

9.6. Theorem Let S be a densely defined symmetric operator, and let n_{\pm} denote its deficiency indices, and \bar{S} its closure. Then one and only one of the following alternatives holds:

- a) If $n_{+} = n_{-} = 0$, S is essentially self-adjoint, (i.e. \bar{S} is self-adjoint)
- b) If $n_{+} = 0, n_{-} \neq 0$ or $n_{-} = 0, n_{+} \neq 0$, \bar{S} is maximally symmetric, but not self-adjoint. Thus S has no self-adjoint extensions.
- c) If $n_{+} \neq n_{-}$, and $n_{+}, n_{-} \neq 0$, then S has symmetric extensions, but no self-adjoint ones.
- d) If $n_{+} = n_{-} \neq 0$, S is not essentially self-adjoint, but it has infinitely many self-adjoint extensions. If $W: \mathcal{K}_{+} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{-}$ is Hilbert space isomorphism, then there is a unique self-adj. extension A of S such that

$$\mathcal{L}_A = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_S \oplus W \quad (\text{Notation: see Ex. 7.2})$$

In addition, every self-adjoint extension of S can be obtained this way.

9.7. Corollary : \checkmark A densely def. symmetric operator S has self-adjoint extensions if and only if $n_{+} = n_{-}$.

If A is a self-adjoint extension, with Cayley transf. $\mathcal{L}_A = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_S \oplus W$, then $D(A) = \{ \mathcal{N} + \varphi_{+} - W\varphi_{+} \mid \mathcal{N} \in D(\bar{S}), \varphi_{+} \in \mathcal{K}_{+} \}$ and $\forall \mathcal{N} \in D(\bar{S}), \varphi_{+} \in \mathcal{K}_{+}$ we have

$$A(\mathcal{N} + \varphi_{+} - W\varphi_{+}) = \bar{S}\mathcal{N} + i\varphi_{+} + iW\varphi_{+}.$$

For the proof of 9.6, we need the following Lemma:

103

9.8. Lemma Suppose T is a densely defined closed operator on \mathcal{H} .

Then for any $\phi, \phi' \in \mathcal{H}$ there are unique $u \in D(T)$, $u' \in D(T^*)$ s.t.

$$(*) \begin{cases} -Tu + u' = \phi \\ u + T^*u' = \phi' \end{cases}$$

Proof: Consider the proof of Theorem 5.7.

There we defined the map $N((u, \phi)) = ((-\phi, u))$, which was unitary on $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$, and showed that $\mathcal{G}(T^*) = N(\mathcal{G}(T))^\perp$. Also since now $\mathcal{G}(T)$ is closed, also $N(\mathcal{G}(T))$ is a closed subspace, and thus by Ex. 3.2. $\Rightarrow N(\mathcal{G}(T)) = [N(\mathcal{G}(T))^\perp]^\perp = \mathcal{G}(T^*)^\perp$. Since $\mathcal{G}(T^*)$ is also a closed subspace, this implies (Theorem 2.11.) that

$$\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}(T^*) \oplus \mathcal{G}(T^*)^\perp = \mathcal{G}(T^*) \oplus N(\mathcal{G}(T)).$$

Thus for any $((\phi, \phi')) \in \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$ there are unique $a \in \mathcal{G}(T^*)$, $b \in N(\mathcal{G}(T))$ s.t. $((\phi, \phi')) = a + b$.
 $\Rightarrow \exists u \in D(T)$ and $u' \in D(T^*)$ s.t.
 $a = ((u', T^*u'))$, $b = ((-Tu, u))$.
 $\Rightarrow (*)$ holds. To see uniqueness, assume also \tilde{u} , and \tilde{u}' satisfy $(*)$, and def.

$$\tilde{a} = ((\tilde{u}', T^*\tilde{u}')), \quad \tilde{b} = ((-T\tilde{u}, \tilde{u})) = N((\tilde{u}, T\tilde{u}))$$

