Hyponormality and Subnormality for Powers of Commuting Pairs of Subnormal Operators

Raúl E. Curto

Department of Mathematics, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Sang Hoon Lee

Department of Mathematics, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Jasang Yoon

Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011

Abstract

Let $\mathfrak{H}_0$ (resp. $\mathfrak{H}_\infty$) denote the class of commuting pairs of subnormal operators on Hilbert space (resp. subnormal pairs), and for an integer $k \geq 1$ let $\mathfrak{H}_k$ denote the class of k-hyponormal pairs in $\mathfrak{H}_0$. We study the hyponormality and subnormality of powers of pairs in $\mathfrak{H}_k$. We first show that if $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_1$, the pair (T_1^2, T_2) may fail to be in $\mathfrak{H}_1$. Conversely, we find a pair $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_0$ such that $(T_1^2, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_1$ but $(T_1, T_2) \notin \mathfrak{H}_1$. Next, we show that there exists a pair $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_1$ such that $T_1^m T_2^n$ is subnormal (all $m, n \geq 1$), but (T_1, T_2) is not in $\mathfrak{H}_\infty$; this further stretches the gap between the classes $\mathfrak{H}_1$ and $\mathfrak{H}_\infty$. Finally, we prove that there exists a large class of 2-variable weighted shifts $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_0$, i.e., those whose core is of tensor form (cf. Definition 3.3), for which the subnormality of (T_1^2, T_2) and (T_1, T_2^2) does imply the subnormality of (T_1, T_2).

Key words: jointly hyponormal pairs, subnormal pairs, 2-variable weighted shifts, powers of commuting pairs of subnormal operators
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 47B20, 47B37, 47A13, 28A50; Secondary 44A60, 47-04, 47A20

1 Introduction

The Lifting Problem for Commuting Subnormals (LPCS) asks for necessary and sufficient conditions for a pair of subnormal operators on Hilbert space to admit commuting normal extensions. It is well known that the commutativity of the pair is necessary but not sufficient ([1], [23], [24], [25]), and it has recently been shown that the joint hyponormality of the pair is necessary but not sufficient [16], thus disproving the conjecture in [13]. An abstract answer to the Lifting Problem was obtained in [10], by stating and proving a multivariable analogue of the Bram-Halmos criterion for subnormality, and then showing concretely that no matter how k-hyponormal a pair might be, it may still fail to be subnormal. While this provides new insights into the LPCS, it stops short of identifying other types of conditions that, together with joint hyponormality, may imply subnormality.

Our previous work ([10], [16], [17], [18], [30]) has revealed that the nontrivial aspects of the LPCS are best detected within the class $\mathfrak{H}_1$ of commuting hyponormal pairs of subnormal operators; we thus focus our attention on this class. More generally, we will denote the class of commuting pairs of subnormal operators on Hilbert space by $\mathfrak{H}_0$, the class of subnormal pairs by $\mathfrak{H}_\infty$, and for an integer $k \geq 1$ the class of k-hyponormal pairs in $\mathfrak{H}_0$ by $\mathfrak{H}_k$. Clearly, $\mathfrak{H}_\infty \subseteq ... \subseteq \mathfrak{H}_k \subseteq ... \subseteq \mathfrak{H}_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{H}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{H}_0$; the main results in [16] and [10] show that these inclusions are all proper. (The LPCS thus asks for necessary and sufficient conditions for a pair $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_0$ to be in $\mathfrak{H}_\infty$.)

In [19], E. Franks proved that if $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_0$ and $p(\mathbf{T})$ is subnormal for all polynomials $p \in \mathbb{C}[z]$ with $\deg p \leq 5$, then $\mathbf{T}$ is necessarily subnormal. Motivated in part by this result, and in part by J. Stampfli's work in [28] and [29], in this article we consider the role of the powers of a pair in ascertaining its subnormality. Clearly, if $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$, and if $m, n \geq 1$, then $\mathbf{T}^{(m,n)} := (T_1^m, T_2^n) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$, and therefore $T_1^m T_2^n$ is a subnormal operator. It is thus natural to ask whether the subnormality of both $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)}$ and $\mathbf{T}^{(1,2)}$ can force the subnormality of $\mathbf{T}$.

Our first main result shows that the class $\mathfrak{H} \equiv \mathfrak{H}_1$ is not invariant under squares, as follows: we construct a pair $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}$ such that $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)} = (T_1^2, T_2) \notin \mathfrak{H}$ (Theorem 2.7). Conversely, we find a pair $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_0$ such that $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)} = (T_1^2, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}$ but $\mathbf{T} \notin \mathfrak{H}$. We then show that for a large class of commuting pairs of subnormal operators, the subnormality of both $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)}$ and $\mathbf{T}^{(1,2)}$ does force the subnormality of $\mathbf{T}$. Concretely, if $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{TC}$, the class of all 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_0$ whose core is of *tensor form* (see Definition 3.3 below), then $\mathbf{T}^{(1,2)} \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{T}^{(2,1)} \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$ (Theorem 3.8). Our results thus seem to indicate that the subnormality of $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)}, \mathbf{T}^{(1,2)}$ may very well be essential in determining the subnormality of

Email addresses: rcurto@math.uiowa.edu (Raúl E. Curto), shlee@math.skku.ac.kr (Sang Hoon Lee), jyoon@iastate.edu (Jasang Yoon).
URLs: http://www.math.uiowa.edu/~rcurto/ (Raúl E. Curto), http://www.public.iastate.edu/~jyoon/ (Jasang Yoon).
[1] Research partially supported by NSF Grants DMS-0099357 and DMS-0422952.

$\mathbf{T}$ within the class $\mathfrak{H}_0$ (Conjecture 3.12). Next, we prove that it is possible for a pair $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}$ to have all powers $T_1^m T_2^n$ $(m, n \geq 1)$ subnormal, without being subnormal (Example 4.5). This provides further evidence that the gap between the classes $\mathfrak{H}_\infty$ and $\mathfrak{H}_1$ is fairly large.

To prove our results, we resort to tools introduced in previous work (e.g., the Six-point Test to check hyponormality (Lemma 2.1) and the Backward Extension Theorem for 2-variable weighted shifts (Lemma 3.2)), together with a new direct sum decomposition for powers of 2-variable weighted shifts which parallels the decomposition used in [14] to analyze k-hyponormality for powers of (one-variable) weighted shifts. Specifically, we split the ambient space $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+^2)$ as an orthogonal direct sum $\mathcal{H}^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}^1$, where $\mathcal{H}^m := \bigvee_{k=0}^{\infty} \{e_{(j,2k+m)} : j = 0, 1, 2, \cdots\}$ $(m = 0, 1)$. Each of the subspaces $\mathcal{H}^0$ and $\mathcal{H}^1$ reduces T_1 and T_2, and $\mathbf{T}^{(1,2)}$ is subnormal if and only if each of $\mathbf{T}^{(1,2)}|_{\mathcal{H}^0}$ and $\mathbf{T}^{(1,2)}|_{\mathcal{H}^1}$ is subnormal (cf. Figure 4).

We devote the rest of this section to establishing our basic terminology and notation. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space and let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the algebra of bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. We say that $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is *normal* if $T^*T = TT^*$, *subnormal* if $T = N|_{\mathcal{H}}$, where N is normal and $N(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, and *hyponormal* if $T^*T \geq TT^*$. For $S, T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ let $[S, T] := ST - TS$. We say that an n-tuple $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, \cdots, T_n)$ of operators on $\mathcal{H}$ is (jointly) *hyponormal* if the operator matrix

$$[\mathbf{T}^*, \mathbf{T}] := \begin{pmatrix} [T_1^*, T_1] & [T_2^*, T_1] & \cdots & [T_n^*, T_1] \\ [T_1^*, T_2] & [T_2^*, T_2] & \cdots & [T_n^*, T_2] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ [T_1^*, T_n] & [T_2^*, T_n] & \cdots & [T_n^*, T_n] \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive on the direct sum of n copies of $\mathcal{H}$ (cf. [2], [11], [13]). The n-tuple $\mathbf{T}$ is said to be *normal* if $\mathbf{T}$ is commuting and each T_i is normal, and $\mathbf{T}$ is *subnormal* if $\mathbf{T}$ is the restriction of a normal n-tuple to a common invariant subspace. Finally, we say that $\mathbf{T}$ is 2-hyponormal if $\mathbf{T}$ is commuting and $(T_1, T_2, T_1^2, T_1T_2, T_2^2)$ is hyponormal. Clearly, normal $\Rightarrow$ subnormal $\Rightarrow$ 2-hyponormal $\Rightarrow$ hyponormal.

The Bram-Halmos criterion for subnormality states that an operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is subnormal if and only if

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

for all finite collections $x_0, x_1, \cdots, x_k \in \mathcal{H}$ ([4], [5]). Using Choleski's algorithm for operator matrices, it is easy to verify that this condition is equivalent to the assertion that the k-tuple $(T, T^2, \cdots, T^k)$ is hyponormal for all $k \geq 1$.

