -2iJ(L_\eta - i)^{-1}Jv.$$

If one replaces this last expression in the result obtained for the derivative, one obtains the desired formula. □

Lemma 2.4 *For any $v \in L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)_+$, the curve $t \mapsto exp(tv)$ is differentiable at $t = 0$ and*

$$\frac{d}{dt}exp(tv)|_{t=0} = \frac{d}{dv}exp(0) = iv.$$

Proof. The one parameter unitary group $t \mapsto e^{itL_v}$ is strongly differentiable at $t = 0$ on the domain of L_v [2], i.e. if $\xi \in D(L_v)$, $\frac{d}{dt}e^{itL_v}\xi|_{t=0}$ exists and equals $iL_v\xi$. Taking $\xi = \vec{1} \in D(L_v)$ proves the result. □

Theorem 2.5 *The maps $exp : L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)_+ \to U_\mathcal{M} \subset L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ and $C : L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)_+ \to U_\mathcal{M} \subset L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ are not differentiable on any neighbourhood of $0 \in L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)_+$.*

Proof Suppose that exp is differentiable on a neighbourhood $0 \in \mathcal{V} \subset L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$. For any $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ let $\xi = \xi_+ + \xi_-$ be the decomposition of ξ in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau) = L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+ \oplus L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_-$. We shall construct a local diffeomorphism on $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, which restricted to $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$ will provide a local homeomorphism onto a neighbourhood of $\vec{1}$ in $U_\mathcal{M}$. Afterwards we shall prove that this fact leads to contradiction. Consider the map

$$\theta : L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau) \to L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau),\ \theta(\xi) = exp(\xi_+) + i\xi_-.$$

The projections $\xi \mapsto \xi_+$ and $\xi \mapsto \xi_-$ are (real) linear and bounded, therefore they are C^∞. It follows that θ is differentiable in $\mathcal{V}$. Note that $\theta(0) = \vec{1}$ and $\frac{d}{d\xi}exp(0) = i\xi$. Therefore

$$d\theta_0(\xi) = i\xi_+ + i\xi_- = i\xi.$$

By the inverse function theorem it follows that there exists a ball $0 \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \subset \mathcal{V}$ in the $\| \ \|_2$-metric and an open set $\vec{1} \in \mathcal{W}$ of $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ such that $\theta : \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \to \mathcal{W}$ is a diffeomorphism. Note that θ maps $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \cap L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$ onto $\mathcal{W} \cap U_\mathcal{M}$, i.e. $\theta|_{L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+}$ is a local homeomorphism between $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$ and a neighbourhood of $\vec{1}$ in $U_\mathcal{M}$ in the L^2-topology.

Fix $\delta^{1/2} < \epsilon$, and for each integer $n \geq 1$ choose a projection $p_n \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\tau(p_n) = \delta/n^2$. Put $a_n = np_n$. Note that $\|a_n\|_2 = \delta^{1/2}$. Indeed, $\tau(a_n^* a_n) = n^2\tau(p_n) = \delta$. Therefore $a_n \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$ and a_n does not tend to 0. On the other hand

$$\|exp(a_n) - 1\|_2^2 = 2 - \tau(e^{ia_n}) - \tau(e^{-ia_n}).$$

Clearly

$$\tau(e^{ia_n}) = 1 + \sum_{k\geq 1} \tau(\frac{(in)^k}{k!}p_n) = 1 + \frac{\delta}{n^2}(e^{in} - 1).$$

Analogously $\tau(e^{-ia_n}) = 1 + \frac{\delta}{n^2}(e^{-in} - 1)$. It follows that $exp(a_n) \to \vec{1}$ but $\theta^{-1}(exp(a_n))$ does not tend to 0, a contradiction.

To prove the same result for C, one proceeds analogously. Using the fact that if C were differentiable, then by 2.3, $dC_0(\xi) = -2i\xi$, one can construct also in this case a local homeomorphism between a ball centered at $0 \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$ and a L^2-neighbourhood of $-\vec{1}$ in $U_\mathcal{M}$ (note that $C(0) = -\vec{1}$). Let $p_n \neq 0$ be projections in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\tau(p_n) \to 0$. Then, as above, $\|1 - exp(p_n)\|_2 \to 0$. Note also that $1 - exp(p_n)$ has non trivial kernel, indeed, $1 - exp(p_n) = (e^i - 1)p_n$. On the other hand, if C were a local homeomorphism, then there would be a neighbourhood $-1 \in \mathcal{U} \subset U_\mathcal{M}$ where all $v \in \mathcal{U}$ would satisfy that $v - 1$ has trivial kernel, because unitaries in the range of the Cayley transform have this property. □

For the Cayley transform one has the following weaker regularity conditions.

