

The Taylor joint spectrum and restriction to hyperinvariant subspaces

Edward J. Timko*

March 18, 2022

Abstract

It is well known that for a single bounded operator A_0 on a Hilbert \mathfrak{H} , if $\mathfrak{M} \subset \mathfrak{H}$ is hyperinvariant for A_0 , then the spectrum of $A_0|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is contained in the spectrum of A_0 . In this note, we modify an example of Taylor to prove the following. There exist a quadruple $A = (A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)$ of commuting bounded Hilbert space operators and a hyperinvariant subspace \mathfrak{X}_1 for A such that the Taylor joint spectrum of A restricted to \mathfrak{X}_1 is not a subset of the Taylor joint spectrum of A .

Let $T = (T_1, \dots, T_d)$ be a d -tuple of commuting bounded operators on a Hilbert space \mathfrak{H} , and denote by $\sigma_{\text{Ta}}(T)$ the Taylor joint spectrum [3] of T . A subspace \mathfrak{M} of \mathfrak{H} is said to be *hyperinvariant* for T if $B\mathfrak{M} \subset \mathfrak{M}$ for every bounded operator B commuting with T_1, \dots, T_d . The purpose of this note is to demonstrate that there exist a quadruple $A = (A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)$ of commuting bounded Hilbert operators and a subspace \mathfrak{X}_1 that is hyperinvariant for A such that $\sigma_{\text{Ta}}(A|_{\mathfrak{X}_1})$ is not a subset of $\sigma_{\text{Ta}}(A)$. The existence of such tuples seems to be folk theorem, but we are motivated by other work to record it. That A should exist may seem surprising when compared with the single-operator case. In particular, if A_0 is a bounded operator on a Hilbert space \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{M} is an A_0 -hyperinvariant subspace of \mathfrak{H} , then $\sigma(A_0|_{\mathfrak{M}}) \subset \sigma(A_0)$.

Before detailing the construction of A , we would like to thank J. Eschmeier for suggesting that we look at a particular example of J. L. Taylor [3, Sec. 4]. We would also like to thank R. Clouâtre for his help in the development of this note.

In what follows, let $\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a closed polydisc with non-empty interior that contains 0, and let U be a bounded open neighborhood of Δ . Set $V = U \setminus \Delta$, which we view alternately as a subset of \mathbb{R}^4 . We denote by ζ_1, ζ_2 the canonical complex coordinates of V and by x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 the canonical real coordinates, with

$$\zeta_j = x_{2j-1} + ix_{2j}, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

*Partially supported by a Pacific Institute of Mathematical Sciences Fellowship

Given a positive integer k , denote by $C_0^k(V)$ the vector space of compactly supported functions on V having continuous derivatives up to and including order k . For $\phi \in C_0^1(V)$, we set

$$D_{x_j}\phi = \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_j}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

Let $L^2(V)$ denote the L^2 -space on V with Lebesgue measure τ . We adopt the convention of identifying an element $f \in L^2(V)$ with a function in the case where f has a smooth representative.

Given $f \in L^2(V)$ and $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, recall that $g \in L^2(V)$ is the *weak x_j -derivative* of f if

$$\int_V g\phi d\tau = - \int_V f D_{x_j}\phi d\tau$$

for every $\phi \in C_0^1(V)$. Because $C_0^1(V)$ is dense in $L^2(V)$, the weak x_j -derivative of f , when it exists, is unique; we denote it by $D_{x_j}f$. For $\phi \in C_0^1(V)$, the x_j -derivative of ϕ and the weak x_j -derivative of ϕ determine the same element of $L^2(V)$, and we denote them both by $D_{x_j}\phi$. It should be noted that, from our definition, the existence of a weak x_j -derivative for $f \in L^2(V)$ implies that $D_{x_j}f \in L^2(V)$.

Denote by $W^{1,2}(V)$ the linear space consisting of all those $f \in L^2(V)$ for which $D_{x_1}f, \dots, D_{x_4}f$ exist. Equipped with the norm given by

$$\|f\|_{W^{1,2}} = \left(\|f\|_{L^2(V)}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^4 \|D_{x_j}f\|_{L^2(V)}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

$W^{1,2}(V)$ is a Hilbert space. Given $f \in W^{1,2}(V)$, we set

$$D_{\zeta_j}f = \frac{1}{2}(D_{x_{2j-1}}f - iD_{x_{2j}}f), \quad D_{\bar{\zeta}_j}f = \frac{1}{2}(D_{x_{2j-1}}f + iD_{x_{2j}}f)$$

for $j = 1, 2$.