For $\alpha \equiv \{\alpha_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ a bounded sequence of positive real numbers (called *weights*) let $W_\alpha : \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+) \to \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$ be the associated unilateral weighted shift, defined by $W_\alpha e_n := \alpha_n e_{n+1}$ (all $n \geq 0$), where $\{e_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is the canonical orthonormal basis in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$. For notational convenience, we will often write $shift(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \cdots)$ to denote W_α. In particular, we shall let

$U_+ := shift(1,1,\cdots)$ (U_+ is the (unweighted) unilateral shift) and $S_a := shift(a,1,1,\cdots)$. For a weighted shift W_α, *the moments of* α are given by

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

It is easy to see that W_α is never normal, and that it is hyponormal if and only if $\alpha_0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \cdots$. Similarly, consider double-indexed positive bounded sequences $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}, \beta_{\mathbf{k}} \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+^2)$, $\mathbf{k} \equiv (k_1,k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2 := \mathbb{Z}_+ \times \mathbb{Z}_+$, and let $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+^2)$ be the Hilbert space of square-summable complex sequences indexed by $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$. (Recall that $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+^2)$ is canonically isometrically isomorphic to $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+) \bigotimes \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$.) We define the 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1,T_2)$ by

$$\begin{cases} T_1 e_{\mathbf{k}} := \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} e_{\mathbf{k}+\varepsilon_1} \\ T_2 e_{\mathbf{k}} := \beta_{\mathbf{k}} e_{\mathbf{k}+\varepsilon_2}, \end{cases}$$

where $\varepsilon_1 := (1,0)$ and $\varepsilon_2 := (0,1)$. Clearly,

$$T_1T_2 = T_2T_1 \Longleftrightarrow \beta_{\mathbf{k}+\varepsilon_1}\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} = \alpha_{\mathbf{k}+\varepsilon_2}\beta_{\mathbf{k}} \ \text{ (all } \mathbf{k}). \tag{1.1}$$

In an entirely similar way one can define multivariable weighted shifts.

A 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1,T_2)$ is called *horizontally flat* if $\alpha_{(k_1,k_2)} = \alpha_{(1,1)}$ for all $k_1,k_2 \geq 1$; $\mathbf{T}$ is called *vertically flat* if $\beta_{(k_1,k_2)} = \beta_{(1,1)}$ for all $k_1,k_2 \geq 1$. If $\mathbf{T}$ is horizontally and vertically flat, then $\mathbf{T}$ is simply called *flat*.

For an arbitrary 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T}$, we shall let $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(\mathbf{T})$ denote the restriction of $\mathbf{T}$ to $\mathcal{M}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j$, where $\mathcal{M}_i$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_j$) is the subspace of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+^2)$ which is spanned by canonical orthonormal basis associated to indices $\mathbf{k} = (k_1,k_2)$ with $k_1 \geq 0$ and $k_2 \geq i$ (resp. $k_1 \geq j$ and $k_2 \geq 0$).

Trivially, a pair of unilateral weighted shifts W_α and W_β gives rise to a 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1,T_2)$, if we let $\alpha_{(k_1,k_2)} := \alpha_{k_1}$ and $\beta_{(k_1,k_2)} := \beta_{k_2}$ (all $k_1,k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$). In this case, $\mathbf{T}$ is subnormal (resp. hyponormal) if and only if so are T_1 and T_2; in fact, under the canonical identification of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+^2)$ and $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+) \bigotimes \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$, $T_1 \cong I \bigotimes W_\alpha$ and $T_2 \cong W_\beta \bigotimes I$, and $\mathbf{T}$ is also doubly commuting. For this reason, we do not focus attention on shifts of this type, and use them only when the above mentioned triviality is desirable or needed. Given $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$, the moment of (α,β) of order $\mathbf{k}$ is

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}(\alpha,\beta) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{k}=0 \\ \alpha_{(0,0)}^2 \cdots \alpha_{(k_1-1,0)}^2 & \text{if } k_1 \geq 1 \text{ and } k_2 = 0 \\ \beta_{(0,0)}^2 \cdots \beta_{(0,k_2-1)}^2 & \text{if } k_1 = 0 \text{ and } k_2 \geq 1 \\ \alpha_{(0,0)}^2 \cdots \alpha_{(k_1-1,0)}^2 \beta_{(k_1,0)}^2 \cdots \beta_{(k_1,k_2-1)}^2 & \text{if } k_1 \geq 1 \text{ and } k_2 \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

(We remark that, due to the commutativity condition (1.1), $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}$ can be computed using any nondecreasing path from $(0,0)$ to (k_1,k_2).). We now recall a well known characterization of subnormality for multivariable weighted shifts [22], due to C. Berger (cf. [5, III.8.16]) and independently established by Gellar and Wallen [20]) in the single variable case: $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2)$ admits a commuting normal extension if and only if there is a probability measure μ (which we call the Berger measure of $\mathbf{T}$) defined on the 2-dimensional rectangle $R = [0, a_1] \times [0, a_2]$ (where $a_i := \|T_i\|^2$) such that $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} = \int_R s^{k_1} t^{k_2} d\mu(s,t)$, for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$. In the single variable case, if W_α is subnormal with Berger measure ξ_α and $h \geq 1$, and if we let $\mathcal{L}_h := \bigvee\{e_n : n \geq h\}$ denote the invariant subspace obtained by removing the first h vectors in the canonical orthonormal basis of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$, then the Berger measure of $W_\alpha|_{\mathcal{L}_h}$ is $\frac{s^h}{\gamma_h} d\xi(s)$; alternatively, if $S : \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+) \to \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+)$ is defined by

$$S(\alpha)(n) := \alpha(n+1) \ (\alpha \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_+), n \geq 0), \tag{1.2}$$

then

$$d\xi_{S(\alpha)}(s) = \frac{s}{\alpha_0^2} d\xi(s). \tag{1.3}$$

Acknowledgment. Most of the examples, and some of the proofs in this paper were obtained using calculations with the software tool *Mathematica [31].*

2 The Class $\mathfrak{H}_1$ Is Not Invariant Under Squares

For a general operator T on Hilbert space, it is well known that the hyponormality of T does not imply the hyponormality of T^2 ([21]). However, for a unilateral weighted shift W_α, the hyponormality of W_α (detected by the condition $\alpha_k \leq \alpha_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 0$) clearly implies the hyponormality of every power W_α^m ($m \geq 1$). For 2-variable weighted shifts, one is thus tempted to expect that a similar result would hold, especially if we restrict attention to the class $\mathfrak{H}_1$ of commuting hyponormal pairs of subnormal operators. Somewhat surprisingly, it is actually possible to build a 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_\mathbf{1}$ such that $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)} \notin \mathfrak{H}_1$, and we do this in this section.

We begin with some basic results. First, we recall a hyponormality criterion for 2-variable weighted shifts.

Lemma 2.1 *([6]) (Six-pointTest) Let $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2)$ be a 2-variable weighted shift, with weight sequences α and β. Then $\mathbf{T}$ is hyponormal if and only if*

$$H_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{k}) := \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}+\varepsilon_1}^2 - \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^2 & \alpha_{\mathbf{k}+\varepsilon_2}\beta_{\mathbf{k}+\varepsilon_1} - \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}\beta_{\mathbf{k}} \\ \alpha_{\mathbf{k}+\varepsilon_2}\beta_{\mathbf{k}+\varepsilon_1} - \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}\beta_{\mathbf{k}} & \beta_{\mathbf{k}+\varepsilon_2}^2 - \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^2 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \quad \textit{(all } \mathbf{k} \equiv (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2\textit{)}.$$

Next, given integers i and ℓ ($\ell \geq 1$, $0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$), consider $\mathcal{H} \equiv \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+) = \bigvee_{j=0}^{\infty}\{e_j\}$. Define



Fig. 1. Weight diagram used in the Six-point Test and weight diagram of the 2-variable weighted shift in Lemma 2.4

$\mathcal{H}_i := \bigvee_{j=0}^{\infty}\{e_{\ell j+i}\}$, so $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\ell-1}\mathcal{H}_i$. Following the notation in [14], for a weight sequence α let

$$P_{i\ell}(\alpha) \equiv \alpha(\ell : i) := \{\Pi_{m=0}^{\ell-1}\alpha_{\ell j+i+m}\}_{j=0}^{\infty}; \tag{2.1}$$

that is, $\alpha(\ell : i)$ denotes the sequence of products of weights in adjacent packets of size ℓ, beginning with $\alpha_i \cdots \alpha_{i+\ell-1}$. For example, $\alpha(2:0) : \alpha_0\alpha_1, \alpha_2\alpha_3, \alpha_4\alpha_5, \cdots$, $\alpha(2:1) : \alpha_1\alpha_2, \alpha_3\alpha_4, \alpha_5\alpha_6, \cdots$ and $\alpha(3:2) : \alpha_2\alpha_3\alpha_4, \alpha_5\alpha_6\alpha_7, \alpha_8\alpha_9\alpha_{10}, \cdots$. Observe that, using the notation introduced in (1.2), $P_{i\ell} = P_{0\ell}S^i$. For a subnormal weighted shift W_α, it was proved in [14] that $W_{P_{i\ell}(\alpha)}$ is also subnormal (all $\ell \geq 1$, $0 \leq i \leq \ell-1$). In fact, more is true.