Proposition 2.6 *The Cayley transform C is weakly C^1, i.e. for any fixed $\nu \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, the complex valued map $\xi \mapsto < C(\xi), \nu >$ is C^1.*

If we regard C as a map from $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$ to $L^1(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, it is differentiable.

Proof. For any $\eta, v \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$, using 2.3 one has

$$\frac{d}{dv} < C, \nu > (\eta) = < \frac{dC}{dv}(\eta), \nu > = -2i < (L_\eta + i)^{-1} J (L_\eta - i)^{-1} Jv, \nu > .$$

Recall that if $\eta_n \to \eta$ in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$, then the resolvents $(L_{\eta_n} - i)^{-1}$ and $(L_{\eta_n} + i)^{-1}$ are contractions which converge strongly to $(L_\eta - i)^{-1}$ and $(L_\eta + i)^{-1}$. It follows that $\frac{d}{dv} < C, \nu > (\eta)$ is continuous in both parameters $\nu, v \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$, and C is weakly C^1. Let us prove that

$$C : L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+ \to L^1(\mathcal{M},\tau)$$

is differentiable. Using the computations done in 2.3, one has that

$$C(\eta+v)-C(\eta)=-2i(L_{\eta+v}+i)^{-1}J(L_\eta-i)^{-1}Jv$$

and

$$\frac{dC}{dv}(\eta)=-2i(L_\eta+i)^{-1}J(L_\eta-i)^{-1}Jv$$

therefore $C(\eta+v)-C(\eta)-\frac{dC}{dv}(\eta)$ equals

$$-2i[(L_{\eta+v}+i)^{-1}-(L_\eta+i)^{-1}]J(L_\eta-i)^{-1}Jv.$$

We must show that the norm 1 of this expression divided by $\|v\|_2$ tends to zero if v tends to zero in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$. Denote by $\Delta=(L_{\eta+v}+i)^{-1}-(L_\eta+i)^{-1}$ and by $\psi=J(L_\eta-i)^{-1}Jv$. Note that $\Delta\in\mathcal{M}$ and $\psi\in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ with $\|\psi\|_2\leq\|v\|_2$. Also

$$\|\Delta\psi\|_1\leq\|\Delta\|_2\|\psi\|_2.$$

Indeed, let $\vec{x}_n$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{M}\vec{1}$ converging to ψ in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$. Then $\|\Delta\vec{x}_n\|_1=\tau(|\Delta x_n|)=\tau(u^*\Delta x_n)$ where u is the partial isometry in the polar decompostion of $\Delta x_n\in\mathcal{M}$, which can be chosen unitary since $\mathcal{M}$ is finite. By the Cauchy Schwarz inequality $\tau(u\Delta x_n)\leq\tau(\Delta^*\Delta)^{1/2}\tau(x_n^*x_n)^{1/2}$. Since $x_n\to\psi$, $\Delta x_n\to\Delta\psi$ in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, and the inequality follows. Therefore

$$\frac{\|C(\eta+v)-C(\eta)-\frac{dC}{dv}(\eta)\|_1}{\|v\|_2}=2\frac{\|\Delta\psi\|_1}{\|v\|_2}\leq 2\|\Delta\|_2.$$

The proof ends by showing that $\|\Delta\|_2\to 0$ as v tends to zero. Clearly Δ tends to zero in the strong operator topology, because $L_{\eta+v}\to L_\eta$ in the strong resolvent sense. Then

$$\tau(\Delta^*\Delta)=<\Delta\vec{1},\Delta\vec{1}>\to 0.$$

□

We now state the result of the non embedddability of $U_\mathcal{M}$ in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ as a Lie group.

