

On disjoint ordered pairs of operators

東北大 教養 吉野 崇 ( Takashi Yoshino )

We obtain sufficient conditions for the nonexistence of non-zero intertwining operators between two nonnormal operators. We say that such pair of operators is disjoint.

1. Let  $B(X)$  be the algebra of all bounded linear operators on a complex Banach space  $X$ . For  $A \in B(X)$  and for a closed set  $\sigma \subset \mathbb{C}$ , let

$$X_A(\sigma) = \{x \in X ; (zI-A)f(z) \equiv x \text{ for some analytic function } f : \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma \rightarrow X \}$$

and for an arbitrary  $\sigma \subset \mathbb{C}$ , let

$$X_A(\sigma) = \cup \{X_A(\tau) ; \tau \subset \sigma \text{ and } \tau \text{ is closed}\}.$$

The set  $X_A(\sigma)$  is called the spectral manifold of  $A$ . It is known that  $X_A(\sigma)$  is an invariant linear manifold of  $A$  and that if  $\sigma_1 \subset \sigma_2$  then  $X_A(\sigma_1) \subset X_A(\sigma_2)$ . And it is clear that  $X_A(\sigma) = X_A(\sigma \cap \sigma(A))$ ,  $X_A(\sigma(A)) = X$ ,  $X_A(\emptyset) = \{0\}$  and that  $X_A(\sigma) \subset \bigcap_{z \notin \sigma} (A-zI)X$  for any closed set  $\sigma \subset \mathbb{C}$ .

Clancey [1] proved the following

Proposition. Let  $T$  on  $H$  be a hyponormal operator ( i. e.,  $T^*T \geq TT^*$  ) and  $\sigma \subset \mathbb{C}$  be a closed set, then  $X_T(\sigma) = \bigcap_{z \notin \sigma} (T-zI)H$  and, in particular,  $\bigcap_{z \in \sigma(T)} (T-zI)H = \bigcap_{z \in \mathbb{C}} (T-zI)H = X_T(\emptyset) = \{0\}$  where  $\sigma(T)$  denotes the spectrum of  $T$ .

Corollary 1. If  $T$  on  $H$  is a subnormal operator with the minimal normal extension  $N$  on  $K$ , then  $\bigcap_{z \in \sigma(N)} (T-zI)H = \{0\}$ .

The following theorem is a slight modification of [6].

Theorem 1. For  $\varphi \in H^\infty$ , let  $T_\varphi$  be the analytic Toeplitz operator on  $H^2$  defined by the relation  $(T_\varphi f)(z) = \varphi(z)f(z)$ . Then  $\bigcap_{z \in \delta} (T_\varphi - \varphi(z)I)H^2 = \{0\}$  if  $\delta$  is an infinite set having a limit point inside  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} ; |z|=1\}$ .

2. For  $A \in B(X)$  and  $B \in B(Y)$ , we shall say that the ordered pair  $(A, B)$  is disjoint if the only bounded linear operator  $C$  mapping  $X$  into  $Y$  and satisfying the equation  $CA = BC$  (i. e.,  $C$  intertwines  $A$  and  $B$ ) is zero.

Lemma 1. If  $CA = BC$  for  $C \in B(X, Y)$ , then  $CX_A(\sigma) \subset X_B(\sigma)$  for

an arbitrary set  $\sigma \subset \mathbb{C}$ . In particular  $CX \subset X_B(\sigma(A))$ .

Then, we have only to seek such  $\sigma \subset \mathbb{C}$  as  $X_A(\sigma)^\sim = X$  and  $X_B(\sigma) = \{0\}$ , in particular, we may prove  $X_B(\sigma(A)) = \{0\}$  in order to show that the pair  $(A, B)$  is disjoint.

The following theorem is well known. But we give here a simple proof.

Theorem 2. [7] If  $\sigma(A) \cap \sigma(B) = \emptyset$ , then the pair  $(A, B)$  is disjoint.

Proof.  $X_B(\sigma(A)) = X_B(\sigma(A) \cap \sigma(B)) = X_B(\emptyset) = \{0\}$ .

Theorem 3. Let  $T$  be a subnormal operator on  $H$  with the minimal normal extension  $N$  on  $K$ . If  $\sigma(A) \cap \sigma(N) = \emptyset$ , then the pair  $(A, T)$  is disjoint.

Proof. By the assumption, there is an open set  $D$  such that  $\sigma(N) \subset D$  and  $\sigma(A) \cap D = \emptyset$ . Then  $X_T(\sigma(A)) \subset X_T(\mathbb{C} \setminus D) = \bigcap_{z \in D} (T - zI)H$   
 $\subset \bigcap_{z \in \sigma(N)} (T - zI)H = \{0\}$  by Proposition and by Corollary 1.

Theorem 4. Let  $T_\varphi$  be an analytic Toeplitz operator on  $H^2$ .

If  $\sigma(T_\varphi) \not\subset \sigma(A)$ , then the pair  $(A, T_\varphi)$  is disjoint.

Proof. It is known that  $\sigma(T_\varphi)$  is the closure of  $\{\varphi(z); |z| < 1\}$ .

Let  $\tau = \{\varphi(z); |z| < 1\} \cap [\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(A)]$ , then  $\tau$  is either a non-empty open set or a singleton, depending on whether  $\{\varphi(z); |z| < 1\}$  is an open set or a singleton (that is, whether  $\varphi$  is non-constant or constant). In either case,  $\delta = \bar{\varphi}^{-1}(\tau) \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C}; |z| < 1\}$  is a non-empty open subset in  $\{z \in \mathbb{C}; |z| < 1\}$  and hence, by the assumption there is an open set  $D$  such that  $\tau \subset D$  and that  $\sigma(A) \cap D = \emptyset$ .

