

## WEAKLY SUBNORMAL WEIGHTED SHIFTS NEED NOT BE 2-HYPONORMAL

JUN IK LEE

ABSTRACT. In this paper we give an example which is a weakly subnormal weighted shift but not 2-hyponormal. Also, we show that every partially normal extension of an isometry  $T$  needs not be 2-hyponormal even though  $\text{p.n.e.}(T)$  is weakly subnormal.

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{K}$  be complex Hilbert spaces, let  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  be the set of bounded linear operators from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathcal{K}$  and write  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) := \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$ . An operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  is said to be *normal* if  $T^*T = TT^*$ , *hyponormal* if  $T^*T \geq TT^*$ , and *subnormal* if  $T = N|_{\mathcal{H}}$ , where  $N$  is normal on some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ . If  $T$  is subnormal then  $T$  is also hyponormal. The Bram-Halmos criterion for subnormality states that an operator  $T$  is subnormal if and only if

$$\sum_{i,j} (T^i x_j, T^j x_i) \geq 0$$

for all finite collections  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{H}$  ([1], [5, II.1.9]). It is easy to see that this is equivalent to the following positivity test:

$$(1) \quad \begin{pmatrix} I & T^* & \cdots & T^{*k} \\ T & T^*T & \cdots & T^{*k}T \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ T^k & T^*T^k & \cdots & T^{*k}T^k \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \quad (\text{all } k \geq 1).$$

---

Received February 9, 2014. Revised March 11, 2015. Accepted March 11, 2015.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 47B20, 47B37, 47A13, 28A50; Secondary 44A60, 47-04, 47A20.

Key words and phrases: subnormal,  $k$ -hyponormal, weakly subnormal.

This research was Supported by a 2014 Research Grant from SangMyung University.

© The Kangwon-Kyungki Mathematical Society, 2015.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Condition (1) provides a measure of the gap between hyponormality and subnormality. In fact, the positivity condition (1) for  $k = 1$  is equivalent to the hyponormality of  $T$ , while subnormality requires the validity of (1) for all  $k$ . Let  $[A, B] := AB - BA$  denote the commutator of two operators  $A$  and  $B$ , and define  $T$  to be  $k$ -hyponormal whenever the  $k \times k$  operator matrix

$$(2) \quad M_k(T) := ([T^{*j}, T^i])_{i,j=1}^k$$

is positive. An application of the Choleski algorithm for operator matrices shows that the positivity of (2) is equivalent to the positivity of the  $(k+1) \times (k+1)$  operator matrix in (1); the Bram-Halmos criterion can be then rephrased as saying that  $T$  is subnormal if and only if  $T$  is  $k$ -hyponormal for every  $k \geq 1$  ([7], [6]).

On the other hand, note that an operator  $T$  is subnormal if and only if there exist operators  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $\widehat{T} := \begin{pmatrix} T & A \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$  is normal, i.e.,

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} [T^*, T] := T^*T - TT^* = AA^* \\ A^*T = BA^* \\ [B^*, B] + A^*A = 0. \end{cases}$$

The operator  $\widehat{T}$  is called a *normal extension* of  $T$ . We also say that  $\widehat{T}$  in  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$  is a *minimal normal extension* (briefly, m.n.e.) of  $T$  if  $\mathcal{K}$  has no proper subspace containing  $\mathcal{H}$  to which the restriction of  $\widehat{T}$  is also a normal extension of  $T$ . It is known that

$$\widehat{T} = \text{m.n.e.}(T) \iff \mathcal{K} = \bigvee \{ \widehat{T}^{*n}h : h \in \mathcal{H}, n \geq 0 \},$$

and the m.n.e.( $T$ ) is unique.

An operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  is said to be *weakly subnormal* if there exist operators  $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}', \mathcal{H})$  and  $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}')$  such that the first two conditions in (3) hold:

$$(4) \quad [T^*, T] = AA^* \quad \text{and} \quad A^*T = BA^*,$$

or equivalently, there is an extension  $\widehat{T}$  of  $T$  such that

$$\widehat{T}^*\widehat{T}f = \widehat{T}\widehat{T}^*f \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

The operator  $\widehat{T}$  is called a *partially normal extension* (briefly, p.n.e.) of  $T$ . We also say that  $\widehat{T}$  in  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$  is a *minimal partially normal extension* (briefly, m.p.n.e.) of  $T$  if  $\mathcal{K}$  has no proper subspace containing  $\mathcal{H}$  to

which the restriction of  $\widehat{T}$  is also a partially normal extension of  $T$ . It is known ([4, Lemma 2.5 and Corollary 2.7]) that

$$\widehat{T} = \text{m.p.n.e.}(T) \iff \mathcal{K} = \bigvee \{ \widehat{T}^{*n} h : h \in \mathcal{H}, n = 0, 1 \},$$

and the  $\text{m.p.n.e.}(T)$  is unique. For convenience, if  $\widehat{T} = \text{m.p.n.e.}(T)$  is also weakly subnormal then we write  $\widehat{T}^{(2)} := \widehat{\widehat{T}}$  and more generally,

$$\widehat{T}^{(n)} := \widehat{\widehat{\widehat{T}^{(n-1)}}},$$

which will be called the  $n$ -th minimal partially normal extension of  $T$ . It was ([4], [3]) shown that

$$(5) \quad 2\text{-hyponormal} \implies \text{weakly subnormal} \implies \text{hyponormal}$$

and the converses of both implications in 5 are not true in general. It was ([4]) known that

$$(6) \quad T \text{ is weakly subnormal} \implies T(\ker [T^*, T]) \subseteq \ker [T^*, T]$$

and it was ([3]) known that if  $\widehat{T} := \text{m.p.n.e.}(T)$  then for any  $k \geq 1$ ,

$T$  is  $(k + 1)$ -hyponormal  $\iff T$  is weakly subnormal and  $\widehat{T}$  is  $k$ -hyponormal.