Lemma 2.2 *([14]) For $\ell \geq 1$, and $0 \leq i \leq \ell-1$, $W_{P_{i\ell}(\alpha)}$ is unitarily equivalent to $W_\alpha^\ell|_{\mathcal{H}_i}$. Therefore, W_α^ℓ is unitarily equivalent to $\oplus_{i=0}^{\ell-1}W_{P_{i\ell}(\alpha)}$. Consequently, W_α^ℓ is k-hyponormal if and only if $W_{P_{i\ell}(\alpha)}$ is k-hyponormal for each i such that $0 \leq i \leq \ell-1$. Moreover, if W_α is subnormal with Berger measure ξ_α, then $W_{P_{i\ell}(\alpha)}$ is subnormal with Berger measure*

$$d\xi_{P_{i\ell}(\alpha)}(s) = d\xi_{P_{0\ell}S^i(\alpha)}(s) = \frac{s^i}{\gamma_i(\alpha)}d\xi_{P_{0\ell}}(s) = \frac{s^{\frac{i}{\ell}}}{\gamma_i(\alpha)}d\xi_\alpha(s^{\frac{1}{\ell}}) \;\; (0 \leq i \leq \ell-1). \tag{2.2}$$

Example 2.3 *Let $W_\alpha \equiv shift(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \cdots)$ be a subnormal weighted shift, with Berger measure ξ_α. Then $shift(\alpha_2\alpha_3, \alpha_4\alpha_5, ...) \equiv W_{P_{22}(\alpha)}$ is also subnormal, with Berger measure $\frac{s}{\alpha_0^2\alpha_1^2}d\xi_\alpha(\sqrt{s})$.*

To produce an example of $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_1$ such that $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)} \notin \mathfrak{H}_1$, we start with an example given in [10]. For $0 < \kappa \leq 1$, let $\alpha \equiv \{\alpha_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be defined by

$$\alpha_n := \begin{cases} \kappa\sqrt{\frac{3}{4}} & \text{if } n = 0 \\ \frac{\sqrt{(n+1)(n+3)}}{(n+2)} & \text{if } n \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

We know that W_α is subnormal, with Berger measure

$$d\xi_\alpha(s) := (1-\kappa^2)d\delta_0(s) + \frac{\kappa^2}{2}ds + \frac{\kappa^2}{2}d\delta_1(s) \ \ \text{([10, Proposition 4.2])}.$$

For $0 < a < 1$, consider the 2-variable weighted shift given by Figure 1, with $\alpha \equiv \{\alpha_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ as above.

Lemma 2.4 *([10]) Let $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2)$ be the 2-variable weighted shift whose weight diagram is given by Figure 1, with $0 < a \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then*
(i) T_1 and T_2 are subnormal;
(ii) $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_1$ if and only if $0 < \kappa \leq h_1(a) := \sqrt{\frac{32-48a^4}{59-72a^2}}$;
(iii) $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_2$ if and only if $0 < \kappa \leq h_2(a) := \sqrt{\frac{81-144a^2}{157-360a^2+144a^4}}$;
(iv) $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$ if and only if $0 < \kappa \leq h_\infty(a) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2-a^2}}$.

Remark 2.5 *Close inspection of the proof of Lemma 2.4 reveals that the hyponormality of the 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T}$ whose weight diagram is given by Figure 1 extends beyond the range $0 < a \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}$. As a matter of fact, the hyponormality of $\mathbf{T}$ is controlled by the nonnegativity of the two expressions, $f(a) := 84 - 95a^2$ and $g(a,\kappa) := (72a^2 - 59)\kappa^2 + 32 - 48a^4$. Of course, the nonnegativity of f requires $a \leq \sqrt{\frac{84}{95}}$, while to analyze the second expression we need to consider three cases: (i) $72a^2 - 59 < 0$; (ii) $72a^2 - 59 = 0$; and (iii) $72a^2 - 59 > 0$. In case (i), $g(a,\kappa) \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow a^4 \leq \frac{2}{3}$ and $\kappa^2 \leq \frac{32-48a^4}{59-72a^2}$; in case (ii), $a^2 = \frac{59}{72}$ and $g(a,\kappa) = 32 - 48(\frac{59}{72})^2 < 0$; and in case (iii), $g(a,\kappa) \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow a^2 > \frac{59}{72}$ and $\kappa^2 \geq \frac{32-48a^4}{59-72a^2}$. Now, it is easy to verify that on the interval $(\sqrt{\frac{59}{72}}, \sqrt{\frac{84}{95}}]$ the expression $\frac{32-48a^4}{59-72a^2}$ is always greater than 1, and since we must have $\kappa \leq 1$, case (iii) cannot really happen. If we now observe that $a \leq \sqrt{\frac{84}{95}}$ is implied by the condition $a^4 \leq \frac{2}{3}$, we conclude that $\mathbf{T}$ is hyponormal if and only if $a \leq \sqrt[4]{\frac{2}{3}}$ and $\kappa \leq \sqrt{\frac{32-48a^4}{59-72a^2}} = h_1(a)$.*

Theorem 2.6 *Let $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2)$ be the 2-variable weighted shift whose weight diagram is given by Figure 1. Then $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)} \equiv (T_1^2, T_2)$ is hyponormal if and only if $0 < \kappa \leq h_{21}(a) := 3\sqrt{\frac{3-5a^4}{47-60a^2}}$, with $0 < a \leq \sqrt[4]{\frac{3}{5}}$.*

Proof. For $m = 0, 1$, let $\mathcal{H}_m := \bigvee_{j=0}^{\infty}\{e_{(2j+m,k)} : k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots\}$. Then $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+^2) \equiv \mathcal{H}_0 \bigoplus \mathcal{H}_1$, and each of $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ reduces T_1^2 and T_2. We can thus write

$$(T_1^2, T_2) \cong (W_{\alpha(2:0)} \oplus (I \otimes S_a), T_2|_{\mathcal{H}_0}) \bigoplus (W_{\alpha(2:1)} \oplus (I \otimes U_+), T_2|_{\mathcal{H}_1}).$$

By [16, Theorem 5.2 and Remark 5.3], the second summand, $(W_{\alpha(2:1)} \oplus (I \otimes U_+), T_2|_{\mathcal{H}_1})$, is subnormal. Thus, the hyponormality of (T_1^2, T_2) is equivalent to the hyponormality of the first summand, $(W_{\alpha(2:0)} \oplus (I \otimes S_a), T_2|_{\mathcal{H}_0})$. Now, to check the hyponormality of the first summand, by Lemma 2.1 it suffices to apply the Six-point Test at $\mathbf{k} = (0, 0)$. We have

$$H_{(W_{\alpha(2:0)} \oplus (I \otimes S_a), T_2|_{\mathcal{H}_0})}(\mathbf{0}) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_3^2\alpha_2^2 - \alpha_1^2\alpha_0^2 & \frac{a^2\kappa}{\alpha_0\alpha_1} - \kappa\alpha_0\alpha_1 \\ \frac{a^2\kappa}{\alpha_0\alpha_1} - \kappa\alpha_0\alpha_1 & 1-\kappa^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{9}{10} - \frac{2}{3}\kappa^2 & \sqrt{6}(\frac{1}{2}a^2 - \frac{1}{3}\kappa^2) \\ \sqrt{6}(\frac{1}{2}a^2 - \frac{1}{3}\kappa^2) & 1-\kappa^2 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (1-\kappa^2)(\tfrac{9}{10} - \tfrac{2}{3}\kappa^2) \geq 6(\tfrac{a^2}{2} - \tfrac{\kappa^2}{3})^2$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \tfrac{9}{10} - \tfrac{47}{30}\kappa^2 - \tfrac{3}{2}a^4 + 2a^2\kappa^2 \geq 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow h(a,\kappa) := (60a^2 - 47)\kappa^2 + 27 - 45a^4 \geq 0.$$

As in Remark 2.5, three cases arise: (i) $60a^2 - 47 < 0$; (ii) $72a^2 - 59 = 0$; and (iii) $60a^2 - 47 > 0$. In case (i), $h(a,\kappa) \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow a^4 \leq \frac{3}{5}$ and $\kappa^2 \leq \frac{9(3-5a^4)}{47-60a^2}$; in case (ii), $a^2 = \frac{47}{60}$ and $h(a,\kappa) = 27 - 45(\frac{47}{60})^2 < 0$; and in case (iii), $h(a,\kappa) \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow a^2 > \frac{47}{60}$ and $\kappa^2 \geq \frac{27-45a^4}{47-60a^2}$. As before, it is easy to verify that on the interval $(\sqrt{\frac{47}{60}}, 1]$ the expression $\frac{27-45a^4}{47-60a^2}$ is always greater than 1, and since we must have $\kappa \leq 1$, case (iii) cannot really happen. We conclude that $\mathbf{T}$ is hyponormal if and only if $a \leq \sqrt[4]{\frac{3}{5}}$ and $\kappa \leq \sqrt{\frac{9(3-5a^4)}{47-60a^2}} \equiv h_{21}(a)$, as desired. $\square$

