

# EXERCISES OPERATOR THEORY

## SHEET 2

### EXERCISE 5

$X = C[0, 1]$ , operator  $A$  on  $X$  given by

$$Ax(t) = x(0) + tx(1).$$

Find  $\sigma(A)$ ,  $r_\sigma(A)$  and  $R_\lambda(A)$  for  $\lambda \in \rho(A)$ .

**Spectrum  $\sigma(A)$ :**

- (1)  $0 \in \sigma(A)$ : Consider the function  $x(t) = t(1 - t)$ . Then  $Ax(t) = 0$ . Hence,  $\text{Ker}(A) \neq \{0\}$  and  $A$  is not injective. Therefore,  $0 \in \sigma(A)$ .
- (2)  $1 \in \sigma(A)$ : Consider the function  $x(t) = t$ . Then  $(A - \text{Id})x(t) = 0$ . By the same argument as before,  $1 \in \sigma(A)$ .

**Resolvent set  $\rho(A)$  and Resolvent  $R_\lambda(A)$ :**  $\lambda \in \rho(A)$  for all  $\lambda \notin \{0, 1\}$ : We can calculate the inverse directly: Let  $y \in C[0, 1]$ . We need to find  $x \in C[0, 1]$  such that

$$(1) \quad (A - \lambda)x(t) = x(0) + tx(t) - \lambda x(t) = y(t).$$

For  $t = 0$ , we need

$$y(0) = x(0) - \lambda x(0) = (1 - \lambda)x(0) \Leftrightarrow x(0) = \frac{1}{1 - \lambda}y(0)$$

For  $t = 1$ , we need

$$\begin{aligned} y(1) &= x(0) + x(1) - \lambda x(1) = x(0) + (1 - \lambda)x(1) = \frac{1}{1 - \lambda}y(0) + (1 - \lambda)x(1) \\ &\Leftrightarrow x(1) = \frac{1}{1 - \lambda}y(1) - \frac{1}{(1 - \lambda)^2}y(0) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can rewrite equation (1) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1 - \lambda}y(0) + \frac{t}{1 - \lambda}y(1) - \frac{t}{(1 - \lambda)^2}y(0) - \lambda x(t) &= y(t) \\ \Leftrightarrow x(t) &= -\frac{1}{\lambda}y(t) + \frac{1}{\lambda(1 - \lambda)} \left[ y(0) + ty(1) - \frac{t}{1 - \lambda}y(0) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the inverse is given by

$$(A - \lambda)^{-1}y(t) = -\frac{1}{\lambda}y(t) + \frac{1}{\lambda(1 - \lambda)} \left[ y(0) + ty(1) - \frac{t}{1 - \lambda}y(0) \right]$$

which is also the explicit form of the resolvent. (One can now double-check this by plugging in  $y = (A - \lambda)x$  to see that this is in fact the inverse.)

$\Rightarrow A - \lambda$  is invertible  $\Rightarrow \lambda \in \rho(A)$ . As stated before, we also have  $R_\lambda(A) = (A - \lambda)^{-1}$  with the above representation.

**Spectral radius  $r_\sigma(A)$ :** We obtain the spectral radius directly by definition,

$$r_\sigma(A) = 1.$$

**How does one actually find the spectrum?** One idea is to just write out the equation to get an idea how the spectrum could look like: For some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , we need

$$(2) \quad x(0) + tx(1) = \lambda x(t).$$

We know that for  $t = 0$ , (2) becomes

$$x(0) = \lambda x(0) \Leftrightarrow \lambda = 1 \vee x(0) = 0$$

Consider the case  $\lambda = 1$ :

$$x(0) + tx(1) = x(t)$$

For  $t = 1$ , we obtain  $x(0) + x(1) = x(1)$  and see that  $x(0) = 0$ . We are left with

$$x(t) = tx(1)$$

so the eigenfunction is some linear function.