A element $f \in W^{1,2}(V)$ is a *weak solution* of the Laplace equation on V if

$$\sum_{j=1}^4 \int_V (D_{x_j}f)(D_{x_j}\phi) d\tau = 0$$

for every $\phi \in C_0^1(V)$. Given $f \in W^{1,2}(V)$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^4 \int_V (D_{x_j}f)(D_{x_j}\phi) d\tau = 4 \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_V (D_{\zeta_j}f)(D_{\zeta_j}\phi) d\tau \quad (1)$$

when $\phi \in C_0^2(V)$. Thus, by a simple density argument, (1) also holds when $\phi \in C_0^1(V)$. In particular, if $D_{\bar{\zeta}_1}f = D_{\bar{\zeta}_2}f = 0$ for some $f \in W^{1,2}(V)$, then f is a weak solution of Laplace's equation on V . It then follows from [1, Cor. 8.11]

that f is infinitely differentiable. Because $D_{\bar{\zeta}_1} f = D_{\bar{\zeta}_2} f = 0$, we see that f is analytic on V .

Set $\mathfrak{X} = W^{1,2}(V) \oplus L^2(V)$, and define A_1, A_2, A_3 , and A_4 in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{X})$ as follows. Given $(f, g) \in \mathfrak{X}$, set

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(f, g) &= (\zeta_1 f, \zeta_1 g), & A_2(f, g) &= (\zeta_2 f, \zeta_2 g), \\ A_3(f, g) &= (0, D_{\bar{\zeta}_1} f), & A_4(f, g) &= (0, D_{\bar{\zeta}_2} f), \end{aligned}$$

and set $A = (A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)$. It is easily seen that A_1, A_2, A_3 , and A_4 commute. Set $\mathfrak{X}_1 = \ker(A_3) \cap \ker(A_4)$. It should be noted that if $(f, g) \in \mathfrak{X}_1$, then $D_{\bar{\zeta}_1} f = D_{\bar{\zeta}_2} f = 0$ and thus f is analytic. We also note that \mathfrak{X}_1 is a hyperinvariant subspace for A .

Theorem. $\sigma_{\text{Ta}}(A|_{\mathfrak{X}_1})$ is not a subset of $\sigma_{\text{Ta}}(A)$.

Proof. Given a bounded C^∞ -function ψ on V , we note that $M_\psi(f, g) = (\psi f, \psi g)$ is a bounded operator on \mathfrak{X} . Set $\psi_j = \bar{\zeta}_j / (|\zeta_1|^2 + |\zeta_2|^2)$ for $j = 1, 2$, and note that $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C^\infty(V)$ are bounded and satisfy the equation $1 = \zeta_1 \psi_1 + \zeta_2 \psi_2$ on V . Thus $I = M_{\psi_1} A_1 + M_{\psi_2} A_2$, and it then follows from [3, Lemma 1.1] and the corollary to [3, Lemma 1.3] that $0 \notin \sigma_{\text{Ta}}(A)$. Note that, if $R = [A_1|_{\mathfrak{X}_1} \dots A_4|_{\mathfrak{X}_1}]$ from $\mathfrak{X}_1^{\oplus 4}$ into \mathfrak{X}_1 is not surjective, then it follows from [3, Def. 1.1] that $0 \in \sigma_{\text{Ta}}(A|_{\mathfrak{X}_1})$.

Suppose that R is surjective. Then there would exist $(f_1, g_1), \dots, (f_4, g_4) \in \mathfrak{X}_1$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^4 A_j(f_j, g_j) = (1, 0).$$

This implies, in particular, that

$$\zeta_1 f_1 + \zeta_2 f_2 = 1$$

where f_1, f_2 are analytic. By Hartogs's Theorem [2, Theorem I.C.5], f_1, f_2 would have unique analytic extensions \tilde{f}_1, \tilde{f}_2 to U such that

$$1 = z_1 \tilde{f}_1(z_1, z_2) + z_2 \tilde{f}_2(z_1, z_2), \quad (z_1, z_2) \in U.$$

However, $(0, 0)$ is in U . Thus R cannot be surjective and thus $0 \in \sigma_{\text{Ta}}(A|_{\mathfrak{X}_1})$. \square

References

- [1] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.
- [2] Robert C. Gunning and Hugo Rossi. *Analytic functions of several complex variables*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965.
- [3] Joseph L. Taylor. A joint spectrum for several commuting operators. *J. Functional Analysis*, 6:172–191, 1970.