

THEORY OF SPECTRAL DECOMPOSITIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE IDENTITY FOR CLOSED OPERATORS*

WANG SHENGWANG (王声望)**

Abstract

In this paper, the author discusses some properties of closed operators acting on a Banach space with the spectral decomposition property with respect to the identity (abbrev. SDI). First, some equivalent conditions are given for a closed operator T to have the SDI. Next, for every hyperinvariant subspace Y of T with the SDI, it is proved that the coinduced operator $\hat{T} = T/Y$ has the SDI. Finally, properties of maximal nets of hyperinvariant subspaces are discussed.

In the present paper, the author discusses some properties of maximal nets of hyperinvariant subspaces for a given closed operator T with the spectral decomposition property with respect to the identity (abbrev. SDI). Let O be the complex plane, X a complex Banach space. The sign $O(X)$ denotes the set of all closed operators T acting in X and $B(X)$ denotes [the algebra of all bounded operators acting on X . A set $E \subset O$ is called a neighborhood of ∞ , denoted by $E \in V_\infty$, if for $r > 0$ sufficiently large

$$\{\lambda \in O: |\lambda| > r\} \subset E.$$

An open set $\Delta \subset O$ is called a Cauchy domain if it has a finite number of components and its boundary $\partial\Delta$ is a positively oriented finite system of closed, nonintersecting, rectifiable Jordan curves. The following definition was given in [2, 9].

Definition 1. Given $T \in O(X)$ and a positive integer $n \geq 1$. We say that T has the n -spectral decomposition property with respect to the identity (n -SDI), if for every open cover $\{G_i\}_{i=0}^n$ of $\sigma(T)$, where G_0 is a neighborhood of ∞ , there exists a system $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^n$ of invariant subspaces of T with the following properties:

- (i) $\sigma(T|X_i) \subset G_i$ for $i=0, 1, 2, \dots, n$;
- (ii) if $G_i (1 \leq i \leq n)$ is relatively compact, then $X_i \subset D_T$;
- (iii) there exists $P_i \in B(X) (0 \leq i \leq n)$ commuting with T , such that

Manuscript received April 6, 1983, Revised October 14, 1983.

* Project supported by the Foundation of the Chinese Academy of Science.

** Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing, China.

$$I = \sum_{i=0}^n P_i, R(P_i) \subset X_i \quad (0 \leq i \leq n).$$

If for every $n \geq 1$, T has the n -SDI, then we say that T has the spectral decomposition property with respect to the identity (SDI).

It is easily seen that if T has the n -SDI, then it has the n -SDP and hence for every closed $F \subset O$, $X_T(F)$ is closed (see [1] Theorem 3). If F is compact, then [1, Theorem 4] implies that

$$\begin{aligned} X_T(F) &= X_T^0(F) \oplus X_T(\emptyset), \\ \sigma(T|X_T^0(F)) &= \sigma(T|X_T(F)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in Definition 1, X_0 can be replaced by $X_T(\bar{G}_0)$ and $X_i (1 \leq i \leq n)$ can be replaced by $X_T^0(\bar{G}_i)$. Furthermore, using a similar argument given in [2], we can prove that if T has the n -SDI, then it has the $(n+1)$ -SDI. Thus, if T has the 1-SDI, then it has the n -SDI for every $n \geq 1$ and hence it has the SDI. As for the open cover $\{G_i\}_{i=0}^n$ of $\sigma(T)$ in Definition 1, it is easily shown that $\{G_i\}_{i=0}^n$ can be changed as the cover of O .

The following Theorem is an extension of [3, Theorem 2.2] to the unbounded case, so we only sketch out the proof.

Theorem 2. *Given T , then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i) T has the SDI;
- (ii) (a) T has the SDP,
- (b) for every closed $F \subset O$ and every open $G \in V_\infty$, if $G \supset F$, then there exists an operator $P \in B(X)$ commuting with T such that

$$Px = x \text{ for every } x \in X_T(F), R(P) \subset X_T(\bar{G});$$

- (iii) (a) T has the SDP,
- (b) for every closed $F \subset O$ and every open $G \in V_\infty$, if $G \supset F$, then there exists a $B(X)$ -valued analytic function R_λ for $\lambda \notin \bar{G}$ commuting with T such that

$$(\lambda - T)R_\lambda x = x \text{ for every } x \in X_T(F),$$

$$R(R_\lambda) \subset X_T(\bar{G}) \cap D_T.$$

Proof (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). Put $G_0 = G$ and let open G_1 be relatively compact and

$$\bar{G}_1 \cap F = \emptyset, G_0 \cup G_1 \supset \sigma(T),$$

then there exists $P_i \in B(X)$ ($i=0, 1$) commuting with T such that

$$I = P_0 + P_1, R(P_0) \subset X_T(\bar{G}_0), R(P_1) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G}_1). \quad (1)$$

For $x \in X_T(F)$, we have $P_1 x = 0$ and hence $P_0 x = x$. Let $P = P_0$, it follows from (1) that P satisfies the request.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). Let P be the operator given in (ii). Then the operator

$$R_\lambda = (\lambda - T|X_T(\bar{G}))^{-1}P$$

for $\lambda \notin \bar{G}$ satisfies all the properties given in (iii).