Now to the case that  $\lambda \neq 1$ . By above considerations at  $t = 0$ , we know that  $x(0) = 0$  is necessary now. This leaves us with the equation

$$tx(1) = \lambda x(t).$$

at  $t = 1$ , this becomes  $x(1) = \lambda x(1)$ . Since we excluded the case  $\lambda = 1$ , we conclude that  $\lambda = 0$  or  $x(1) = 0$ . As it turns out, both conditions are equivalent in our setting. Hence, we only have to find some continuous function for which  $x(0) = x(1) = 0$  holds (e.g.  $x(t) = t - t^2$ ) and we have an eigenfunction to the eigenvalue  $\lambda = 0$ .

Of course, in a more general setting, not all elements of the spectrum are eigenvalues, and this becomes more complicated. But as a first step, one can try to explicitly calculate the spectrum.

### EXERCISE 6

Let  $X$  be a Banach space. Suppose  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  and  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ . Show that  $\lambda^n \in \sigma(A^n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Reminder** (Spectral Mapping Theorem). *Let  $f$  be analytic in some neighbourhood of  $\sigma(B)$ . Then*

$$\sigma(f(B)) = f(\sigma(B))$$

Obviously, the function  $f(z) = z^n$  is analytic for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, the statement of the exercise follows by the spectral mapping theorem.

Alternatively, we can use an argument from the proof of Theorem 2.23: Assume  $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ . Then  $A - \lambda$  is not invertible. We can rewrite  $(A^n - \lambda^n)$  as

$$A^n - \lambda^n = (A - \lambda)(\lambda^{n-1} + \lambda^{n-2}A + \dots + \lambda A^{n-2} + A^{n-1})$$

Since the operators on the right-hand-side commute, by Lemma 2.3, the operator  $A^n - \lambda^n$  is not invertible. Hence,  $\lambda^n \in \sigma(A^n)$ .

### EXERCISE 7

$A: l^2 \rightarrow l^2, Ax = (\lambda_1 x_1, \lambda_2 x_2, \dots), \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}, \sup |\lambda_n| < \infty$ . Find  $\sigma(A)$ .

Claim:  $\sigma(A) = \overline{\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}}$ .

(1)  $\lambda_n \in \sigma(A) \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let  $e_n = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots)$ . Then

$$Ae_n = (0, \dots, 0, \lambda_n, 0, \dots) = \lambda_n e_n.$$

Hence,  $\lambda_n$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$  and by Lemma 2.7,  $\lambda_n \in \sigma(A)$ .

(2) Let  $\lambda \in \overline{\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}} \setminus \{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then there exists a subsequence  $\{\lambda_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\lambda_{n_k} \rightarrow \lambda, k \rightarrow \infty$ . Especially,

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k} - \lambda} \right| = \infty.$$

Assume that  $A - \lambda$  is invertible. Then the inverse is given by

$$(A - \lambda)^{-1}y = \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda}y_1, \frac{1}{\lambda_2 - \lambda}y_2, \dots \right)$$

we show that this operator would be unbounded:

$$\|(A - \lambda)^{-1}\| = \sup_{\|y\|=1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{y_n}{\lambda_n - \lambda} \right)^2 \geq \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(e_j)_n^2}{(\lambda_n - \lambda)^2} = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(\lambda_j - \lambda)^2} = \infty$$

By theorem 2.2 (Banach), a bounded invertible operator has bounded inverse. Hence,  $A - \lambda$  can not be invertible.

(3)  $\lambda \notin \sigma(A)$  for all  $\lambda \notin \overline{\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}}$ .

Let  $\lambda \notin \{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , i.e.  $\lambda \neq \lambda_n \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We claim that  $A - \lambda$  is invertible. By theorem 2.2, it suffices to show that the operator  $A - \lambda$  is bijective.

