

# SOME PROPERTIES OF $N$ -SUPERCYCLIC OPERATORS

P. S. BOURDON, N. S. FELDMAN, AND J. H. SHAPIRO

ABSTRACT. Let  $T$  be a continuous linear operator on a Hausdorff topological vector space  $\mathcal{X}$  over the field  $\mathbb{C}$ . We show that if  $T$  is  $N$ -supercyclic, i.e., if  $\mathcal{X}$  has an  $N$  dimensional subspace whose orbit under  $T$  is dense in  $\mathcal{X}$ , then  $T^*$  has at most  $N$  eigenvalues (counting geometric multiplicity). We then show that  $N$ -supercyclicity cannot occur nontrivially in the finite dimensional setting: the orbit of an  $N$  dimensional subspace cannot be dense in an  $N + 1$  dimensional space. Finally, we show that a subnormal operator on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space can never be  $N$ -supercyclic.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $E$  be a subset of a complex, Hausdorff topological vector space  $\mathcal{X}$  and let  $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be a continuous linear operator. The orbit of  $E$  under  $T$ , denoted  $\text{orb}_T(E)$ , is the subset of  $\mathcal{X}$  given by

$$\text{orb}_T(E) = \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} T^k(E).$$

If  $E = \{x\}$  is a singleton and  $\text{orb}_T(E)$  is dense in  $\mathcal{X}$ , then  $T$  is said to be *hypercyclic* and  $x$  is a *hypercyclic vector* for  $T$ . If  $E = \{x\}$  is a singleton and the linear span of  $\text{orb}_T(E)$  is dense in  $\mathcal{X}$ , then  $T$  is *cyclic* with *cyclic vector*  $x$ . Finally, if  $E$  is a subspace of dimension  $N$  and  $\text{orb}_T(E)$  is dense in  $\mathcal{X}$ , then  $T$  is said to be  *$N$ -supercyclic* and  $E$  is called a *supercyclic subspace* for  $T$ .

The study of density of orbits of singletons, i.e., the study of what is now called “hypercyclicity,” dates back at least to a 1929 paper by G. D. Birkhoff [4]. The study of cyclicity dates back even further. In 1974 Hilden and Wallen [11] introduced the notion of “supercyclicity”, defining  $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  to be supercyclic provided there is a vector  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\{\zeta T^k x : \zeta \in \mathbb{C}, k \geq 0\}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{X}$ . More recently, Feldman [8] observed that  $T$  is supercyclic provided there is a one-dimensional subspace  $E$  of  $\mathcal{X}$  with dense orbit and introduced the concept of  $N$ -supercyclicity, with, of course, 1-supercyclicity being equivalent to supercyclicity.

For a survey of results related to hypercyclicity, the reader may see [9]. We now set the stage for our study of some properties of  $N$ -supercyclic operators by discussing pertinent results concerning these operators. In [11], Hilden and Wallen showed that the backward shift on  $\ell^2$  is a supercyclic operator and proved that no normal operator on a Hilbert space of dimension  $> 1$  can be supercyclic. They also established that no linear operator on  $\mathbb{C}^n$  can be supercyclic ( $1 < n < \infty$ ). Herrero [10] proved that the adjoint of a supercyclic operator

---

*Date:* July 11, 2004.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47A16, 47B20, 15A04.

Research supported in part by a grants from the National Science Foundation (DMS 0100290 & DMS 0100502).

on Hilbert space may have at most one simple eigenvalue, a result that was generalized to the Banach-space setting by Ansari and Bourdon [2]. Working in the infinite-dimensional setting, Feldman [8] provided examples of operators that are  $N$ -supercyclic but not  $(N-1)$ -supercyclic and proved several necessary conditions and several sufficient conditions for an operator on Hilbert space to be  $N$ -supercyclic. In particular, he showed that the class of  $N$ -supercyclic operators has interesting spectral structure, establishing the following:

**$N$ -Circles Theorem.** *Suppose that  $T$  is  $N$ -supercyclic; then there are  $N$  circles  $\{\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_N\}$  centered at the origin such that for every invariant subspace  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $T^*$ , the spectrum of  $T^*|_{\mathcal{M}}$  must intersect  $\cup_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j$ . In particular, every component of the spectrum of  $T$  must intersect  $\cup_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j$ .*

In [8], Feldman also generalized one of Hilden and Wallen's results by establishing that no normal operator on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space may be  $N$ -supercyclic.

Observe that if an operator  $T$  is hypercyclic or supercyclic, then it is clearly cyclic. However, an  $N$ -supercyclic operator need not be cyclic—trivial examples are furnished by the observation that if  $\dim(\mathcal{X}) = N$ , then every linear operator on  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $N$ -supercyclic (here,  $\mathcal{X}$  itself is a supercyclic subspace). We now describe a more interesting example featuring an operator that is nontrivially  $N$ -supercyclic. Take a hypercyclic operator  $T$ , say twice the backward shift on  $\ell^2$  (see [12] for the original proof this operator is hypercyclic), then form  $T \oplus I : \ell^2 \oplus \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \ell^2 \oplus \mathbb{C}$ . It's not difficult to prove that  $T \oplus I$  is supercyclic with supercyclic vector  $h \oplus 1$ , where  $h$  is any hypercyclic vector for  $T$  (see [10, Lemma 3.2]). Note that 1 is a simple eigenvalue for  $T \oplus I$  with corresponding eigenvector  $0 \oplus 1$ . (Thus, the adjoint of a supercyclic operator on an infinite-dimensional space may have a simple eigenvalue.) Now, consider  $T \oplus I \oplus I : \ell^2 \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ . We claim that  $S := T \oplus I \oplus I$  is 2-supercyclic with supercyclic subspace spanned by  $\{h \oplus 1 \oplus 0, 0 \oplus 0 \oplus 1\}$ , where, as above,  $h$  is hypercyclic for  $T$ . Because  $S^*$  has a multiple eigenvalue (namely 1),  $S$  cannot be cyclic (or supercyclic). Thus if our claim that  $S$  is 2-supercyclic is valid, we have the desired example of a  $N$ -supercyclic operator that is not cyclic. We now prove the claim. Let  $v \oplus \alpha \oplus \beta$  be an arbitrary vector in  $\ell^2 \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$  and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Because  $h \oplus 1$  is a supercyclic vector for  $T \oplus I$ , there is a scalar  $\zeta$  and a positive integer  $k$  such that  $\|(T \oplus I \oplus I)^k(\zeta(h \oplus 1 \oplus 0)) - v \oplus \alpha \oplus 0\| < \varepsilon$ . Hence

$$\|(T \oplus I \oplus I)^k(\zeta(h \oplus 1 \oplus 0) + \beta(0 \oplus 0 \oplus 1)) - v \oplus \alpha \oplus \beta\| < \varepsilon$$

and the claim follows.

It's easy to modify the construction of the preceding paragraph to produce an  $N$ -supercyclic operator  $S$  (on  $\ell^2$  direct sum  $N$  copies of  $\mathbb{C}$ ) such that  $S^*$  has any desired collection of  $N$  nonzero eigenvalues (counting multiplicity). On the other hand, note that the  $N$ -Circles Theorem shows that  $S^*$  cannot have  $N+1$  eigenvalues having different moduli. In the next section, we strengthen this result by showing that the adjoint of an  $N$ -supercyclic operator can never have more than  $N$  eigenvalues counting multiplicity. This generalizes Herrero's "simple eigenvalue" result for 1-supercyclic operators. In Section 3, we prove that in finite dimensions,  $N$ -supercyclicity cannot occur nontrivially, generalizing Hilden and Wallen's result for 1-supercyclicity. Specifically, we show that a linear mapping  $T : \mathbb{C}^{N+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  cannot be  $N$ -supercyclic (which obviously implies  $T$  can't be  $J$ -supercyclic for any  $J \leq N-1$ ). The methods employed in Sections 2 and 3 are not simply routine generalizations of methods that yield the corresponding results for 1-supercyclicity.

For example, when considering 1-supercyclicity in the finite-dimensional setting, one may focus on the action of a single Jordan block. We are unable to take advantage of this reduction when analyzing  $N$ -supercyclicity for  $N > 1$ .

In Section 4 of the paper, we prove that no subnormal operator on infinite-dimensional Hilbert space can be  $N$ -supercyclic, answering a question raised in [8]. We present two proofs, the first of which takes advantage of our work in the finite-dimensional setting. The second proof relies on our exploiting and enhancing an intertwining relationship between subnormals and normals described in [6].

In the final section of the paper, we pose some natural questions for further investigation of the properties of  $N$ -supercyclic operators. We conclude the introduction with a simple lemma that will be used often in the sequel.