We are now ready to formulate our first main result. Consider the two functions h_1 and h_{21} in Remark 2.5 and Theorem 2.6, respectively, restricted to the common portion of their domains, namely the interval $(0, \sqrt[4]{\frac{3}{5}}]$. A calculation shows that there exists a unique point $a_{int} \in (0, \sqrt[4]{\frac{3}{5}}]$ such that $h_1(a_{int}) = h_{21}(a_{int})$; in fact, $a_{int} \cong 0.8386$. Figure 2 shows two regions in the (a,κ)-plane, one where $\mathbf{T}$ is hyponormal but $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)}$ is not, and one where $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)}$ is hyponormal but $\mathbf{T}$ is not. For added emphasis, we include the graphs of h_2 and h_∞ mentioned in Lemma 2.4, which are only defined on the interval $(0, \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}]$. We thus have:

Theorem 2.7 *Let* $\mathbf{T}$ *be the* 2*-variable weighted shift whose weight diagram is given by Figure*

1. Then
(i) $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_1$ *and* $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)} \notin \mathfrak{H}_1 \iff a_{int} < a \leq \sqrt[4]{\frac{3}{5}}$ *and* $h_{21}(a) < \kappa \leq h_1(a)$ *(see Figure 2).*
(ii) $\mathbf{T} \notin \mathfrak{H}_1$ *and* $\mathbf{T}^{(2,1)} \in \mathfrak{H}_1 \iff 0 < a < a_{int}$ *and* $h_1(a) < \kappa \leq h_{21}(a)$ *(see Figure 2).*



Fig. 2. Graphs of h_1, h_{21}, h_2 and h_∞ on the interval $[0, \sqrt[4]{\frac{3}{5}}]$

3 A large Class for Which $(T_1^2, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty \iff (T_1, T_2^2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty \iff (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$

It is well known that for a single operator T, the subnormality of all powers T^n $(n \geq 2)$ does not imply the hyponormality of T, even if T is a unilateral weighted shift ([29]). In the multivariable case, the analogous result is nontrivial if one further assumes that each component is subnormal. To study this, we begin by recalling some useful notation and results. Given a weighted shift W_α, a (one-step) backward extension of W_α is the weighted shift $W_{\alpha(x)}$, where $\alpha(x) : x, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots$.

Lemma 3.1 (*Subnormal backward extension of a* 1*-variable weighted shift; cf. [7], [16, Proposition 1.5]*) *Let* T *be a weighted shift whose restriction* $T|_{\mathcal{L}}$ *to* $\mathcal{L} := \vee\{e_1, e_2, \cdots\}$ *is subnormal, with Berger measure* $\mu_{\mathcal{L}}$*. Then* T *is subnormal (with Berger measure* μ*) if and only if*
(i) $\frac{1}{t} \in L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{L}})$*, and*
(ii) $\alpha_0^2 \leq (\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{L}})})^{-1}$.
In this case, $d\mu(t) = \frac{\alpha_0^2}{t} d\mu_{\mathcal{L}}(t) + (1 - \alpha_0^2 \left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{L}})}) d\delta_0(t)$*, where* δ_0 *denotes Dirac measure at* 0*. In particular,* T *is never subnormal when* $\mu_{\mathcal{L}}(\{0\}) > 0$.

To state the 2-variable version of Lemma 3.1, we need to recall two notions from [16]: (i) given a probability measure μ on $X \times Y \equiv \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$, with $\frac{1}{t} \in L^1(\mu)$, the *extremal measure* μ_{ext} (which is also a probability measure) on $X \times Y$ is given by $d\mu_{ext}(s,t) := (1 - \delta_0(t)) \frac{1}{t\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu)}} d\mu(s,t)$;

and (ii) given a measure μ on $X \times Y$, the *marginal measure* μ^X is given by $\mu^X := \mu \circ \pi_X^{-1}$, where $\pi_X : X \times Y \to X$ is the canonical projection onto X. Thus, $\mu^X(E) = \mu(E \times Y)$, for every $E \subseteq X$. Observe that if μ is a probability measure, then so is μ^X. For example,

$$d(\xi \times \eta)_{ext}(s,t) = (1 - \delta_0(t)) \frac{1}{t \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\eta)}} d\xi(s) d\eta(t) \tag{3.1}$$

and $(\xi \times \eta)^X = \xi$.

Lemma 3.2 *(Subnormal backward extension of a 2-variable weighted shift; cf. [16, Proposition 3.10]) Consider the following 2-variable weighted shift (see Figure 3), and let $\mathcal{M}$ be the subspace of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+^2)$ spanned by the canonical orthonormal basis vectors associated to indices $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2)$ with $k_1 \geq 0$ and $k_2 \geq 1$. Assume that $\mathcal{R}_{10}(\mathbf{T}) \equiv \mathbf{T}|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is subnormal with Berger measure $\mu_{\mathcal{M}}$ and that $W_0 := shift(\alpha_{00}, \alpha_{10}, \cdots)$ is subnormal with Berger measure ν. Then $\mathbf{T}$ is subnormal if and only if*
(i) $\frac{1}{t} \in L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})$;
(ii) $\beta_{00}^2 \leq (\left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})})^{-1}$;
(iii) $\beta_{00}^2 \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})} (\mu_{\mathcal{M}})_{ext}^X \leq \nu$.
Moreover, if $\beta_{00}^2 \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})} = 1$, *then* $(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})_{ext}^X = \nu$. *In the case when $\mathbf{T}$ is subnormal, the Berger measure μ of $\mathbf{T}$ is given by*

$$d\mu(s,t) = \beta_{00}^2 \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})} d(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})_{ext}(s,t) + (d\nu(s) - \beta_{00}^2 \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})} d(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})_{ext}^X(s)) d\delta_0(t).$$

Definition 3.3 *(i) The core of a 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T}$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{T}$ to $\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_1$, in symbols, $c(\mathbf{T}) := \mathbf{T}|_{\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{N}_1} \equiv \mathcal{R}_{11}(\mathbf{T})$.*
(ii) A 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T}$ is said to be of tensor form if $\mathbf{T} \cong (I \otimes W_\alpha, W_\beta \otimes I)$. When $\mathbf{T}$ is subnormal, this is equivalent to requiring that the Berger measure be a Cartesian product $\xi \times \eta$.
(iii) The class of all 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_0$ whose core is of tensor form will be denoted by $\mathcal{TC}$, that is, $\mathcal{TC} := \{\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_0 : c(\mathbf{T})$ is of tensor form$\}$.
(iv) For each $\mathbf{k} \equiv (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$, let $A_{\mathbf{k}} := \{\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_0 : \mathcal{R}_{k_1 k_2}(\mathbf{T}) \in \mathcal{TC}\}$.

Observe that for $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$ with $\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{m}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$), we have $A_{\mathbf{k}} \subseteq A_{\mathbf{m}}$. Thus, the collection $\{A_{\mathbf{k}}\}$ forms an ascending chain with respect to set inclusion and the partial order induced by $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$. Moreover $\mathcal{TC} = A_{\mathbf{0}} \subseteq A_{\mathbf{k}}$ for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$. All 2-variable weighted shifts considered in [16], [17], [18] and [10] are in $\mathcal{TC}$. Thus, $\mathcal{TC}$ is a rather large class; as a matter of fact, much more is true. The following theorem shows that an outer propagation phenomena occurs for $\mathcal{TC}$.

