

## NORM CONVERGENCE OF $T^n$

GLENN R. LUECKE

**Introduction.** Throughout this paper  $X$  will denote a complex Banach space and all operators  $T$  will be assumed to be continuous linear transformations from  $X$  into  $X$ . If  $T$  is an operator then  $\sigma(T)$ ,  $r(T)$ , and  $R(T)$  will denote the spectrum of  $T$ , the spectral radius of  $T$ , and range of  $T$ , respectively. This paper contains necessary and sufficient conditions for the (norm) convergence of  $\{T^n\}$  when  $T$  is an operator on  $X$ . The results of this paper generalize results of Yosida and Kakutani [10] and of M. Lin [7]. Recall that  $T$  is quasi-compact if there exists a compact operator  $K$  and a positive integer  $n$  such that  $\|T^n - K\| < 1$ . In [10, Theorem 4, p. 200] Yoshida and Kakutani have proved:

**THEOREM 1.** (Yosida and Kakutani). *If  $T$  is quasi-compact and if there exists a constant  $C$  such that  $\|T^n\| \leq C$  for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  then  $\sigma(T) \cap \{z: |z| = 1\} = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k\}$ , a finite set, where each  $\lambda_i$  is an eigenvalue of finite multiplicity. Furthermore, there exists compact operators  $K_1, \dots, K_m$  and a quasi-compact operator  $S$  such that*

$$T^n = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^n K_i + S^n, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

and

$$\|S^n\| \leq \frac{M}{(1 + \epsilon)^n}$$

for some  $\epsilon > 0$ .

Let  $S$  be a topological space and let  $C(S)$  denote all bounded continuous scalar-valued functions on  $S$  with the sup norm. The following theorem is similar to Theorem 1 and is found in Dunford and Schwartz [1, Theorem VIII. 8.6].

**THEOREM 2.** *If  $T$  is a positive quasi-compact operator in  $C(S)$  such that  $T^n/n$  converges to zero weakly, then the same conclusions found in Theorem 1 are valid.*

M. Lin [7, p. 337] has shown the following.

**THEOREM 3.** (M. Lin) *If  $T$  is an operator on  $X$  such that  $\|T^n/n\| \rightarrow 0$  then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $T - I$  has closed range,
- (2)  $T - I$  has closed range and  $X = \ker(T - I) \oplus R(T - I)$ , and
- (3) the sequence  $\{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N T^i\}$  (norm) converges.

---

Received January 25, 1977 and in revised form, May 3, 1977 and June 1, 1977. This research was supported in part by funds from the Iowa State University Science and Humanities Research Institute.

**Necessary and sufficient conditions for  $T^n$  to converge.** It has already been shown by J. J. Koliha [5, Theorem 2.5] that  $T^n$  converges if and only if  $\sup |\sigma(T) \sim \{1\}| < 1$  and 1 is a pole of  $(T - \lambda I)^{-1}$  of order  $\leq 1$ . If  $\sigma(T) = \{1\}$  take  $\sup |\sigma(T) \sim \{1\}| = 0$ .

Koliha [5, Theorem 3.2] has shown that if (1)  $\sup_n \|T^n\| < \infty$ , (2)  $T - I$  has closed range, (3)  $T - I$  has finite descent, and if (4)  $\lambda \in \sigma(T) \sim \{1\}$  implies  $|\lambda| < 1$ , then  $T^n$  converges. Using a result of M. Lin the following improvement is true.

**THEOREM 4.** *If (1)  $\|T^n/n\| \rightarrow 0$ , (2)  $T - I$  has closed range, and (3)  $\lambda \in \sigma(T) \sim \{1\}$  implies  $|\lambda| < 1$ , then  $T^n$  converges.*

*Proof.* Since  $\|T^n/n\| \rightarrow 0$  and  $T - I$  has closed range,  $X = \ker(T - I) \oplus R(T - I)$  (see [7, p. 337]). Since  $\ker(T - I)$  and  $R(T - I)$  are invariant under  $T$  we may write  $T = I \oplus A$ . Since  $T - I$  is invertible on  $R(T - I)$ , and since  $1 \neq \lambda \in \sigma(T)$  implies  $|\lambda| < 1$ ,  $A - \lambda I$  is invertible for all  $|\lambda| = 1$  so that  $r(A) < 1$ .  $r(A) < 1$  implies  $A^n \rightarrow 0$  so that  $T^n = I \oplus A^n \rightarrow I \oplus 0$  and the proof is complete.