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Let $\{G_0, G_1\}$ be an open cover of $\sigma(T)$ with $G_0 \in V_\infty$ and $\bar{G}_0 \neq O$, G_1

relatively compact. Let $H_0 \in V_\infty$ be another open subset such that

$$\bar{H}_0 \subset G_0, H_0 \cup G_1 \supset \sigma(T).$$

Then there exists a $B(X)$ -valued analytic function R_λ for $\lambda \notin \bar{G}_0$, commuting with T such that

$$(\lambda - T)R_\lambda x = x \text{ for } x \in X_T(\bar{H}_0), R(R_\lambda) \subset X_T(\bar{G}_0) \cap D_T. \quad (2)$$

Let $\lambda_0 \notin \bar{G}_0$ be fixed. Put $P_0 = (\lambda_0 - T)R_{\lambda_0}$, $P_1 = I - P_0$, then $P_i \in B(X)$ ($i=0, 1$) and commutes with T . Let $x \in X$, there corresponds a decomposition

$$x = x_0 + x_1 \text{ with } x_0 \in X_T(\bar{H}_0), x_1 \in X_T^0(\bar{G}_1).$$

It follows from (2) that $P_0 x_0 = x_0$ and hence

$$P_1 x = (I - P_0)x_0 + P_1 x_1 \in X_T^0(\bar{G}_1)$$

or equivalently, $R(P_1) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G}_1)$. (2) also implies that $R(P_0) \subset X_T(\bar{G}_0)$. Then for $X_0 = X_T(\bar{G}_0)$, $X_1 = X_T^0(\bar{G}_1)$ and P_0, P_1 , all the conditions in Definition 1 are satisfied. T thus has the SDI.

Remara. If $F \subset C$ is compact, then the conditions (ii) and (iii) given in Theorem 3 can be replaced by the following ones respectively:

(ii') (a) T has the SDP,

(b) for every compact F and every relatively compact open G , if $G \supset F$, then there exists $P \in B(X)$ commuting with T such that

$$Px = x \text{ for } x \in X_T^0(F), R(P) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G});$$

(iii') (a) T has the SDP,

(b) for every compact F and every relatively compact open G , if $G \supset F$, then there exists $B(X)$ -valued analytic function R_λ for $\lambda \notin \bar{G}$, commuting with T and

$$(\lambda - T)R_\lambda x = x \text{ for } x \in X_T^0(F), R(R_\lambda) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G}).$$

Lemma 3. Let $T: D_T \rightarrow X$ be a linear operator. Y_i ($i=0, 1$) is invariant under T and satisfies

$$X = Y_0 + Y_1, Y_1 \subset D_T, T|Y_1 \in B(Y_1). \quad (3)$$

Then T is closed iff $T|Y_0$ is closed.

Proof The "only if" part is evident.

"If". It follows from (3) that there exists a number $M > 0$ such that for every $x \in X$, there exists $y_i \in Y_i$ ($i=0, 1$) satisfying

$$x = y_0 + y_1, \|y_0\| + \|y_1\| \leq M\|x\|. \quad (4)$$

To prove the closedness of T , let $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset D_T$ satisfy

$$\{x_n\} \rightarrow x, \{Tx_n\} \rightarrow z.$$

Without loss of generality, we may suppose that

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \|x_{n+1} - x_n\| < +\infty.$$

It follows from (4) that for every x_n , there exists $y_{ni} \in Y_i$ ($i=0, 1$) such that

$$x_n = y_{n0} + y_{n1};$$

$$\|y_{n+10} - y_{n0}\| + \|y_{n+11} - y_{n1}\| \leq M \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|$$

and hence $\{y_{ni}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ converges. Let

$$\lim y_{ni} = y_i (i=0, 1).$$

Since $T|Y_1$ is bounded, we have $Ty_{n1} \rightarrow Ty_1$ and hence

$$Ty_{n0} \rightarrow z - Ty_1. \quad (5)$$

(5) and the closedness of $T|Y_0$ imply that $y_0 \in Y_0 \cap D_T$ and $Ty_0 = z - Ty_1$. Thus $x = y_0 + y_1 \in D_T$, $Tx = Ty_0 + Ty_1 = z$ and hence T is closed.

Theorem 4. *Given T with the SDI. If $Z \subset X$ is hyperinvariant under T , then the coinduced operator T on X/Z of T is closed.*

Proof The proof consists of three stages.

