

## ON THE RANGE OF A HYPONORMAL DERIVATION

JOSEPH G. STAMPFLI<sup>1</sup>

ABSTRACT. The inner derivation induced by a hyponormal operator has closed range if and only if the operator has finite spectrum.

Let  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  denote the algebra of all bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Define the inner derivation

$$\Delta_A: \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \quad \text{by} \quad \Delta_A(X) = AX - XA$$

for  $A, X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ . For  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  normal, Anderson and Foiaş [1] proved that the range of  $\Delta_T$  (denoted by  $\mathcal{R}(\Delta_T)$ ) is norm closed if and only if  $\sigma(T)$  is finite. Their proof uses a number of deep results on decomposable operators and asymptotic commutativity. In this note we present a simple proof which enables us to extend their result to hyponormal operators.

The method of proof also permits us to answer partially a question raised by S. R. Caradus. To wit, when is  $\mathcal{R}(\Delta_T) \cap \mathcal{K} = \Delta_T(\mathcal{K})$  where  $\mathcal{K}$  is the ideal of compact operators. When  $T$  is hyponormal we show that equality holds if and only if  $\sigma(T)$  is finite. The following result is a slight variation on a well-known result. See [3, Lemma 2] and subsequent material for example.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  be hyponormal. Let  $\{\lambda_n\}_1^\infty$  be a sequence of distinct nonisolated boundary points of  $\sigma(T)$ . Let  $\{\epsilon_n\}_1^\infty$  be a sequence of positive (nonzero) numbers converging to 0. Then there exists an orthonormal sequence  $\{f_n\}_1^\infty$  of vectors from  $\mathcal{H}$  such that*

- (1)  $\|(T - \lambda_n)f_n\| < \epsilon_n$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , and
- (2)  $(f_j, Tf_n) = 0$  for  $n = 1, \dots, j - 1$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  be hyponormal. Then  $\mathcal{R}(\Delta_T)$  is norm closed if and only if  $\sigma(T)$  is finite.*

**Proof.** Let  $\sigma(T)$  be infinite. Then  $\sigma(T)$  has an infinite number of boundary points. We distinguish two cases. If  $\sigma(T)$  has an infinite number of *isolated* boundary points  $\{\lambda_n\}_1^\infty$ , then by a well-known result [2] there exists an orthonormal sequence  $\{f_n\}_1^\infty$  such that  $Tf_n = \lambda_n f_n$  (this case is much easier to handle and the reader may wish to work it out first). If  $\sigma(T)$  has an infinite

---

Received by the editors July 12, 1974.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 16A72, 17B05, 18B20.

Key words and phrases. Hyponormal operator, inner derivation, closed range, compact operator.

<sup>1</sup> The author gratefully acknowledges the support of the National Science Foundation under grant no. GP 29006.

number of distinct nonisolated boundary points  $\{\lambda_n\}_1^\infty$ , we can apply the previous lemma. In this case there exists an orthonormal sequence  $\{f_n\}_1^\infty$  such that  $\|(T - \lambda_n)f_n\| < \epsilon_n$  and  $(f_j, Tf_n) = 0$  for  $j > n$ . We may further assume the  $\lambda_n$ 's converge and we choose the  $\epsilon_n$ 's to satisfy the following conditions:

- (1)  $\epsilon_n > \epsilon_{n+1} > \dots$ ;
- (2)  $\epsilon_n \leq |\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n|^2$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ;
- (3)  $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \epsilon_n \eta_n < \infty$  where  $\eta_n = \max_{j=1, \dots, n} |\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j|^{-1/2}$ .