**THEOREM 5.** *If (1)  $X = \ker(T - I) \oplus M$ ,  $T(M) \subseteq M$ , (2)  $T - I$  has closed range, and (3)  $\lambda \in \sigma(T) \sim \{1\}$  implies  $|\lambda| < 1$ , then  $T^n$  converges.*

Notice that in Theorem 5 the first hypothesis is weaker than the first hypothesis ( $\|T^n/n\| \rightarrow 0$ ) of Theorem 4. This is true since  $\|T^n/n\| \rightarrow 0$  and  $T - I$  has closed range implies  $X = \ker(T - I) \oplus R(T - I)$  [7, p. 337], but the converse is false (for example take  $T = 2I$ ). Notice that for Theorem 5 there are no *a priori* bounds on  $\|T^n\|$  but that it follows from Theorem 5 that  $\sup_n \|T^n\|$  is finite. Also notice that the third hypothesis of Theorem 5 allows 1 to be an accumulation point of  $\sigma(T)$ .

Recall that the *approximate point spectrum* of an operator  $A$ ,  $\sigma_\pi(A)$ , is the set of all  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$  such that there exists  $\|x_n\| = 1$  such that  $\|(A - \lambda I)x_n\| \rightarrow 0$ . In [2, Problem 63] a proof is given that for any (bounded) operator  $A$  on a Hilbert space that  $\partial\sigma(A)$  is a subset of  $\sigma_\pi(A)$ . By appropriately modifying the proof given in [2, Problem 63] we have the following lemma for operators on a Banach space.

**LEMMA.**  $\partial\sigma(A) \subseteq \sigma_\pi(A)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda \in \partial\sigma(A)$ . Without loss of generality assume  $\lambda = 0$ . Since  $0 \in \partial\sigma(A)$ , there exists invertible  $A_n \rightarrow A$ . Suppose, to the contrary, that  $0 \notin \sigma_\pi(A)$ . Then there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\|Ax\| \geq \epsilon\|x\|$  for all  $x$ . Therefore  $A$  is one-to-one and has closed range. Since  $A$  is not invertible, the closed set  $R(A)$  is not dense in the Banach space  $X$ . Thus there exists  $y \in X$  and  $\delta > 0$  so that  $\|y - Ax\| \geq \delta$  for all  $x \in X$ . Define  $x_n = A_n^{-1}y/\|A_n^{-1}y\|$ . Then  $\|x_n\| = 1$ ,  $\|A_n x_n - Ax_n\| \leq \|A_n - A\| \rightarrow 0$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_n x_n - Ax_n\| &= \|y/\|A_n^{-1}y\| - Ax_n\| = \|y - A(x_n/\|A_n^{-1}y\|)\|/\|A_n^{-1}y\| \\ &\geq \delta/\|A_n^{-1}y\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\|A_n^{-1}y\| \rightarrow +\infty$ . Hence

$$\|Ax_n\| \leq \|A_n x_n - Ax_n\| + \|A_n x_n\| \leq \|A_n - A\| + \|y\|/\|A_n^{-1}y\| \rightarrow 0.$$

But this contradicts  $\|Ax\| \geq \epsilon\|x\|$  for all  $x$  and the proof of the lemma is complete.

*Proof of Theorem 5.* Since  $X = \ker(T - I) \oplus M, T(M) \subseteq M, T = I \oplus A$  so that  $T^n = I \oplus A^n$ . Therefore, to show  $T^n$  converges it suffices to show  $A^n \rightarrow 0$ .

If  $1 \notin \sigma(A)$ , then since  $\lambda \in \sigma(A) \sim \{1\}$  implies  $|\lambda| < 1$  (this is true for  $A$  since it is true for  $T$ ),  $r(A) < 1$ . Therefore, since  $\|A^n\|^{1/n} \rightarrow r(A) < 1, A^n \rightarrow 0$ .

Next suppose  $1 \in \sigma(A)$ . Then since  $\partial\sigma(A) \subseteq \sigma_\pi(A), 1 \in \sigma_\pi(A)$ . Thus there exists  $\|x_n\| = 1$  such that  $\|(A - I)x_n\| \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $T - I$  has closed range,  $A - I$  has closed range. By construction  $A - I$  is one-to-one. Thus  $A - I$  is one-to-one and has closed range so there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\|(A - I)x\| \geq \delta\|x\|$  for all  $x$ . But this contradicts  $\|(A - I)x_n\| \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore  $1 \notin \sigma(A)$  and the proof of Theorem 5 is complete.