**Lemma 1.1.** *Suppose that  $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is nontrivially  $N$ -supercyclic (so that  $N < \dim(\mathcal{X})$ ) with supercyclic subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  of dimension  $N$ . Then given any vector  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , there is a sequence  $(s_m)$  of vectors in  $\mathcal{S}$  and a subsequence  $(n_m)$  of the sequence of natural numbers such that*

$$\lim_m T^{n_m} s_m = x.$$

*Proof.* Observe that for each nonnegative integer  $j$ ,  $\cup_{k=0}^j T^k(\mathcal{S})$  is closed and nowhere dense in  $\mathcal{X}$  (because each set this finite union comprises is a subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$  having dimension at most  $N$  and  $N < \dim(\mathcal{X})$ ). Thus, because  $\mathcal{S}$  is a supercyclic subspace for  $T$ , we must have that for each  $j \geq 0$ ,  $\cup_{k=j}^{\infty} T^k(\mathcal{S})$  is dense in  $\mathcal{X}$ . The lemma follows.  $\square$

Note Lemma 1.1 tells us that nontrivially  $N$ -supercyclic operators always have dense range.

## 2. POINT SPECTRUM OF THE ADJOINT

As in the Introduction,  $\mathcal{X}$  denotes a Hausdorff topological vector space and  $T$ , a continuous linear operator on  $\mathcal{X}$ . We use  $\mathcal{X}^*$  to denote the *dual space* of  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e., the vector space of continuous linear functionals on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is not assumed locally convex, it's possible that  $\mathcal{X}^*$  may not separate points; it may even equal  $\{0\}$ , but this will have no bearing on the work to follow. Finally, define the adjoint operator  $T^* : \mathcal{X}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^*$  in the usual way:

$$(T^* \Lambda)(x) = \Lambda(Tx) \quad (x \in \mathcal{X}, \Lambda \in \mathcal{X}^*).$$

We'll be concerned with the consequences of  $T^*$  having eigenvalues. Here is a simple one:

**2.1. Lemma.** *If  $\varphi \in \mathcal{X}^*$  is an eigenvector of  $T^*$ , then  $\ker \varphi$  is a proper, closed,  $T$ -invariant subspace.*

*Proof.* We're assuming that  $\varphi$  is a nontrivial continuous linear functional on  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $T^* \varphi = \lambda \varphi$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Clearly  $\ker \varphi$  is a proper, closed subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$ . As for  $T$ -invariance, suppose  $x \in \ker \varphi$ , i.e.,  $\varphi(x) = 0$ . Then

$$\varphi(Tx) := (T^* \varphi)(x) = \lambda \varphi(x) = \lambda \cdot 0 = 0,$$

so also  $Tx \in \ker \varphi$ .  $\square$

In the preceding section, we observed that the adjoint of an  $N$ -supercyclic operator may have  $N$ -eigenvalues, counting multiplicity. The following theorem shows that adjoints of  $N$ -supercyclic operators never have more than  $N$ -eigenvalues.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Suppose that  $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is a continuous linear operator and  $N$  is a positive integer. If  $T^*$  has  $N + 1$  linearly independent eigenvectors, then  $T$  is not  $N$ -supercyclic.*

A special case of this theorem is:

**Corollary 2.2.** *No diagonalizable linear operator on  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  is  $N$ -supercyclic.*

In fact the proof of Theorem 2.1 reduces to this apparently innocent corollary!

**Corollary 2.2**  $\implies$  **Theorem 2.1.**

*Proof.* Suppose we've proved Corollary 2.2, and  $T^*$  has  $N + 1$  linearly independent eigenvectors  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_{N+1} \in \mathcal{X}^*$ . By Lemma 2.1,  $\mathcal{K} := \bigcap_{j=1}^{N+1} \ker \varphi_j$  is a closed  $T$ -invariant subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$ , hence the quotient  $\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{K}$  is a Hausdorff topological vector space on which the quotient operator  $T/\mathcal{K}$ , defined by

$$(T/\mathcal{K})(x + \mathcal{K}) := Tx + \mathcal{K} \quad (x \in \mathcal{X}),$$

is a “well-defined” continuous linear operator.

By linear independence of the set of eigenvectors  $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^{N+1}$ , the subspace  $\mathcal{K}$  has codimension  $N + 1$ , hence  $\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{K}$  has dimension  $N + 1$ . It's easy to check that the set of quotient functionals  $\{\varphi_j/\mathcal{K}\}_1^{N+1}$  is a linearly independent subset of  $(\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{K})^*$ , and that each is an eigenvector of  $(T/\mathcal{K})^*$  (with eigenvalue  $\lambda_j$  for  $\varphi_j/\mathcal{K}$ ). Thus  $(T/\mathcal{K})^*$  can be regarded as a diagonal operator on  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$ , hence the same is true of  $T/\mathcal{K}$ . Since  $(T/\mathcal{K})^*$  has a set of  $N + 1$  linearly independent eigenvectors,  $T/\mathcal{K}$  can't be  $N$ -supercyclic by Corollary 2.2.

Finally,  $N$ -supercyclicity is preserved by taking quotients—in fact the “degree of supercyclicity” may even be improved. More precisely, it's easy to check that if  $\mathcal{M}$  is a closed subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$  with dense  $T$ -orbit, and  $\mathcal{K}$  is any  $T$ -invariant closed subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$ , then the image of  $\mathcal{M}$  under the quotient map (a closed subspace of  $\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{K}$  of dimension possibly smaller than that of  $\mathcal{M}$ ) has dense  $T/\mathcal{K}$ -orbit in  $\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{K}$ .

Thus the “non- $N$ -supercyclicity” of  $T/\mathcal{K}$  guarantees the same for  $T$ .  $\square$

Observe that the argument of the next-to-last paragraph of the preceding proof establishes the following.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Suppose that  $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is continuous and  $\mathcal{K}$  is a closed subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$  invariant under  $T$ . If  $T$  is  $N$ -supercyclic with supercyclic subspace  $\mathcal{M}$ , then the quotient map  $T/\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{X}/\mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}/\mathcal{K}$  has supercyclic subspace  $\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{K}$  and thus is  $J$ -supercyclic where  $J = \dim(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{K})$ .*

We turn now to the proof of Corollary 2.2, showing no diagonalizable operator on  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  is  $N$ -supercyclic. In the next section, we prove that *no linear operator on  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  can be  $N$ -supercyclic*. There Corollary 2.2 plays the role of a lemma, allowing us to focus on Jordan-form matrices that are not diagonal.

*Proof of Corollary 2.2.* Suppose that  $T$  is a diagonal operator on  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  having eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{N+1}$  (counting multiplicity). We write

$$(2.1) \quad T = \text{diag} [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{N+1}],$$

and view  $T$  both as an operator on  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  and as an  $(N+1) \times (N+1)$  matrix. We aim to show that  $T$  is not  $N$ -supercyclic. This has been done for the case  $N = 1$  by Hilden and Wallen [11]. The proof below is an induction, using this special case as its starting point. However, curiously, the proof for  $N = 1$  is built into the induction-step argument, as we'll point out when we come to it. So let's assume, for purposes of induction, that  $N > 1$ , and that we have proven that no diagonalizable operator on  $\mathbb{C}^N$  is  $(N-1)$ -supercyclic. We suppose, in order to obtain a contradiction, that the diagonal operator  $T$  given by (2.1) is  $N$ -supercyclic. If one of the eigenvalues  $\lambda_j$  is zero, the range of  $T$  lies entirely in the subspace of vectors whose  $j$ -th coordinate is zero, so clearly  $T$  cannot be  $N$ -supercyclic. Thus we may assume for the remainder of the argument that *no  $\lambda_j$  is zero*. We may also assume, without loss of generality, that

$$|\lambda_1| = \min\{|\lambda_j| : 1 \leq j \leq N+1\}.$$

Let's view the elements of  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  as column vectors, using the following notation for  $x \in \mathbb{C}^{N+1}$ :

$$(2.2) \quad x = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \xi_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (\xi_1 \in \mathbb{C}, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{C}^N),$$

which effects a canonical decomposition of  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  into the orthogonal direct sum of  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbb{C}^N$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $N$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  that is supercyclic for  $T$ . Fix, for the rest of this proof, a basis  $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  for  $\mathcal{M}$  where, in accordance with the convention of (2.2)

$$x_j = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{j,1} \\ \xi_{j,2} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad \xi_{j,1} \in \mathbb{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_{j,2} \in \mathbb{C}^N.$$

So consider an arbitrary vector  $y = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \end{bmatrix}$  with nonzero components  $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\eta_2 \in \mathbb{C}^N$ .

