

INSTITUTUL  
DE  
MATEMATICĂ

INSTITUTUL NAȚIONAL  
PENTRU CREAȚIE  
ȘTIINȚIFICĂ ȘI TEHNICĂ

---

ULTRAWEAKLY CLOSED OPERATOR  
ALGEBRAS

by  
Constantin APOSTOL

PREPRINT SERIES IN MATHEMATICS  
NO. 41/1978

---

BUCUREȘTI

Med 15701

ULTRAWEAKLY CLOSED OPERATOR  
ALGEBRAS

by  
Constantin APOSTOL\*)

*November 1978*

\*) Department of Mathematics, National Institute for Scientific and Technical Creation,  
Bdul Păcii 220, 77538 Bucharest, Romania.

## ULTRAWEAKLY CLOSED OPERATOR ALGEBRAS

Constantin Apostol

The "Invariant Subspace Problem" stays unsolved since more than 30 years. The question to be answered is the following: Does any bounded linear operator  $T$  acting in a separable complex Hilbert space have a proper invariant subspace? Scott Brown [3] answered "yes" this question in case  $T$  is subnormal (i.e. the restriction to an invariant subspace of a normal operator). The way he solved the problem is beautiful, but the most remarkable fact is that his techniques are strong enough for significant generalizations as well as for the study of the ultraweakly closed algebra generated by some operators. We already know three generalizations belonging to J. Agler [1], to S. Brown, B. Chevreau and C. Pearcy [4] and to J. Stampfli [13]. Given  $T$ , assume that we have

$$\|f(T)\| \leq a \sup \{ |f(\lambda)| : \lambda \in \sigma(T) \}$$

where  $a \geq 1$  is fixed and  $f$  is any rational function with poles outside  $\sigma(T)$ . Then "yes" holds again as shown by J. Agler for  $a=1$  and by J. Stampfli for  $a>1$ . The theorem of Agler will apply to  $T$  if, for instance,  $\|T\|=1$  and  $\sigma(T)$  is the closed unit disk. The Brown-Chevreau-Pearcy's result includes the case  $\|T\|=1$ ,  $\sigma(T) = \{\lambda : r \leq |\lambda| \leq 1\}$  ( $0 < r < 1$ ), but its exact statement will be given later. I mention (see the Remark after Theorem 2.3) that



D.Voiculescu discovered by himself a proof of Brown-Chevreaux-Pearcy's result after he knew the announcement of J.Agler. His proof was presented in May 1978, at a Colloquium of Functional Analysis in Timișoara, Romania.

In the sequel we shall use the following notation:

$H$ : an infinite-dimensional complex Hilbert space,

$B_H$ : the open unit ball of  $H$ ,

$\mathcal{L}(H)$ : the algebra of all bounded linear operators acting in  $H$ ,

$\mathcal{T}(H)$ : the set of all trace-class operators acting in  $H$ ,

$S$ : the adjoint of a unilateral shift acting in  $H$ ,

$\mathcal{A}(T)$ : the ultraweakly closed algebra generated by all polynomials in  $T$ , where  $T$  belongs to  $\mathcal{L}(H)$ ,

$D$ : the interior of the unit disk.

$\overline{\text{aco}}$ : the closure of the absolutely convex hull.

Consider the bilinear functional on  $\mathcal{L}(H) \times \mathcal{T}(H)$

$$A, K \longrightarrow \text{tr}(AK), \quad A \in \mathcal{L}(H), \quad K \in \mathcal{T}(H).$$

This functional allows an identification of  $\mathcal{L}(H)$  with the conjugate space of  $\mathcal{T}(H)$  and the corresponding  $w^*$ -topology of  $\mathcal{L}(H)$  coincides with the ultraweak topology of  $\mathcal{L}(H)$ . Recall that the ultraweak topology in  $\mathcal{L}(H)$  is the weakest topology which makes the map

$$A \longrightarrow \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle Ax_n, y_n \rangle, \quad A \in \mathcal{L}(H),$$

continuous for any  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset H$ ,  $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset H$ , such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x_n\| \|y_n\| < \infty, \quad \text{where } \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \text{ denotes the scalar product in } H.$$

The equivalence of the two topologies can be found in [5].



pp. 35, 105.

Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$  be given. The set

$$\{ K \in \mathcal{T}(H) : \text{tr}(AK) = 0, \quad (\forall) A \in \mathcal{A}(T) \}$$

is a subspace in  $\mathcal{T}(H)$  and the corresponding quotient space  $\mathcal{T}^T(H)$  is a predual of  $\mathcal{A}(T)$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{A}(T)$  can be canonically identified with the dual space of  $\mathcal{T}^T(H)$ . The norm in  $\mathcal{T}^T(H)$  will be denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_*$ . For any  $x, y \in H$  define  $x \otimes y \in \mathcal{T}(H)$  by the equation

$$(x \otimes y)h = \langle h, y \rangle x, \quad h \in H$$

and denote by  $x \otimes^T y$  the image of  $x \otimes y$  in  $\mathcal{T}^T(H)$ . If  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  are subsets in  $H$  then the sets  $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{T}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{G} \otimes^T \mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{T}^T(H)$  will be pointwise defined.

