

ON DEGENERATE HAMBURGER MOMENT PROBLEM AND EXTENSIONS OF POSITIVE SEMIDEFINITE HANKEL BLOCK MATRICES

VLADIMIR BOLOTNIKOV

ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider two related objects: singular positive semidefinite Hankel block-matrices and associated degenerate truncated matrix Hamburger moment problems. The description of all solutions of a degenerate matrix Hamburger moment problem is given in terms of a linear fractional transformation. The case of interest is the Hamburger moment problem whose Hankel block-matrix admits a positive semidefinite Hankel extension.

This is the corrected version of the original paper [2]. The work was inspired by V. Dubovoj's paper [4] containing the first systematic study of degenerate matricial interpolation problems. Another source of inspiration must have been the paper by R. Curto and L. Fialkow [3] but I was not aware of it then. The original paper contained several erratae and the author is very grateful to A. Ben-Artzi and H. Woerdeman for indicating them. A short proof in Section 5 fixes these incorrectnesses. The remaining four sections are mostly the same as in [2].

1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this article is to describe the solutions of a degenerate truncated matrix Hamburger moment problem **HMP**. We start with a set of Hermitian matrices $s_0, \dots, s_{2n} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ and let K_n denote the Hankel block matrix

$$K_n = (s_{i+j})_{i,j=0}^n. \quad (1.1)$$

Let $\mathcal{Z}(K_n)$ denote the set of all solutions of the associated truncated Hamburger moment problem, i.e., the set of nondecreasing right continuous $m \times m$ matrix-valued functions $\sigma(\lambda)$ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^k d\sigma(\lambda) = s_k \quad (k = 0, \dots, 2n-1) \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^{2n} d\sigma(\lambda) \leq s_{2n}. \quad (1.3)$$

As in the scalar case (see [1: §2.1]) $\mathcal{Z}(K_n)$ is nonempty if and only if K_n is positive semidefinite and, moreover, by a theorem of H. Hamburger and R. Nevanlinna [1: §3.1], the formula

$$w(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma(\lambda)}{\lambda - z} \quad (1.4)$$

establishes a one-to-one correspondence between $\mathcal{Z}(K_n)$ and the class $\mathcal{R}(K_n)$ of $\mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ -valued functions $w(z)$ analytic and with positive semidefinite imaginary part in the upper half plane \mathbb{C}_+ such that uniformly in the angle $\{z = \rho e^{i\theta} : \varepsilon \leq \theta \leq \pi - \varepsilon, \varepsilon > 0\}$,

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ z^{2n+1} w(z) + \sum_{k=0}^{2n} s_k z^{2n-k} \right\} \geq 0. \quad (1.5)$$

This correspondence reduces the **HMP** problem to a boundary interpolation problem of finding all $\mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ -valued Pick functions w (which by definition are analytic and with positive semidefinite imaginary part in \mathbb{C}_+) with prescribed asymptotic behaviour (1.5) at infinity.

In this paper we follow the Potapov's method of the fundamental matrix inequality [9]. The starting point is the following theorem which describes the set $\mathcal{R}(K_n)$ in terms of a matrix inequality (see [9, §1] for the proof).

Theorem 1.1. *Let w be a $\mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ -valued function analytic in \mathbb{C}_+ . Then w belongs to $R(K_n)$ if and only if it satisfies the inequality*

$$\begin{pmatrix} K_n & (I - zF_{m,n})^{-1}(Uw(z) + M) \\ (w(z)^*U^* + M^*)(I - \bar{z}F_{m,n}^*)^{-1} & \frac{w(z) - w(z)^*}{z - \bar{z}} \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \quad (1.6)$$

for every $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, where

$$F_{m,n} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_m & \dots & 0 \\ I_m & \ddots & \\ 0 & I_m & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & I_m & 0_m \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{m(n+1) \times m(n+1)} \quad (1.7)$$

is the matrix of the m -dimensional shift in $\mathbb{C}^{m(n+1)}$ and where $U, M \in \mathbb{C}^{m(n+1) \times m}$ are given by

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} I_m \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M = F_{m,n}K_nU = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ s_0 \\ \vdots \\ s_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.8)$$

The matrix K_n (the so-called *Pick matrix* of the **HMP**) satisfies the following Lyapunov identity

$$F_{m,n}K_n - K_nF_{m,n}^* = MU^* - UM^* \quad (1.9)$$

which can be easily verified with help of (1.1), (1.7) and (1.8).