Because  $y$  lies in the closure of  $\text{orb}_T(\mathcal{M})$ , there exists a subsequence  $(n_k)$  of the sequence of positive integers and  $N$  scalar sequences

$$(a_{1,k}), (a_{2,k}), \dots, (a_{N,k})$$

such that

$$(2.3) \quad T^{n_k} \left( \sum_{j=1}^N a_{j,k} x_j \right) \rightarrow y \quad (k \rightarrow \infty).$$

We'll write this as two matrix equations, employing the following cast of characters:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda &:= \text{diag} [\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_{N+1}] && \text{an } N \times N \text{ matrix,} \\ X_1 &:= [\xi_{1,1}, \xi_{2,1}, \dots, \xi_{N,1}], && \text{a } 1 \times N \text{ (row) matrix,} \\ X_2 &:= [\xi_{1,2}, \xi_{2,2}, \dots, \xi_{N,2}], && \text{a } N \times N \text{ matrix, and} \\ A_k &:= [a_{1,k}, a_{2,k}, \dots, a_{N,k}]^t, && \text{an } N \times 1 \text{ (column) matrix,} \end{aligned}$$

where the superscript "t" stands for "matrix transpose". With this notation we can rewrite (2.3) as:

$$(2.4) \quad \lambda_1^{n_k} X_1 A_k = \eta_1 + \varepsilon_k \quad (\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty),$$

an equation with scalars on both sides, and

$$(2.5) \quad \Lambda^{n_k} X_2 A_k = \eta_2 + \delta_k \quad (\delta_k \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty),$$

an equation with  $N$ -dimensional column vectors on each side.

We claim that the matrix  $X_2$  is nonsingular. For the case  $N = 1$  this is trivial: for then  $X_2$  is just a  $1 \times 1$  matrix, i.e., a scalar. If it's zero then we're just saying that the subspace  $\mathcal{M}$  is spanned by the single vector  $x_1$ , which has second coordinate zero. Since  $T$  is diagonal, everything in the orbit of  $\mathcal{M}$  therefore has second coordinate zero, hence that orbit has no chance of being dense. In the general case we need the induction hypothesis. Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the  $N$  dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  consisting of vectors in  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  whose first coordinate is zero. Note that  $\mathcal{K}$  is a reducing subspace for our diagonal operator  $T$ . Thus  $T|_{\mathcal{K}} : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is supercyclic with supercyclic subspace  $P_{\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{M}$ , where  $P_{\mathcal{K}}$  represents the orthogonal projection of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  onto  $\mathcal{K}$ . Observe that  $P_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{M})$  is spanned by the columns of  $X_2$ . If  $X_2$  were singular so that its columns form a dependent set, then  $T|_{\mathcal{K}}$  would have supercyclic subspace,  $P_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{M})$  of dimension less than  $N$ . This contradicts our induction hypothesis since  $T|_{\mathcal{K}}$  is unitarily equivalent to a diagonal operator on  $\mathbb{C}^N$ .

So we assume from now on that  $X_2$  is nonsingular, noting that in the case  $N = 1$  this assumption did not need the induction hypothesis, and that the proof to follow works for any  $N \geq 1$ . Since  $\Lambda$  is also nonsingular (recall that we assumed, WLOG that none of the diagonal elements of  $T$ , hence of  $\Lambda$  were zero) we can solve equation (2.5) for  $A_k$ :

$$A_k = X_2^{-1} \Lambda^{-n_k} (\eta_2 + \delta_k) \quad (\delta_k \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty).$$

Substitute this result into (2.4):

$$\lambda_1^{n_k} X_1 X_2^{-1} \Lambda^{-n_k} (\eta_2 + \delta_k) = \eta_1 + \varepsilon_k \quad (\varepsilon_k, \delta_k \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty),$$

from which it follows that for each  $k$ ,

$$(2.6) \quad |\eta_1 + \varepsilon_k| \leq |\lambda_1^{n_k}| \|X_1 X_2^{-1}\| \|\Lambda^{-n_k}\| \|\eta_2 + \delta_k\|.$$

Letting  $\lambda_{j_0}$  be the diagonal entry of  $\Lambda$  of minimum modulus, we obtain from (2.6)

$$(2.7) \quad |\eta_1 + \varepsilon_k| \leq C \left| \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_{j_0}} \right|^{n_k} \|\eta_2 + \delta_k\|,$$

where  $C = \|X_1 X_2^{-1}\|$ . Recall that  $\lambda_1$  was selected to be the eigenvalue of  $T$  of minimum modulus so that  $|\lambda_1| \leq |\lambda_{j_0}|$ . Because  $\eta_1$  was chosen to be nonzero and both  $\delta_k$  and  $\varepsilon_k$  approach 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , inequality (2.7) tells us  $|\lambda_1| = |\lambda_{j_0}|$  and hence that

$$(2.8) \quad |\eta_1| \leq C \|\eta_2\|.$$

This contradicts the choice of  $y$  as an arbitrary vector in  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  with nonzero components.  $\square$

*Remark.* We have chosen to present a self-contained proof of Corollary 2.2. We could have presented a shorter proof based on Proposition 4.4 of [6], a result that, e.g., implies the columns of the matrix  $X_2$  in our argument must be dependent, which immediately yields a contradiction of the induction hypothesis.

### 3. $N$ -SUPERCYCLICITY IN FINITE DIMENSIONS

Let  $T : \mathbb{C}^{N+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  be linear. In this section, we prove a fundamental result: the  $T$ -orbit of an  $N$  dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  cannot be dense in  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$ . Note that in the real setting such orbits can be dense. For example, let  $P$  be the  $xy$ -plane, let  $\theta$  be an irrational multiple of  $\pi$ , let  $A$  be the linear mapping on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  that rotates  $\mathbb{R}^3$  by  $\theta$  radians about the  $x$ -axis. Then  $\text{orb}_A(P)$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

Our proof that a linear mapping  $T$  on  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  cannot be  $N$ -supercyclic is inductive, taking as its starting point Hilden and Wallen's result that no linear operator on  $\mathbb{C}^N$  can be 1-supercyclic for  $N > 1$  ([11]). We break the proof up into two pieces, first showing that no  $N \times N$  Jordan-block matrix represents an  $(N - 1)$ -supercyclic operator and then taking care of the general argument. The general argument uses ideas and techniques from the Jordan-block subsection, as well as its key Lemma (Lemma 3.1) and its cousins, Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3.

#### Jordan Block Matrices

We will show that no  $N \times N$  Jordan-block matrix represents an  $(N - 1)$ -supercyclic operator. The idea of the proof is well-illustrated by the  $3 \times 3$  case. We identify the linear mapping  $\Lambda : \mathbb{C}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^3$  with its matrix representation:

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note

$$\Lambda^n = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^n & n\lambda^{n-1} & C(n, 2)\lambda^{n-2} \\ 0 & \lambda^n & n\lambda^{n-1} \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda^n \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $C(n, k)$  denotes  $n$  choose  $k$ . Now suppose that  $\Lambda$  is 2-supercyclic having supercyclic subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  with basis  $\{v, w\}$ , where  $v = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$  and  $w = (w_1, w_2, w_3)$ . Observe that at least one of  $v_3$  and  $w_3$  is nonzero (for otherwise every vector in  $\text{orb}_\Lambda(\mathcal{S})$  will have 0 as its final component contradicting the density of the orbit in  $\mathbb{C}^3$ ). By taking an appropriate linear combination of  $v$  and  $w$ , one obtains a basis  $\{\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}\}$  for  $\mathcal{S}$  such that  $\tilde{v}_3 \neq 0$  and  $\tilde{w}_3 = 0$ . We may assume that  $\tilde{v}_3 = 1$ . We drop the tilde's. Thus we have a basis for  $\mathcal{S}$  that has the form

$$\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

We will now show that  $w_2$  is nonzero. Suppose not. Then  $\mathcal{S}$  has a basis one of the elements of which can be taken to be  $w = (1, 0, 0)$ . Note  $w$  is an eigenvector for  $\Lambda$  with corresponding eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . Because  $\langle w \rangle$ , the 1 dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{C}^3$  spanned by  $w$ , is invariant for  $\Lambda$ , Proposition 2.3 tells us that  $\Lambda/\langle w \rangle : \mathbb{C}^3/\langle w \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^3/\langle w \rangle$  is  $J$ -supercyclic, where  $J = \dim(\mathcal{S}/\langle w \rangle) = 1$ . Thus  $\Lambda/\langle w \rangle$  is a 1-supercyclic operator on a two-dimensional space, contradicting Hilden and Wallen's result. Thus, since  $w_2$  is nonzero, we can assume that