A. Let $F \subset C$ be a closed subset and let $G \supset F$ be open and $\bar{G} \neq C$. It follows from Theorem 2 that there exists an operator $P \in B(X)$ commuting with T such that

$$Px = x \text{ for every } x \in X_T(F), \mathcal{R}(P) \subset X_T(\bar{G}).$$

Put $R_\lambda = (\lambda - T|X_T(\bar{G}))^{-1}P$ for $\lambda \notin \bar{G}$, then $\mathcal{R}(R_\lambda) \subset X_T(\bar{G}) \cap D_T$ and for every $x \in X$,

$$(\lambda - T)R_\lambda x = Px. \quad (6)$$

(6) implies that $T R_\lambda \in B(X)$ and hence $\hat{T} \hat{R}_\lambda = \hat{T} \hat{R}_\lambda \in B(X/Z)$, furthermore, we have for every $\hat{x} \in X/Z$,

$$(\lambda - \hat{T}) \hat{R}_\lambda \hat{x} = \hat{P} \hat{x}. \quad (7)$$

It follows from $\mathcal{R}(R_\lambda) \subset X_T(\bar{G}) \cap D_T$ that

$$\mathcal{R}(PR_\lambda) \subset X_T(\bar{G}) \cap D_T,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} PR_\lambda &= (\lambda - T|X_T(\bar{G}))^{-1}(\lambda - T)PR_\lambda \\ &= (\lambda - T|X_T(\bar{G}))^{-1}P(\lambda - T)R_\lambda = R_\lambda P. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Put

$$\hat{X}_{\bar{G}} = \{\hat{x}: \hat{x} \in X/Z, \hat{P}\hat{x} = \hat{x}\},$$

evidently,

$$\hat{X}_{\bar{G}} \supset \widehat{X_T(F)} = \{\hat{x}: \hat{x} \cap X_T(F) \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (9)$$

Since $\hat{P}$ commutes with $\hat{T}$, we have $\hat{P}\hat{T}\hat{x} = \hat{T}\hat{P}\hat{x} = \hat{T}\hat{x}$ for every $\hat{x} \in \hat{X}_{\bar{G}} \cap D_{\hat{T}}$ and hence $\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}$ is invariant under $\hat{T}$. It follows from (8) that $\hat{P}$ commutes with $\hat{R}_\lambda$, so $\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}$ is invariant under $\hat{R}_\lambda$. (7) and the commutability of $\hat{T}$ with $\hat{R}_\lambda$ imply that

$$(\lambda - \hat{T}) \hat{R}_\lambda \hat{x} = \hat{x} \text{ for } \hat{x} \in \hat{X}_{\bar{G}},$$

$$\hat{R}_\lambda (\lambda - \hat{T}) \hat{x} = \hat{x} \text{ for } \hat{x} \in \hat{X}_{\bar{G}} \cap D_{\hat{T}}$$

and hence $(\lambda - \hat{T}|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}})^{-1} = \hat{R}_\lambda|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}}$. Since $\hat{R}_\lambda|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}} \in B(\hat{X}_{\bar{G}})$, we obtain that $\lambda - \hat{T}|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}}$ is closed and so is $\hat{T}|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}}$. Furthermore, we have

$$\sigma(\hat{T}|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}}) \subset \bar{G}. \quad (10)$$

B. Let F be compact and let open G be relatively compact and $F \subset G$. It

follows from the Remark of Theorem 2 that there exists $P \in B(X)$ such that

$$Px = x \text{ for every } x \in X_T^0(F), \mathcal{R}(P) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G}).$$

Put

$$\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}^0 = \{\hat{x} : \hat{x} \in X/Z, \hat{P}\hat{x} = x\}, \quad (11)$$

evidently, we have

$$\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}^0 \supset \widehat{X_T^0(F)} = \{\hat{x} : \hat{x} \cap X_T^0(F) \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (12)$$

Using the similar manner given in stage A, we can prove that $\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}^0$ is invariant under $\hat{T}$, $\hat{T}|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}^0}$ is closed and

$$\sigma(\hat{T}|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}^0}) \subset \bar{G}. \quad (13)$$

It follows from $\mathcal{R}(P) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G}) \subset D_T$ that $\mathcal{R}(\hat{P}) \subset D_{\hat{T}}$ and hence $\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}^0 \subset D_{\hat{T}}$ by the equality (11). Thus $\hat{T}|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}^0}$ is bounded.

O. In this final stage, we prove that $\hat{T}$ is closed. Let $\{G_0, G_1\}$ be an open cover of $\sigma(T)$ with $G_0 \in V_\infty$, $\bar{G}_0 \neq O$ and G_1 relatively compact. Let $\{H_0, H_1\}$ be another open cover of $\sigma(T)$ such that $H_0 \in V_\infty$, $\bar{H}_0 \subset G_0$ and $\bar{H}_1 \subset G_1$. Then we have

$$X = X_T(\bar{H}_0) + X_T^0(\bar{H}_1)$$

and hence

$$\hat{X} = \widehat{X_T(\bar{H}_0)} + \widehat{X_T^0(\bar{H}_1)}.$$

Applying (9) and (12) to the pairs $\bar{H}_0, G_0$ and $\bar{H}_1, G_1$ respectively, we have

$$\widehat{X_T(\bar{H}_0)} \subset \hat{X}_{\bar{G}_0}, \widehat{X_T^0(\bar{H}_1)} \subset \hat{X}_{\bar{G}_1}^0$$

and hence

$$\hat{X} = \hat{X}_{\bar{G}_0} + \hat{X}_{\bar{G}_1}^0.$$

It follows from stage A that $\hat{T}|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}_0}}$ is closed and from stage B that $\hat{T}|_{\hat{X}_{\bar{G}_1}^0}$ is bounded. Thus $\hat{T}$ is closed by Lemma 3.

