In addition,  $(\lambda-A)$  is surjective: For  $g\in E$  there exists  $\hat{f}\in E_{/}$  such that  $(\lambda-A_{/})\hat{f}=\hat{g}$ , i.e. there exists  $h\in N$  such that  $(\lambda-A)f-g=h=(\lambda-A)k$  for some  $k\in D(A_{|})$ . Therefore we obtain  $(\lambda-A)(f-k)=g$ .

(iii) The integral representation of the resolvent for  $\lambda > \omega(T)$  (see A-I, Prop.1.11) shows that  $R(\lambda,A)N \subseteq N$ . By the power series expansion for holomorphic functions this extends to all  $\lambda \in \rho_+(A)$ . Therefore the restriction  $R(\lambda,A)$  coincides with the resolvent  $R(\lambda,A)$ . On the other hand  $R(\lambda,A)$  is well defined on E and satisfies

$$R(\lambda,A)/(f+N) = R(\lambda,A)f + N$$

(use again the integral representation). This proves that

$$R(\lambda,A) / = R(\lambda,A)$$
.

Corollary 4.3. Under the above assumptions take a point  $\,\mu\,$  in the closure of  $\,\rho_{+}\left(A\right)$  . Then

- (i)  $\mu \in \sigma(A)$  if and only if  $\mu \in \sigma(A_{||})$  or  $\mu \in \sigma(A_{||})$ .
- (ii)  $\mu$  is a pole of  $R(\cdot,A)$  if and only if  $\mu$  is a pole of  $R(\cdot,A_{|})$  and of  $R(\cdot,A_{/})$ . In that case,  $\max(k_{|},k_{/}) \leq k \leq k_{|} + k_{/}$

for the respective pole orders.

<u>Proof.</u> (i) follows from Prop.4.2, inclusions (ii) and (iii). (ii) By the previous assertion we may assume that for some  $\delta > 0$  the pointed disc

$$\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : 0 < |\lambda - \mu| < \delta\}$$

is contained in  $\rho(A)$   $\cap$   $\rho(A_{|})$   $\cap$   $\rho(A_{|})$ . Call  $U_n$  the coefficients of the Laurent expansion of  $R(\cdot,A)$ . Since N is  $R(\lambda,A)$ -invariant for  $\lambda \in \rho_+(A)$  the same holds for each  $U_n$ . With the obvious notations we have