**COROLLARY 1.**  $T^n \rightarrow 0$  if and only if  $r(T) < 1$ .

**COROLLARY 2.** If (1)  $\lambda \in \sigma(T) \sim \{1\}$  implies  $|\lambda| < 1$ , (2)  $T - I$  has closed range, and (3)  $T^n \rightarrow Q$  weakly, then  $T^n \rightarrow Q$  (in norm).

*Proof.* Since  $Q^2 = Q = TQ = QT, X = N \oplus M$  where  $N$  and  $M$  are invariant under  $T, N = R(Q)$ , and  $M = \ker Q$ . It follows that  $\ker(T - I) = R(Q)$  so that  $X = \ker(T - I) \oplus M, T(M) \subseteq M$ . Thus the corollary follows from Theorem 5.

Another variation of Theorem 5 is

**THEOREM 6.** If (1)  $\|T^n(T - I)\| \rightarrow 0$ , (2)  $T - I$  has closed range and (3)  $X = \ker(T - I) \oplus M, T(M) \subseteq M$ , then  $T^n$  converges.

*Proof.* As in the proof of Theorem 5 write  $T = I \oplus A$ . It follows that  $A - I$  is one-to-one and has closed range. Hence there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\|(A - I)x\| \geq \delta\|x\|$  for all  $x \in M$ . Since  $T^n(T - I) \rightarrow 0, A^n(A - I) \rightarrow 0$ . Now  $\|A^n(A - I)x\| = \|(A - I)A^n x\| \geq \delta\|A^n x\|$  so that  $\delta\|A^n x\| \leq \|A^n(A - I)x\|$  for all  $x$ . Hence  $\delta\|A^n\| \leq \|A^n(A - I)\| \rightarrow 0$  which implies  $A^n \rightarrow 0$  and the proof is complete.

**THEOREM 7.** If  $T^n \rightarrow Q$  then (1)  $(T - zI)^{-1}$  has a pole of order  $\leq 1$  at  $z = 1$ , (2)  $\sup |\sigma(T) \sim \{1\}| < 1$ , (3)  $T - I$  has closed range, (4)  $X = \ker(T - I) \oplus R(T - I)$ , and (5)

$$Q = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z-1|=\epsilon} (T - zI)^{-1} dz$$

for some  $\epsilon > 0$  sufficiently small.

*Proof.* (1) and (2) have been proved by J. J. Koliha [5, Theorem 2.5]. Since  $T^n \rightarrow Q$  implies  $\|T^n/n\| \rightarrow 0$  and  $\|N^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} T^n - Q\| \rightarrow 0$ , we may apply a result of M. Lin (see Theorem 3) to conclude that (3) and (4) are true. To prove (5), choose  $\epsilon > 0$  so that  $\{z: |z - 1| \leq \epsilon\} \cap \sigma(T) \subseteq \{1\}$  and define

$$E = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z-1|=\epsilon} (T - zI)^{-1} dz.$$

Then  $TE = ET = E = E^2$  [8, p. 421]. By (1)  $(z - 1)(T - zI)^{-1}$  is analytic in a neighborhood of  $z = 1$  so that

$$TE - E = (T - I)E = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z-1|=\epsilon} (z - 1)(T - zI)^{-1} dz = 0.$$

Thus  $TE = E$ . By (2) there exists  $0 < p < 1$  so that  $\sigma(T) \sim \{1\} \subseteq \{z: |z| < p\}$ . Then

$$I - E = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=p} (T - zI)^{-1} dz$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^n(I - E)\| &= \left\| -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=p} z^n (T - zI)^{-1} dz \right\| \\ &\leq p^{n+1} \sup_{|z|=p} \|(T - zI)^{-1}\| \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $T^n = T^n E + T^n(I - E) = E + T^n(I - E) \rightarrow E$  and the proof is complete.