- $A - \lambda$  is injective: For any  $x \in l^2$ , we have

$$(A - \lambda)x = ((\lambda_1 - \lambda)x_1, (\lambda_2 - \lambda)x_2, \dots)$$

Then

$$(A - \lambda)x = 0 \Leftrightarrow (\lambda_n - \lambda)x_n = 0 \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \stackrel{\lambda_n \neq \lambda}{\Leftrightarrow} x_n = 0 \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

Hence,  $\text{Ker}(A - \lambda) = \{0\}$  and  $A - \lambda$  is injective.

- $A - \lambda$  is surjective: Let  $y \in l^2$ . We need to find  $x \in l^2$  such that  $(A - \lambda)x = y$ . This means that

$$(\lambda_n - \lambda)x_n = y_n \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \stackrel{\lambda_n \neq \lambda}{\Leftrightarrow} x_n = \frac{1}{\lambda_n - \lambda}y_n$$

Hence, we found the desired  $x$  and  $A - \lambda$  is surjective. It is still left to show that  $x \in l^2$ . But since  $\lambda \notin \overline{\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}}$ , there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$(\lambda - \varepsilon, \lambda + \varepsilon) \cap \overline{\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}} = \emptyset \Rightarrow \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n - \lambda| > \varepsilon \Rightarrow \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n - \lambda} \right| < \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$$

And hence,

$$\|x\|_{l^2} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|y\|_{l^2} \Rightarrow x \in l^2$$

and  $A - \lambda$  is surjective.

In total,  $A - \lambda$  is bijective and hence by Theorem 2.2 invertible.

**Remark.** The inverse is given by

$$(A - \lambda)^{-1}y = \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda}y_1, \frac{1}{\lambda_2 - \lambda}y_2, \dots \right)$$

## EXERCISE 8

Consider the operator

$$Ax(t) = \int_a^t x(u)du$$

on  $(C[a, b], \|\cdot\|_{\infty})$ . Show that  $\sigma(A) = 0$ .

(1)  $\lambda = 0 \in \sigma(A)$ .

Side note: By the fundamental theorem of calculus,  $A$  is injective. But  $A$  is not surjective: Since by definition,  $Ax(0) = 0$  for all  $x \in C[a, b]$ , there exists no  $x$  such that  $Ax = y$  for e.g.  $y \equiv 1$ . Hence,  $A$  is not invertible and  $0 \in \sigma(A)$ .

(2)  $\lambda \notin \sigma(A)$  for all  $\lambda \neq 0$ .

Let  $\lambda \neq 0$  and consider the equation

$$(3) \quad Ax - \lambda x = y$$

for some  $y \in C[a, b]$ . Since  $\frac{d}{dt}Ax(t) = x(t)$ , we can substitute  $z(t) = Ax(t) \in C^1[a, b]$ ,  $\dot{z}(t) = x(t)$  and rewrite (3) as

$$z(t) - \lambda \dot{z}(t) = y(t), z(a) = 0 \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\dot{z}(t) = \frac{1}{\lambda}z(t) - \frac{1}{\lambda}y(t), z(a) = 0$$

By variation of constants formula from ODE, this equation has a unique solution for any fixed  $y \in C[a, b]$  given by

$$z(t) = e^{\frac{t}{\lambda}} \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_a^t e^{-\frac{s}{\lambda}} y(s) ds$$

Especially, we obtain  $z \equiv 0$  for  $y \equiv 0$ . Hence, for given  $y \in C[a, b]$ , we find  $x \in C[a, b]$  with  $Ax - \lambda x = y$  given by

$$x(t) = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \int_a^t e^{\frac{(t-s)}{\lambda}} y(s) ds + \frac{1}{\lambda} y(t)$$

which means that  $A$  is bijective and hence invertible. This means  $\lambda \in \rho(A)$  and the claim is shown.

Alternatively, one can show that

$$\|A^n\| \leq \frac{(b-a)^n}{n!}$$

and use theorem 2.23 to show that

$$r(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A^n\|^{\frac{1}{n}} = 0.$$

And hence  $\sigma(A) \subset \{0\}$ . Since  $\sigma(A) \neq \emptyset$  by lemma 2.19, we know that  $\sigma(A) = \{0\}$ .