Theorem 3.4 *For all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$, $A_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathcal{TC}$.*



Fig. 3. Weight diagram of the 2-variable weighted shift in Lemma 3.2 and weight diagram of a 2-variable weighted shift with $\mathcal{R}_{11}(\mathbf{T}) \cong (I \otimes W_\alpha, W_\beta \otimes I)$, respectively

Proof. Since we always have $\mathcal{TC} \subseteq A_{\mathbf{k}}$, we prove the reverse inclusion. Without loss of generality, it is enough to show that if $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_0$ and $\mathbf{T}|_{\mathcal{M}_2 \cap \mathcal{N}_2}$ is of tensor form, then $c(\mathbf{T})$ is of tensor form. If $\mathbf{T}|_{\mathcal{M}_2 \cap \mathcal{N}_2}$ is of tensor form, then $shift(\beta_{22}, \beta_{23}, \cdots) = shift(\beta_{k_12}, \beta_{k_13}, \cdots)$ for all $k_1 \geq 2$. The subnormality of T_2 then implies that $shift(\beta_{k_10}, \beta_{k_11}, \cdots)$ is subnormal for all $k_1 \geq 2$. By Lemma 3.1, we have $\beta_{k_11} = \sqrt{(\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\xi_{k_1})})^{-1}}$ $(k_1 \geq 2)$, where ξ_{k_1} is the Berger measure of $shift(\beta_{k_12}, \beta_{k_13}, \cdots)$. Thus, $shift(\beta_{21}, \beta_{22}, \cdots) = shift(\beta_{k_11}, \beta_{k_12}, \cdots)$ for all $k_1 \geq 2$. Now, since $\beta_{21} = \beta_{k_11}$ (all $k_1 \geq 2$), the commutativity of T_1 and T_2 implies $\alpha_{k_12} = \alpha_{k_11}$ for all $k_1 \geq 2$. Thus, $shift(\alpha_{21}, \alpha_{31}, \cdots) = shift(\alpha_{2k_2}, \alpha_{3k_2}, \cdots)$ for all $k_2 \geq 1$. By the subnormality of T_1 and Lemma 3.1, we have $shift(\alpha_{11}, \alpha_{21}, \cdots) = shift(\alpha_{1k_2}, \alpha_{2k_2}, \cdots)$ for all $k_2 \geq 1$. Therefore $c(\mathbf{T})$ is of tensor form. $\square$

We now consider the 2-variable weighted shift given by Figure 3, where $W_x := shift(x_0, x_1, \cdots)$ and $W_y := shift(y_0, y_1, \cdots)$ are subnormal with Berger measures μ_y and μ_x, respectively. Further, we let $W_\alpha := shift(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots)$ and $W_\beta := shift(\beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots)$ be subnormal with Berger measures ξ and η, respectively, and we let $r := \left\|\frac{1}{s}\right\|_{L^1(\xi)} \in (0, \infty]$ and $d\widetilde{\xi}(s) := \frac{d\xi(s)}{s}$. We then have:

Theorem 3.5 *Let $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathcal{TC}$. Then $\mathcal{R}_{10}(\mathbf{T}) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$ if and only if $x^2 r\eta \leq (\mu_y)_1$. In this case, the Berger measure of $\mathcal{R}_{10}(\mathbf{T})$ is $x^2\widetilde{\xi} \times \eta + \delta_0 \times ((\eta_y)_1 - x^2 r\eta)$, where $(\eta_y)_1$ is the Berger measure of the subnormal shift $shift(y_1, y_2, \cdots)$.*

Proof. This is a straightforward application of Lemma 3.2, if we think of $\mathcal{R}_{10}(\mathbf{T})$ as the backward extension of $c(\mathbf{T})$ (in the s direction). $\square$

Proposition 3.6 *Let $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathcal{TC}$. Then $\left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_1)} = y_1^2 \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)}$, where $(\eta_y)_1$ (resp. $(\eta_y)_2^2$) is the Berger measure of $shift(y_1, y_2, \cdots)$ (resp. $shift(y_2 y_3, y_4 y_5, \cdots)$). Moreover, $\left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\eta)} = \beta_1^2 \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\eta_1^2)}$, where η_1^2 is the Berger measure of $shift(\beta_2\beta_3, \beta_4\beta_5, \cdots)$.*

Proof. Since $shift(y_0, y_1, \cdots)$ has Berger measure η_y, we have $(d\eta_y)_1 = \frac{t}{y_0^2} d\eta_y(t)$; moreover, the Berger measure of $shift(y_2, y_3, \cdots)$ is $(d\eta_y)_2(t) = \frac{t^2}{y_0^2 y_1^2} d\eta_y(t)$. Thus by Lemma 2.2, $shift(y_2 y_3, y_4 y_5, \cdots)$ has Berger measure $(d\eta_y)_2^2 \equiv \frac{t}{y_0^2 y_1^2} d\eta_y(\sqrt{t})$. Observe that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_1)} = \frac{1}{y_0^2} = \int_0^A \frac{1}{y_0^2} d\eta_y(t) = \frac{1}{y_0^2} \int_0^{A^2} d\eta_y(\sqrt{t}) = \frac{1}{y_0^2} \int_0^{A^2} \frac{y_0^2 y_1^2}{t} d\,(\eta_y)_2^2 = y_1^2 \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)},$$

where $A := \| shift(y_0, y_1, \cdots) \|^2$. Thus, we get $\left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_1)} = y_1^2 \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)}$, as desired.

Next, we observe that $d\eta_1(t) \equiv \frac{t}{\beta_1^2} d\eta(t)$ is the Berger measure of $shift(\beta_2, \beta_3, \cdots)$ and $d\eta_1^2(t) \equiv \frac{\sqrt{t}}{\beta_1^2} d\eta(\sqrt{t})$ is the Berger measure of $shift(\beta_2\beta_3, \beta_4\beta_5, \cdots)$. Let $B := \| shift(\beta_0, \beta_1, \cdots) \|^2$; we then have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\eta)} = \int_0^B \frac{1}{t} d\eta(t) = \int_0^{B^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} d\eta(\sqrt{t}) = \beta_1^2 \int_0^{B^2} \frac{1}{t} \frac{\sqrt{t}}{\beta_1^2} d\eta(\sqrt{t}) = \beta_1^2 \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\eta_1^2)},$$

as desired. $\square$

We next recall that (T_1, T_2^2) can be regarded as the orthogonal direct sum of two 2-variable weighted shifts. For $m = 0, 1$, let

$$\mathcal{H}^m := \bigvee_{k=0}^{\infty} \{ e_{(j, 2k+m)} : j = 0, 1, 2, \cdots \}.$$

Then $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+^2) \equiv \mathcal{H}^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}^1$ and each of $\mathcal{H}^0$ and $\mathcal{H}^1$ reduces T_1 and T_2. Thus, (T_1, T_2^2) is subnormal if and only if each of $(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^0}$ and $(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^1}$ is subnormal. The weight diagrams of these 2-variable weighted shifts are shown in Figure 4.

We first focus on $(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^1}$:

Proposition 3.7 *Let $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathcal{TC}$. Then $(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ is subnormal if and only if $\mathcal{R}_{10}(\mathbf{T})$ is subnormal.*



Fig. 4. Weight diagrams of $(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^0}$ and $(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^1}$ in the proof of Proposition 3.7 and Theorem 3.8

Proof. First, recall that $shift(y_0, y_1, y_2, \cdots)$ has Berger measure η_y, that $d\,(\eta_y)_1\,(t) = \frac{t}{y_0^2} d\eta_y(t)$ and that $d\,(\eta_y)_2\,(t) = \frac{t^2}{y_0^2 y_1^2} d\eta_y(t)$. Now, Theorem 3.5 states that

$$(T_1, T_2)|_{\mathcal{M}_1} \text{ is subnormal } \Leftrightarrow x^2 r\eta \leq (\eta_y)_1 .$$

On the other hand, Theorem 3.5 (applied to $(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$) says that

$$(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \text{ is subnormal } \iff x^2 r \eta^2 \leq (\eta_y)_1^2 ,$$

and if $(T_1, T_2)|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ is subnormal, its Berger measure is $x^2 \widetilde{\xi} \times \eta^2 + \delta_0 \times ((\eta_y)_1^2 - x^2 r \eta^2)$, where $(\eta_y)_1^2$ is the Berger measure of $shift(y_1 y_2, y_3 y_4, \cdots)$ and η^2 is the Berger measure of $W_\beta := shift(\beta_1\beta_2, \beta_3\beta_4, \cdots)$. By observing that

$$x^2 r \eta^2 \leq (\eta_y)_1^2 \Leftrightarrow x^2 r d\eta(\sqrt{t}) \leq d\,(\eta_y)_1\,(\sqrt{t}) \Leftrightarrow x^2 r d\eta(t) \leq d\,(\eta_y)_1\,(t),$$

we obtain the desired result. $\square$

Theorem 3.8 *Let* $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathcal{TC}$. *Then*

$$(T_1, T_2^2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty \iff (T_1^2, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty \iff (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty.$$

Proof. Clearly, it is enough to show that $(T_1, T_2^2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty \Rightarrow (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$. Since $(T_1, T_2^2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty \Rightarrow (T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$, our strategy consists of first characterizing the subnormality of $\mathbf{T}$

and of $(T_1,T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^0}$ in terms of the given parameters (y_0, ν, etc), and then establishing the desired implication at the parameter level. That is, we will show that $(T_1,T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^0}\in\mathfrak{H}_\infty \Rightarrow \mathbf{T}\in\mathfrak{H}_\infty$ using their parametric characterizations. Proposition 3.7 will help us characterize the subnormality of $\mathbf{T}$. Recall that $(T_1,T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ is subnormal if and only if $(T_1,T_2)|_{\mathcal{M}_1}$ is subnormal, and in that case the Berger measure of $(T_1,T_2)|_{\mathcal{M}_1}$ is

$$\mu_{\mathcal{M}}=x^2\widetilde{\xi}\times\eta+\delta_0\times\left((\eta_y)_1-x^2r\eta\right).$$

