

NORMAL AND QUASINORMAL COMPOSITION OPERATORS

ROBERT WHITLEY

ABSTRACT. A bounded linear operator C_T on $L^2(X, \Sigma, m)$ is a composition operator if it is induced by a point mapping $T: X \rightarrow X$ via $C_T f = f \circ T$.

Normal and quasinormal composition operators on a finite measure space are characterized: C_T is normal iff T is measure preserving and $T^{-1}(\Sigma)$ is (essentially) all of Σ ; C_T is quasinormal iff T is measure preserving.

In what follows, the composition operator C_T on $L^2(X, \Sigma, m)$, a sigma-finite measure space, will always be a bounded linear operator; in terms of T this means that T is measurable, $m \circ T^{-1}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to m , and the Radon-Nikodým derivative $h = dm \circ T^{-1} / dm$ is essentially bounded. Conversely, composition with any T satisfying these conditions induces a bounded linear operator C_T on $L^2(X, \Sigma, m)$ [1, pp. 663–665] and [3].

The change of variable equation

$$\int C_T f \, dm = \int f \circ T \, dm = \int fh \, dm \quad (1)$$

is basic.

The following concept arises in understanding normal composition operators:

DEFINITION 1. Let (X, Σ, m) be a measure space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ a measurable function on X . The sigma algebra $T^{-1}(\Sigma)$ is *essentially all of* Σ iff given A in Σ there is a B in Σ with the symmetric difference $T^{-1}(B) \Delta A = (T^{-1}(B) - A) \cup (A - T^{-1}(B))$ having $m(T^{-1}(B) \Delta A) = 0$.

Since the elements of L^2 are equivalence classes of functions under the equivalence relation “equal almost everywhere”, changing T on a set of measure zero does not change C_T . Consequently, any characterization of C_T in terms of T must use “essential” properties of T as in Definition 1, invariant under the class of maps inducing the same C_T .

LEMMA 1. Let (X, Σ, m) be a sigma-finite measure space. The composition operator C_T has dense range iff $T^{-1}(\Sigma)$ is essentially all of Σ .

PROOF. Suppose C_T has dense range and let A be a set in Σ of finite measure. By hypothesis there are functions f_n in L^2 with $C_T f_n \rightarrow \chi_A$, by passing to a subsequence $C_T f_n \rightarrow \chi_A$ a.e. Since each function $C_T f_n$ is

Received by the editors November 3, 1977.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 47B99; Secondary 47B15, 47B20.

Key words and phrases. Composition operator, normal operator, quasinormal operator.

© American Mathematical Society 1978

measurable with respect to the sigma-algebra $T^{-1}(\Sigma)$, the equivalence class χ_A is also $T^{-1}(\Sigma)$ measurable. Which is to say that there is a B in Σ with $\chi_{T^{-1}(B)} = \chi_A$ a.e., so $m(T^{-1}(B) \Delta A) = 0$. Since this is true for each set of finite measure, it is true for each measurable set in the sigma-finite measure space.

Suppose that $T^{-1}(\Sigma)$ is essentially all of Σ and let A be a set of finite measure. There is a set B in Σ with $m(T^{-1}(B) \Delta A) = 0$ by hypothesis. Using sigma-finiteness write B as the union of an increasing sequence $\{B_n\}$ of sets of finite measure. Then $C_T \chi_{B_n}$ increases monotonically to χ_A a.e., and so $\|C_T \chi_{B_n} - \chi_A\| \rightarrow 0$. Thus the closure of the range of C_T contains all simple functions and is therefore all of L^2 . Q.E.D.

Singh shows in [7] that if T is one-to-one, with a measurable S on X satisfying $STx = x$ a.e., then C_T has dense range. This is immediate from Lemma 1.

LEMMA 2. Let (X, Σ, m) be sigma-finite. The composition operator C_T is normal iff

- (a) $T^{-1}(\Sigma)$ is essentially all of Σ , and
- (b) $h \circ T = h$ a.e. (Recall $h = dm \circ T^{-1}/dm$.)

PROOF. For any f and g in L^2 ,

$$(C_T^* C_T f, g) = (C_T f, C_T g) = \int (f \circ T)(\bar{g} \circ T) dm = \int f \bar{g} h dm,$$

so $C_T^* C_T f = hf$. And, if f belongs to the range of C_T , $f = C_T f_0$, then $C_T C_T^* f = C_T C_T^* C_T f_0 = C_T (h f_0) = (h \circ T) f$ [6].