The **HMP** is called *nondegenerate* if its Pick matrix K_n is strictly positive and it is termed *degenerate* if K_n is singular and positive semidefinite. The parametrization of all solutions to the inequality (1.6) for the case $K_n > 0$ was obtained in [9] and will be recalled in Theorem 1.3 below. To formulate this theorem we first introduce some needed definitions and notations. We will denote by \mathbf{W} the class of $\mathbb{C}^{2m \times 2m}$ -valued meromorphic functions Θ which are J -unitary on \mathbb{R} and J -expansive in \mathbb{C}_+ :

$$\Theta(z)J\Theta(z)^* = J \quad (z \in \mathbb{R}), \quad \Theta(z)J\Theta(z)^* \geq J \quad (z \in \mathbb{C}_+) \quad (1.10)$$

where

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & iI_m \\ -iI_m & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.11)$$

Definition 1.2. A pair $\{p, q\}$ of $\mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ -valued functions meromorphic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ is called a *Nevanlinna pair* if

$$(i) \quad \det(p(z)^*p(z) + q(z)^*q(z)) \neq 0 \quad (\text{the nondegeneracy of the pair})$$

$$(ii) \quad \frac{q(z)^*p(z) - p(z)^*q(z)}{z - \bar{z}} = (p(z)^*, q(z)^*) \frac{J}{i(\bar{z} - z)} \begin{pmatrix} p(z) \\ q(z) \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \quad (\Im z \neq 0). \quad (1.12)$$

A pair $\{p, q\}$ is said to be *equivalent* to the pair $\{p_1, q_1\}$ if there exists a $\mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ -valued function Ω ($\det \Omega(z) \neq 0$) meromorphic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ such that $p_1 = p\Omega$ and $q_1 = q\Omega$. The set of all $m \times m$ matrix valued Nevanlinna pairs will be denoted by \mathbf{N}_m .

Theorem 1.3. Let K_n be a strictly positive matrix given by (1.1) and let $F_{m,n}$, U and M be defined by (1.7), (1.8). Then

(1) The function

$$\Theta(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_{11}(z) & \theta_{12}(z) \\ \theta_{21}(z) & \theta_{22}(z) \end{pmatrix} = I_{2m} + z \begin{pmatrix} M^* \\ -U^* \end{pmatrix} (I - zF_{m,n}^*)^{-1} K_n^{-1}(U, M) \quad (1.13)$$

belongs to the class \mathbf{W} .

(2) The formula

$$w(z) = (\theta_{11}(z)p(z) + \theta_{12}(z)q(z))(\theta_{21}(z)p(z) + \theta_{22}(z)q(z))^{-1} \quad (1.14)$$

gives all the solutions w to the inequality (1.6) when $\{p, q\}$ varies in \mathbf{N}_m .

(3) Two pairs $\{p(z), q(z)\}$ and $\{p_1(z), q_1(z)\}$ lead by (1.14) to the same function $w(z)$ if and only if these pairs are equivalent.