Then $\tilde{a} \in \mathcal{G}(T^*)$, $\tilde{b} \in N(\mathcal{G}(T))$ and

$$\tilde{a} + \tilde{b} = ((\phi, \phi')). \Rightarrow \tilde{a} = a, \quad \tilde{b} = b \quad \square$$

9.9. Corollary Suppose T is densely defined and closed operator. Then $R(1 + T^*T) = \mathcal{H}$.

Proof: Suppose $\phi' \in \mathcal{H}$ is given, and apply the lemma with $\phi = 0$. $\Rightarrow \exists u \in D(T)$, $u' \in D(T^*)$ s.t. $u' = Tu$ and $\phi' = u + T^*u' = u + T^*Tu$
 $\Rightarrow u \in D(1 + T^*T)$ and $\phi' = (1 + T^*T)u \quad \square$

9.10. Lemma: Suppose A is a symmetric op. (104)

Then A is self-adjoint $\Leftrightarrow e_A$ is unitary.

Proof: Suppose first A is self-adjoint. By Corollary 9.9., $D(1+A^*A) = D(A^2)$ and $R(1+A^2) = \mathcal{H}$.

For any $\eta \in D(A^2)$ we have

$$(1+A^2)\eta = (A+i)(A-i)\eta = (A-i)(A+i)\eta$$

$$\text{and thus } R(A+i) = \mathcal{H} = R(A-i).$$

This implies that e_A is an isometry with $R(e_A) = \mathcal{H} = D(e_A)$.

$\Rightarrow e_A$ is unitary (Ex. 3.4.)

Conversely, assume A is symmetric and e_A is unitary. Then if $\phi \perp R(1-e_A)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \forall \eta \in \mathcal{H} : (\phi, (1-e_A)\eta) &= 0 \\ &= (\phi, \eta) - (\phi, e_A\eta) = (\phi, \eta) - (e_A^*\phi, \eta) \\ &= (\phi - e_A^*\phi, \eta) \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow \phi = e_A^*\phi \Rightarrow e_A\phi = \phi$. But since $1-e_A$ is injective (Thm. 9.4.0)

$\Rightarrow \phi = 0$. Thus $R(1-e_A)^\perp = D(A)^\perp = \{0\}$

$\Rightarrow \overline{D(A)} = (D(A)^\perp)^\perp = \mathcal{H}$. Therefore,

A is then densely defined, $\Rightarrow \exists A^*$.

Since A is symmetric, then $A \subset A^*$.

(Ex. 5.4.) Let $\phi \in D(A^*) \setminus D(A)$.

Since $R(A+i) = D(e_A) = \mathcal{H}$

$\Rightarrow \exists \tilde{\phi} \in D(A)$ s.t. $(A^*+i)\phi = (A+i)\tilde{\phi}$
 $\stackrel{A \subset A^*}{=} (A^*+i)\tilde{\phi}$. Let $\eta_0 := \phi - \tilde{\phi} \in D(A^*)$.

Then $\forall \eta \in D(A)$:

$$(\eta_0, (A-i)\eta) = \overbrace{((A^*+i)\eta_0, \eta)} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \eta_0 \in R(A-i)^\perp = R(e_A)^\perp = \mathcal{H}^\perp = \{0\}$$

$$\Rightarrow \eta_0 = 0 \text{ and } \phi = \tilde{\phi} \Rightarrow \phi \in D(A)$$

$$\Rightarrow A^*\phi = A\phi.$$

Therefore, also $A^* \subset A \Rightarrow A^* = A$

and A is self-adjoint. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.6.

$$a) \text{ If } n_+ = n_- = 0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{K}_+ = \{0\} = \mathcal{K}_- \\ \Rightarrow \overline{R(\bar{s}+i)} = \mathcal{K} = \overline{R(s-i)}.$$

$$\text{By Thm. 9.4, } \overline{e_{\bar{s}}} = \overline{e_s} \\ \Rightarrow D(\overline{e_{\bar{s}}}) = \overline{R(\bar{s}+i)} = \mathcal{K} \\ R(\overline{e_{\bar{s}}}) = \overline{R(s-i)} = \mathcal{K}.$$

Thus $\overline{e_{\bar{s}}}$ is unitary (Ex. 3.4.),
 $\Rightarrow \bar{s}$ is self-adjoint. (Lemma 9.10.)