Suppose C_T is normal and write $X = \cup X_n$, a union of sets of finite measure. The function $\chi_{T^{-1}(X_n)}$ belongs to the range of C_T and thus, from the above, $h = h \circ T$ a.e. on $T^{-1}(X_n)$ and so $h = h \circ T$ a.e. on $\cup T^{-1}(X_n) = X$. Let $A_n = \{x: h(x) \geq 1/n\}$. For f in L^2 , $g = (\chi_{A_n}/h)f$ also belongs to L^2 and $C_T C_T^* g = C_T^* C_T g = \chi_{A_n} f$. Because $\cup A_n = \sigma = \sigma(h) = \{x: h(x) > 0\}$, $\|\chi_{A_n} f - \chi_\sigma f\| \rightarrow 0$ and C_T has range dense in $L^2(\sigma(h))$. Write $X = T^{-1}(\sigma) \cup T^{-1}(\sigma^c)$ and note that $m(T^{-1}(\sigma^c)) = 0$ from (1), since $\|C_T f\|^2 = \int |f|^2 h dm$. By (b), $T^{-1}(\sigma) = \sigma$ so $\sigma = X$ to within a set of measure zero. Hence C_T has range dense in $L^2(X)$ and (a) follows from Lemma 1.

Suppose that (a) and (b) hold. As above, $C_T^* C_T f = hf = h \circ T f = C_T C_T^* f$ for f in the range of C_T . Hence $C_T^* C_T - C_T C_T^*$ is zero on the range of C_T and so identically zero by (a) and Lemma 1, i.e. C_T is normal. Q.E.D.

As it stands, Lemma 2 is a characterization of normal C_T , but it is not entirely satisfactory as it does not explicitly indicate the properties of T involved. The answer to exactly which T gives rise to a normal C_T is hidden precisely in those solutions to the curious equation

$$h = h \circ T \tag{2}$$

relating T and its Radon-Nikodým derivative $h = dm \circ T^{-1}/dm$.

I can determine these solutions for finite measure spaces; the surprising answer is that $h = 1$ a.e.

THEOREM 1. *Let (X, Σ, m) be a finite measure space. The following are equivalent:*

1. C_T is normal,
2. C_T is unitary,
3. (a) $T^{-1}(\Sigma)$ is essentially all of Σ , and
(b) T is measure preserving.

PROOF. Suppose that C_T is normal. By Lemma 2, $h = h \circ T$, so $B = \{x: h(x) \geq 1\} = \{x: h(Tx) \geq 1\} = T^{-1}(B)$. Then

$$\|C_T \chi_B\|^2 = \int \chi_B h \, dm = \int (\chi_B \circ T)(h \circ T) \, dm = \int \chi_B h^2 \, dm.$$

Since $h^2 \geq h$ on B , $h^2 = h$ on B and it follows that $h = 1$ on B (a.e.). A similar argument applied to the set $C = \{x: h(x) < 1\}$ shows that $h = 0$ (a.e.) on C . Hence $h = \chi_B$. The equation $m(X) = m(T^{-1}(X)) = \int \chi_B \, dm = m(B)$ shows that $m(B^c) = 0$ and $h = 1$ a.e. Another use of equation (1) shows that $m(T^{-1}(A)) = \int \chi_A \, dm = m(A)$ and 3 (b) holds. Also, $C_T^* C_T f = C_T(C_T^* f) = hf = f$, C_T is onto and Lemma 1 implies 3 (a).

Suppose that 3 (a) and 3 (b) hold. Because T is measure preserving, $m(T^{-1}(A)) = m(A) = \int \chi_A \, dm$ for all measurable A . From the uniqueness of the Radon-Nikodým derivative h , $h = 1$ a.e. and thus $\|C_T f\|^2 = \int |f|^2 h \, dm = \|f\|^2$. The range of C_T is then closed, and therefore ran of $L^2(X)$ by Lemma 1. Each f in L^2 belongs to the range of C_T , so as in the proof of Lemma 2, $C_T C_T^* f = C_T^* C_T f = hf = f$, and C_T is unitary. Q.E.D.

In the case where (X, Σ, m) is sigma-finite, simple examples show that C_T can be normal without T being measure preserving. (Consider the real line with Lebesgue measure and $Tx = 2x$.)