Let  $H^\infty$  denote the disk algebra of all bounded holomorphic functions defined in  $D$  and endowed with the norm

$$\|f\|_\infty = \sup \{ |f(\lambda)| : \lambda \in D \}, \quad f \in H^\infty$$

The  $w^*$ -topology in  $H^\infty$  will be determined by the predual of  $H^\infty$  as defined in [8], Ch.9. If  $T$  is a completely nonunitary contraction (i.e. no subspace reduces  $T$  to a unitary operator) then by [9], Ch.III, Theorem 2.1 we may consider the operator  $f(T)$  for any  $f \in H^\infty$ . More precisely, we have

$$f(T) = s\text{-}\lim_{r \rightarrow 1-0} f_r(T)$$

where  $f_r(\lambda) = f(r\lambda)$ . Now if  $T$  is a completely non-unitary contraction we may consider the maps

$$\phi^T: H^\infty \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}(T), \quad \phi_*^T: (H^\infty, w^*) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{A}(T), w^*)$$

defined by the equations

$$\phi^T(f) = f(T), \quad \phi_*^T(f) = f(T), \quad f \in H^\infty.$$

The properties of  $\phi^T$  and  $\phi_*^T$  are listed in [9], Ch. III, Theorem 2.1 and 4, Theorem 3.2. We mention only the following consequence of the proof of [4], Theorem 3.2, (g): If  $\phi^T$  is bounded from below then  $\phi_*^T$  maps homeomorphically  $(H^\infty, w^*)$  onto  $(\mathcal{A}(T), w^*)$ . In case  $\phi_*^T$  is a homeomorphism we shall denote by  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda^T$  the  $w^*$ -continuous multiplicative functional in  $\mathcal{A}(T)$  determined by the equation  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda^T \circ \phi_*^T = \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ , where  $\lambda \in D$  and  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  is the evaluation at  $\lambda$  in  $H^\infty$ . As seen in the proof of [4], Lemma 4.2, to any  $w^*$ -continuous linear functional in  $\mathcal{A}(T)$  we can associate an element in  $\mathcal{T}^T(H)$ .

In the present paper we use the techniques of Scott Brown to put in evidence some properties of the predual of  $\mathcal{A}(S)$  (§1), whence we shall derive a generalization of the result of S. Brown, B. Chevreau and C. Pearcy (see Theorem 2.3). Moreover we reduce the invariant subspace problem for a contraction  $T$  with  $\mathcal{E}(T) \supset \partial D$ , to the case when  $\phi_*^T$  is a homeomorphism (see Theorem 2.2).

### 1. Properties of $\mathcal{T}^S(H)$ .

Because by [2], Theorem 7,  $\mathcal{A}(S)$  is isometric isomorphic with  $H^\infty$ , we may consider the functional  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda^S$ ,  $\lambda \in D$ . If  $e_\lambda \in \ker(S - \lambda)$ ,  $\|e_\lambda\| = 1$ , we have

$$(e_\lambda \otimes^S e_\lambda) f(S) = \langle f(S) e_\lambda, e_\lambda \rangle = f(\lambda), \quad f \in H^\infty,$$



consequently  $S = e \overset{S}{x} e$ .

Let  $X$  be an invariant subspace of  $S$  and let  $P, P_\lambda$  denote the orthogonal projections of  $H$  onto  $X$ , resp.  $\ker(S - \lambda)$ . If  $A \in \mathcal{L}(H)$  is given we denote by  $\tilde{A}$  the image of  $A$  in the Calkin algebra. Recall that a set  $\Gamma \subset D$  is called dominant in the sense of L.A. Rubel and A. Shields [10], if

$$\sup \{ |f(\lambda)| : \lambda \in \Gamma \} = \|f\|_\infty, \quad f \in H^\infty.$$

For any  $0 < a < 1$  we put

$$\Gamma_a(X) = \{ \lambda \in D : \|PP_\lambda\| > (1-a^2)^{1/2} \},$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_a(X) = \{ \lambda \in D : \|\tilde{P}\tilde{P}_\lambda\| > (1-a^2)^{1/2} \}.$$

It is plain that we have  $\Gamma_a(X) \supset \tilde{\Gamma}_a(X)$ .