We conclude this paper with three examples:

Let  $X = \mathbf{R}^2$  and  $T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . Then  $\sigma(T) = \{1\}$  and  $T - I$  has closed range. Suppose  $X = \ker(T - I) \oplus M$ ,  $T(M) \subseteq M$ . One checks that  $\ker(T - I) = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$  and hence  $M \neq \{0\}$ . Let  $x \in M$ ,  $x \neq 0$ . Since  $T(M) \subseteq M$  and since  $M$  has dimension one,  $Tx = \lambda x$  for some  $\lambda$ . Since  $\sigma(T) = \{1\}$ ,  $\lambda = 1$  and  $Tx = x$ , i.e.  $x \in \ker(T - I)$ , a contradiction. Therefore hypothesis (1) cannot be omitted from Theorem 5. If we let  $S = -T$  then  $r(S) = 1$  and  $S - I$  is invertible but  $\|S^n/n\| \not\rightarrow 0$ . This shows that in Theorem 3  $r(T) = 1$  cannot replace  $\|T^n/n\| \rightarrow 0$ . By letting  $X = l_2$  and  $T = \text{diag}(0, 1/2, 2/3, 3/4, 4/5, \dots)$  one easily sees that hypotheses (2) and (3) of Theorem 5 cannot be deleted.

This next example shows that Theorem 5 is false if we omit hypothesis (2), i.e.  $T - I$  has closed range. Let  $X = l_2$ . Let  $x_1, x_2, \dots$  be the canonical orthonormal basis for  $l_2$  and define  $Ax_n = a_n x_{n+1}$  where  $a_n \downarrow 0$ ,  $a_n > 0$  for all  $n$ . Then from [2, Problem 80]  $\sigma(A) = \{0\}$ ,  $\sigma_p(A) = \emptyset$ , and  $A$  does not have closed range. Let  $T = I + A$  so that  $\sigma(T) = \{1\}$ ,  $T - I$  does not have closed range, and

since  $\ker(T - I) = \ker A = \{0\}$ ,  $X = \ker(T - I) \oplus X$  and hypothesis (1) is satisfied trivially. One computes that

$$T^n x_k - x_k = a_k a_{k+1} \cdots a_{k+n-1} x_{k+n} + n a_k a_{k+1} \cdots a_{k+n-2} x_{k+n-1} \\ + n a_k a_{k+1} \cdots a_{k+n-3} x_{k+n-2} + \cdots + n a_k a_{k+1}.$$

Hence  $\|(T^n - I)x_k\| \geq n a_k$ . If we let  $a_k = 1/k$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  then  $\|(T^n - I)x_n\| \geq 1$  for all  $n$ . Suppose  $\{T^n\}$  converged (in norm). Then by Theorem 7,  $T^n \rightarrow E$  where

$$E = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z-1|=\epsilon} (T - zI)^{-1} dz.$$

Since  $\sigma(T) = \{1\}$ ,  $E = I$ . Thus, if  $\{T^n\}$  converged then  $T^n \rightarrow I$ . But  $\|(T^n - I)x_n\| \geq 1$  for all  $n$ ,  $\|x_n\| = 1$ . Hence  $\{T^n\}$  does not converge.

*Acknowledgement.* The author would like to thank the referee for suggesting Theorems 4 and 6 and for suggesting the above proof of Theorem 7 (parts (1) through (4)) and the above proof of Theorem 5 which are much shorter than the original proofs.

#### REFERENCES

1. N. Dunford and J. Schwartz, *Linear operators, Part I* (Wiley Interscience, New York, 1957).
2. P. R. Halmos, *A Hilbert space problem book* (Van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J., 1967).
3. D. Isaacson and G. R. Luecke, *Ergodicity versus strong ergodicity*, to appear.
4. S. Karlin, *Positive operators*, J. Math. and Mech. 8 (1959), 907-937.
5. J. J. Koliba, *Power convergence and pseudo inverses of operators in Banach space*, J. Math. Anal. and Appl. 48 (1974), 446-469.
6. M. Lin, *Quasi-compactness and uniform ergodicity of Markov operators*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, 11 (1975), 345-354.
7. ———, *On the uniform ergodic theorem, I*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 43 (1974), 337-340.
8. F. Riesz and B. Sz.-Nagy, *Functional analysis* (Ungar, New York, 1955).
9. M. Schechter, *Principles of functional analysis* (Academic Press, New York and London, 1971).
10. K. Yosida and S. Kakutani, *Operator-theoretical treatment of Markoff's process and mean ergodic theorem*, Annals of Mathematics 42 (1941), 188-228.

Iowa State University,  
Ames, Iowa 50011