Similar behavior is possible for a generalized composition operator: In [4] Ridge defines a composition operator C_T induced by a map $T: X_1 \rightarrow X$ on a measurable subset X_1 of X by $C_T f = (f \circ T)\chi_{X_1}$. With this definition and X of finite measure, for C_T to be normal $C_T C_T^* 1 = [(C_T^* 1) \circ T]\chi_{X_1} = C_T^* C_T 1 = h$, and h must vanish off X_1 ; thus $m(T^{-1}(X_1^c)) = \int \chi_{X_1^c} h \, dm = 0$ and T essentially maps X_1 into X_1 , which is basically the case considered here. However it is possible for such a generalized C_T to be quasinormal without T being measure preserving. (Consider $X = (0, 2)$ with Lebesgue measure, $X_1 = (0, 1)$, and $Tx = 2x$.)

In either case, (X, Σ, m) sigma-finite or for Ridge's generalized composition operators, it would be interesting to characterize normal and quasinormal C_T .

Normal composition operators have now been characterized in terms of two properties of T . One of these properties was shown to correspond to a standard operator theoretic property of C_T in Lemma 1. There is a correspondence for the other property, as is now shown.

LEMMA 3. *Let (X, Σ, m) be a sigma-finite measure space. Then C_T is quasinormal iff $h = h \circ T$.*

PROOF. By definition [2], C_T is quasinormal iff C_T commutes with $C_T^*C_T$. From $C_T^*C_Tf = hf$, $C_T C_T^*C_Tf = (h \circ T)(f \circ T)$ and $C_T^*C_T C_Tf = h(f \circ T)$. As in Lemma 2, $h = h \circ T$.

The converse follows from the calculation above. Q.E.D.

THEOREM 2. Let (X, Σ, m) be a finite measure space. The following are equivalent:

1. C_T is quasinormal,
2. C_T is an isometry,
3. T is measure preserving.

PROOF. Suppose C_T is quasinormal. Arguing as in Theorem 1 shows that T is measure preserving and so that $h = 1$ a.e. Thus

$$\|C_Tf\|^2 = \int |f|^2h \, dm = \int |f|^2 \, dm, \tag{3}$$

and C_T is an isometry.

Suppose C_T is an isometry. (3) shows that $h = 1$ a.e. and thus that T is measure preserving.

Suppose T is measure preserving. Then $h = 1$ a.e. and Lemma 3 shows that C_T is quasinormal. Q.E.D.

In [7] the result is given that for T one-to-one, with S measurable and $STx = x$ a.e., C_T is normal iff C_T is quasinormal. This follows as condition (a) of Lemma 2 is automatically satisfied for T one-to-one.

EXAMPLE. A composition operator C_T on $L^2(0, 1)$ which is quasinormal but not normal.

Consider the T on $(0, 1)$ given by:

$$Tx = \begin{cases} 2x, & 0 \leq x \leq 1/2, \\ 2 - 2x, & 1/2 \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

For this T , $mT^{-1}(0, x) = m(0, x/2) + m(1 - x/2, 1) = m(0, x)$. It follows that $mT^{-1}(a, b) = m(a, b)$ and thus $m \circ T^{-1} \ll m$. Since each measurable set is nearly a disjoint union of intervals [5, pp. 62 and 71] T is measure preserving and so $h = 1$. Alternately, a change of variable shows that $\|C_Tf\|^2 = \|f\|^2$ and C_T is an isometry and thus T measure preserving.

Since $h = 1$, C_T is quasinormal by Lemma 3. Alternately, a direct computation shows that

$$C_T^*f(x) = (1/2)f(x/2) + (1/2)f(1 - x/2).$$

Thus C_T commutes with the identity $C_T^*C_T$.

You can directly see that C_T is not normal by considering the action of $C_T C_T^*$ and $C_T^*C_T$ on $\chi_{(0,1/2)}$. Alternately, for $g = \chi_{(0,1/2)} - \chi_{(1/2,1)}$

$$\int \chi_{T^{-1}(A)} g \, dm = 0$$

for all measurable A . It follows, for example, that $(0, 1/2)$ does not essentially belong to $T^{-1}(\Sigma)$, Σ the Lebesgue measurable sets.

I would like to thank Eric Nordgren for his interesting lectures in which he raised the problem of characterizing normal composition operators, see [3].

REFERENCES

1. N. Dunford and J. T. Schwartz, *Linear operators*. I, Interscience, New York, 1958.
2. P. Halmos, *A Hilbert space problem book*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J., 1967.
3. E. Nordgren, *Composition operators*, Conf. on Concrete Representations of Operators on Hilbert Space (to appear).
4. W. Ridge, *Spectrum of a composition operator*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **37** (1973), 121–127.
5. H. Royden, *Real analysis*, 2nd ed., Macmillan, New York, 1968.
6. R. Singh, *Compact and quasinormal composition operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **45** (1974), 80–82.
7. _____, *Normal and Hermetian composition operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **47** (1975), 348–350.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92717