1.1. Proposition. Let  $0 < a < 1$  be such that  $\Gamma_a(X)$  is a dominant set. Then we have

$$\{ \varphi \in \mathcal{T}^S(H) : \|\varphi\|_* \leq 1-a \} \subset \overline{\text{aco}}(B_X \overset{S}{\otimes} B_X).$$

Proof. Let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}^S(H)$  be given. For any  $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^m \subset \Gamma_a(X)$ ,

$\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^m$  complex numbers,  $e_k \in \ker(S - \lambda_k)$  such that  $\sum_{k=1}^m |\alpha_k| \leq \|\varphi\|_*$

$\|e_k\|=1$ ,  $\|Pe_k\| > (1-a^2)^{1/2}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k Pe_k \overset{S}{\otimes} Pe_k\|_* &= \|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k Pe_k \overset{S}{\otimes} e_k\|_* \leq \\ &\leq \|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k e_k \overset{S}{\otimes} e_k\|_* + \sum_{k=1}^m |\alpha_k| \|e_k \overset{S}{\otimes} e_k - Pe_k \overset{S}{\otimes} e_k\|_* = \end{aligned}$$



$$= \|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k \tilde{e}_k^S\|_* + \sum_{k=1}^m |\alpha_k| \|(I-P)e_k\| <$$

$$< \|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k \tilde{e}_k^S\|_* + a \|\varphi\|_*.$$

Since by [4], Proposition 2.8,  $\|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \tilde{e}_k^S\|_*$  can be made arbitrarily small we derive

$$\text{dist}(\varphi, \overline{\text{aco}}(B_X \otimes B_X)) \leq a \|\varphi\|_*.$$

We shall prove by induction the relation

$$(*) \inf \left\{ \|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^n \varphi_k\|_* : \varphi_k \in \alpha^{k-1} \overline{\text{aco}}(B_X \otimes B_X) \right\} \leq \alpha^n \|\varphi\|_*.$$

Because we already proved (\*) for  $n=1$ , assume (\*) holds true for  $n \leq m$  and pick  $\varphi_k \in \alpha^{k-1} \overline{\text{aco}}(B_X \otimes B_X)$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq m$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ . But we have

$$\text{dist}(\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \varphi_k, \|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \varphi_k\|_* \overline{\text{aco}}(B_X \otimes B_X)) \leq \alpha \|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \varphi_k\|_*$$

consequently we can find  $\varphi_{m+1} \in \|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \varphi_k\|_* \overline{\text{aco}}(B_X \otimes B_X)$  such that

$$\|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^{m+1} \varphi_k\|_* < (\alpha + \varepsilon) \|\varphi - \sum_{k=1}^m \varphi_k\|_*$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrarily small and the induction hypothesis (\*) follows for  $n=m+1$ . Now we observe that we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \|\varphi_k\|_* \leq \|\varphi\|_* \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha^{k-1} \leq \|\varphi\|_* (1 - \alpha)^{-1}$$

whence  $\sum_{k=1}^n \varphi_k \in (1-\alpha)^{-1} \|\varphi\|_* \overline{\text{co}}(B_X \overset{S}{\otimes} B_X)$  and this implies

$$\text{dist}(\varphi, (1-\alpha)^{-1} \|\varphi\|_* \overline{\text{co}}(B_X \overset{S}{\otimes} B_X)) = 0.$$

Thus if  $\|\varphi\|_* \leq 1-\alpha$  we have

$$\varphi \in (1-\alpha)^{-1} \|\varphi\|_* \overline{\text{co}}(B_X \overset{S}{\otimes} B_X) \subset \overline{\text{co}}(B_X \overset{S}{\otimes} B_X).$$

1.2. Lemma. For any  $h \in H$  the function

$$x \longrightarrow h \otimes x, \quad x \in H,$$

is weakly sequentially continuous.

Proof. Since  $H = \text{span} \{ \ker(S-\lambda) \}_{\lambda \in D}$  it suffices to assume  $h \in \ker(S-\lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in D$ . But in this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|h \otimes x\|_* &= \sup \{ |\langle f(S)h, x \rangle| : f \in B_{H^\infty} \} = \\ &= |\langle h, x \rangle| \sup \{ |f(\lambda)| : f \in B_{H^\infty} \} = \\ &= |\langle h, x \rangle| \end{aligned}$$

and the continuity becomes obvious.

1.3. Lemma. Let  $0 < \alpha < 1$ ,  $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}^S(H)$ ,  $x, y \in H$  be such that  $\tilde{I}_\alpha^S(X)$  is a dominant set and put  $\|\varphi - x \overset{S}{\otimes} y\|_* = b$ . Then we have

$$\text{dist}(\varphi, (x + \sqrt{b} B_X) \overset{S}{\otimes} (y + \sqrt{b} B_X)) \leq \alpha \sqrt{b} (\|y\|^2 + b)^{1/2}.$$

If, moreover, the function

$$x \longrightarrow x \overset{S}{\otimes} h, \quad x \in X$$

is weakly sequentially continuous for any  $h \in X$  then



Proof. Let  $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^m \subset \tilde{T}_a(X)$ ,  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^m$  be given. Because we have  $\|\tilde{P}\tilde{P}_{\lambda_k}\| > (1-a^2)^{1/2}$  we can find  $z_k \in \ker(S-\lambda_k)$ ,  $\|z_k\|=1$  such that (see [7])

$$\|Pz_k\| > (1-a^2)^{1/2}, \quad z_k \perp z_j, \quad (I-P)z_k \perp (I-P)z_j, \quad k \neq j.$$