Theorem 5. Given T with the SDI. If Y and Z are hyperinvariant under T and $Y \supset Z$. Then the restriction operator $\hat{T}|_{\hat{Y}}$ has the SDI, where $\hat{T}$ is the coinduced operator on X/Z and $\hat{Y} = Y/Z$.

Proof First we prove that for open $G \subset O$, $\bar{G} \neq O$,

$$\sigma(\hat{T}|_{\hat{Y} \cap \hat{X}_{\bar{G}}}) \subset \bar{G}, \quad (14)$$

if G is relatively compact, then

$$\sigma(\hat{T}|_{\hat{Y} \cap \hat{X}_{\bar{G}}^0}) \subset \bar{G}, \quad (15)$$

where $\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}$, $\hat{X}_{\bar{G}}^0$ are defined in stage A and stage B of Theorem 4 respectively. We confine the proof to (14). Since Y is hyperinvariant under T , it is invariant under R_λ given in stage A of Theorem 4 and hence $\hat{Y}$ is invariant under $\hat{R}_\lambda$. It follows from (7) and the commutability of $\hat{T}$ with $\hat{R}_\lambda$ that

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda - \hat{T})\hat{R}_\lambda \hat{x} &= \hat{x} \text{ for } \hat{x} \in \hat{Y} \cap \hat{X}_{\bar{G}}, \\ \hat{R}_\lambda (\lambda - \hat{T})\hat{x} &= \hat{x} \text{ for } \hat{x} \in \hat{Y} \cap \hat{X}_{\bar{G}} \cap D_T, \end{aligned}$$

thus (14) is proved.

Next, assume that $\{G_0, G_1\}$ is an open cover of O with $G_0 \in V_\infty$, $\bar{G}_0 \neq O$ and G_1

relatively compact. Let $\{H_0, H_1\}$ be another open cover of O such that $H_0 \in V_\infty$, $\bar{H}_0 \subset G_0$, $\bar{H}_1 \subset G_1$. Then there exists $P_i \in B(X)$ ($i=0, 1$) commuting with T and satisfying

$$I = P_0 + P_1, \mathcal{R}(P_0) \subset X_T(\bar{H}_0), \mathcal{R}(P_1) \subset X_T^0(\bar{H}_1),$$

thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I} &= \hat{P}_0 + \hat{P}_1, \mathcal{R}(\hat{P}_0) \subset \widehat{X_T(\bar{H}_0)} \subset \hat{X}_{G_0}, \\ \mathcal{R}(\hat{P}_1) &\subset \widehat{X_T^0(\bar{H}_1)} \subset \hat{X}_{G_1}^0. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

(16) implies that

$$\hat{I}|_{\hat{Y}} = \hat{P}_0|_{\hat{Y}} + \hat{P}_1|_{\hat{Y}}, \mathcal{R}(\hat{P}_0|_{\hat{Y}}) \subset \hat{Y} \cap \hat{X}_{G_0}, \mathcal{R}(\hat{P}_1|_{\hat{Y}}) \subset \hat{Y} \cap \hat{X}_{G_1}^0 \quad (17)$$

and (14), (15) imply that

$$\sigma(\hat{T}|_{\hat{Y} \cap \hat{X}_{G_0}}) \subset \bar{G}_0, \sigma(\hat{T}|_{\hat{Y} \cap \hat{X}_{G_1}^0}) \subset \bar{G}_1. \quad (18)$$

(17), (18) conclude that $\hat{T}|_{\hat{Y}}$ has the SDI.

Corollary 1. *If T has the SDI, then every hyperinvariant subspace Z of T is analytically invariant under T .*

Proof Let $f: \omega_f \rightarrow D_T$ be analytic on an open connected ω_f and

$$(\lambda - T)f(\lambda) \in Z.$$

Then $(\lambda - \hat{T})\hat{f}(\lambda) = \hat{O}$. It follows from Theorem 5 that $\hat{T}$ has the SDI and hence it has the SVEP. Thus we have $\hat{f}(\lambda) = \hat{O}$ and hence $f(\lambda) \in Y$.

Corollary 2. *If T has the SDI, then for every hyperinvariant subspace Y of $T|Y$ has the SDI.*

Proof Put $Z = \{0\}$, then the SDI of $T|Y$ is a consequence of Theorem 5.

