

## A SUFFICIENT CONDITION FOR HYPERINVARIANCE

W. E. LONGSTAFF

**ABSTRACT.** A linear transformation on a finite-dimensional complex linear space has the property that all of its invariant subspaces are hyperinvariant if and only if its lattice of invariant subspaces is distributive [1]. It is shown that an operator on a complex Hilbert space has this property if its lattice of invariant subspaces satisfies a certain distributivity condition.

**1. Preliminaries.** Throughout this paper  $H$  will denote an arbitrary complex Hilbert space. All operators are bounded and all subspaces are closed. By a *subspace lattice* on  $H$  is meant a family of subspaces of  $H$  which is closed under the formation of arbitrary intersections and arbitrary closed linear spans and which contains the zero subspace  $(0)$  and  $H$ . The family of subspaces invariant under an operator  $T$  is denoted by  $\text{Lat } T$ . This is a subspace lattice as is the family of subspaces invariant under every operator commuting with  $T$  which we denote by  $\text{Hyperlat } T$ . The elements of  $\text{Hyperlat } T$  are called the *hyperinvariant* subspaces of  $T$ . Clearly  $\text{Hyperlat } T \subseteq \text{Lat } T$ . A subspace lattice  $\mathfrak{F}$  is called *commutative* if for every pair of subspaces  $M, N \in \mathfrak{F}$  the corresponding projections  $P_M$  and  $P_N$  commute. Let  $L$  be an abstract lattice. We say that  $L$  is

(i) *distributive* if

$$a \vee (b \wedge c) = (a \vee b) \wedge (a \vee c) \quad (a, b, c \in L)$$

and its dual statement holds identically;

(ii)  *$\sigma$ -infinitely meet distributive* if  $L$  is  $\sigma$ -complete and

$$a \vee \{ \bigwedge b_n : n \geq 1 \} = \bigwedge \{ a \vee b_n : n \geq 1 \} \quad (a, b_n \in L)$$

holds identically in  $L$ .

That the dual equation defining distributivity are equivalent to each other is an elementary result of lattice theory.

**2. A sufficient condition for hyperinvariance.** The key to the sufficient condition is a result of Sarason and the following lattice-theoretic result.

**PROPOSITION 2.1.** *If  $L$  is an abstract  $\sigma$ -infinitely meet distributive lattice and  $\theta: L \rightarrow L$  is a lattice automorphism with the properties*

(I)  $a \leq \theta(a) \vee \theta^{-1}(a)$  ( $a \in L$ );

(II)  $a, \theta(a)$  comparable implies  $a = \theta(a)$ ,

*then  $\theta$  is the identity automorphism.*

**PROOF.** For every  $n \geq 1$  let  $\theta^n: L \rightarrow L$  be defined in the obvious way. Let  $a$

---

Received by the editors March 27, 1975.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 47A15; Secondary 26A30.

Copyright © 1977, American Mathematical Society

be an arbitrary fixed element of  $L$ . For  $n \geq 1$  put  $a_n = a \wedge \theta(a) \wedge \theta^2(a) \wedge \dots \wedge \theta^n(a)$ . Then  $a_n \wedge \theta(a_n) = a_{n+1}$  ( $n \geq 1$ ). Using (I) and the fact that  $L$  is distributive the statement

$$\theta(x) = (x \wedge \theta(x)) \vee [\theta(x \wedge \theta(x))]$$

holds identically in  $L$ . Using this identity it is easily shown that  $\theta(a) = a_1 \vee \theta(a_n)$  ( $n \geq 1$ ). Thus

$$\theta(a) = \bigwedge \{a_1 \vee \theta(a_n) : n \geq 1\} = a_1 \vee (\bigwedge \{\theta(a_n) : n \geq 1\}).$$

If  $c = \bigwedge \{a_n : n \geq 1\}$  then

$$\theta(c) = \bigwedge \{\theta(a_n) : n \geq 1\} \geq \bigwedge \{a_{n+1} : n \geq 1\} \geq c$$

and by (II),  $\theta(c) = c$ . Hence  $\theta(a) = a_1 \vee \theta(c) = a_1 \vee c = a_1 \leq a$  and again by (II),  $\theta(a) = a$ . This completes the proof.

Let  $T$  be an operator on  $H$ . Notice that if  $S$  is an invertible operator commuting with  $T$  then  $SM \in \text{Lat } T$  ( $M \in \text{Lat } T$ ) and the mapping  $M \rightarrow SM$  is a lattice automorphism with the mapping  $M \rightarrow S^{-1}M$  as its inverse. If the operator  $A$  commutes with  $T$  and  $\mu$  is a scalar with  $|\mu| > \|A\|$ , the operator  $S = A - \mu$  is invertible, commutes with  $T$  and  $\text{Lat } A = \text{Lat } S$ . By a result of Sarason [4],  $\text{Lat } S = \text{Lat } S^{-1}$ . It readily follows that  $\text{Hyperlat } T = \text{Lat } T$  if and only if for every invertible operator  $S$  commuting with  $T$  satisfying  $\text{Lat } S = \text{Lat } S^{-1}$  the mapping  $M \rightarrow SM$  ( $M \in \text{Lat } T$ ) is the identity automorphism.