The degenerate scalar **HMP** is simple: $\mathcal{R}(K_n)$ consists of the unique rational function $w(z)$ (this follows immediately from (1.6)). In the degenerate *matrix* case, the description of $\mathcal{R}(K_n)$ depends on the degeneracy of K_n , but we still have a parametrization of all the solutions as a linear fractional transformation (1.14) with the coefficient matrix Θ from the class \mathbf{W} and for a suitable choice of parameters $\{p, q\}$ (see Theorem 4.6 below). To construct the coefficient matrix of the degenerate **HMP**, we follow the method of V. Dubovoj which was applied in [4] to the degenerate Schur problem. Note that if $\det \theta_{22} \neq 0$, the transformation (1.14) can be written as

$$w(z) = \psi_{11}(z) + \psi_{12}(z)p(z)(\psi_{22}(z)p(z) + q(z))^{-1}\psi_{21} \quad (1.15)$$

where

$$\psi_{11} = \theta_{11}\theta_{22}^{-1}, \quad \psi_{12} = \theta_{11} - \theta_{12}\theta_{22}^{-1}\theta_{22}, \quad \psi_{21} = \theta_{22}^{-1}, \quad \psi_{22} = \theta_{22}^{-1}\theta_{21} \quad (1.16)$$

and it turns out that the function $\Psi(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{11}(z) & \psi_{12}(z) \\ \psi_{21}(z) & \psi_{22}(z) \end{pmatrix}$ is a Pick function (i.e. analytic and with positive semidefinite imaginary part in \mathbb{C}_+). If $\det \theta_{22} \equiv 0$, formulas (1.16) make no sense, but nevertheless the set $\mathcal{R}(K_n)$ can be parametrized by the transformation (1.15) with a coefficient matrix Ψ from the Pick class. This Ψ can be constructed as a characteristic function of certain unitary colligation associated with the initial data $\{s_j\}$ of the problem. This approach (see [8]) is much more stable with respect to a possible degeneracy of the Pick matrix K_n . The degenerate **HMP** will be discussed in some more detail in Section 2.

2. POSITIVE SEMIDEFINITE HANKEL EXTENSIONS OF HANKEL BLOCK MATRICES

Let $\mathcal{H}_{m,n}$ be the set of all positive semidefinite Hankel block matrices of the form (1.1). We say that a matrix $K_n \in \mathcal{H}_{m,n}$ admits a positive semidefinite Hankel extension if there exist Hermitian matrices $s_{2n+1}, s_{2n+2} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ such that the block matrix $K_{n+1} = (s_{i+j})_{i,j=0}^{n+1}$ is still positive semidefinite. The class of such matrices will be denoted by $\mathcal{H}_{m,n}^+$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{m,n}^+ = \{K_n \in \mathcal{H}_{m,n} : (s_{i+j})_{i,j=0}^{n+1} \geq 0 \text{ for some } s_1 = s_1^* \text{ and } s_2 = s_2^*\}. \quad (2.1)$$

In the scalar case ($m = 1$) every positive semidefinite Hankel matrix admits a positive semidefinite Hankel extension and therefore, $\mathcal{H}_{1,n}^+ = \mathcal{H}_{1,n}$. For $n \geq 2$, $\mathcal{H}_{m,n}^+$ is a proper subset of $\mathcal{H}_{m,n}$ as can be seen from the example

$$K_2 = \begin{pmatrix} s_0 & s_1 \\ s_1 & s_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad s_0 = s_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad s_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We introduce two more subsets of $\mathcal{H}_{m,n}$:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n} := \left\{ K_n \in \mathcal{H}_{m,n} : \mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K_{n-1}} \begin{pmatrix} s_{n+1} \\ \vdots \\ s_{2n} \end{pmatrix} = 0 \right\} \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n} := \left\{ K_n \in \mathcal{H}_{m,n} : s_{2n} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^{2n} d\sigma(\lambda) \text{ for some } \sigma \in \mathcal{Z}(K_n) \right\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Thus, $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$ consists of all matrices $K_n \in \mathcal{H}_{m,n}$, the associated truncated Hamburger moment problem admits an ‘‘exact’’ solution σ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^k d\sigma(\lambda) = s_k \quad (k = 0, \dots, 2n), \quad (2.4)$$

that is, with equality for the last assigned moment s_{2n} rather than inequality (1.3). In (2.2) and in what follows, $\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto the kernel of K . We will show below that

$$\mathcal{H}_{m,n}^+ = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n} = \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n} \quad (2.5)$$

which will provide therefore, several equivalent characterizations of Hankel block matrices admitting positive semidefinite Hankel extensions. The following two propositions can be easily verified.