Corollary 3. *If T has the SDI, then for every two hyperinvariant subspaces Y and Z , $Y \supset Z$ implies that $\sigma(T|Y) \supset \sigma(T|Z)$.*

Proof It follows from Corollary 1 that Z is analytically invariant under T and hence is analytically invariant under $T|Y$. Thus we have $\sigma(T|Y) \supset \sigma(T|Z)$.

Proposition 6. *If the densely defined operator T has the SDP and if for every relatively compact open G , there exists an operator $P \in B(X)$ commuting with T and satisfying $\mathcal{R}(P) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G})$, then for the operator T^* , P^* commutes with it and satisfies $\mathcal{R}(P^*) \subset X_{T^*}^{*0}(\bar{G})$.*

Proof Let the open G be relatively compact. Since T has the SDP, it follows from [8, Theorem IV 5.5] that T^* has the SDP and

$$X_{T^*}^{*0}(\bar{G}) = [X_T(H)]^\perp, \quad (19)$$

where $H = O \setminus \bar{G}$. By the hypothesis, for the open G , there exists an operator $P \in B(X)$ such that P commutes with T and that $\mathcal{R}(P) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G})$. Let $x \in X_T(H)$, then $\sigma_T(Px) \subset \sigma_T(x)$. Since $\sigma_T(x) \cap \bar{G} = \emptyset$, we have

$$Px \in X_T^0(\bar{G}) \cap X_T(\sigma_T(x)) = X_T^0(\bar{G} \cap \sigma_T(x)) = X_T^0(\emptyset) = \{0\} \quad (20)$$

and hence $Px = 0$. Let $x^* \in X^*$, then

$$\langle x, P^*x^* \rangle = \langle Px, x^* \rangle = 0 \quad (x \in X_T(H))$$

and hence (19) implies that $P^*x^* \in X_{T^*}^{*0}(\bar{G})$, or equivalently,

$$\mathcal{R}(P^*) = X_{T^*}^{*0}(\bar{G}). \quad (21)$$

Proposition is thus proved.

Corollary. *If T is densely defined and has the SDI, then T^* has the SDI.*

Proof Let $\{G_0, G_1\}$ be an open cover of C with $G_0 \in V_\infty$ and G_1 relatively compact, then there exists $P_i \in B(X)$ commuting with T and satisfying

$$I = P_0 + P_1, \mathcal{R}(P_0) \subset X_T(\bar{G}_0), \mathcal{R}(P_1) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G}_1).$$

It follows from (21) that

$$\mathcal{R}(P_1^*) \subset X_{T^*}^{*0}(\bar{G}_1). \quad (22)$$

By [8, Theorem IV 5.5], T^* has the SDP and in addition to (19), we have

$$X_{T^*}^{*0}(\bar{G}_0) = [\overline{X_T^0(H_1)}]^\perp,$$

where $H_1 = C \setminus \bar{G}_0$ and $\overline{X_T^0(H_1)} = \bigvee_{\substack{F \subset H_1 \\ F \text{ compact}}} X_T^0(F)$. By a similar argument used in

Proposition 7, we have

$$\mathcal{R}(P_0^*) \subset X_{T^*}^{*0}(\bar{G}_0). \quad (23)$$

(22), (23) and the evident equality $I^* = P_0^* + P_1^*$ imply that T^* has the SDI.

Definition 7. *Let T have the SDP. If there exists a sequence of relatively compact open sets $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and a sequence $\{P_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of bounded linear operators commuting with T such that $\mathcal{R}(P_n) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G}_n)$ and that for every $x \in X$ and every $x^* \in X^*$,*

$$\langle P_n x, x^* \rangle \rightarrow \langle x, x^* \rangle,$$

then we say that T has property (δ).

Theorem 8. *Let T have the SDP and property (δ), then for every family of hyperinvariant subspaces $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ of T , $Y = \bigvee_{\alpha \in A} X_\alpha$ is also hyperinvariant under T .*

Proof Let $S \in B(X)$ commute with T . Since S is bounded, it is easily seen that Y is invariant under S and hence it is sufficient to prove that Y is invariant under T .

Let $x \in X_\alpha$, then $P_n x \in X_\alpha \cap X_T^0(\bar{G}_n)$ and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle P_n x, x^* \rangle = \langle x, x^* \rangle,$$

consequently, by the Hahn-Banach Theorem, we have

$$X_\alpha = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty X_\alpha \cap X_T^0(\bar{G}_n).$$

Since $X_\alpha \cap X_T^0(\bar{G}_n) \subset D_T$, $T|_{X_\alpha}$ is densely defined. It follows from the same reason that T is densely defined. Let $X_\alpha^\perp$ be the annihilator of X_α in X^* . Let $x \in X_\alpha \cap D_T$, $x^* \in X_\alpha^\perp \cap D_{T^*}$, then $\langle x, T^* x^* \rangle = \langle T x, x^* \rangle = 0$ and $\overline{X_\alpha \cap D_T} = X_\alpha$ imply that $T^* x^* \in X_\alpha^\perp$ and hence $X_\alpha^\perp$ is invariant under T^* .