If we put

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \sum_{k=1}^m \sqrt{\alpha_k} z_k, \quad v = \sum_{k=1}^m \sqrt{\alpha_k} z_k, \quad x' = Pu, \quad y' = Pv, \\ x' \otimes^S y' &= x' \otimes^S v = u \otimes^S v - (I-P)u \otimes^S v, \\ x' \otimes^S y &= u \otimes^S y - (I-P)u \otimes^S y, \\ u \otimes^S v &= \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k \tilde{e}_{\lambda_k}^S, \\ u \otimes^S y &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi - (x+x') \otimes^S (y+y') &= \varphi - x \otimes^S y - x' \otimes^S y' - x \otimes^S y' - x' \otimes^S y = \\ &= \varphi - x \otimes^S y - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k \tilde{e}_{\lambda_k}^S + (I-P)u \otimes^S (v+y) - x \otimes^S y'. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\eta > 0$  be fixed. Applying [4], Proposition 2.8 we may suppose  $\sum_{k=1}^m |\alpha_k| \leq b$  and  $\|\varphi - x \otimes^S y - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k \tilde{e}_{\lambda_k}^S\|_* < \eta$ . But it is easy to see that we may choose  $y'$  orthogonal to any given finite-dimensional subspace, thus by Lemma 1.2, we may also suppose  $\|x \otimes^S y'\|_* < \eta$ . Consequently we may determine  $x', y' \in X$  such that

$$\|\varphi - (x+x') \otimes^S (y+y')\|_* < 2\eta + \|(I-P)u \otimes^S (v+y)\|_*,$$

$$\|x'\| \leq \sqrt{b}, \quad \|y'\| \leq \sqrt{b}, \quad \|v+y\|^2 \leq b + \|y\|^2,$$

$$\|(I-P)u\|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^m |\alpha_k| \|(I-P)z_k\|^2 \leq a^2 b$$



and this implies

$$\text{dist}(\varphi, (x + \sqrt{b} B_X) \otimes^S (y + \sqrt{b} B_X)) \leq \alpha \sqrt{b} (\|y\|^2 + b)^{1/2}.$$

If the function

$$x \rightarrow x \otimes^S r, \quad x \in X$$

is weakly sequentially continuous for any  $h \in X$ , then as before we may suppose  $\|Pu \otimes^S y\|_* < \eta$ , thus

$$\|\varphi - (x+x') \otimes^S (y+y')\|_* < 3\eta + \|(I-P)u \otimes^S v\|_* \leq 3\eta + \alpha b$$

and the proof is concluded.

1.4. Theorem. If  $\tilde{T}_a(X)$  is dominant for any  $0 < a < 1$   
then we have

$$\{\varphi \in \mathcal{T}^S(H) : \|\varphi\|_* < 1\} = B_X \otimes^S B_X.$$

Proof. Let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}^S(H)$  be given. Applying Lemma 1.3 we can find by induction two sequences  $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty, \{y_k\}_{k=0}^\infty \subset X$  such that

$$x_0 = y_0 = 0, \quad b_{k+1} \leq \alpha_{k+1} \sqrt{b_k} (\|y_k\|^2 + b_k)^{1/2}, \quad \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| \leq \sqrt{b_k}, \quad \|y_{k+1} - y_k\| \leq \sqrt{b_k},$$

where  $b_k = \|\varphi - x_k \otimes^S y_k\|_*$ ,  $0 < \alpha_k < 1$ . If  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  converges enough fast to zero then  $x_k \xrightarrow{S} x, y_k \xrightarrow{S} y, \varphi = x \otimes^S y$  and  $|\|x\| - \|\varphi\|_*^{1/2}|, |\|y\| - \|\varphi\|_*^{1/2}|$  can be made arbitrarily small. This implies the inclusion "C" and because the opposite inclusion is trivial, the proof is concluded.

1.5. Theorem. Let  $0 < a < 1$  be such that  $\tilde{\Gamma}_a(X)$  is a dominant set. If the function

$$x \longrightarrow x \overset{S}{\otimes} h, \quad x \in X$$

is weakly sequentially continuous for any  $h \in X$ , then we have

$$\{\varphi \in \mathcal{T}^S(H) : \|\varphi\|_* < 1-a\} \subset B_X \overset{S}{\otimes} B_X.$$

Proof. Let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}^S(H)$  be given. Applying Lemma 1.3 we can find two sequences  $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^\infty, \{y_k\}_{k=0}^\infty \subset X$  such that

$$x_0 = y_0 = 0, \quad \|\varphi - x_k \overset{S}{\otimes} y_k\|_* < a^k \|\varphi\|_*, \quad \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| \leq (a \|\varphi\|_*)^{1/2}, \quad \|y_{k+1} - y_k\| \leq (a \|\varphi\|_*)^{1/2}.$$

It is easy to see that we may also suppose  $x_{k+1} - x_k \perp x_{j+1} - x_j$

$y_{k+1} - y_k \perp y_{j+1} - y_j, k \neq j$ , thus we deduce

$$x_k \xrightarrow{S} x, \quad y_k \xrightarrow{S} y, \quad \varphi = x \overset{S}{\otimes} y,$$

$$\|x\|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^\infty \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 \leq (1-a)^{-1} \|\varphi\|_*^2,$$

$$\|y\|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^\infty \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 \leq (1-a)^{-1} \|\varphi\|_*^2.$$

Now the inclusion in our Theorem becomes obvious.