the supercyclic subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  for  $\Lambda$  has a basis of the form  $\{v, w\}$  where

$$(3.1) \quad v = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad w = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Because the orbit of  $\mathcal{S}$  with basis  $\{v, w\}$  of (3.1) is dense in  $\mathbb{C}^3$ , there is a sequence  $s_j = \alpha_{0,j}v + \alpha_{1,j}w$  of linear combinations of  $v$  and  $w$  and a subsequence  $(n_j)$  of the sequence of natural numbers such that

$$(3.2) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda^{n_j} s_j = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We will show that (3.2) leads to a contradiction. Projecting onto the third component, we obtain from (3.2) that

$$(3.3) \quad \lim_j \lambda^{n_j} \alpha_{0,j} = 1.$$

Similarly projection onto the second component yields

$$n_j \lambda^{n_j-1} \alpha_{0,j} + \lambda^{n_j} \alpha_{1,j} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Divide the quantity on the left of the preceding line by  $n_j$  and note the result tends to zero (even faster); using 3.3, conclude that

$$\frac{\lambda^{n_j} \alpha_{1,j}}{n_j} \rightarrow \frac{-1}{\lambda}.$$

Finally, because we must have convergence in the first component, (3.1) gives

$$\lambda^{n_j} \alpha_{0,j} v_1 + \lambda^{n_j} \alpha_{1,j} w_1 + n_j \lambda^{n_j-1} \alpha_{1,j} + \frac{n_j(n_j-1)}{2} \lambda^{n_j-2} \alpha_{0,j} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty$$

Now divide the quantity on left-hand side of the preceding line by  $n_j^2$  and take the limit as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  to get

$$0 + 0 - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} + \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} = \frac{-1}{2\lambda^2},$$

but we should have gotten 0. This contradiction proves that no linear operator represented by a  $3 \times 3$  Jordan-block matrix can be 2 supercyclic.

Now we handle the general Jordan-block case. Let  $N \geq 3$ . Suppose we know that for all  $J$  less than  $N$ , a  $J \times J$  Jordan-block matrix cannot be  $J-1$  supercyclic. We wish to show that an  $N \times N$  Jordan-block matrix cannot be  $(N-1)$ -supercyclic.

Let  $\Lambda$  denote our  $N \times N$  Jordan-block matrix so that

$$\Lambda^n = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^n & n\lambda^{n-1} & C(n, 2)\lambda^{n-2} & \cdots & C(n, N-1)\lambda^{n-N+1} \\ 0 & \lambda^n & n\lambda^{n-1} & \cdots & C(n, N-2)\lambda^{n-N+2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda^n \end{bmatrix};$$

that is,

$$[\Lambda^n]_{ij} = \begin{cases} C(n, j-i)\lambda^{n-(j-i)} & \text{if } j \geq i \\ 0 & \text{if } j < i. \end{cases}$$

Let  $w$  be the vector  $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$  in  $\mathbb{C}^N$  and note that the quotient operator  $\Lambda/\langle w \rangle : \mathbb{C}^N/\langle w \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N/\langle w \rangle$  may be represented as an  $(N-1) \times (N-1)$  Jordan block matrix (with respect to the basis  $\{(0, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0) + \langle w \rangle, (0, 0, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0) + \langle w \rangle, \dots, (0, 0, \dots, 0, 1) + \langle w \rangle\}$  of  $\mathbb{C}^N/\langle w \rangle$ ). Suppose, in order to obtain a contradiction, that  $\Lambda$  is  $(N-1)$ -supercyclic. Then  $\lambda \neq 0$  because  $\Lambda$  must have dense range. Let  $B = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{N-1}\}$  be a basis for a supercyclic subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  for  $\Lambda$ . We view the elements of  $B$  as column vectors. At least one of the basis vectors in  $B$  must have a nonzero final entry (otherwise every element of the orbit of  $\mathcal{S}$  under  $\Lambda$  will have a zero final entry and the orbit would not be dense). Thus we assume that the final entry (the entry in row  $N$ ) of  $v_1$  is nonzero, in fact 1. By taking appropriate linear combinations of basis elements of  $B$ , we can assume that the final entries in the vectors  $v_2$  through  $v_{N-1}$  are all zeros. Now suppose, in order to obtain a contradiction, that the entries of  $v_2$  through  $v_{N-1}$  in row  $N-1$  are also all zero. This means that the  $N-2$  vectors  $\tilde{v}_2$  through  $\tilde{v}_{N-1}$  in  $\mathbb{C}^{N-2}$  formed, respectively, by eliminating the last two entries of  $v_2$  through  $v_{N-1}$  must be independent (because  $\{v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{N-1}\}$  is independent). That is,  $\{\tilde{v}_2, \dots, \tilde{v}_{N-1}\}$  is a basis of  $\mathbb{C}^{N-2}$ . Thus an appropriate linear combination of these vectors will be 1 followed by zeros. It follows that  $\mathcal{S}$  contains the vector  $w := (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$  which is an eigenvector for  $\Lambda$  with corresponding eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . By Proposition 2.3,  $\Lambda/\langle w \rangle : \mathbb{C}^N/\langle w \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N/\langle w \rangle$  is  $J$  supercyclic with  $J = \dim(\mathcal{S}/\langle w \rangle) \leq N-2$ . We have already observed that  $\Lambda/\langle w \rangle$  may be represented as a Jordan-block matrix and, as we have just seen,  $\Lambda/\langle w \rangle$  is  $(N-2)$ -supercyclic on a space of dimension  $N-1$ : this contradicts our induction hypothesis. Thus, we may assume that at least one of the entries in row  $N-1$  of  $v_2$  through  $v_{N-1}$  is nonzero. Upon reordering, relabeling, and taking appropriate linear combinations, we may assume that our supercyclic subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  has a basis  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  where the final entry of  $v_1$  is 1 and all other final entries are 0 and where the entry in  $v_2$  in row  $N-1$  is 1 and all other basis vectors have zero as their entry in row  $N-1$ . Now, the assumption that none of the vectors  $v_3, v_4, \dots, v_n$  has a nonzero entry in row  $N-2$  leads once again, to the conclusion that  $w = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{S}$ , which in turn contradicts the induction hypothesis just as before. Repeating this process, allows us to assume that  $\mathcal{S}$  has a basis of the form

$$B = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{N-1}\},$$

where

$$v_1 = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, v_2 = \begin{bmatrix} b_2 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, v_{N-1} = \begin{bmatrix} b_{N-1} \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{N-1}$  are complex constants.

Because  $\Lambda$  is supercyclic with supercyclic subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  with basis  $B$  displayed above, there are sequences of scalars  $(\alpha_{0,j}), (\alpha_{1,j}), \dots, (\alpha_{N-2,j})$  and a subsequence  $(n_j)$  of the sequence

of natural numbers such that

$$(3.4) \quad \lim_j \Lambda^{n_j} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} \alpha_{k,j} v_{k+1} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *For each  $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-2\}$ ,*

$$\lim_j \frac{\lambda^{n_j} \alpha_{q,j}}{n_j^q} = \frac{(-1)^q}{\lambda^q q!}$$

*Proof.* To see that the limit of the lemma has the advertised value for  $q = 0$ , consider information (3.4) gives in its last row, keeping in mind the form of the  $v_j$ 's and the formula for  $\Lambda^{n_j}$ . Suppose that the limit of the lemma has been shown to be valid for  $q = 0$  to  $q = k$ , where  $0 \leq k \leq N-3$ . We complete the proof of the lemma by establishing its validity for  $q = k+1$ . Consider the information provided by the  $N - (k+1)$  row of (3.4):

$$\sum_{m=0}^{k+1} C(n_j, k+1-m) \lambda^{n_j - (k+1-m)} \alpha_{m,j} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty$$

Divide the quantity on the left of the preceding line by  $n_j^{k+1}$ , use that fact that the result still tends to 0 as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , and apply the induction hypothesis to obtain