Since $Y^\perp = (\bigvee_{\alpha \in A} X_\alpha)^\perp = \bigcap_{\alpha \in A} X_\alpha^\perp$ and $X_\alpha^\perp$ is invariant under T^* , we have that $Y^\perp$ is invariant under T^* . Now, suppose that $x \in Y \cap D_T$, $x^* \in Y^\perp$. It follows from

Proposition 6 that $P_n^*x^* \in X_{T^*}^{*0}(\bar{G}_n)$ and hence

$$P_n^*x^* \in Y^\perp \cap X_{T^*}^{*0}(\bar{G}_n) \subset Y^\perp \cap D_{T^*}; T^*P_n^*x^* \in Y^\perp.$$

Thus for every n ,

$$0 = \langle x, T^*P_n^*x^* \rangle = \langle Tx, P_n^*x^* \rangle = \langle P_nTx, x^* \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle P_nTx, x^* \rangle = \langle Tx, x^* \rangle,$$

which concludes that Y is invariant under T .

Now we are in a position to discuss the properties of a given maximal net of hyperinvariant subspaces of T . Let A be a totally ordered set, a family $N = \{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ of hyperinvariant subspaces of T is called a net, if for $\alpha, \beta \in A$, $\alpha < \beta$ implies $X_\alpha \subset X_\beta$. In virtue of Zorn's Lemma, we can show that N is contained in a maximal net of hyperinvariant subspaces of T . Without loss of generality, we may suppose that N itself is maximal. Thus we have that $\{0\}, X \in N$ and hence N is nonempty.

Lemma 9. *Let T have the SDP and property (δ) and let $N = \{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ be a maximal net of hyperinvariant subspaces of T . Then for every $\alpha \in A$, there exists a $\beta \in A$ such that*

$$X_\beta = \bigvee_{\gamma < \alpha} X_\gamma.$$

Proof Put $Y = \bigvee_{\gamma < \alpha} X_\gamma$, by Theorem 9, Y is hyperinvariant under T , furthermore, we have

$$X_\gamma \subset Y \subset X_{\gamma'} \text{ for } \gamma < \alpha \leq \gamma'. \quad (24)$$

If $Y \notin N$, it follows from (24) that $N' = \{X_\alpha, Y\}_{\alpha \in A}$ is a net of hyperinvariant subspaces of T which contains N as a proper subset, this contradicts the maximal property of N . Thus the lemma follows.

Denote β by $\alpha - 0$, then $\alpha - 0 \leq \alpha$. If $\alpha - 0 = \alpha$, we will say that N is continuous at α .

Theorem 10. *Given T with the SDI and property (δ) . Let $N = \{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ be a maximal net of hyperinvariant subspaces of T , then*

(i) *for every $\alpha \in A$, we have*

$$\sigma(T|X_\gamma) \subset \sigma(T|X_{\alpha-0}) \text{ for } \gamma < \alpha, \quad (25)$$

$$\sigma(T|X_{\alpha-0}) = \bigvee_{\gamma < \alpha} \sigma(T|X_\gamma), \quad (26)$$

$$\sigma(T|X_{\alpha-0}) \subset \sigma(T|X_\alpha); \quad (27)$$

(ii) *if N is discontinuous at α , let $\hat{T}_\alpha$ be the coinduced operator of $T|X_\alpha$ on $\hat{X}_\alpha = X_\alpha/X_{\alpha-0}$, then either*

(1°) $\hat{T}_\alpha$ *is unbounded and $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha) = \emptyset$*

or

(2°) $\hat{T}_\alpha \in B(\hat{X}_\alpha)$ *and $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha)$ consists of exactly one point ξ_α , furthermore, either $\hat{T}_\alpha = \xi_\alpha \hat{T}_\alpha$ or $\hat{T}_\alpha - \xi_\alpha \hat{I}_\alpha$ is a quasinilpotent;*

(iii) N *is discontinuous at α , if either $\sigma(T|X_{\alpha-0}) \neq \sigma(T|X_\alpha)$ or $\hat{X}_\alpha$ is finitely*

dimensional, then there exists a hyperinvariant subspace Y_α of T such that

$$X_\alpha = X_{\alpha-0} \oplus Y_\alpha, Y_\alpha \subset D_T$$

and $\sigma(T|Y_\alpha)$ consists of exactly one point ξ_α , furthermore, the conclusion given in (ii, 2°) remains true and in the case of $\hat{X}_\alpha$ being finitely dimensional, we have

$$T|Y_\alpha = \xi_\alpha I|Y_\alpha.$$

Proof Since the proof is similar to that of [3, Theorem 3.2], we only sketch out it.

(i) (25) and (27) are the consequence of Corollary 3 of Theorem 5. To prove (26), it is easy to see that

$$\sigma(T|X_{\alpha-0}) \supset \bigvee_{\gamma < \alpha} \sigma(T|X_\gamma).$$

In virtue of the reduction to absurdity, we can prove the opposite inclusion.