Suppose then, that $A \supset S$, and A is self-adjoint. By Thm. 9.4. & Lemma 9.10.

$\Rightarrow e_s \subset e_A = \text{unitary}$. Thus e_A is then a unitary extension of the isometry e_s .

Exercise 7.2. b) $\Rightarrow W = (e_A - (e_s \oplus 0)) \big|_{D(e_s)^\perp}$ is an isomorphism $D(e_s)^\perp \rightarrow R(e_s)^\perp$
 $= R(\bar{s}+i)^\perp = R(s-i)^\perp$

i.e. between \mathcal{K}_+ and \mathcal{K}_- .

b) If $n_+ \neq n_-$, \mathcal{K}_+ and \mathcal{K}_- are not isomorphic, and thus S then cannot have any self-adjoint extensions.

$\Rightarrow \bar{s}$ is not self-adjoint.

If $n_+ = n_-$ and $W: \mathcal{K}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_-$ is an isomorphism, then: $U := \overline{e_s} \oplus W = \overline{e_{\bar{s}}} \oplus W$ is unitary on \mathcal{H} . Suppose $\eta \in \mathcal{K}$ is such that $(1-U)\eta = 0$. As $\mathcal{K} = D(\overline{e_{\bar{s}}}) \oplus \mathcal{K}_+$

$\Rightarrow \exists! \eta_0 \in D(\overline{e_{\bar{s}}})$, $\eta_+ \in \mathcal{K}_+$ s.t.

$\eta = \eta_0 + \eta_+$. In addition, by def.,

$U\eta = \overline{e_{\bar{s}}}\eta_0 + W\eta_+$. Let $\eta_- = W\eta_+ \in \mathcal{K}_-$, when $0 = \eta - U\eta = (1 - \overline{e_{\bar{s}}})\eta_0 + \eta_+ - \eta_-$

$\Rightarrow \eta_- = \eta_+ + \phi_0$, where $\phi_0 := (1 - \overline{e_{\bar{s}}})\eta_0$

$\in R(1 - \overline{e_{\bar{s}}}) = D(\bar{s})$. Since $\eta_- \in \mathcal{K}_-$
 $= R(s-i)^\perp = \overline{R(\bar{s}+i)^\perp} = R(\overline{e_{\bar{s}}})^\perp = R(\bar{s}-i)^\perp$

$\Rightarrow \forall \phi \in D(\bar{s}): 0 = ((\bar{s}-i)\phi, \eta_-)$

$\stackrel{\bar{s} \text{ symm.}}{=} ((\bar{s}-i)\phi, \phi_0 + \eta_+)$

$= (\phi, (\bar{s}+i)\phi_0) + ((\bar{s}+i)\phi - 2i\phi, \eta_+)$

$\in R(\bar{s}+i) \quad \in \mathcal{K}_+ = R(\bar{s}+i)^\perp = R(\bar{s}+i)^\perp$

$= (\phi, (\bar{s}+i)\phi_0) + (\phi, 2i\eta_+)$

$= (\phi, (\bar{s}+i)\phi_0 + 2i\eta_+)$

$D(\bar{s})$ is dense!

$$\Rightarrow (\bar{s}+i)\phi_0 + 2i\psi_+ = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \psi_+ = \frac{1}{-2i}(\bar{s}+i)\phi_0 \in \mathcal{R}(\bar{s}+i)$$

$$\Rightarrow \psi_+ \in \mathcal{R}(\bar{s}+i) \cap \mathcal{K}_+ = \mathcal{R}(\bar{s}+i) \cap \mathcal{R}(\bar{s}+i)^\perp$$

$$\Rightarrow \psi_+ = 0 \Rightarrow \psi_- = W\psi_+ = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow 0 = \psi - U\psi = (1 - C_{\bar{s}})\psi_0$$

Since \bar{s} is symm. op. $\Rightarrow 1 - C_{\bar{s}}$ is 1-1.