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{1}{\lambda^{k+1}} \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{(-1)^m}{(k+1-m)! m!} + \lim_j \frac{\lambda^{n_j} \alpha_{k+1,j}}{n_j^{k+1}} = 0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_j \frac{\lambda^{n_j} \alpha_{k+1,j}}{n_j^{k+1}} &= -\frac{1}{\lambda^{k+1}} \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{(-1)^m}{(k+1-m)! m!} \\ &= -\frac{1}{(k+1)! \lambda^{k+1}} \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{(-1)^m (k+1)!}{(k+1-m)! m!} \\ &= -\frac{1}{(k+1)! \lambda^{k+1}} \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m C(k+1, m) \\ &= -\frac{1}{(k+1)! \lambda^{k+1}} \left[ \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} (-1)^m C(k+1, m) - (-1)^{k+1} \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{(k+1)! \lambda^{k+1}} \left[ (1 + (-1))^{k+1} - (-1)^{k+1} \right] \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{\lambda^{k+1} (k+1)!}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Using the preceding lemma, we can show that the “first-row” limit of (3.4) cannot be 0, and this contradiction completes the proof that  $\Lambda$  cannot be  $(N - 1)$ -supercyclic. The first-row information from (3.4) is

$$0 = \lim_j \sum_{m=0}^{N-2} \alpha_{m,j} \left[ b_{1+m} \lambda^{n_j} + C(n_j, N - 1 - m) \lambda^{n_j - (N-1-m)} \right].$$

Dividing the preceding by  $n_j^{N-1}$ , taking the limit as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , and using Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{\lambda^{N-1}} \sum_{m=0}^{N-2} \frac{(-1)^m}{(N-1-m)!m!} \\ &= \frac{1}{(N-1)! \lambda^{N-1}} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{N-2} (-1)^m C(N-1, m) + (-1)^{N-1} - (-1)^{N-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{(N-1)! \lambda^{N-1}} \left( (1 + (-1))^{N-1} - (-1)^{N-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^N}{(N-1)! \lambda^{N-1}} \\ &\neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

the desired contradiction.

At this point we know that no  $N \times N$  Jordan-block matrix represents an  $(N - 1)$ -supercyclic operator. Although this fact will not be used directly to establish that no  $N \times N$  matrix can represent an  $(N - 1)$ -supercyclic operator, much of the reasoning that we used to dispense with the Jordan-block case will be needed for the general argument. In particular, we will need the following lemmas, which are essentially corollaries of the proof of Lemma 3.1.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $N$  be a positive integer. Suppose that  $\Lambda$  is an  $N \times N$  Jordan-block matrix with eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . If there are sequences  $(\alpha_{0,j})$ ,  $(\alpha_{1,j})$ , and  $(\alpha_{N-1,j})$  of scalars and a subsequence  $(n_j)$  of the sequence of natural numbers such that*

$$(3.6) \quad \lim_j \Lambda^{n_j} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{N-1,j} \\ \alpha_{N-2,j} \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_{0,j} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

then for each  $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, N - 1\}$ ,

$$(3.7) \quad \lim_j \frac{\lambda^{n_j} \alpha_{q,j}}{n_j^q} = \frac{(-1)^q}{\lambda^q q!}.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that (3.6) holds. Then equation (3.4) is valid in rows 2 through  $N$ , which is what we needed to obtain Lemma 3.1. Thus, (3.7) holds for  $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, N - 2\}$ . Now, the information provided by the first row of (3.6) is

$$\sum_{m=0}^{N-1} C(n_j, N - 1 - m) \lambda^{n_j - (N-1-m)} \alpha_{m,j} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty$$

and the validity of (3.7) for  $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-2\}$  implies its validity for  $q = N-1$  by the argument that concludes Lemma 3.1.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $N$  be a positive integer. Suppose that  $\Lambda$  is an  $N \times N$  Jordan-block matrix with eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . If there are sequences  $(\alpha_{0,j})$ ,  $(\alpha_{1,j})$ , and  $(\alpha_{N-1,j})$  of scalars and a subsequence  $(n_j)$  of the sequence of natural numbers such that*

$$\lim_j \Lambda^{n_j} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{N-1,j} \\ \alpha_{N-2,j} \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_{0,j} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

then for each  $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$ ,

$$\lim_j \frac{\lambda^{n_j} \alpha_{q,j}}{n_j^q} = 0.$$

*Proof.* The argument proceeds exactly as that of Lemma 3.1. At the stage (3.5) of the proof, the sum on the left is now zero by the induction hypothesis.  $\square$

### The General Argument

We argue by induction. We know that no  $2 \times 2$  matrix operator on  $\mathbb{C}^2$  can be 1-supercyclic (Hilden and Wallen's result). Suppose  $N \geq 3$  and we know that for all  $J$  less than  $N$ , a  $J \times J$  matrix cannot be  $(J-1)$ -supercyclic. We wish to show that a  $N \times N$  matrix cannot be  $(N-1)$ -supercyclic.

Suppose, in order to obtain a contradiction, that  $\Lambda$  is an  $N \times N$  matrix representing a operator on  $\mathbb{C}^N$  that is  $(N-1)$ -supercyclic. Because  $(N-1)$ -supercyclicity is similarity invariant, we may assume that  $\Lambda$  is in Jordan canonical form with the largest Jordan-block of  $\Lambda$  appearing in the upper left-hand corner; of course, "largest block" may be ambiguous—we simply wish to arrange things so that the size of the uppermost block is greater than or equal to the size of all other blocks. We'll be sloppy and continue to refer to the first block as the "largest block." By Corollary 2.2, we may assume that the largest block of  $\Lambda$  is at least  $2 \times 2$  (that is, we may assume that  $\Lambda$  is not a diagonal matrix). Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a  $(N-1)$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{C}^N$  that is supercyclic for  $\Lambda$  with basis  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{N-1}\}$ . Just as in the Jordan-block argument, our induction hypothesis together with the fact that  $w = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$  is an eigenvector for  $\Lambda$  allows us to assume that  $\mathcal{S}$  has a basis  $B = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{N-1}\}$ , where

$$v_1 = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, v_2 = \begin{bmatrix} b_2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, v_{N-1} = \begin{bmatrix} b_{N-1} \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now suppose that the upper-left Jordan block of  $\Lambda$  has dimension  $r_1 \times r_1$ , and the next block has dimension  $r_2 \times r_2$  and so on. Let  $k$  be the number of Jordan blocks that  $\Lambda$

comprises. (Note  $k < N$  since we're assuming that  $\Lambda$  is not diagonal.) Let  $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k\}$  be the eigenvalues of  $\Lambda$  corresponding, respectively, to the  $k$  Jordan blocks of  $\Lambda$ .

The remainder of the argument consists of two cases with the first being much easier than the second.

**Case 1.** Suppose that  $\lambda_1$ , the eigenvalue corresponding to the uppermost Jordan block of  $\Lambda$ , is such that

$$|\lambda_1| \leq |\lambda_i| \quad \forall i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}.$$

Recall that  $\Lambda$  comprises  $k$  Jordan blocks and that the uppermost is  $r_1 \times r_1$ . Let  $e_{r_1}$  be the vector in  $\mathbb{C}^N$  with 1 as its  $r_1$  component and zeros elsewhere. Because  $\Lambda$  is  $(N-1)$ -supercyclic with supercyclic subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  spanned by the basis  $B$  above, there are sequences of scalars  $(\alpha_{0,j}), (\alpha_{1,j}), \dots, (\alpha_{N-1,j})$  and a subsequence  $(n_j)$  of the sequence of natural numbers such that

$$(3.8) \quad \lim_j \Lambda^{n_j} \sum_{i=0}^{N-2} \alpha_{i,j} v_{i+1} = e_{r_1}.$$

For  $m \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$ , consider the information that (3.8) provides for the rows corresponding to the  $m$ -th Jordan block of  $\Lambda$ . Conclude from Lemma 3.3:

$$(3.9) \quad \lim_j \frac{\lambda_k^{n_j} \alpha_{q,j}}{n_j^q} = 0, \quad q = 0, \dots, r_k - 1$$

$$(3.10) \quad \lim_j \frac{\lambda_{k-1}^{n_j} \alpha_{q,j}}{n_j^{q-r_k}} = 0, \quad q = r_k, \dots, r_k + r_{k-1} - 1$$

$$\vdots = \vdots$$

$$(3.11) \quad \lim_j \frac{\lambda_2^{n_j} \alpha_{q,j}}{n_j^{q-\sum_{u=3}^k r_u}} = 0, \quad q = \sum_{u=3}^k r_u, \dots, \sum_{u=3}^k r_u + r_2 - 1$$

Now let's determine what information can be gleaned from examining the limit (3.8) in its first  $r_1$  rows. Using Lemma 3.1, we have for  $q = 0, \dots, r_1 - 2$ ,

$$(3.12) \quad \lim_j \frac{\lambda_1^{n_j} \alpha_{N-r_1+q,j}}{n_j^q} = \frac{(-1)^q}{\lambda_1^q q!}$$