(ii) Theorem 5 implies that $\hat{T}_\alpha$ has the SDI. If $\hat{T}_\alpha$ is unbounded and if $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha)$ consists at least one point, then there exists for $\hat{T}_\alpha$, a nontrivial $\hat{T}_\alpha$ -bounded spectral maximal space $\hat{Z}$. Let

$$Z = \{x: x \in \hat{x} \in \hat{Z}\},$$

then $X_{\alpha-0} \subseteq Z \subseteq X_\alpha$ and Z is hyperinvariant under T , this is impossible, since N is a maximal net. Thus $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha)$ is empty. If $\hat{T}_\alpha$ is bounded and if $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha)$ consists of more than one point, then a similar argument used above shows that there is a contradiction. Hence $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha)$ consists of exactly one point ξ_α . By the reduction to absurdity, it follows the second conclusion of (ii, 2°).

(iii) First, suppose that $\sigma(T|X_{\alpha-0}) \subsetneq \sigma(T|X_\alpha)$, it follows from [4, Theorem 2.1] that $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha)$ is nonempty and then (ii) implies that $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha)$ consists of exactly one point ξ_α and $\hat{T}_\alpha$ is bounded. Evidently, $\{\xi_\alpha\}$ and $\sigma(T|X_{\alpha-0})$ are spectral set of $T|X_\alpha$. Then the application of [5, Theorem V. 9.1] concludes the first case of (iii).

Next, suppose that $\hat{X}_\alpha$ is finitely dimensional, let $\{\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_n\}$ be a base of $\hat{X}_\alpha$. Then $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a linear independent system contained in X_α , where $x_i \in \hat{x}_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$). Let Y_α be the subspace spanned by $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, then

$$X_\alpha = X_{\alpha-0} \oplus Y_\alpha$$

and $T|Y_\alpha = \xi_\alpha I|Y_\alpha$.

Given T . Suppose that there exists a function $f: G \rightarrow O$ analytic on a neighborhood G of $\sigma(T) \cup \{\infty\}$ and assuming zero at most at $\lambda=0$ and at $\lambda=\infty$ and being non-constant on every component of G such that $f(T)$ is completely continuous. Then $\sigma(T)$ has no non-zero cluster point on O and hence, by applying [5, Theorem V. 9.1], T has the SDI. Furthermore, we suppose that T satisfies the property (δ), then it follows from Theorem 8 that for a family $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ of hyperinvariant subspaces of T , $Y = \bigvee_{\alpha \in A} X_\alpha$ is hyperinvariant under T .

Theorem 11. Suppose that T satisfies all the conditions mentioned above. Let $N = \{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ be a maximal net of hyperinvariant subspaces of T , if for every discontinuous point α of N , the coinduced operator $\hat{T}_\alpha$ on $X_\alpha/X_{\alpha-0}$ satisfies $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha) = \{0\}$ or $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha) = \emptyset$, then T is a quasinilpotent, i. e. T is bounded and $\sigma(T) = \{0\}$.

Proof First, we show that $\sigma(T) = \{0\}$ or $\sigma(T) = \emptyset$. Assume the contrary, then there exists a point $\xi_0 \neq 0$ such that $\xi_0 \in \sigma(T)$. By the hypothesis, ξ_0 is an isolated point of $\sigma(T)$. Since $\{0\}, X \in N$ and $\sigma(T|_{\{0\}}) = \emptyset$, $\sigma(T|_X) = \sigma(T)$, we may divide A into two parts:

$$A^- = \{\gamma: \xi_0 \notin \sigma(T|_{X_\gamma}), \gamma \in A\}; \quad (28)$$

$$A^+ = \{\gamma: \xi_0 \in \sigma(T|_{X_\gamma}), \gamma \in A\}. \quad (29)$$

A^-, A^+ are nonempty and

$$A = A^- \cup A^+, \quad A^- \cap A^+ = \emptyset.$$

Put

$$X^- = \bigvee_{\gamma \in A^-} X_\gamma, \quad X^+ = \bigcap_{\gamma \in A^+} X_\gamma,$$

then $X^\pm$ is hyperinvariant under T and satisfies

$$X_\gamma \subset X^- \subset X^+ \subset X_{\gamma'} \text{ for } \gamma \in A^-, \gamma' \in A^+.$$

Since N is a maximal net and T has property (δ) , there exists $\alpha \in A$ such that

$$X^- = X_{\alpha-0}, \quad X^+ = X_\alpha.$$

Since ξ_0 is an isolated point of $\sigma(T)$, it follows from (26) and (28) that

$$\xi_0 \notin \bigvee_{\gamma \in A^-} (T|_{X_\gamma}) = \sigma(T|_{X_{\alpha-0}}). \quad (30)$$