\Rightarrow also $\psi_0 = 0$. Thus $\psi = 0$.

This proves that $1-U$ is 1-1.

Thm. 9.4,

$$\Rightarrow A = i(1+U)(1-U)^{-1} \text{ is symm. oper. and } U = C_A.$$

Since U is unitary, Lemma 9.16.

$\Rightarrow A$ is self-adjoint.

We have thus proven d). (Note that \exists inf. many maps W , see p. 107)

To prove b) & c), assume $n_+ \neq n_-$ and suppose s' is a symm. extension of \bar{s} . $\Rightarrow C_{\bar{s}} \subset C_{s'}$. If $n_+ = 0$, we have $\mathcal{K}_+ = \{0\} \Rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\bar{s}+i) = \mathcal{K} = D(C_{\bar{s}})$

$$\Rightarrow C_{s'} = C_{\bar{s}} \Rightarrow s' = \bar{s}. \text{ If } n_- = 0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{K}_- = \{0\}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathcal{R}(C_{\bar{s}}) = \mathcal{K}. \text{ Suppose } \psi \in D(C_{s'}) \text{ is}$$

such that $\psi \in \mathcal{K}_+ = D(C_{\bar{s}})^\perp \Rightarrow$

$$C_{s'}\psi \in \mathcal{R}(C_{\bar{s}}) \Rightarrow \exists \psi' \in D(C_{\bar{s}}) \text{ s.t.}$$

$$C_{s'}\psi = C_{\bar{s}}\psi' = C_{s'}\psi' \Rightarrow C_{s'}(\psi - \psi') = 0$$

$$\xrightarrow{C_{s'} \text{ is } 1-1} \psi - \psi' = 0 \Rightarrow \psi' = \psi$$

$$\Rightarrow \psi \in D(C_{\bar{s}})^\perp \cap D(C_{\bar{s}}) \Rightarrow \psi = 0.$$

$$\text{Thus } D(C_{s'}) = D(C_{\bar{s}}) = D(C_{\bar{s}}) \Rightarrow C_{s'} = C_{\bar{s}} \Rightarrow s' = \bar{s}.$$

This proves that \bar{s} is maximally symmetric, and concludes the proof b).

If $n_+ \neq n_-$, $n_+, n_- \neq 0 \Rightarrow \exists e_+ \in \mathcal{K}_+, e_- \in \mathcal{K}_-$ s.t. $\|e_\pm\| = 1$. Let $\mathcal{R}_+ := \mathcal{R}(\bar{s}+i) \oplus \text{span}(e_+)$,

$\mathcal{R}_- := \mathcal{R}(\bar{s}-i) \oplus \text{span}(e_-)$ and define

$$V: \mathcal{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_- \text{ by } V(\psi + \alpha e_+) = C_{\bar{s}}\psi + \alpha e_-$$

$\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{C}, \psi \in D(C_{\bar{s}}) = \mathcal{R}(\bar{s}+i)$. Then V

is an isometry, and a similar argument

to the above case proves that $1-V$ is

injective. $\Rightarrow \exists s'$ s.t. $V = C_{s'}$. Since

$$C_{\bar{s}} \neq V \Rightarrow \bar{s} \neq s'. \quad \square$$

Proof of Corollary 9.7: Suppose S is dens-def. and symmetric.