We set  $\mathcal{H}_1 = \text{clm} \{f_n\}_1^\infty$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{H}_1^\perp$ . If we write  $Tf_n = \mu_n f_n + \delta_n$  where  $(\delta_n, f_n) = 0$  then  $|\mu_n - \lambda_n| < \epsilon_n$  and  $\|\delta_n\| < \epsilon_n$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . We will now define operators  $V_m$  such that  $TV_m - V_m T$  will converge in norm to an operator  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ , but  $A \neq TW - WT$  for any  $W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ . We define the unbounded operator  $V$  as follows:  $Vf_n = |\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n|^{-1/2} f_{n+1}$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $Vg = 0$  for  $g \in \mathcal{H}_2$ . Let  $P_m$  be the projection of  $\mathcal{H}$  onto  $\mathfrak{M}_m = \text{clm} \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$  and set  $V_m = VP_m$ . We claim that  $TV_m - V_m T$  converges in norm to an operator  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ . Note first that

$$(TV_n - V_n T)f_j = \begin{cases} |\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j|^{-1/2}(\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j)f_{j+1} + |\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j|^{-1/2}\delta_{j+1} - V_n \delta_j & \text{for } j \leq n, \\ -V_n \delta_j & \text{for } j > n. \end{cases}$$

Thus

$$[\Delta_T(V_n) - \Delta_T(V_m)]f_j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } j \leq n \leq m, \\ -|\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j|^{-1/2}(\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j)f_{j+1} + |\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j|^{-1/2}\delta_{j+1} + (V_m - V_n)\delta_j & \text{for } n < j \leq m, \\ (V_m - V_n)\delta_j & \text{for } n \leq m < j. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $\|V_n \delta_j\| \leq \|V_n\| \|\delta_j\| \leq n \epsilon_j \leq n_j \epsilon_j$  for all  $n, j$ . (The last estimate follows by considering the two cases  $n \leq j, n \geq j$  and using the fact that  $(\delta_j, f_m) = 0$  for  $m = j + 1, j + 2, \dots$  in the latter.) Let  $h \in \mathcal{H}_1$ , and write  $h = \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j f_j$ . By a standard argument we see that  $\|[\Delta_T(V_n) - \Delta_T(V_m)]h\| \rightarrow 0$ , uniformly in  $h$  as  $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ , since  $|\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j|^{-1/2} |\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j| \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\sum \epsilon_j \eta_j < \infty$ . We still must consider vectors  $g \in \mathcal{H}_2$ . For such a  $g$ ,

$$(TV_n - V_n T)g = -V_n Tg.$$

Let  $Tg = \sum a_j f_j + w$  where  $w \in \mathcal{H}_2$ . Then  $T^*f_j = \bar{\mu}_j f_j + \gamma_j$  where  $(\gamma_j, f_j) = 0$ . Since  $T$  is hyponormal  $\|\gamma_j\| < \epsilon_j$ . Thus  $a_j = (Tg, f_j) = (g, T^*f_j) = (g, \gamma_j)$  and hence  $|a_j| < \epsilon_j$  if  $g$  is a unit vector. Hence

$$(TV_n - V_n T)g = -\sum_{j=1}^n a_j |\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j|^{-1/2} f_{j+1}.$$

Finally

$$\|(\Delta_T(V_n) - \Delta_T(V_m))g\| \leq \sum_{j=n}^m |a_j| |\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sum_n^m \epsilon_j \eta_j$$

and the last term tends to zero as  $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus  $\{\Delta_T(V_n)\}$  is a Cauchy sequence and hence it converges to an operator  $A \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ . To complete the first half of the proof we must show that  $A \neq TW - WT$ . Assume the contrary. Thus  $((TW - WT)f_n, f_{n+1}) = (Af_n, f_{n+1})$  for all  $n$  and hence

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_{n+1} - \mu_n)(Wf_n, f_{n+1}) + (Wf_n, \gamma_{n+1}) - (W\delta_n, f_{n+1}) \\ = (Af_n, f_{n+1}) = (\mu_{n+1} - \mu_n)|\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

since  $(\delta_{n+1}, f_{n+1})$  and  $(V\delta_n, f_{n+1})$  are zero. Thus  $|(Wf_n, f_{n+1})| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  for large  $n$  since  $\epsilon_n/|\mu_{n+1} - \mu_n| \rightarrow 0$ . This implies that  $W$  is unbounded, contrary to assumption. The other half of the proof will be sketched later.