Then  $X_{T_\varphi}(\sigma(A)) \subset X_{T_\varphi}(\mathbb{C} \setminus D) = \bigcap_{z \in D} (T_\varphi - zI)H^2$  by Proposition  
 $\subset \bigcap_{z \in \tau} (T_\varphi - zI)H^2 = \bigcap_{z \in \delta} (T_\varphi - \varphi(z)I)H^2 = \{0\}$  by Theorem 1.

Corollary 2. [4] Let  $T_\varphi, T_\psi$  be two analytic Toeplitz operators on  $H^2$ . If  $\{\psi(z); |z| < 1\} \not\subset \sigma(T_\varphi)$ , then the pair  $(T_\varphi, T_\psi)$  is disjoint.

Let  $A$  and  $B$  are bounded linear operators on two Hilbert spaces  $H$  and  $K$  respectively.

Lemma 2. [2] Let  $CA = BC$  for  $C \in B(H, K)$ . If  $C$  has dense range and if  $B$  is hyponormal, then  $\sigma(B) \subset \sigma(A)$ .

If  $CA = BC$  for  $C \in B(H, K)$  implies that  $CA^* = B^*C$ , then  $\ker[C]^\perp$  and  $\text{range}[C]^\sim$  are reducing subspaces for  $A$  and  $B$  respectively and it is easily seen that  $A|_{\ker[C]^\perp}$  and  $B|_{\text{range}[C]^\sim}$  are normal and hence  $\sigma(A|_{\ker[C]^\perp}) = \sigma(B|_{\text{range}[C]^\sim})$  by Lemma 2.

$A \in B(H)$  is dominant if there is a number  $M_\lambda$  for each  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\|(A-\lambda I)^* x\| \leq M_\lambda \|(A-\lambda I)x\|$  for all  $x \in H$ . If there is a constant  $M$  such that  $M_\lambda \leq M$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $A$  is called  $M$ -hyponormal and if  $M = 1$ ,  $A$  is hyponormal.

Theorem 5. Let  $A^* \in B(H)$  be  $M$ -hyponormal and let  $B \in B(K)$  be dominant. If  $\sigma(A^{(n)}) \cap \sigma(B^{(n)}) = \emptyset$ , then the pair  $(A, B)$  is disjoint, where  $A^{(n)}$  denotes the normal part of  $A$ .

Proof. By [8],  $CA = BC$  for  $C \in B(H, K)$  implies that  $CA^* = B^*C$  and hence, by the arguments after Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(B|_{\text{range}[C]^\sim}) &= \sigma(A|_{\ker[C]^\perp}) \cap \sigma(B|_{\text{range}[C]^\sim}) \subset \sigma(A^{(n)}) \cap \sigma(B^{(n)}) \\ &= \emptyset \text{ and } C = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$A \in B(H)$  is paranormal if  $\|Ax\|^2 \leq \|A^2x\| \|x\|$  for all  $x \in H$ .

If  $A^* \in B(H)$  be an isometry and if  $B \in B(K)$  be a paranormal contraction (i. e.,  $\|B\| \leq 1$ ), then, by [5], it is easily seen

that  $CA = BC$  for  $C \in B(H, K)$  implies  $CA^* = B^*C$ . And then

$A|_{\ker[C]^\perp}$  and  $B|_{\text{range}[C]^\sim}$  are unitary because

$\sigma(B|_{\text{range}[C]^\sim}) = \sigma(A|_{\ker[C]^\perp}) \subset \sigma(A^{(n)}) = \sigma(A^{(u)})$  by the arguments after Lemma 2, where  $A^{(u)}$  denotes the unitary part of  $A$ . And

hence we have

Theorem 6. Let  $A^* \in B(H)$  be an isometry and let  $B \in B(K)$  be a paranormal contraction. If  $\sigma(A^{(u)}) \cap \sigma(B^{(u)}) = \emptyset$ , then the pair  $(A, B)$  is disjoint.

Proof.  $\sigma(B|_{\text{range}[C]^\sim}) = \sigma(A|_{\ker[C]^\perp}) \cap \sigma(B|_{\text{range}[C]^\sim})$   
 $\subset \sigma(A^{(u)}) \cap \sigma(B^{(u)}) = \emptyset$  and  $C = 0$ .

#### References

- [1] K. F. Clancey, On the local spectra of seminormal operators  
Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 72(1978) 473 - 479.
- [2] S. Clary, Equality of spectra of quasi-similar hyponormal  
operators, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 53(1975) 88 - 90
- [3] R. G. Douglas and C. Pearcy, Hyperinvariant subspaces and  
transitive algebras, Michigan Math. J., 19(1972) 1-

- [4] J. A. Deddens, Intertwining analytic Toeplitz operators,  
Michigan Math. J., 18(1971) 243 - 246.
- [5] E. Goya and T. Saitô, On intertwining by an operator having  
a dense range, Tôhoku Math. J., 33(1981) 127 - 131.
- [6] C. R. Putnam, Ranges of normal and subnormal operators,  
Michigan Math. J., 18(1971) 33 - 36.
- [7] M. Rosenblum, On operator equation  $BX - XA = Q$ ,  
Duke Math. J., 23(1956) 263 - 269.
- [8] T. Yoshino, Remark on the generalized Putnam-Fuglede theorem,  
Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., ( to appear ).