By Thm 9.6, it has self-adj. extensions iff $n_+ = n_-$. Moreover, if A is self-adj. and $S \subset A$, then $\mathcal{E}_A = \overline{\mathcal{E}_S} \oplus W$. (Set $W=0$, if $n_+ = n_- = 0$), where $W: \mathcal{K}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_-$ is a unitary map.

For simplicity, denote $U := \mathcal{E}_A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ and $V := \overline{\mathcal{E}_S}$. By Theorem 9.4, then $V = \mathcal{E}_{\bar{S}}$ and

$$A = i(1+U)(1-U)^{-1} \text{ with } D(A) = R(1-U).$$

Since $D(U) = \mathcal{K} = \overline{D(\mathcal{E}_S)} \oplus \mathcal{K}_+$, if $\eta \in D(A)$ then $\exists \phi_0 \in \overline{D(\mathcal{E}_S)} = D(V)$ and $\varphi_+ \in \mathcal{K}_+$ s.t. $\phi_0 \perp \varphi_+$ and $\eta = (1-U)(\phi_0 + \varphi_+) = \phi_0 - V\phi_0 + \varphi_+ - W\varphi_+ = (1-V)\phi_0 + \varphi_+ - W\varphi_+$. Here $(1-V)\phi_0 \in R(1-V) = D(\bar{S}) \Rightarrow \eta \in D_0 := \{ \eta_0 + \varphi_+ - W\varphi_+ \mid \eta_0 \in D(\bar{S}), \varphi_+ \in \mathcal{K}_+ \}$.
 If $\eta \in D_0 \Rightarrow \exists \eta_0 \in D(\bar{S}) = R(1-V), \varphi_+ \in \mathcal{K}_+$ s.t.
 $\eta = \eta_0 + \varphi_+ - W\varphi_+ \Rightarrow \exists \phi_0 \in D(V)$ s.t. $\eta = (1-V)\phi_0 + \varphi_+ - W\varphi_+ = \phi_0 + \varphi_+ - V\phi_0 - W\varphi_+ = (1-U)(\phi_0 + \varphi_+) \in R(1-U) = D(A)$.
 Then also $A\eta = i(1+U)(\phi_0 + \varphi_+) = i(1+U)\phi_0 + i\varphi_+ + iU\varphi_+ = i(1+V)\phi_0 + i\varphi_+ + iW\varphi_+$, where $i(1+V)\phi_0 = i(1+V)(1-U)^{-1}(1-U)\phi_0 = \bar{S}(1-V)\phi_0 = \bar{S}(1-U)\phi_0 = \bar{S}\eta_0$

Therefore, $D(A) = D_0$ and $\eta \in D(A) \Rightarrow \exists \eta_0 \in D(\bar{S}), \varphi_+ \in \mathcal{K}_+$ s.t. $\eta = \eta_0 + \varphi_+ - W\varphi_+$. Whatever the choice of η_0, φ_+ , then also

$$A\eta = A(\eta_0 + \varphi_+ - W\varphi_+) = \bar{S}\eta_0 + i\varphi_+ + iW\varphi_+ \quad \square$$

* For instance, if $n_+ = n_- = n < \infty$, then $W: \mathcal{K}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_-$ are in one-to-one correspondence with matrices $w \in U(n)$ (= set of unitary $n \times n$ matrices.)
Explicitly, if $\{e_-^i\}$ is an ONB for \mathcal{K}_- and $\{e_+^j\}$ for \mathcal{K}_+ , then (proof left as a straightforward exercise)

$$W: \mathcal{K}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_- \text{ is a unitary map } n \Leftrightarrow \exists ! w \in U(n) \text{ s.t. } W\varphi = \sum_{i,j=1}^n e_-^i w_{ij} (e_+^j, \varphi) \mathbb{K} e_+^j.$$

Hence, any parametrization of $U(n)$ yields a parametrization of the self-adjoint extensions $S \Rightarrow$ inf. many, if $n > 0$.