We then have

$$\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})}=\int\frac{1}{t}d\mu_{\mathcal{M}}(s,t)=x^2r\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)}+\int\frac{1}{t}d\left(\eta_y\right)_1(t)-x^2r\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)}=\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_1)}. \quad (3.2)$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})_{ext}(s,t)&=d\{x^2\widetilde{\xi}\times\eta+\delta_0\times\left((\eta_y)_1-x^2r\eta\right)\}_{ext}(s,t)\\
&=\frac{1}{t\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})}}\{x^2d\widetilde{\xi}(s)d\eta(t)+d\delta_0(s)(d\left(\eta_y\right)_1(t)-x^2rd\eta(t))\}\\
&=\frac{1}{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})}}\left\{x^2d\widetilde{\xi}(s)\frac{d\eta(t)}{t}+d\delta_0(s)\left(\frac{d\left(\eta_y\right)_1(t)}{t}-x^2r\frac{d\eta(t)}{t}\right)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (3.2), it follows that

$$(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})_{ext}^X=\left(\frac{x^2\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)}}{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_1)}}\right)\widetilde{\xi}+\left(1-\frac{x^2r\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)}}{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_1)}}\right)\delta_0=:B.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
(T_1,T_2)\text{ is subnormal }&\Leftrightarrow y_0^2\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})}(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})_{ext}^X\le\nu\text{ (by Lemma 3.2)}\\
&\Leftrightarrow y_0^2\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_1)}B\le\mu_x.
\end{aligned}\quad (3.3)$$

We have thus characterized the subnormality of $\mathbf{T}$.

We now consider the 2-variable weighted shift $(T_1,T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^0}$ and the associated subspace $\mathcal{HM}:=\vee\{e_{\mathbf{k}}\in\mathcal{H}^0:k_2\ge1\}$. Observe that $(T_1,T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^0}$ can be regarded as a backward extension of $(T_1,T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{HM}}$, and that the latter is subnormal with Berger measure

$$\theta:=\frac{x^2\beta_1^2}{y_1^2}\widetilde{\xi}\times\eta_1^2+\delta_0\times\left((\eta_y)_2^2-\frac{x^2r\beta_1^2}{y_1^2}\eta_1^2\right)$$

where η_1^2 (resp. $(\eta_y)_2^2$) is the Berger measure of $shift(\beta_2\beta_3, \beta_4\beta_5, \cdots)$ (resp. $shift(y_2y_3, y_4y_5, \cdots)$). We then have

$$\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{HM}})} = \left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)}, \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d(\mu_{\mathcal{HM}})_{ext}(s,t) &= d\theta_{ext}(s,t) \\ &= \frac{1}{t\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{HM}})}} d\theta(s.t). \end{aligned}$$

From (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_{\mathcal{HM}})_{ext}^X &= \frac{1}{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)}} \left\{ \frac{x^2\beta_1^2}{y_1^2}\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1^2)} \widetilde{\xi} + (\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)} - \frac{x^2r\beta_1^2}{y_1^2}\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1^2)})\delta_0 \right\} \\ &=: \frac{1}{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)}} C. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.2 again,

$$\begin{aligned} &(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \text{ is subnormal} \\ &\Leftrightarrow y_0^2y_1^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{HM}})} (\mu_{\mathcal{HM}})_{ext}^X \le \nu \Leftrightarrow y_0^2y_1^2 C \le \mu_x \qquad (3.5) \\ &\Leftrightarrow y_0^2\left\{x^2\beta_1^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1^2)}\widetilde{\xi} + \left(y_1^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)} - x^2r\beta_1^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1^2)}\right)\delta_0\right\} \le \mu_x. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &y_0^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_1)} B \le \mu_x \Leftrightarrow y_0^2y_1^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)} B \le \mu_x \\ &\Leftrightarrow y_0^2\left\{x^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)}\widetilde{\xi} + \left(y_1^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)} - x^2r\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)}\right)\delta_0\right\} \le \mu_x \qquad (3.6) \\ &\Leftrightarrow y_0^2\left\{x^2\beta_1^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1^2)}\widetilde{\xi} + \left(y_1^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_2^2)} - x^2r\beta_1^2\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1^2)}\right)\delta_0\right\} \le \mu_x. \end{aligned}$$

By combining 3.5 and 3.6, we easily see that

$$(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \text{ is subnormal } \Leftrightarrow y_0^2 \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1((\eta_y)_1)} B \leq \mu_x. \tag{3.7}$$

We thus have a characterization of the subnormality of $(T_1, T_2^2)|_{\mathcal{H}^0}$. From (3.3) and (3.7) it now follows that the subnormality of (T_1, T_2^2) implies the subnormality of (T_1, T_2). $\square$

It is straightforward from Definition 3.3 that a flat 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_0$ necessarily belongs to $\mathcal{TC}$. Thus, the following result is an easy consequence of Theorem 3.8.

Corollary 3.9 *Let $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2)$ be a flat 2-variable weighted shifts, that is, a 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T} \in \mathfrak{H}_0$ given by Figure 5. Then we have $(T_1, T_2^2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$ if and only if $(T_1^2, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$ if and only if $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$.*

For flat, contractive 2-variable weighted shift, we can give a concrete condition for subnormality of $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2)$. To do this, let $shift(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \cdots)$ and $shift(\beta_0, \beta_1, \cdots)$ have Berger measures ξ and η, respectively. Also, recall that for $0 < \alpha < \beta$, $shift(\alpha, \beta, \beta, ...)$ is subnormal, with Berger measure $(1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta^2})\delta_0 + \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta^2}\delta_{\beta^2}$. To avoid trivial cases, and to ensure that each of T_1 and T_2 is a contraction, we need to assume that $ab^n < \Pi_{j=1}^n \beta_j$, and we shall see in Theorem 3.10 that we also need $\frac{a^2}{b^2} < \left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\eta_1)}$, where η_1 is the Berger measure of $shift(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \cdots)$. Finally, we know from [17, Theorem 3.3] and [18, Section 5] that if $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2)$ is subnormal, then ξ and η are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= p\delta_0 + q\delta_1 + [1 - (p + q)]\rho \\ \eta &= u\delta_0 + v\delta_{b^2} + [1 - (u + v)]\sigma, \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where $0 < p, q, u, v < 1$, $p + q \leq 1$, $u + v \leq 1$, and ρ, σ are probability measures with $\rho(\{0\} \cup \{1\}) = 0$, $\sigma(\{0\} \cup \{b^2\}) = 0$. We then have:

Theorem 3.10 *Let $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_0$ be a contractive 2-variable weighted shift whose weight diagram is given by Figure 5, let $v := \eta(\{b^2\})$ and $\xi \equiv p\delta_0 + q\delta_1 + [1 - (p + q)]\rho$, with $p, q > 0$, $p + q \leq 1$ (cf. (3.8)), and let η_1 denote the Berger measure of $shift(\beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots)$. Then $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$ if and only if*

$$\beta_0 \leq \min \left\{ \frac{b}{a}\sqrt{v}, \sqrt{\frac{p}{(\left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\eta_1)} - \frac{a^2}{b^2})}}, \frac{b}{a}\sqrt{q}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{\left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\eta_1)}}} \right\}.$$

Proof. We first observe that

$$\mu_{\mathcal{M}} = a^2\delta_1 \times \delta_{b^2} + \delta_0 \times (\eta_1 - a^2\delta_{b^2}). \tag{3.9}$$



Fig. 5. Weight diagrams of the 2-variable weighted shifts in Theorem 3.10 and Lemma 4.3, respectively

Using (3.8) and (3.9), a calculation shows that $(T_1, T_2)|_{\mathcal{M}_1} \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$ if and only if $\beta_0 \leq \frac{b}{a}\sqrt{v}$. Observe that

$$(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})^X_{ext} = \frac{1}{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1)}} \left\{ \left(\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1)} - \frac{a^2}{b^2} \right) \delta_0 + \frac{a^2}{b^2}\delta_1 \right\}.$$

By [16, Theorem 5.2], $(T_1, T_2)|_{\mathcal{N}_1} \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty &\Leftrightarrow y_0^2 \left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})} (\mu_{\mathcal{M}})^X_{ext} \leq \nu \text{ (by Lemma 3.2) and } \beta_0 \leq \tfrac{b}{a}\sqrt{v} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \beta_0^2 \left\{ \left(\left\|\tfrac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1)} - \tfrac{a^2}{b^2} \right) \delta_0 + \tfrac{a^2}{b^2}\delta_1 \right\} \leq \xi \text{ and } \beta_0 \leq \tfrac{b}{a}\sqrt{v} \qquad (3.10) \\
&\Leftrightarrow \beta_0 \leq \min \left\{ \tfrac{b}{a}\sqrt{v}, \sqrt{\tfrac{p}{(\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1)} - \frac{a^2}{b^2})}}, \tfrac{b}{a}\sqrt{q}, \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta_1)}}} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.11 *Let* $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathcal{TC}$. *If* (T_1, T_2^2), $(T_1^2, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$, *then* $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$.

In view of Theorem 3.8, the following conjecture for 2-variable weighted shifts is natural.