Next, we show that $\xi_0 \in \sigma(T|_{X_\alpha})$, by Corollary 1 of Theorem 5, for every $\gamma \in A$, X_γ is analytically invariant under T , then

$$X_\gamma \cap X_T^0(\{\xi_0\}) = X_{\gamma, T|_{X_\gamma}}^0(\{\xi_0\}) \quad (31)$$

for $\gamma \in A$. Since $\xi_0 \neq 0$ and $\xi_0 \neq \infty$, we have $f(\xi_0) \neq 0$. Since $f(T)$ is completely continuous $X_{f(T)}(f(\{\xi_0\}))$ is finitely dimensional, [1, Theorem 2.1] implies that

$$X_{f(T)}(f(\{\xi_0\})) = X_T^0(f^{-1}(f(\{\xi_0\}))) \supset X_T^0(\{\xi_0\})$$

and hence $X_T^0(\{\xi_0\})$ is finitely dimensional. Since, for every $\gamma \in A^+$, we have $\xi_0 \in \sigma(T|_{X_\gamma})$ and $\sigma(T|_{X_{\gamma, T|_{X_\gamma}}^0(\{\xi_0\})}) = \{\xi_0\} \neq \emptyset$, it follows that

$$X_{\gamma, T|_{X_\gamma}}^0(\{\xi_0\}) \neq \{0\} \text{ for } \gamma \in A^+.$$

$X_T^0(\{\xi_0\})$ being finite dimensional, (31) implies that there exists a $\gamma_0 \in A^+$ such that, for every $\gamma \in A^+$ with $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$ we have

$$X_T^0(\{\xi_0\}) \cap X_\gamma = X_T^0(\{\xi_0\}) \cap X_{\gamma_0} \neq \{0\}. \quad (32)$$

It follows from (31), (32) and $X^+ = X_\alpha$ that

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\alpha, T|_{X_\alpha}}^0(\{\xi_0\}) &= X_T^0(\{\xi_0\}) \cap X_\alpha = X_T^0(\{\xi_0\}) \cap \left(\bigcap_{\gamma \in A^+} X_\gamma \right) = \bigcap_{\gamma \in A^+} [X_T^0(\{\xi_0\}) \cap X_\gamma] \\ &= X_T^0(\{\xi_0\}) \cap X_{\gamma_0} \neq \{0\} \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\xi_0 \in \sigma(T|X_{\alpha, T|X_\alpha}^0(\{\xi_0\})) \subset \sigma(T|X_\alpha). \quad (33)$$

(30) and (33) imply that N is discontinuous at α and $\sigma(\hat{T}_\alpha) = \{\xi_0\}$. By hypothesis, we have either $\sigma(T_\alpha) = \{0\}$ or $\sigma(T_\alpha) = \emptyset$. This contradicts the assumption $\xi_0 \neq 0$, therefore $\sigma(T_\alpha) = \{0\}$ or $\sigma(T_\alpha) = \emptyset$. Next, to prove that $X_T(\emptyset) = \{0\}$, let $x \in X_T(\emptyset)$, by the property (δ), there exist relatively compact open G_n and operator

$$P_n \in B(X)$$

such that P_n commutes with T and satisfies $\mathcal{R}(P_n) \subset X_T^0(\bar{G}_n)$, then

$$P_n x \in X_T^0(\bar{G}_n) \cap X_T(\emptyset) = X_T^0(\emptyset) = \{0\}$$

and hence $P_n x = 0$. It follows from the equality

$$\langle x, x^* \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle P_n x, x^* \rangle = 0$$

for every $x^* \in X^*$ that $x = 0$ and hence $X_T(\emptyset) = \{0\}$. Thus $\sigma(T) = \{0\}$ and the decomposition

$$X = X_0 \oplus X_T(\emptyset)$$

with $X_0 \subset D_T$ implies that T is bounded and thus T is a quasinilpotent.

References

- [1] Wang Shengwang and Erdelyi, I., Spectral Decompositions of closed operators in banach Spaces, (to appear).
- [2] 王声望、刘光裕, 具有可单位分解性质的谱容量, 将发表于数学研究与评论.
- [3] 王声望, 局部预解式与可单位分解算子, 数学学报, **26**: 2 (1983), 153—162.
- [4] Wang Shengwang and Erdelyi, I., Analytically Invariant Spectral Resolvents of Closed Operators, *J. Functional Anal.* **58** (1984), 53—78
- [5] Taylor, A. E. and Lay, D. C., Introduction to Functional Analysis, Wiley, New York 1980.
- [6] Colojoara, I. and Foias, C., Theory of Generalized Spectral Operators, Gordon and Breach Sci. Publ. New York (1968).
- [7] Apostol, C., Restrictions and Quotients of Decomposable Operators in Banach Spaces, *Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl.*, **13** (1968), 147—150.
- [8] Vasilescu, F.-H., Analytic Functional Calculus and Spectral Decompositions, D Reidel Publ. Co. Dordrecht, Boston, London, 1982.
- [9] 张奠宙、王漱石, 无界可单位分解算子, 华东师大学报(自然科学), **4** (1981), 5—11.