Finally, consider the first row information provided by (3.8):

$$(3.13) \quad \lim_j \sum_{h=0}^{N-r_1-1} \lambda_1^{n_j} b_{h+1} \alpha_{h,j} + \sum_{q=0}^{r_1-2} [b_{N-r_1+q+1} \lambda_1^{n_j} + C(n_j, r_1 - 1 - q) \lambda_1^{n_j - (r_1 - 1 - q)}] \alpha_{N-r_1+q,j} = 0$$

We can, of course, divide on the left by  $(n_j)^{r_1-1}$  and still have zero limit. Using (3.9) through (3.11),  $r_1 - 1 \geq r_j - 1$  for  $j = 2, \dots, k$  (remember the uppermost Jordan block is the largest), and the fact that  $|\lambda_1| \leq |\lambda_j|$  for  $j = 2, \dots, k$ , we see that

$$(3.14) \quad \lim_j \sum_{h=0}^{N-r_1-1} \frac{\lambda_1^{n_j} b_{h+1} \alpha_{h,j}}{n_j^{r_1-1}} = 0$$

However, using (3.12) just as we did in the Jordan-block subsection, we obtain

$$(3.15) \quad \lim_j \sum_{q=0}^{r_1-2} \frac{[b_{N-r_1+1+q} \lambda_1^{n_j} + C(n_j, r_1 - 1 - q) \lambda^{n_j - (r_1 - 1 - q)}] \alpha_{N-r_1+q, j}}{n_j^{r_1-1}} =$$

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_1^{r_1-1}} \sum_{q=0}^{r_1-2} \frac{(-1)^q}{(r_1 - 1 - q)! q!} =$$

$$\frac{(-1)^{r_1}}{(r_1 - 1)! \lambda_1^{r_1-1}} \neq 0.$$

Note that (3.14) and (3.15) combine to contradict (3.13).

**Case 2.** We are assuming that  $\Lambda$  has  $k$  Jordan blocks,  $\{J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k\}$  and that there is at least one  $i \in \{2, \dots, k\}$  such that

$$|\lambda_1| > |\lambda_i|,$$

where, as before,  $\lambda_i$  is the eigenvalue of the block  $J_i$ . Let  $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m\}$  be those indices in  $\{2, \dots, k\}$  such that

$$|\lambda_1| > |\lambda_{i_j}|, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Thus the indices  $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m\}$  identify Jordan blocks of  $\Lambda$  in which the corresponding eigenvalue has modulus less than  $|\lambda_1|$ . We need to build a correspondence between the 2-nd through  $k$ -th Jordan blocks of  $\Lambda$ ,  $\{J_2, J_3, \dots, J_k\}$ , and the numbers  $\{b_1, \dots, b_{N-1}\}$  which appear as initial entries of the basis vectors of  $B$ . Consider the  $j$ -th basis vector of  $B$ , which begins with  $b_j$ ; note  $b_j$  has below it a 1 in the  $N - j + 1$  row. If the  $N - j + 1$  row of  $\Lambda$  is one of the rows that the Jordan block  $J_t$  occupies, then associate  $b_j$  with  $J_t$ . In this way, we associate with  $J_t$  precisely  $r_t$  of the  $b_j$ 's (recall  $J_t$  has dimension  $r_t \times r_t$  and  $2 \leq t \leq k$ ). For example, if

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

then  $b_1$ , and  $b_2$  are associated with the lowest Jordan block “ $J_3$ ” of  $\Lambda$  while  $b_3$ ,  $b_4$ , and  $b_5$  are associated with  $\Lambda$ 's middle Jordan block  $J_2$ . If all of the  $b_j$ 's associated with the Jordan blocks  $\{J_{i_1}, \dots, J_{i_m}\}$  are zero, then the argument of Case 1 yields a contradiction: the calculation of (3.15) remains as before and the limit of (3.14) remains zero as well because the only nonzero terms in the sum would have zero limit even if  $\lambda_1$  were replaced by the eigenvalue associated with the Jordan block corresponding to  $b_{h+1}$  (that eigenvalue has modulus  $\geq |\lambda_1|$ ). Thus we may assume that at least one of the blocks  $\{J_{i_1}, \dots, J_{i_m}\}$  has associated with it a nonzero  $b_j$ . Let  $s$  be the minimum modulus of eigenvalues from those Jordan blocks in  $\{J_{i_1}, \dots, J_{i_m}\}$  having at least one nonzero  $b_j$  in association. Let  $\{h_1, \dots, h_u\}$  be those indices from  $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$  such that for  $n = 1, 2, \dots, u$

- (a) the eigenvalue associated with  $J_{h_n}$  has modulus  $s$ , and
- (b) at least one nonzero  $b_j$  is associated with  $J_{h_n}$ .

At this point in the argument, we've identified an important list of blocks:

$$\mathcal{J}_s := \{J_{h_1}, \dots, J_{h_u}\},$$

where each of these blocks has eigenvalue of modulus  $s$ , where  $s$  is the minimum modulus of eigenvalues of Jordan blocks in  $\{J_{i_1}, \dots, J_{i_m}\}$  corresponding to which there is least one nonzero  $b_j$ . Note well that  $s$  is positive: our  $(N - 1)$ -supercyclic operator  $\Lambda$  on  $\mathbb{C}^N$  has dense range by Lemma 1.1 and hence must be invertible so that  $\Lambda$  cannot have 0 as an eigenvalue. The  $b_j$ 's associated with each of the blocks in  $\mathcal{J}_s$  are naturally ordered by their indices. For example, if  $J_{h_1}$  occupies rows  $g_1$  through  $g_2$  of  $\Lambda$  ( $g_1 \leq g_2$ ); then its list will be  $(b_{N-g_2+1}, \dots, b_{N-g_1+1})$ . We know that at least one number in each "b<sub>j</sub>" listing will be nonzero. Eliminate any trailing zeros in these  $b_j$  lists, measure the lengths of the the resulting lists  $\{L_1, \dots, L_u\}$  so that  $L_i$  counts the number of entries in the list for  $J_{h_i}$  from the first through the last nonzero entry. Choose

$$J_*$$

to be an element of  $\mathcal{J}_s$  whose associated list length  $L_*$  satisfies  $L_* \geq L_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, u$ . Let  $\lambda_*$  be the eigenvalue of  $J_*$  so that, in particular,  $|\lambda_*| = s$ . Assume that  $J_*$  occupies rows  $g_1$  through  $g_2$ ,  $g_1 \leq g_2$ , of  $\Lambda$  and let  $e_{g_2}$  be the vector in  $\mathbb{C}^N$  having 1 in position  $g_2$  and zeros elsewhere. Because  $\Lambda$  is  $(N - 1)$ -supercyclic with supercyclic subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  spanned by the basis  $B$  above, there are sequences of scalars  $(\alpha_{0,j}), (\alpha_{1,j}), \dots, (\alpha_{N-1,j})$  and a subsequence  $(n_j)$  of the sequence of natural numbers such that

$$(3.16) \quad \lim_j \Lambda^{n_j} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \alpha_{i,j} v_{i+1} = e_{g_2}.$$

To complete the proof, we show that the preceding equation leads to a contradiction.

We start by considering what rows 2 through  $r_1$  of (3.16) tell us: a slight variant of Lemma 3.3 yields

$$(3.17) \quad \lim_j \frac{\lambda_1^{n_j} \alpha_{N-r_1+q,j}}{n_j^q} = 0 \quad \text{for } q = 0, \dots, r_1 - 2.$$

(Compare with (3.12) where these limits are nonzero because the  $r_1$  entry of the limit vector is 1 rather than 0.) Now, note that the first row of (3.16) gives us the following, just as in (3.13):

$$(3.18) \quad \lim_j \sum_{h=0}^{N-r_1-1} \lambda_1^{n_j} b_{h+1} \alpha_{h,j} + \sum_{q=0}^{r_1-2} [b_{N-r_1+q+1} \lambda_1^{n_j} + C(n_j, r_1 - 1 - q) \lambda_1^{n_j - (r_1 - 1 - q)}] \alpha_{N-r_1+q,j} = 0$$

We divide by  $n_j^{r_1-1}$  and note that the second sum of (3.18), so divided, will have limit zero because of (3.17):

$$(3.19) \quad \lim_j \sum_{q=0}^{r_1-2} \frac{[b_{N-r_1+q+1} \lambda_1^{n_j} + C(n_j, r_1-1-q) \lambda_1^{n_j-(r_1-1-q)}] \alpha_{N-r_1+q,j}}{n_j^{r_1-1}} = 0.$$

What happens when the first sum of (3.18) is divided by  $n_j^{r_1-1}$ ?