Lemma 2.1. *The block matrix $T = (t_{ij})_{i,j=0}^n$ ($t_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times l}$) is Hankel if and only if*

$$F_{l,n}^* (F_{l,n} T - T F_{r,n}^*) F_{r,n} = 0 \quad (2.6)$$

where F is a shift matrix defined via (1.7).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $K, V \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ and $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times r}$ be matrices such that $K = K^*$ and $\det V \neq 0$. Then, $\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}KA} = \mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}VKV^*VA}$.*

Given a $K \geq 0$, let Q be a matrix such that

$$QKQ^* > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rank } QKQ^* = \text{rank } K. \quad (2.7)$$

We define the pseudoinverse matrix $K^{[-1]}$ by

$$K^{[-1]} = Q^* (QKQ^*)^{-1} Q. \quad (2.8)$$

Since the pseudoinverse matrix depends on the choice of Q , it is not uniquely defined.

Lemma 2.3. For every choice of $K^{[-1]}$,

$$I - KK^{[-1]} = \left(I - KK^{[-1]} \right) \mathbf{P}_{KerK}. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof: By (2.7), every vector f can be decomposed as $f = g + hQ$ for some $g \in Ker K$ and $h \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times \text{rank}K}$. Therefore,

$$f \left(I - KK^{[-1]} \right) = (g + hQ) \left(I - KQ^*(QKQ^*)^{-1}Q \right) = g$$

which implies (2.9). \square

Lemma 2.4. The block matrix $\begin{pmatrix} K & B \\ B^* & C \end{pmatrix}$ is positive semidefinite if and only if

$$K \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{P}_{kerK}B = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad R = C - B^*K^{[-1]}B \geq 0.$$

Moreover, if $\begin{pmatrix} K & B \\ B^* & C \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$, then the matrix R does not depend on the choice of $K^{[-1]}$.

Proof: The first assertion of lemma follows from the factorization

$$\begin{pmatrix} K & B \\ B^* & C \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ B^*K^{[-1]} & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K & 0 \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & K^{[-1]}B \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$$

which in view of (2.9), is valid if and only if $\mathbf{P}_{kerK}B = 0$.

Furthermore, let C admit two different representations $C = R_i + B^*K_i^{[-1]}B$ ($i = 1, 2$). Then

$$R_1 - R_2 = B^* \left(K_2^{[-1]} - K_1^{[-1]} \right) B. \quad (2.10)$$

In view of (2.9),

$$K \left(K_2^{[-1]} - K_1^{[-1]} \right) B = \left\{ \left(I - KK_1^{[-1]} \right) - \left(I - KK_2^{[-1]} \right) \right\} \mathbf{P}_{KerK}B = 0.$$

Since $\begin{pmatrix} K & B \\ B^* & C \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$, then also $B^* \left(K_2^{[-1]} - K_1^{[-1]} \right) B = 0$ which both with (2.10) implies $R_1 = R_2$. \square

Lemma 2.5. Let $K_n \in \mathcal{H}_{m,n}$ and let \mathcal{L} be the subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{1 \times m}$ given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \{ f \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times m} : (f_0, \dots, f_{n-2}, f) \in KerK_{n-1} \text{ for some } f_0, \dots, f_{n-2} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times m} \}. \quad (2.11)$$

Then K_n belongs to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$, that is

$$\mathbf{P}_{KerK_{n-1}} \begin{pmatrix} s_{n+1} \\ \vdots \\ s_{2n} \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (2.12)$$

if and only if the block s_{2n} is of the form

$$s_{2n} = (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1}) K_{n-1}^{[-1]} (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})^* + R \quad (2.13)$$

for some positive semidefinite matrix $R \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ which vanishes on the subspace \mathcal{L} and does not depend on the choice of $K_{n-1}^{[-1]}$.