So, in particular, one can see that

$$(7) \quad \text{if } T \text{ is subnormal then } \widehat{T} \text{ is subnormal.}$$

Recall that given a bounded sequence of positive numbers  $\alpha : \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots$  (called *weights*), the (*unilateral*) *weighted shift*  $W_\alpha$  associated with  $\alpha$  is the operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$  defined by  $W_\alpha e_n := \alpha_n e_{n+1}$  for all  $n \geq 0$ , where  $\{e_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$  is the canonical orthonormal basis for  $\ell^2$ . It is straightforward to check that  $W_\alpha$  can never be normal, and that  $W_\alpha$  is hyponormal if and only if  $\alpha_n \leq \alpha_{n+1}$  for all  $n \geq 0$ . The moments of  $\alpha$  are given as

$$\gamma_k \equiv \gamma_k(\alpha) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \alpha_0^2 \cdots \alpha_{k-1}^2 & \text{if } k > 0. \end{cases}$$

We now recall a well known characterization of subnormality for single variable weighted shifts, due to C. Berger (cf. [5, III.8.16]):  $W_\alpha$  is subnormal if and only if there exists a probability measure  $\xi$  supported in  $[0, \|W_\alpha\|^2]$  such that  $\gamma_k(\alpha) := \alpha_0^2 \cdots \alpha_{k-1}^2 = \int t^k d\xi(t)$  ( $k \geq 1$ ).

In a talk at Kyoto University entitled ‘On 2-hyponormal operators’, W.Y. Lee posed the following question.

QUESTION 1. *Is every weakly subnormal weighted shift 2-hyponormal?*

In this paper we negatively answer to the Question 1. To do so, we need the next Lemma.

LEMMA 2. ([2, Corollary 6]) *Let  $W_\alpha$  be 2-hyponormal. If  $\alpha_n = \alpha_{n+1}$  for some  $n \geq 0$ , then  $\alpha$  is flat, i.e.,  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \dots$ .*

EXAMPLE 3. If  $W_\alpha$  is the weighted shift with weight sequence  $\alpha \equiv \{\alpha_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ , where

$$\alpha_0 = a, \quad \alpha_1 = b, \quad \alpha_n = 1 \quad (n \geq 2, \quad a < b < 1)$$

then  $W_\alpha$  is weakly subnormal, but  $W_\alpha$  is not 2-hyponormal.

*Proof.* For the weak subnormality, let

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{b^2 - a^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{1 - b^2} \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0 \quad \text{and}$$

$$B := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{b^2 - a^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b\sqrt{\frac{1-b^2}{b^2-a^2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0.$$

Observe that  $[W_\alpha^*, W_\alpha] = A^2 = AA^*$  and  $A^*W_\alpha = BA^*$ . Thus,  $\widehat{W}_\alpha := \begin{pmatrix} W_\alpha & A \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$  is a partially normal extension of  $W_\alpha$  (cf. [4, Theorem 5.4]).

Since  $\alpha$  has two equal weights, by Lemma 2  $W_\alpha$  cannot be 2-hyponormal without being flat. Thus,  $W_\alpha$  is not 2-hyponormal. □

REMARK 4. In particular, the weighted shift  $W_\alpha$  in Example 3 is a partially normal extension of the unilateral shift  $U$ : indeed, observe that

$$W_\alpha \cong \left( \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} & & & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & U & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline & & & 0 & a & 0 \\ & 0 & & 0 & 0 & b \\ & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) = \text{p.n.e.}(U).$$

So, we need not expect that every partially normal extension of an isometry  $T$  is 2-hyponormal even though  $\text{p.n.e.}(T)$  is weakly subnormal.

### References

- [1] J. Bram, *Subnormal operators*, Duke Math. J. **22** (1955), 75–94.
- [2] R.E. Curto, *Quadratically hyponormal weighted shifts*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **13** (1990), 49–66.
- [3] R.E. Curto, I.B. Jung and S. S. Park, *A characterization of  $k$ -hyponormality via weak subnormality*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **279** (2003), 556–568.
- [4] R.E. Curto and W.Y. Lee, *Towards a model theory for 2-hyponormal operators*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **44** (2002), 290–315.
- [5] J. Conway, *The Theory of Subnormal Operators*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 36, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1991.
- [6] R. Curto, S.H. Lee and W.Y. Lee, *A new criterion for  $k$ -hyponormality via weak subnormality*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear)
- [7] R. Curto, P. Muhly and J. Xia, *Hyponormal pairs of commuting operators*, Operator Theory: Adv. Appl. **35** (1988), 1–22.

Jun Ik Lee  
Department of Mathematics Education  
Sangmyung University  
Seoul 110-743, Republic of Korea  
*E-mail*: jilee@smu.ac.kr