$$(3.20) \quad \sum_{h=0}^{N-r_1-1} \frac{\lambda_1^{n_j} b_{h+1} \alpha_{h,j}}{n_j^{r_1-1}} = \frac{1}{n_j^{r_1-L_*}} \left( \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_*} \right)^{n_j} \sum_{h=0}^{N-r_1-1} \frac{\lambda_*^{n_j} b_{h+1} \alpha_{h,j}}{n_j^{L_*-1}}$$

By choice of  $L_*$ ,  $\lambda_*$  (recall  $|\lambda_*| = s$ ), and the limit vector  $e_{g_2}$  of (3.16), Lemma 3.2 shows that for exactly one value of  $h$  between  $N - g_2$  and  $N - g_1$  inclusive

$$\lim_j \frac{\lambda_*^{n_j} b_{h+1} \alpha_{h,j}}{n_j^{L_*-1}}$$

will be nonzero—it will be nonzero for  $h = N - g_2 + L_* - 1$ , which corresponds to the rightmost nonzero entry in the list of  $b_j$ 's corresponding to  $J_*$ . It's not difficult to check that all other summands of in the sum on the right of (3.20) will be zero—use the choice of  $s$ ,  $L_*$ , and Lemma 3.3 (in the notation of Lemma 3.3, observe that whenever “ $q$ ” exceeds  $L_* - 1$ ,  $|\lambda_*| < |\lambda_i|$  and this provides an exponential decay factor which dominates the polynomial growth provided by a power of  $n_j$ ). Because  $|\lambda_1| > |\lambda_*|$  and

$$\lim_j \sum_{h=0}^{N-r_1-1} \frac{\lambda_*^{n_j} b_{h+1} \alpha_{h,j}}{n_j^{L_*-1}}$$

is nonzero (exactly one summand has a nonzero limit), we have

$$(3.21) \quad \lim_j \frac{1}{n_j^{r_1-L_*}} \left( \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_*} \right)^{n_j} \sum_{h=0}^{N-r_1-1} \frac{\lambda_*^{n_j} b_{h+1} \alpha_{h,j}}{n_j^{L_*-1}} = \infty.$$

Note (3.21) and (3.19) are inconsistent with (3.18), which is the contradiction we needed to establish that  $N$ -supercyclicity cannot occur nontrivially in finite dimensions.  $\square$

Knowing that no linear map on  $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  can be  $N$ -supercyclic, gives us the following generalization of Theorem 2.1.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Suppose that  $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is a continuous linear operator and  $N$  is a positive integer. If  $T^*$  has an  $N + 1$  dimensional invariant subspace, then  $T$  is not  $N$ -supercyclic.*

*Proof.* The proof is quite similar to that showing Corollary 2.2 implies Theorem 2.1. Suppose that  $T^*$  has an  $N + 1$  dimensional invariant subspace  $\mathcal{W}$ . Then  $\mathcal{K} := {}^\perp \mathcal{W}$  is easily seen to be a closed subspace of  $\mathcal{X}$  of codimension  $N + 1$  that is invariant for  $T$ . If  $T$  were  $N$ -supercyclic, then by Proposition 2.3,  $T/\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{X}/\mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}/\mathcal{K}$  would be an  $N$ -supercyclic operator on an  $N + 1$  dimensional space, a contradiction.  $\square$

4. SUBNORMAL OPERATORS CANNOT BE  $N$ -SUPERCYCLIC

In this section, we present two proofs of the fact that a subnormal operator on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space cannot be  $n$ -supercyclic. In the first proof, Corollary 2.2, which states that diagonal operators are never nontrivially  $n$ -supercyclic, plays a crucial role. The second proof depends upon a new intertwining relationship between subnormal operators and normal operators established in Theorem 4.4 below as well as the fact that no normal operators can be nontrivially  $n$ -supercyclic.

**Theorem 4.1.** *A normal operator on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space is never  $n$ -supercyclic, and a normal operator on an  $n$ -dimensional Hilbert space is never  $(n - 1)$ -supercyclic.*

*Proof.* For the infinite-dimensional result, see [8]; the finite-dimensional result is exactly Corollary 2.2 above.  $\square$

Notice that in the following theorem  $\mathcal{H}$  is allowed to be equal to  $L^2(\mu)$ , thus the arguments below may be turned into another proof, different from that in [8], that a normal operator on an infinite-dimensional space cannot be  $n$ -supercyclic.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Suppose that  $S = M_z$  on  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq L^2(\mu)$ , where  $\mu$  is a compactly supported regular Borel measure in  $\mathbb{C}$ , that  $\mathcal{H}$  is invariant for  $S$ , and that  $\dim \mathcal{H} > n$ ; then  $S$  is not  $n$ -supercyclic.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $S$  is  $n$ -supercyclic and  $\mathcal{M}$  is an  $n$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathcal{H}$  whose orbit under  $S$  is dense in  $\mathcal{H}$ . If  $\dim \mathcal{H} < \infty$ , then  $S$  is normal and  $n$ -supercyclic, but since  $\dim \mathcal{H} > n$ , this contradicts Theorem 4.1. Hence we may assume that  $\dim \mathcal{H} = \infty$ , and that  $S$  is not normal (again, by Theorem 4.1). Thus, we may also assume that  $M_z$  on  $L^2(\mu)$  is the minimal normal extension of  $S$ . It is then an easy exercise using Conway [13, Proposition 17.14, p.249], to show that up to unitary equivalence, we may assume that  $1 \in \mathcal{H}$ . Hence, all polynomials are also in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the (countable) set of all polynomials with (complex) rational coefficients.

Let  $\{f_j : 1 \leq j \leq n\}$  be a basis for  $\mathcal{M}$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}$  has dense orbit under  $S$ , for each  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ , there exists scalars  $\{a_{j,k} : 1 \leq j \leq n, 1 \leq k < \infty\}$  and integers  $m_k \rightarrow \infty$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^n z^{m_k} a_{j,k} f_j \rightarrow p$  in  $L^2(\mu)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . By passing to a subsequence we may assume that as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^n z^{m_k} a_{j,k} f_j(z) \rightarrow p(z)$   $\mu$ -almost everywhere, let's say for all  $z \in \text{supp}(\mu) \setminus \Delta_p$  where  $\mu(\Delta_p) = 0$ . If we let  $\Delta = \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \Delta_p$ , then  $\mu(\Delta) = 0$  and we have

$$(*) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n z^{m_k} a_{j,k} f_j(z) \rightarrow p(z)$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , for all  $z \in \text{supp}(\mu) \setminus \Delta$ . Since  $\dim \mathcal{H} = \infty$ , we may choose  $(n + 1)$  distinct points,  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{n+1}$ , in  $\text{supp}(\mu) \setminus \Delta$ . Evaluating  $(*)$  at these  $(n + 1)$  points gives that for each

$p \in \mathcal{P}$ ,

$$(**) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1^{m_k} & & & \\ & \lambda_2^{m_k} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \lambda_{n+1}^{m_k} \end{bmatrix} \left( \sum_{j=1}^n a_{j,k} \begin{bmatrix} f_j(\lambda_1) \\ f_j(\lambda_2) \\ \vdots \\ f_j(\lambda_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix} \right) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} p(\lambda_1) \\ p(\lambda_2) \\ \vdots \\ p(\lambda_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix}$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

Thus if  $T = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & \\ & \lambda_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \lambda_{n+1} \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\mathcal{L} = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} f_j(\lambda_1) \\ f_j(\lambda_2) \\ \vdots \\ f_j(\lambda_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix} : 1 \leq j \leq n \right\}$ , then  $\mathcal{L}$  is an  $n$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ . Furthermore, by (\*\*), it follows that the closure of  $\text{orb}_T(\mathcal{L})$  contains the set  $\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} p(\lambda_1) \\ p(\lambda_2) \\ \vdots \\ p(\lambda_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix} : p \in \mathcal{P} \right\}$ . Since this latter set is dense in  $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ , it

follows that  $T$  is  $n$ -supercyclic on  $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ , contradicting Theorem 4.1. Thus  $S$  cannot be  $n$ -supercyclic.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** *If  $S$  is a subnormal operator on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, then  $S$  is not  $n$ -supercyclic for any  $n \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $S$  is a subnormal operator on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  that is  $n$ -supercyclic for some  $n \geq 1$ . By Theorem 4.1 we may assume that  $S$  is pure, and thus has no eigenvectors. Let  $N$  be the minimal normal extension of  $S$  acting on a space  $\mathcal{K}$ . Let  $v \in \mathcal{H}$  be any non-zero vector and let  $\mathcal{K}_1$  be the reducing subspace for  $N$  generated by  $v$ . Also let  $P$  be the orthogonal projection of  $\mathcal{K}$  onto  $\mathcal{K}_1$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{H}$  cannot be orthogonal to  $\mathcal{K}_1$  because both  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_1$  contain the nonzero vector  $v$ . Thus, let  $\mathcal{H}_1 := \text{cl}P(\mathcal{H})$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is a non-zero subspace of  $\mathcal{K}_1$ . Furthermore since  $P$  commutes with  $N$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is invariant under  $N$  and that  $P : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$  intertwines  $S$  with  $N|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ .

Since  $N|_{\mathcal{K}_1}$  is  $*$ -cyclic, it is unitarily equivalent to an operator of the form  $M_z$  on  $L^2(\mu)$  for some regular Borel compactly supported measure  $\mu$  in the complex plane; let  $U : \mathcal{K}_1 \rightarrow L^2(\mu)$  be the unitary that conjugates  $N|_{\mathcal{K}_1}$  to  $M_z$ . If we let  $\mathcal{H}' := U(\mathcal{H}_1)$ , then we see that  $N|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$  is unitarily equivalent to  $T = M_z$  on  $\mathcal{H}' \subseteq L^2(\mu)$ . Furthermore the map  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$  given by  $A = UP$  intertwines  $S$  with  $T$  and has dense range. Since  $S$  is  $n$ -supercyclic, it follows that  $T$  is  $n$ -supercyclic. Notice that  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is infinite dimensional because  $\mathcal{H}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}_1$  and  $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{K}_1$  contains the invariant subspace  $[v]$  of  $S$  generated by  $v$ . Furthermore,  $[v]$  cannot be finite dimensional otherwise  $S$  would have eigenvectors, contradicting the purity of  $S$ . Thus  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , and hence also  $\mathcal{H}'$ , is infinite dimensional. Thus  $T$  is  $n$ -supercyclic on  $\mathcal{H}'$  and  $\dim \mathcal{H}' > n$ , contradicting Theorem 4.2. Thus  $S$  cannot be  $n$ -supercyclic.  $\square$

We now give another proof that subnormal operators are not  $n$ -supercyclic, that does not use Theorem 4.2, but uses Theorem 4.1 and the following result.

**Theorem 4.4.** *If  $S$  is a subnormal operator acting on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , then there exists a normal operator  $N$  acting on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$  and a bounded linear operator  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  with dense range satisfying  $AS = NA$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $S$  is pure. In the proof of Theorem 4.3 (also see [6] Feldman) it is shown that there exists a bounded linear operator  $A_1 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2(\mu)$  where  $\mu$  satisfies  $A_1S = M_z A_1$ . Thus  $A_1$  intertwines  $S$  with the normal operator  $N_\mu = M_z$  on  $L^2(\mu)$ . Now let  $\mathcal{H}_1$  be the closure of the range of  $A_1$  and let  $S_1 = M_z$  on  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . Thus  $A_1S = S_1A_1$ .

We may assume that  $N_\mu$  is the minimal normal extension of  $S_1$ . In this case we may replace  $S_1$  with a unitarily equivalent operator  $S_2 = M_z$  on  $\mathcal{H}_2 \subseteq L^2(\nu)$  that also satisfies  $1 \in \mathcal{H}_2$  and thus all polynomials are in  $\mathcal{H}_2$ . Let  $\varphi \in L^\infty(\nu)$  be a cyclic vector for  $M_z$  on  $L^2(\nu)$ , [13, p. 232]. Then let  $A_2 : \mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow L^2(\nu)$  be given by multiplication by  $\varphi$ . Clearly  $A_2$  is one-to-one with dense range and satisfies  $A_2S_2 = N_\nu A_2$ . If  $U : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$  is the unitary that intertwines  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , then  $A = A_2UA_1$  is the required map.  $\square$

It now follows immediately from Theorem 4.4, that if a subnormal operator  $S$  is  $n$ -supercyclic, and  $A$  is a dense range map that intertwines  $S$  with a normal operator  $N$ , both  $S$  and  $N$  acting on infinite-dimensional spaces, then  $N$  is also  $n$ -supercyclic, contradicting Theorem 4.1.

## 5. NATURAL QUESTIONS

Question 6.4 of [8] reads

Can a pure subnormal (hyponormal) operator be  $N$ -supercyclic?

Theorem 4.3 answers this question in the negative for subnormal operators, but the question remains open for hyponormal operators except in the  $N = 1$  case (no hyponormal operator on a infinite dimensional Hilbert space can be supercyclic [5, Theorem 3.1]).

Our proof, presented in Section 3, that  $N$ -supercyclicity cannot occur nontrivially in the finite-dimensional setting is long and quite technical.

*Question 5.1.* Does there exist a short, non-technical proof showing that a linear mapping  $T : \mathbb{C}^{N+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{N+1}$  cannot be  $N$ -supercyclic?

In the Introduction, we presented examples of  $N$ -supercyclic operators  $T$  that are not cyclic, with non-cyclicity being due to the existence of multiple eigenvalues of  $T^*$ .

*Question 5.2.* Suppose that  $T$  is  $N$ -supercyclic and  $T^*$  has no multiple eigenvalues; must  $T$  be cyclic?

Ansari [1] has shown that powers of supercyclic operators are always supercyclic.

*Question 5.3.* If  $T$  is  $N$ -supercyclic and  $n$  is a positive integer, must  $T^n$  be  $N$ -supercyclic?

Recall that a subset  $E$  of a topological vector space  $\mathcal{X}$  is *somewhere dense* in  $\mathcal{X}$  provided the closure of  $E$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  has non-empty interior. An affirmative answer to the following question would yield an affirmative answer to Question 5.3.

*Question 5.4.* Suppose that there is an  $N$  dimensional subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathcal{X}$  whose orbit under the operator  $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is somewhere dense in  $\mathcal{X}$ ; must  $\text{orb}_T(\mathcal{S})$  then be everywhere dense in  $\mathcal{X}$  (so that  $T$  is, in particular,  $N$ -supercyclic)?

Bourdon and Feldman [7] have shown that the answer to the preceding question is yes when  $N = 1$ . The argument that shows a yes answer to Question 5.4 yields a yes answer to Question 5.3 is essentially the same as that of [7, Corollary 2.6].

The inverse of a supercyclic operator is always supercyclic (see, e.g., [2, Section 4]).

*Question 5.5.* If  $T$  is invertible and  $N$ -supercyclic must  $T^{-1}$  be  $N$ -supercyclic?

We remark that Question 5.2 above is essentially the same as Questions 6.2 of [8].

*Remark.* After this paper was accepted for publication, the authors learned that Bayart and Matheron [3] have shown that hyponormal operators cannot be  $N$ -supercyclic.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] S. I. Ansari, *Hypercyclic and cyclic vectors*, J. Funct. Anal. **128** (1995), 374–383.
- [2] S. I. Ansari and P. S. Bourdon, *Some properties of cyclic operators*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **63** (1997), 195–207.
- [3] F. Bayart and E. Matheron, *Hyponormal operators, weighted shifts, and weak forms of supercyclicity*, Preprint.
- [4] G. D. Birkhoff, *Démonstration d'un théorème élémentaire sur les fonctions entières*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **189** (1929), 473–475.
- [5] P. S. Bourdon, *Orbits of hyponormal operators*, Mich. Math. J. **44** (1997), 345–353.
- [6] N.S. Feldman *Pure Subnormal Operators have Cyclic Adjoints* J. Funct. Analysis **162** (1999), no. 2, 379–399.
- [7] P. S. Bourdon and N. S. Feldman, *Somewhere dense orbits are everywhere dense*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **52** (2003), 811–819.
- [8] N. S. Feldman  *$N$ -Supercyclic Operators*, Studia Mathematica **151** (2002), 141–159.
- [9] K-G. Grosse-Erdmann, *Universal families and hypercyclic operators*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **36** (1999), 345–381.
- [10] D. A. Herrero, *Limits of hypercyclic and supercyclic operators*, it J. Funct. Anal. **99** (1991), 179–190.
- [11] H. M. Hilden and L. J. Wallen, *Some cyclic and non-cyclic vectors of certain operators*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **23** (1974), 557–565.
- [12] S. Rolewicz, *On orbits of elements*, Studia Math. **32** (1969), 17–22.
- [13] J.B. Conway, *The Theory of Subnormal Operators*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1991.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY, LEXINGTON, VA 24450, USA  
*E-mail address:* pbourdon@wlu.edu

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY, LEXINGTON, VA 24450, USA  
*E-mail address:* feldmann@wlu.edu

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MI 48824 USA  
*E-mail address:* shapiro@math.msu.edu