Proof: Since $K_n \geq 0$, then by Lemma 2.4,

$$s_{2n} - (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1}) K_{n-1}^{[-1]} (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})^* \geq 0$$

and therefore, s_{2n} admits a representation (2.13) for some $R \geq 0$. Moreover, since $K_n \geq 0$, then for every vector (f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}) from $\text{Ker} K_{n-1}$

$$(f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}) \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & \dots & s_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ s_n & \dots & s_{2n-1} \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{n-1}(s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1}) &= -(f_0, \dots, f_{n-2}) \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & \dots & s_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ s_{n-1} & \dots & s_{2n-2} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -(0, f_0, \dots, f_{n-2}) K_{n-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &f_0 s_{n+1} + \dots + f_{n-2} s_{2n-1} + f_{n-1}(s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1}) K_{n-1}^{[-1]}(s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})^* \\ &= (0, f_0, \dots, f_{n-2}) \left\{ I - K_{n-1} K_{n-1}^{[-1]} \right\} (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})^* \\ &= (0, f_0, \dots, f_{n-2}) \left\{ I - K_{n-1} K_{n-1}^{[-1]} \right\} \mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker} K_{n-1}}(s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})^* = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

where the first equality holds due to (2.14), the second follows by (2.9) and the last one holds since $K_n \geq 0$ and therefore, $\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker} K_{n-1}}(s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})^* = 0$. Comparing (2.15) with (2.13) gives

$$f_0 s_{n+1} + \dots + f_{n-1} s_{2n} = f_{n-1} R. \quad (2.16)$$

It remains to show that R vanishes on the subspace \mathcal{L} if and only if (2.12) holds. To this end, let us observe that condition (2.12) means that $f_0 s_{n+1} + \dots + f_{n-1} s_{2n} = 0$ for every vector $(f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}) \in \text{Ker} K_{n-1}$. The latter is equivalent, in view of (2.16) and (2.11), to $f_{n-1} R = 0$ for all $f_{n-1} \in \mathcal{L}$. By Lemma 2.4, the matrix $R = s_{2n} - (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1}) K_{n-1}^{[-1]}(s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})^*$ does not depend on the choice of $K_{n-1}^{[-1]}$. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{H}_{m,n}^+$, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$ be the classes defined in (2.1)–(2.3). Then*

$$\mathcal{H}_{m,n}^+ \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}. \quad (2.17)$$

Proof: Let K_{n+1} be a positive semidefinite Hankel extension of K_n . Since $K_{n+1} \geq 0$, by the solvability criterion for the associated Hamburger moment problem, the set $\mathcal{Z}(K_{n+1})$ is nonempty. Furthermore, for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{Z}(K_{n+1})$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^k d\sigma(\lambda) = s_k \quad (k = 0, \dots, 2n+1) \text{ and } \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^{2n+2} d\sigma(\lambda) \leq s_{2n+2}$$

and therefore, $K_n \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$ which proves the first containment in (2.17).

Now let us assume that K_n belongs to $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$ and let $d\sigma$ be the measure satisfying conditions (2.4). Then

$$K_n = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (I_m, \dots, \lambda^n I_m)^* d\sigma(\lambda) (I_m, \dots, \lambda^n I_m). \quad (2.18)$$

Let $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times mn}$ be a vector from $\text{Ker} K_{n-1}$. Then $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\lambda) d\sigma(\lambda) f(\lambda)^* = 0$, where

$$f(\lambda) = f_0 + \lambda f_1 + \dots + \lambda^{n-1} f_{n-1} = \mathbf{f} (I_m, \dots, \lambda^{n-1} I_m)^*. \quad (2.19)$$