**PROPOSITION 2.2.** *If  $\text{Lat } T$  is distributive and  $S$  is an invertible operator commuting with  $T$ , then  $M \subseteq SM \vee S^{-1}M$  ( $M \in \text{Lat } T$ ).*

**PROOF.** Choose  $\lambda$  with  $0 < \lambda < 1/\|S\|$ . The operator  $C = 1 + \lambda S$  is invertible and commutes with  $T$ . Let  $M \in \text{Lat } T$ . It is readily verified that  $CM \cap SM = C(M \cap SM)$  and  $CM \cap M = C(M \cap S^{-1}M)$ . Since  $CM \subseteq SM \vee M$ , by distributivity we have

$$\begin{aligned} CM &= (CM \cap SM) \vee (CM \cap M) = C(M \cap SM) \vee C(M \cap S^{-1}M) \\ &= C(M \cap [SM \vee S^{-1}M]) \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

**THEOREM 2.3.** *If  $\text{Lat } T$  is  $\sigma$ -infinitely meet distributive  $\text{Hyperlat } T = \text{Lat } T$ .*

**PROOF.** By our earlier remarks it suffices to show that if  $S$  is an invertible operator commuting with  $T$  and satisfying  $\text{Lat } S = \text{Lat } S^{-1}$  then the automorphism  $M \rightarrow SM$  of  $\text{Lat } T$  is the identity automorphism. Since  $\text{Lat } T$  is distributive, this automorphism satisfies condition (I) of Proposition 2.1 by Proposition 2.2. Since  $\text{Lat } S = \text{Lat } S^{-1}$ , condition (II) is also satisfied. The result now follows from Proposition 2.1.

**COROLLARY 2.3.1.**  $\text{Hyperlat } T = \text{Lat } T$  if  $\text{Lat } T$  is any one of the following:

- (i) commutative;
- (ii) isomorphic to the direct product of complete chains;
- (iii) totally ordered.

PROOF. It is clear that in cases (ii) and (iii) Lat  $T$  is  $\sigma$ -infinitely meet distributive. Suppose that Lat  $T$  is commutative. Then it is also distributive. This follows from the fact that if  $P$  and  $Q$  are commuting projections then  $PQ$  is the projection onto the intersection of the ranges of  $P$  and  $Q$  and  $P + Q - PQ$  is the projection onto the closed linear span of the ranges of  $P$  and  $Q$ . Thus if  $K, L, M \in \text{Lat } T$  then

$$\begin{aligned} P_{K \cap (L \vee M)} &= P_K P_{L \vee M} = P_K (P_L + P_M - P_L P_M) \\ &= P_{K \cap L} + P_{K \cap M} - P_{K \cap L} P_{K \cap M} = P_{(K \cap L) \vee (K \cap M)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let

$$K, L_n (n \geq 1) \in \text{Lat } T.$$

Then  $P_{\cap \{L_n: n \geq 1\}}$ , respectively  $P_{\cap \{K \vee L_n: n \geq 1\}}$ , is the strong limit of the sequence  $\{P_{\cap \{L_n: 1 \leq n \leq k\}}: k \geq 1\}$ , respectively  $\{P_{\cap \{K \vee L_n: 1 \leq n \leq k\}}: k \geq 1\}$ . But

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\cap \{K \vee L_n: 1 \leq n \leq k\}} &= P_{K \vee \cap \{L_n: 1 \leq n \leq k\}} \\ &= P_K + P_{\cap \{L_n: 1 \leq n \leq k\}} - P_K P_{\cap \{L_n: 1 \leq n \leq k\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking strong limits gives

$$P_{\cap \{K \vee L_n: n > 1\}} = P_K + P_{\cap \{L_n: n > 1\}} - P_K P_{\cap \{L_n: n > 1\}} = P_{K \vee \cap \{L_n: n > 1\}}.$$

Hence Lat  $T$  is  $\sigma$ -infinitely meet distributive. The result follows by applying Theorem 2.3.

The results (i) and (iii) above are not new. The former was proved in [2] and the latter in [3].

**3. Concluding remarks.** It is a simple exercise to show for any linear transformation  $T$  on a finite-dimensional complex linear space that Hyperlat  $T$  is distributive and finite, therefore  $\sigma$ -infinitely meet distributive. It seems an interesting question whether Hyperlat  $T$  is always  $\sigma$ -infinitely meet distributive or even whether the converse of Theorem 2.3 holds. For a normal operator  $T$ , Hyperlat  $T$  consists of the ranges of the spectral projections for  $T$  [2] and so is both commutative and a Boolean algebra and so is certainly  $\sigma$ -infinitely meet distributive.

#### REFERENCES

1. L. Brickman and P. A. Fillmore, *The invariant subspace lattice of a linear transformation*, *Canad. J. Math.* **19**(1967), 810–822. MR **35** #4242.
2. R. G. Douglas and Carl Pearcy, *On a topology for invariant subspaces*, *J. Functional Analysis* **2**(1968), 323–341. MR **38** #1547.
3. Peter Rosenthal, *A note on unicellular operators*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **19**(1968), 505–506. MR **36** #5753.
4. Donald Sarason, *The  $H^p$  spaces of an annulus*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. No. 56*(1965). MR **32** #6256.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FLINDERS UNIVERSITY, BEDFORD PARK, SOUTH AUSTRALIA 5042