In the remainder of this section we shall denote by  $A$  the restriction of  $S$  to  $X$ . Since  $A$  is a completely nonunitary operator we may consider the maps

$$\phi^A : H^\infty \longrightarrow A(A), \quad \phi_*^A : (H^\infty, w^*) \longrightarrow (A(A), w^*).$$

We already mentioned that in case  $\phi^A$  is bounded from below,  $\phi_*^A$  becomes a homeomorphism.

1.6. Theorem. (i) If  $\tilde{\Gamma}_a(X)$  is dominant for some  $0 < a < 1$  then we have

$$\|\phi^A(f)\| \geq (1-a) \|f\|_\infty, \quad f \in H^\infty,$$



consequently  $\phi_*^A$  is a homeomorphism.

(ii) If  $\tilde{T}_a(X)$  is dominant for any  $0 < a < 1$  then for any  $\lambda \in D$  there exists  $x_\lambda \in X$ ,  $\|x_\lambda\|=1$  such that

$$e_\lambda^A = x_\lambda \otimes x_\lambda.$$

(iii) If  $\tilde{T}_a(X)$  is dominant for some  $0 < a < 1$  and the function

$$x \rightarrow x \otimes^S h, \quad x \in X$$

is continuous for any  $h \in X$ , then for any  $\lambda \in D$  there exists  $x_\lambda \in X$ ,  $\|x_\lambda\|=1$  such that

$$e_\lambda^A = x_\lambda \otimes^A x_\lambda.$$

Proof. (i) Let  $f \in H^\infty$  be given and let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}(H)$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  be such that  $\|\varphi\|_* = 1$ ,  $|\varphi(f(S))| + \varepsilon > \|f\|_\infty$ . Now using Proposition 1.1 we can find  $K \in \mathcal{T}(X)$ ,  $\|K\|_{tr} \leq (1-a)^{-1}$  such that  $|\text{tr}(f(S)KP)| + \varepsilon > \|f\|_\infty$ . Using the relation

$$\text{tr}(f(S)KP) = \text{tr}(f(A)K)$$

we derive

$$\|f(A)\| \geq (1-a) |\text{tr}(f(A)K)| > (1-a)(\|f\|_\infty - \varepsilon)$$

whence it follows

$$\|\phi^A(f)\| \geq (1-a)\|f\|_\infty.$$

(ii) By Theorem 1.4 we know that we have  $e_\lambda^S = x \otimes^S y$  for some  $x, y \in X$ . Let  $B$  denote the restriction of  $A$  to the invariant subspace  $\text{span}\{A^k x\}_{k=0}^\infty$ . Since  $e_\lambda^S((S - \lambda)^k) = 0 = \langle (B - \lambda)^k x, y \rangle$ ,  $k \geq 1$  and  $\langle x, y \rangle = 1$  it follows that the range of  $B - \lambda$  is not dense. If we take  $x_\lambda \in \ker(B - \lambda)^*$ ,  $\|x_\lambda\|=1$  then for any polynomial  $p$  we have



$$(x_\lambda \otimes x_\lambda)^A(p(A)) = \langle p(A)x_\lambda, x_\lambda \rangle = \langle p(B)x_\lambda, x_\lambda \rangle = p(\lambda).$$

Since by (i)  $e_\lambda^A$  is well defined and coincides with  $x_\lambda \otimes x_\lambda^A$  on the set of all polynomials we infer  $e_\lambda^A = x_\lambda \otimes x_\lambda^A$ .

(iii) We proceed as in (ii).

1.7. Corollary. If either the condition (ii) or the condition (iii) of Theorem 1.6 is fulfilled then A has a proper invariant subspace.

Proof. Let  $\lambda \in D$  be given. By Theorem 1.6 we can find  $x_\lambda \in X$ ,  $\|x_\lambda\| = 1$  such that  $e_\lambda^A = x_\lambda \otimes x_\lambda^A$ . If we put  $X_\lambda = \text{span} \{(A-\lambda)^k x_\lambda\}_{k=0}^\infty$ , then  $X_\lambda \perp x_\lambda$ , thus  $X_\lambda$  is an invariant subspace and  $X_\lambda \neq X$ . In case  $X_\lambda \neq \{0\}$  the proper invariant subspace of A looked for is  $X_\lambda$ ; if  $X_\lambda = \{0\}$ ,  $x_\lambda$  is an eigenvector and A has a one-dimensional invariant subspace.