Conjecture 3.12 *If* $(T_1, T_2^2), (T_1^2, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$, *then* $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$.

4 Subnormality for Powers of Hyponormal Pairs

In this section we study the connection between the joint subnormality of pairs $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_1$ and the subnormality of the associated monomials $T_1^m T_2^n$ $(m, n \geq 1)$. Our results will further exhibit the large gap between the classes $\mathfrak{H}_\infty$ (subnormal pairs) and $\mathfrak{H}_0$ (commuting pairs of subnormal operators). We begin with the following proposition, which is a direct consequence of a well known result of J. Stampfli's ([28], [29]): if T is hyponormal and T^n is normal for some $n \geq 1$, then T is necessarily normal.

Proposition 4.1 *Let $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2)$ be hyponormal, and assume that (T_1^m, T_2^n) is normal for some $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$. Then (T_1, T_2) is normal.*

In view of Proposition 4.1, one might conjecture that if (T_1, T_2) is hyponormal and $T_1^m T_2^n$ is normal for some $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$, then (T_1, T_2) is normal (cf.[29]). But this is not true even if we assume that (T_1, T_2) is subnormal and $T_1^m T_2^n$ is normal for all $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$, as the following example shows.

Example 4.2 *Let $T_1 := U_+ \bigoplus 0_\infty$ and $T_2 := 0_\infty \bigoplus U_+$, then (T_1, T_2) is subnormal and $T_1^m T_2^n$ is normal for all $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$. However, (T_1, T_2) is not normal.*

Whether Proposition 4.1 holds with "normal" replaced by "subnormal" is not at all obvious. Our main result of this section states that it is indeed possible to have a pair $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_1$ with $T_1^m T_2^n$ subnormal for all $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$, but such that $(T_1, T_2) \notin \mathfrak{H}_\infty$. To do so, consider a subnormal weighted shift $shift(\beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots)$ with Berger measure η. For $0 < a < x < 1$ and $y > 0$, let

$$\alpha(\mathbf{k}) := \begin{cases} x & \text{if } k_1 = 0 \text{ and } k_2 = 0 \\ a & \text{if } k_1 = 0 \text{ and } k_2 \geq 1 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\beta(\mathbf{k}) := \begin{cases} \beta_{k_2} & \text{if } k_2 \geq 1 \\ y & \text{if } k_1 = 0 \text{ and } k_2 = 0 \\ \frac{ay}{x} & \text{if } k_1 \geq 1 \text{ and } k_2 = 0, \end{cases}$$

$(\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2)$. We now let $\mathbf{T} := (T_1, T_2)$ denote the pair of 2-variable weighted shift on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+^2)$ defined by $\alpha(\mathbf{k})$ and $\beta(\mathbf{k})$. We then have:

Lemma 4.3 *Let $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2)$ be the 2-variable weighted shift associated with α and β above. Then*
(i) $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_1$ *if and only if*

$$y \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\beta_1 x \sqrt{1 - x^2}}{\sqrt{x^2 + a^4 - 2a^2 x^2}}, \sqrt{\left\| \frac{1}{t} \right\|_{L^1(\eta)}^{-1}} \right\}.$$

(ii) $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$ *if and only if*

$$y \leq \sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)}^{-1}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1-x^2}{1-a^2}}.$$

Proof. First observe that if $shift(y, \beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots)$ is subnormal then T_2 is subnormal. To guarantee this, by Lemma 3.2 we must have $y \leq \sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)}^{-1}}$. For the hyponormality of (T_1, T_2), it suffices to apply the Six-point Test to $\mathbf{k} = (0, 0)$, since

$$\mathcal{R}_{10}(\mathbf{T}) \equiv (T_1, T_2)|_{\mathcal{M}_1} \cong (I \otimes U_+, shift(\frac{ay}{x}, \beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots) \otimes I) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{01}(\mathbf{T}) \equiv (T_1, T_2)|_{\mathcal{N}_1} \cong (I \otimes S_a, shift(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \cdots) \otimes I) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1-x^2 & \frac{a^2 y}{x} - xy \\ \frac{a^2 y}{x} - xy & \beta_1^2 - y^2 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \text{ (by Lemma 2.1)}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y^2(1 + \tfrac{a^4}{x^2} - 2a^2) \leq \beta_1^2(1-x^2)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y \leq \tfrac{\beta_1 x\sqrt{1-x^2}}{\sqrt{x^2+a^4-2a^2x^2}}.$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_1$ if and only if

$$y \leq \min\left\{\frac{\beta_1 x\sqrt{1-x^2}}{\sqrt{x^2+a^4-2a^2x^2}}, \sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)}^{-1}}\right\}.$$

We now study the subnormality of $\mathbf{T}$. Since $\mu_{\mathcal{M}}(s,t) = [(1-a^2)\delta_0(s) + a^2\delta_1(s)] \cdot \eta(t)$ is the Berger measure of $(I \otimes S_a, shift(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \cdots) \otimes I)$, Lemma 3.2 implies that

$\mathbf{T}$ is subnormal

$$\Leftrightarrow y^2 \left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_{\mathcal{M}})} \mu_{\mathcal{M}}(s,t)^X_{ext} \leq (1-x^2)\delta_0(s) + x^2\delta_1(s) \text{ and } y \leq \sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|^{-1}_{L^1(\eta)}}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y^2 \left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)} [(1-a^2)\delta_0(s) + a^2\delta_1(s)] \leq (1-x^2)\delta_0(s) + x^2\delta_1(s)$$
$$\text{and } y \leq \sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|^{-1}_{L^1(\eta)}}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y \leq \min\left\{\sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|^{-1}_{L^1(\eta)}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1-x^2}{1-a^2}}, \sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|^{-1}_{L^1(\eta)}} \cdot \frac{x}{a}, \sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|^{-1}_{L^1(\eta)}}\right\}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y \leq \sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|^{-1}_{L^1(\eta)}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1-x^2}{1-a^2}}$$

(because $x > a$ implies $\sqrt{\frac{1-x^2}{1-a^2}} < \frac{x}{a}$ and $\sqrt{\frac{1-x^2}{1-a^2}} < 1$).

□

We now detect the hyponormality and subnormality of the powers of (T_1, T_2) in Lemma 4.3. Let

$$\mathcal{H}_{(m,i)} := \bigvee_{j=0}^{\infty} \{e_{(mj+i,k)} : m \geq 1,\ 0 \leq i \leq m-1 \text{ and } k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots\}.$$

Then $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^2_+) \equiv \bigoplus_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{H}_{(m,i)}$. Under this decomposition, we have

$$T_1^m \cong T_1 \bigoplus (I \otimes U_+) \bigoplus \cdots \bigoplus (I \otimes U_+)$$

and

$$T_2 \cong T_2 \bigoplus (shift(\frac{ay}{x}, \beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots) \otimes I) \bigoplus \cdots \bigoplus (shift(\frac{ay}{x}, \beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots) \otimes I).$$

Thus, for all $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$,

$$(T_1^m, T_2^n) \cong (T_1, T_2^n) \bigoplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m-1} (C, D),$$

where $C := I \otimes U_+$ and $D := (shift(\frac{ay}{x}, \beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots))^n \otimes I$. But, since (C, D) is subnormal, the hyponormality(or subnormality) of (T_1^m, T_2^n) is equivalent to the hyponormality (or subnormality) of (T_1, T_2^n). Therefore, (T_1, T_2^n) is hyponormal (or subnormal) if and only if (T_1^m, T_2^n) is hyponormal (or subnormal) for all $m \geq 1$.

Theorem 4.4 *For the 2-variable weighted shift $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2)$ in Lemma 4.3, the following are equivalent.*
(i) $T_1^m T_2^n$ is subnormal for all $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$;
(ii) $T_1 T_2^n$ is subnormal for all $n \geq 1$;
(iii) The $shift(\frac{ay \cdot \Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}\beta_j}{x}, \Pi_{j=n}^{2n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=2n}^{3n-1}\beta_j, \cdots)$ is subnormal for all $n \geq 1$;
(iv) $y \leq \frac{x}{a} \cdot \frac{1}{\Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}\beta_j}\sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta^{(n)})}^{-1}}$ for all $n \geq 1$, where $d\eta^{(n)}(t) := \frac{t^{1-\frac{1}{n}}}{\beta_1^2 \cdots \beta_{n-1}^2} d\eta(t^{\frac{1}{n}})$.

Proof. $(i) \Longleftrightarrow (ii)$ From the above observations, we can see that $T_1^m T_2^n$ is subnormal for all $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$ if and only if $T_1 T_2^n$ and CD are subnormal for all $n \geq 1$. But observe that CD is always subnormal if $shift(\frac{ay}{x}, \beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots)$ is subnormal.