Theorem 2.7 *The unitary group $U_\mathcal{M}$ of M, with the L^2 metric is not an embedded submanifold of $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ with differentiable multiplication map $(u,w)\mapsto uw$ ($u,w\in U_\mathcal{M}$).*

Proof. The proof consists of showing that if $U_\mathcal{M}\subset L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ were an embedded submanifold, then it would be a Lie group, with Lie algebra identified with $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_-:=\{\xi\in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau):J\xi=-\xi\}$. Moreover, the Lie bracket would extend the commutator of (antiselfadjoint) elements of $\mathcal{M}$, $[x,y]=xy-yx$. This is clearly not possible, the commutators of elements of $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ lie in $L^1(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, eventually outside of $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ [3].

Suppose that $U_\mathcal{M}\subset L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ is a submanifold. If $u(t)$ is a smooth curve of unitaries with $u(0)=1$ and $u'(0)=\xi$, differentiating $u^*(t)u(t)=1$ at $t=0$ yields $J\xi+\xi=0$, i.e. $\xi\in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_-$. Also any element $\xi\in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_-$ can be obtained as the velocity vector of a curve in $U_\mathcal{M}$. It was shown above that the curve $u(t)=exp(tv)$ is differentiable at $t=0$ for any $v\in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_+$, put $v=-i\xi$, then $u'(0)=\xi$. The tangent space of $U_\mathcal{M}$ at a point $u\in U_\mathcal{M}$ clearly identifies with $uL^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_-$.

The multiplication is differentiable by hypothesis. The invertion $u\mapsto u^{-1}=u^*$ is continuous ($\mathcal{M}$ is finite). It can be regarded as the restriction of a real linear map of $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$, namely J, and therefore is differentiable.

Therefore $U_\mathcal{M}$ is a Lie group, and its Lie algebra identifies with $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_-$. Let us compute the bracket under this identification. The left action of the group $U_\mathcal{M}$ on itself, $\ell^u:U_\mathcal{M}\to U_\mathcal{M}$,

$\ell^u(w) = uw$ extends to a linear bounded operator on $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$. Then if $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_-$, the left invariant vector field induced by ξ is $X_\xi(u) = u\xi$ ($u \in U_{\mathcal{M}}$). If f is a smooth function on a neighbourhood of $\vec{1} \in U_{\mathcal{M}}$, then the derivative $X_\xi f$ can be computed as follows:

$$X_\xi f(u) = \frac{d}{dt} f(ue^{tL_\xi})|_{t=0} = df_u(u\xi),$$

where df_u is the tangent map of f at $u \in U_{\mathcal{M}}$. Note that in the above computation again one only uses that $t \mapsto e^{tL_\xi}\vec{1}$ is differentiable at $t = 0$ ($\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_-$). Let $\vec{x},\vec{y} \in i\mathcal{M}_{sa} \subset L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_-$ two antiselfadjoint elements on $\mathcal{M}$ (note that $i\mathcal{M}_{sa}$ is dense in $L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)_-$). Let us compute $X_{\vec{x}}X_{\vec{y}}f$:

$$X_{\vec{x}}X_{\vec{y}}f(u) = \frac{d}{dt} df_{ue^{tx}}(ue^{tx}\vec{y})|_{t=0} = d^2f_u(u\vec{x},u\vec{y}) + df_u(u\vec{xy}).$$

Since d^2f_u is a symmetric bilinear form, it follows that the bracket $[X_{\vec{x}},X_{\vec{y}}]$ is given by

$$[X_{\vec{x}},X_{\vec{y}}]f(u) = df_u(u\vec{xy} - u\vec{yx}) = df_u(u(\overrightarrow{xy - yx})),$$

which coincides with the left invariant derivation $X_{\overrightarrow{xy-yx}}f(u)$. This says that the bracket of x,y regarded as an element of the Lie algebra of $U_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the usual commutator $xy - yx$. □

It would be interesting to know if the result holds dropping the assumption on the differentiability of the multiplication. That is, if $U_{\mathcal{M}} \subset L^2(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ is never an embedded submanifold.

References

[1] E. Christensen, Universally bounded operators on von Neumann algebras of type II_1, Algebraic methods in operator theory, 195-204, Birkäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1994.

[2] M. Read, B. Simon, Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, vol. I: Functional Analysis, Academic Press, New York, 1978.

[3] I.E. Segal, A non commutative extension of abstract integration, Ann. Math. 57 (1953), 401-457.

Esteban Andruchow
Instituto de Ciencias
Universidad Nacional de Gral. Sarmiento
J. M. Gutierrez entre J.L. Suarez y Verdi
(1613) Los Polvorines
Argentina
e-mail: eandruch@ungs.edu.ar