## 2. Invariant subspaces

Throughout this section we shall denote by T a fixed contraction acting in H. For any  $0 < a < 1$  put

$$\mathcal{J}_a(T) = D \cap (\sigma(T) \cup \{\lambda \in \sigma(T) : a\|(\lambda - T)^{-1}\| > (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\}),$$

$$\mathcal{J}_a(\tilde{T}) = D \cap (\sigma(\tilde{T}) \cup \{\lambda \in \sigma(\tilde{T}) : a\|(\lambda - \tilde{T})^{-1}\| > (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\}).$$

Recall that T is by definition a contraction of class  $C_0$  if  $T^n \xrightarrow{s} 0$  (see [9], Ch.II, §4).

2.1. Lemma. If  $\sigma(T) \supset \partial D$  and  $\mathcal{J}_a(T)$  is not dominant for some  $0 < a < 1$  then T has a proper hyperinvariant subspace (i.e. there exists a proper subspace in H invariant for all operators which commute with T).

Proof. It is easy to see that the set

$$\mathcal{J}'_a(\mathcal{T}) = D \cap (\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) \cup \{\lambda \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}) : \alpha \|(\lambda - \mathcal{T})^{-1}\| \geq (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}\})$$

is not dominant. Arguing as in [3], Lemma 3.1 we can find a measurable set  $\mathcal{G} \subset \partial D$  of positive Lebesgue measure such that for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$  we have

$$\Gamma'_\mu = \{t\mu : \varepsilon_\mu < t < 1\} \subset D \setminus \mathcal{J}'_a(\mathcal{T})$$

for some  $0 < \varepsilon_\mu < 1$ . Further we observe that because  $\mathcal{G}$  is not countable and  $D \setminus \mathcal{J}'_a(\mathcal{T})$  being open has at most countable many connected components, there exists a connected component  $G$  of  $D \setminus \mathcal{J}'_a(\mathcal{T})$  such that

$$\Gamma'_{\mu_k} \subset G, \quad 1 \leq k \leq 4, \quad \mu_k \in \mathcal{G}, \quad \mu_k \neq \mu_j, \quad k \neq j.$$

If  $\mu_k = e^{i\theta_k}$ ,  $0 \leq \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \theta_3 < \theta_4 < 2\pi$  and if we put

$$\Gamma'_{1,2} = \{e^{i\theta} : \theta_1 < \theta < \theta_2\}, \quad \Gamma'_{3,4} = \{e^{i\theta} : \theta_3 < \theta < \theta_4\},$$

$$\Gamma_{\mu_k} = \{t\mu_k : \varepsilon_{\mu_k} < t < 1 + \varepsilon_{\mu_k}\},$$

then we can find two simple rectifiable closed curves  $\Gamma_{1,2} > \Gamma_{3,4}$  enjoying the properties:

$$\Gamma_{1,2} \cap \partial D = \{\mu_1\} \cup \{\mu_2\}, \quad \Gamma_{3,4} \cap \partial D = \{\mu_3\} \cup \{\mu_4\}, \quad \Gamma_{1,2} \cap \Gamma_{3,4} = \emptyset,$$

$$\Gamma_{1,2} \cap D \subset G, \quad \Gamma_{3,4} \cap D \subset G, \quad \Gamma_{1,2} \supset \Gamma_{\mu_1} \cup \Gamma_{\mu_2}, \quad \Gamma_{3,4} \supset \Gamma_{\mu_3} \cup \Gamma_{\mu_4},$$

$$\Gamma'_{1,2} \text{ is surrounded by } \Gamma_{1,2}, \quad \Gamma'_{3,4} \text{ is surrounded by } \Gamma_{3,4}.$$

Since  $G \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\alpha \|(\lambda - \mathcal{T})^{-1}\| < (1 - |\lambda|)^{-1}$ ,  $\lambda \in G$  the

operators

$$B_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{1,2}} (\lambda - \mu_1)(\lambda - \mu_2)(\lambda - \mathcal{T})^{-1} d\lambda, \quad B_{3,4} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{3,4}} (\lambda - \mu_3)(\lambda - \mu_4)(\lambda - \mathcal{T})^{-1} d\lambda$$

are well defined and the inclusion  $\partial D \supset \Gamma'_{1,2} \cup \Gamma'_{3,4}$  implies (via Gelfand Representation Theorem)  $B_{1,2} \neq 0$ ,  $B_{2,3} \neq 0$ .