$(ii) \Longleftrightarrow (iii)$ Let $\mathcal{M}_{(i,j)} := \bigvee\{e_{i+k,j+k} : k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots\}$ for $i, j \geq 0$ with $ij = 0$. Then $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+^2) \equiv \bigoplus_{i,j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_{(i,j)}$. Under this decomposition, we have

$$T_1 T_2^n \cong \cdots \bigoplus W_{-1} \bigoplus W_0 \bigoplus W_1 \bigoplus \cdots,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_{-1} &:= shift(a\Pi_{j=n}^{2n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=2n}^{3n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=3n}^{4n-1}\beta_j, \cdots) : \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{(0,1)}, \\ W_0 &:= shift(ay \cdot \Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=n}^{2n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=2n}^{3n-1}\beta_j, \cdots) : \mathcal{M}_{(0,0)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{(0,0)}, \text{ and} \\ W_1 &:= shift(\frac{ay}{x} \cdot \Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=n}^{2n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=2n}^{3n-1}\beta_j, \cdots) : \mathcal{M}_{(1,0)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{(1,0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since W_{-1} is subnormal, the result follows from the fact that if W_1 is subnormal then W_0 is also subnormal.

$(iii) \Longleftrightarrow (iv)$ Since $shift(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \cdots)$ has Berger measure η, we can use by mathematical induction to show that $shift(\beta_n, \beta_{n+1}, \beta_{n+2}, \cdots)$ has Berger measure $\frac{t^{n-1}}{\beta_1^2 \cdots \beta_{n-1}^2} d\eta(t)$ for each $n \geq 1$. Thus by Lemma 2.2, $shift(\Pi_{j=n}^{2n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=2n}^{3n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=3n}^{4n-1}\beta_j, \cdots)$ has Berger measure $d\eta^{(n)}(t) \equiv \frac{t^{1-\frac{1}{n}}}{\beta_1^2 \cdots \beta_{n-1}^2} d\eta(t^{\frac{1}{n}})$ for each $n \geq 1$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.1 we see that $shift(\frac{ay \cdot \Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}\beta_j}{x}, \Pi_{j=n}^{2n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=2n}^{3n-1}\beta_j, \cdots)$ is subnormal if and only if $y \leq \frac{x}{a} \cdot \frac{1}{\Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}\beta_j}\sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta^{(n)})}^{-1}}$. $\square$

For a concrete example, let $d\eta(t) := dt$ on $[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$, so that $\beta_1 = 1$ and $\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta)} = \ln 3$. Since $\gamma_{n-1} = \beta_1^2 \beta_2^2 \cdots \beta_{n-1}^2 = \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{3}{2}} t^{n-1} d\eta(t) = \frac{1}{n}(\frac{3^n - 1}{2^n})$ and $\gamma_{2n-1} = \frac{1}{2n}(\frac{3^{2n}-1}{2^{2n}})$, it follows that $shift(\beta_n, \beta_{n+1}, \cdots)$ has Berger measure $\frac{n \cdot 2^n \cdot t^{n-1}}{3^n - 1} dt$ for each $n \geq 1$ on $[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$ and $shift(\Pi_{j=n}^{2n-1}\beta_j, \Pi_{j=2n}^{3n-1}\beta_j, \cdots)$ has Berger measure $d\eta^{(n)}(t) = \frac{2^n}{3^n - 1} dt$ on $[\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n, \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^n]$ (all $n \geq 1$). Moreover, $\sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\eta^{(n)})}^{-1}} = \sqrt{\frac{3^n - 1}{n 2^n \ln 3}}$. Thus, Lemma 4.3 implies that
(i) T_1 is subnormal if $0 < a < x < 1$;

(ii) T_2 is subnormal $\Leftrightarrow y \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ln 3}}$;
(iii) $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_1 \Leftrightarrow y \leq m := \min\{\frac{x\sqrt{1-x^2}}{\sqrt{x^2+a^4-2a^2x^2}}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ln 3}}\}$;
(iv) $(T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_\infty \Leftrightarrow y \leq s := \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ln 3}\frac{1-x^2}{1-a^2}}$.
Therefore, we have the following result.

Example 4.5 *For $s < y \leq m$ and $0 < a < x < 1$, we have*
(i) $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \in \mathfrak{H}_1$*;*
(ii) $\mathbf{T} \equiv (T_1, T_2) \notin \mathfrak{H}_\infty$*;*
(iii) $T_1^m T_2^n$ *is subnormal for all* $m \geq 1, n \geq 1$.
For, observe that if $0 < a < x < 1$, then $s \equiv \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ln 3}\frac{1-x^2}{1-a^2}} < \frac{x\sqrt{1-x^2}}{\sqrt{x^2+a^4-2a^2x^2}}$ and $s < \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ln 3}}$; thus, $s < m$, and it is then possible to choose values of y between these two quantities. From Theorem 4.4, we can see that $T_1^m T_2^n$ is subnormal for all $m \geq 1, n \geq 1$ if and only if $y \leq \frac{x}{a} \cdot \frac{1}{\Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}\beta_j}\sqrt{\left\|\frac{1}{t}\right\|_{L^1(\mu_\eta)}^{-1}} = \frac{x}{a}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\ln 3}}$. But since $y \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ln 3}} < \frac{x}{a}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\ln 3}}$, it follows that $T_1^m T_2^n$ is subnormal for all $m \geq 1, n \geq 1$.

References

[1] M. Abrahamse, Commuting subnormal operators, *Ill. Math. J.*. 22(1978), 171-176.

[2] A. Athavale, On joint hyponormality of operators, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 103(1988), 417-423.

[3] K. Atkinson, *Introduction to Numerical Analysis*, Wiley and Sons, 2nd. Ed. 1989.

[4] J. Bram, Subnormal operators, *Duke Math. J.*, 2(1955), 75-94.

[5] J. Conway, *The Theory of Subnormal Operators,* Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 36, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1991.

[6] R. Curto, Joint hyponormality: A bridge between hyponormality and subnormality, *Proc. Symposia Pure Math.* 51(1990), 69-91.

[7] R. Curto, Quadratically hyponormal weighted shifts, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* 13(1990), 49-66.

[8] R. Curto, An operator-theoretic approach to truncated moment problems, in *Linear Operators*, Banach Center Publ., vol. 38, 1997, pp. 75-104.

[9] R. Curto, S.H. Lee and W.Y. Lee, A new criterion for k-hyponormality via weak subnormality, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 133(2005), 1805-1816.

[10] R. Curto, S.H. Lee and J. Yoon, k-hyponormality of multivariable weighted shifts, *J. Funct. Anal.,* 229(2005), 462-480.

[11] R. Curto and W.Y. Lee, Joint hyponormality of Toeplitz pairs, *Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc.* 150, no. 712(2001), x+65 pages.

[12] R. Curto and W.Y. Lee, Towards a model theory for 2-hyponormal operators, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* 44(2002), 290-315.

[13] R. Curto, P. Muhly and J. Xia, Hyponormal pairs of commuting operators, *Operator Theory: Adv. Appl.* 35(1988), 1-22.

[14] R. Curto and S. Park, k-hyponormality of powers of weighted shifts, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 131(2002), 2762-2769.

[15] R. Curto, Y. Poon and J. Yoon, Subnormality of Bergman-like weighted shifts, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 308(2005), 334-342.

[16] R. Curto and J. Yoon, Jointly hyponormal pairs of subnormal operators need not be jointly subnormal, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.,* to appear.

[17] R. Curto and J. Yoon, Disintegration-of-measure techniques for multivariable weighted shifts, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 93(2006), 381-402.

[18] R. Curto and J. Yoon, Propagation phenomena for hyponormal 2-variable weighted shifts, *J. Operator Theory,* to appear.

[19] E. Franks, Polynomially subnormal operator tuples, *J. Operator Theory* 31(1994), 219-228.

[20] Gellar and Wallen, Subnormal weighted shifts and the Halmos-Bram criterion, *Proc. Japan Acad.* 46(1970), 375-378.

[21] P.R. Halmos, *A Hilbert Space Problem Book*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York.

[22] N.P. Jewell and A.R. Lubin, Commuting weighted shifts and analytic function theory in several variables, *J. Operator Theory* 1(1979), 207-223.

[23] A. Lubin, Weighted shifts and product of subnormal operators, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 26(1977), 839-845.

[24] A. Lubin, Extensions of commuting subnormal operators, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 693(1978), 115-120.

[25] A. Lubin, A subnormal semigroup without normal extension, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 68(1978), 176-178.

[26] V. Paulsen, Completely bounded maps and dilations, *Pitmam Research Notes in Mathematics Series*, vol. 146, Longman Sci. Tech., New York, 1986.

[27] J.L. Smul'jan, An operator Hellinger integral, *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)* 49 (1959), 381–430 (in Russian).

[28] J. Stampfli, Hyponormal operators, *Pacific J. Math.* 12(1962), 1453-1458.

[29] J. Stampfli, Which weighted shifts are subnormal?, *Pacific J. Math.* 17(1966), 367-379.

[30] J. Yoon, A new proof of the existence of disintegration of measures and its application in 2-variable weighted shifts, preprint 2006.

[31] Wolfram Research, Inc. *Mathematica*, Version 4.2, *Wolfram Research Inc.*, Champaign, IL, 2002.