We now turn to the question of Caradus mentioned in the introduction.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $T \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{H})$  be hyponormal. Then  $\mathfrak{R}(\Delta_T) \cap \mathfrak{K} = \Delta_T(\mathfrak{K})$  if and only if  $\sigma(T)$  is finite.*

**Proof.** Again we prove only half the theorem now. Let  $\sigma(T)$  be infinite. Proceed as in Theorem 1 and select  $\lambda_n, f_n$  and  $\epsilon_n$  as before. This time however we define  $Vf_n = f_{n+1}$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $Vg = 0$  for  $g \in \mathfrak{H}_2$ .

By estimates similar to those in Theorem 1, it is easy to see that  $B = TV - VT$  is compact. (Indeed, the operator  $A$  in Theorem 1 is compact.) Note that  $((TV - VT)f_n, f_{n+1}) = (\mu_{n+1} - \mu_n)$ , since the other terms are zero. Assume that  $B = TW - WT$  for some noncompact  $W \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} ((TW - WT)f_n, f_{n+1}) &= (\mu_{n+1} - \mu_n)(Wf_n, f_{n+1}) + (Wf_n, \gamma_{n+1}) - (W\delta_n, f_{n+1}) \\ &= (Bf_n, f_{n+1}) = (\mu_{n+1} - \mu_n). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing the last equation by  $(\mu_{n+1} - \mu_n)$  and letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we see that  $(Wf_n, f_{n+1}) \rightarrow 1$ . Thus  $W$  is not compact and therefore  $B \notin \Delta_T(\mathfrak{K})$ .

**Remark.** Let us now assume that  $T$  is hyponormal and  $\sigma(T)$  is finite. In that case  $T$  must be normal. Thus we write  $T = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j E_j$  when the  $E_j$ 's are just the spectral projections. For  $V \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{H})$  write  $V$  as a matrix  $[V_{ij}]$  on  $\mathfrak{H} = \sum_{j=1}^n \bigoplus E_j \mathfrak{H}$ . Then the  $ij$  entry in the matrix representation of  $(TV - VT)$  is just  $(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)V_{ij}$ . This observation should make it clear that  $\mathfrak{R}(\Delta_T)$  is closed and moreover that  $\mathfrak{R}(\Delta_T) \cap \mathfrak{K} = \Delta_T(\mathfrak{K})$  since  $[(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)V_{ij}]$  is compact if and only if  $V_{ij}$  is compact for all  $i \neq j$ .

**Example.** In the case of an arbitrary operator  $T \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{H})$  we note that

$\alpha(T)$  finite does not imply  $\mathcal{R}(\Delta_T) \cap \mathcal{K} = \Delta_T(\mathcal{K})$ . For example let  $T = \begin{vmatrix} 0 & Q \\ 0 & 0 \end{vmatrix}$  on  $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$  where  $Q$  is compact. If  $R = \begin{vmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{vmatrix}$  then

$$TR - RT = \begin{vmatrix} QC & QD - AQ \\ 0 & -CQ \end{vmatrix}.$$

If we set  $A = D = 0$  and  $C = I$  then the operator  $\begin{vmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & -Q \end{vmatrix}$  is in  $\mathcal{R}(\Delta_T) \cap \mathcal{K}$ . But if  $Q$  is a selfadjoint compact operator with trivial kernel then  $\begin{vmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & -Q \end{vmatrix}$  is clearly not in  $\Delta_T(\mathcal{K})$ .

## REFERENCES

1. Joel H. Anderson and C. Foias, *On the range of a derivation*, Pacific J. Math. (to appear).
2. Joseph G. Stampfli, *Hyponormal operators and spectral density*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 117 (1965), 469–476; errata, *ibid.*, 550. MR 30 #3375; 33 #4686.
3. ———, *Compact perturbations, normal eigenvalues and a problem of Salinas*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 9 (1974), 165–175.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA  
47401