Let  $\Omega$  denote the unbounded domain whose boundary is

$\Gamma'_{1,2}$  and let  $H'$  denote the linear manifold of all vectors  $h \in H$  such that the function

$$\lambda \longrightarrow (\lambda - T)^{-1} h, \quad |\lambda| > 1$$

has an analytic extension in  $\Omega$ . It is plain that  $H'$  is invariant under any operator which commutes with  $T$  and the norm-closure  $\overline{H'}$  enjoys the same property. Let  $x \in H'$  be given,  $g_x$  be the analytic extension in  $\Omega$  of the function

$$\lambda \longrightarrow (\lambda - T)^{-1} x, \quad |\lambda| > 1.$$

Because  $\Gamma'_{3,4} \subset \Omega$  we have

$$B_{3,4} x = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma'_{3,4}} (\lambda - \mu_3)(\lambda - \mu_4) g_x(\lambda) d\lambda = 0$$

thus  $\overline{H'} \subset \ker B_{3,4} \neq H$ . On the other hand if  $y \notin \ker B_{1,2}$  and we put  $z = B_{1,2} y$  then the function

$$g_z(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma'_{1,2}} (\mu - \mu_1)(\mu - \mu_2)(\mu - \lambda)^{-1} (\mu - T)^{-1} y d\mu$$

is analytic in  $\Omega$  and

$$(\lambda - T) g_z(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma'_{1,2}} (\mu - \mu_1)(\mu - \mu_2)(\mu - \lambda) d\mu + z = z.$$

This shows that  $g_z$  is an analytic extension in  $\Omega$  of the function

$$\lambda \longrightarrow (\lambda - T)^{-1} z, \quad |\lambda| > 1$$

and  $z \in H' \neq \{0\}$ . It follows that  $H'$  is a proper subspace and the proof is concluded.



Remark. The idea of proof used in the above Lemma involves a functional calculus similar with the techniques of [12].

2.2. Theorem. If  $\sigma(T) \supset \partial D$  and  $T$  has no proper hyperinvariant subspace then  $\Phi^T$  is well defined and  $\|\Phi^T(f)\| = \|f\|_\infty$ ,  $f \in H^\infty$ , consequently  $\Phi^T$  is a homeomorphism.

Proof. Using [9], Ch.II, Theorem 5.4 we may suppose either  $T \in C_0$  or  $T^* \in C_0$ , thus anyway  $T$  is a completely non-unitary contraction and  $\Phi^T$  will be well defined. Because  $\Phi^T$  and  $\Phi^{T^*}$  could be isometries only simultaneously we may suppose  $T \in C_0$  and by [9] Ch.II, Theorem 2.1,  $T$  will be unitarily equivalent with  $A = S|X$ , as defined at the end of § 1. To avoid the existence of proper hyperinvariant subspaces for  $T$  we have to assume  $\sigma(T) = \sigma_\ell(T) = \sigma_*(T) = \sigma_p(T) = \sigma_r(T)$ . Now we have to prove that  $\Phi^A$  is an isometry. To this aim put

$$S(\lambda) = (\lambda - S)^* [(\lambda - S)(\lambda - S)^*]^{-1}, \lambda \in D$$

and observe that  $S(\lambda)$  is a right inverse of  $\lambda - S$ ,  $S(\lambda)H$  is orthogonal to  $\ker(S - \lambda)$  and  $S(\lambda)(\lambda - S) = I - P_N$ . This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|y\| &= \|(\lambda - S)S(\omega)y\| \geq \|S(\omega)y\| \inf\{\|(\lambda - S)h\| : h \perp \ker(S - \lambda), \|h\| = 1\} = \\ &= \|S(\omega)y\| \inf\{\|(\lambda - S)^*h\| : \|h\| = 1\} = \\ &= \|S(\omega)y\|(1 - |\omega|), \quad (\forall) y \in H, \end{aligned}$$

thus  $\|S(\omega)\| = 1 - |\omega|$ . Since for any  $\lambda \in \rho(A)$  we obviously have

$$\inf\{\|(\lambda - A)x\| : x \in X, \|x\| = 1\} = \|(\lambda - A)^{-1}\|^{-1}$$

we infer that for any  $\lambda \in \rho_a(T)$  the inequality

$$\inf\{\|(\lambda - A)x\| : x \in X, \|x\| = 1\} < \alpha(1 - |\omega|)$$

holds. It follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|P_R\|^2 &= \|R_P\|^2 = \sup\{\|R x\|^2 : x \in X, \|x\|=1\} = \\
 &= 1 - \inf\{\|(I-R)x\|^2 : x \in X, \|x\|=1\} = \\
 &= 1 - \inf\{\|S(\lambda)(\lambda-S)x\|^2 : x \in X, \|x\|=1\} \geq \\
 &\geq 1 - \|S(\lambda)\|^2 \inf\{\|(\lambda-A)x\|^2 : x \in X, \|x\|=1\} > \\
 &> 1 - \alpha^2
 \end{aligned}$$

which means  $\lambda \in \Gamma_a(X)$  and  $\mathcal{I}_a(\mathcal{T}) \subset \Gamma_a(X)$ . But  $\mathcal{I}_a(\mathcal{T})$  is dominant for any  $0 < a < 1$ , by Lemma 2.1, thus by Theorem 1.6 (i)

$$\|\Phi^A(f)\| \geq (1-\alpha)\|f\|_\infty, f \in H^\infty, 0 < \alpha < 1$$

and the proof is concluded.

**2.3. Theorem.** If  $\mathcal{I}_a(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})$  is dominant for any  $0 < a < 1$ , then  $T$  has a proper invariant subspace.

Proof. Making the same reductions as in the proof of Theorem 2.2 we know in particular that  $T$  is unitarily equivalent with  $A=S|_X$ . Let  $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}_a(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})$  be given. Then it is easy to see that there exists an orthonormal sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset X$  such that

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(\lambda - A)x_n\| < \alpha(1-|\lambda|)$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\tilde{P}_R\|^2 &= \|\tilde{P}_R\|^2 \geq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|R x_n\|^2 = 1 - \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(I-R)x_n\|^2 = \\
 &= 1 - \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S(\lambda)(\lambda-A)x_n\|^2 \geq 1 - \|S(\lambda)\|^2 \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(\lambda-A)x_n\|^2 > \\
 &> 1 - \alpha^2.
 \end{aligned}$$



This shows that we have  $\mathfrak{I}_\alpha(\tilde{T}) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}_\alpha(X)$  consequently  $\tilde{\Gamma}_\alpha(X)$  is dominant for any  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . To conclude the <sup>proof</sup> we apply Corollary 1.7.

Remark. If  $D \cap \mathfrak{S}(T)$  is dominant then  $T$  has a proper invariant subspace by the Theorem of Brown-Chevreaux-Pearcy [4].

2.4. Corollary. If  $\mathfrak{S}(T) \supset \partial D$  and  $\|(\lambda - T)^{-1}\| = \|(\lambda - \tilde{T})^{-1}\|, \lambda \in \rho(T)$  then  $T$  has a proper invariant subspace.

Proof. Because we may suppose  $\mathfrak{S}(T) = \mathfrak{S}_\rho(\tilde{T}) = \mathfrak{S}_r(\tilde{T})$  we derive  $\mathfrak{I}_\alpha(T) = \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(\tilde{T}), 0 < \alpha < 1$ . If  $\mathfrak{I}_\alpha(T)$  is not dominant for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$  we apply Lemma 2.1 and in the contrary case we apply Theorem 2.3.

2.5. Theorem If  $T \in C_0, T^* \in C_0$  and  $\mathfrak{I}_\alpha(\tilde{T})$  is dominant for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$  then  $T$  has a proper invariant subspace.

Proof. As seen in the proof of Theorem 2.3 we may suppose that  $T$  is unitarily equivalent with  $A = S|X$  and  $\Gamma_\alpha(X)$  is a dominant set. Because by [9], Ch.II, Theorem 2.1, the isometric dilation  $W$  of  $A$  is a unilateral shift, if we put

$$\tilde{f}(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{a}_n \lambda^n \quad \text{if } f \in H^\infty, \quad f(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \lambda^n$$

we have for any  $x, h \in X$

$$\begin{aligned} |(x \otimes h) f(A)| &= |\langle f(A)x, h \rangle| = |\langle x, \tilde{f}(A^*)h \rangle| = \\ &= |\langle x, \tilde{f}(W^*)h \rangle| = |(h \otimes x) f(W^*)| \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 1.2 we infer that the function

$$x \longrightarrow x \otimes h, \quad x \in X$$

is weakly sequentially continuous and the proof is concluded if we use Corollary 1.7.

R E F E R E N C E S

- [1] J. Agler, An invariant subspace theorem (to appear).
- [2] A. Brown and P. R. Halmos, Algebraic properties of Toeplitz operators, J. Reine Angew. Math. 213 (1964), 89-109.
- [3] S. Brown, Invariant subspaces for subnormal operators, (to appear).
- [4] S. Brown, B. Chevreau and C. Pearcy, An invariant subspace theorem, (to appear).
- [5] J. Dixmier, Les algèbres d'opérateurs dans l'espace hilbertien, Gauthier Villars, Paris, 1957.
- [6] N. Dunford and J. T. Schwartz, Linear Operators, I, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1958.
- [7] P. A. Fillmore, J. G. Stampfli and J. P. Williams, On the essential numerical range, the essential spectrum and a problem of Halmos, Acta Sci. Math. 33 (1973), 179-192.
- [8] K. Hoffman, Banach spaces of analytic functions, Prentice Hall, 1962.
- [9] B. Sz. Nagy - C. Foiaş, Analyse harmonique des opérateurs de l'espace de Hilbert, Budapest, 1967.
- [10] L. A. Rubel and A. Shields, The space of bounded analytic functions on a region, Ann. Inst. Fourier, 16 (1966), 235-277.
- [11] S. Sakai,  $C^*$ -algebras and  $W^*$ -algebras, Springer Verlag, 1971.
- [12] J. T. Schwartz, Subdiagonalization of operators in Hilbert space with compact imaginary part, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 15 (1962), 159-172.
- [13] J. G. Stampfli,