In particular, for every choice of $-\infty < a < b < +\infty$,

$$\int_a^b f(\lambda) d\sigma(\lambda) f(\lambda)^* = 0. \quad (2.20)$$

Let $g \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times m}$ be an arbitrary nonzero vector. By the Cauchy inequality,

$$\int_a^b f(\lambda) d\sigma(\lambda) \lambda^{n+1} g^* \leq \left(\int_a^b f(\lambda) d\sigma(\lambda) f(\lambda)^* \int_a^b \lambda^{2n+2} g d\sigma(\lambda) g^* \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

which in view of (2.20) implies $\int_a^b f(\lambda) d\sigma(\lambda) \lambda^{n+1} g^* = 0$. Since $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $g \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times m}$ are arbitrary, then

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\lambda) d\sigma(\lambda) \lambda^{n+1} I_m = 0$$

which on account of (2.4)–(2.19) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{f}(s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{2n})^* = 0. \quad (2.21)$$

Thus, every vector $\mathbf{f} \in \text{Ker } K_{n-1}$ satisfies (2.21) or in other words, $\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker } K_{n-1}}(s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{2n})^* = 0$ and therefore, $K_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$, which completes the proof of the second inclusion in (2.17). \square

In connection with the last lemma we consider the following question: *to describe all matrices $s \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ such that $s = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^{2n} d\sigma(\lambda)$ for some $\sigma \in \mathcal{Z}(K_n)$.*

Lemma 2.7. *Let $K_n \geq 0$ be a block matrix of the form (1.1) with the block s_{2n} of the form*

$$s_{2n} = (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1}) K_{n-1}^{[-1]} (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})^* + R \quad (2.22)$$

for some matrix $R \geq 0$ (which does not depend on the choice of $K_{n-1}^{[-1]}$) and let $s \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ be defined by

$$s = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^{2n} d\sigma(\lambda) \quad (2.23)$$

for some $\sigma \in \mathcal{Z}(K_n)$. Then there exists a positive semidefinite matrix $R_0 \leq R$ which vanishes on the subspace \mathcal{L} defined by (2.11) and such that

$$s = (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1}) K_{n-1}^{[-1]} (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})^* + R_0 \quad (0 \leq R_0 \leq R \quad \text{and} \quad R_0|_{\mathcal{L}} = 0). \quad (2.24)$$

Proof: Let s be of the form (2.23) for some $\sigma \in \mathcal{Z}(K_n)$. We introduce the Hankel block matrix

$$\tilde{K}_n = \begin{pmatrix} s_0 & \dots & s_{n-1} & s_n \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ s_{n-1} & & & s_{2n-1} \\ s_n & \dots & s_{2n-1} & s \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.25)$$

which differs from K_n only by the block $\tilde{s}_{2n} = s$. Thus, $\tilde{K}_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$. Therefore, $\tilde{K}_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$, by Lemma 2.6. By Lemma 2.5, the block $\tilde{s}_{2n} = s$ admits representation (2.24) for some $R_0 \geq 0$ vanishing on \mathcal{L} . The inequality $R_0 \leq R$ follows from (1.3) and (2.22)–(2.24). \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let $K_n \in \mathcal{H}_{m,n}$ be of the form (1.1), let \mathcal{L} be the subspace given by (2.11), let s_{2n} , s and \tilde{K}_n be matrices defined by (2.22), (2.24) and (2.25) respectively, and let the positive semidefinite $R_0 : \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$ be defined by*

$$R_0 h = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } h \in \mathcal{L}, \\ R h & \text{for } h \in \mathcal{L}^\perp. \end{cases} \quad (2.26)$$

Then the Hamburger moment problems associated with the sets of matrices $\{s_0, \dots, s_{2n-1}, s_{2n}\}$ and $\{s_0, \dots, s_{2n-1}, s\}$ have the same solutions: $\mathcal{Z}(K_n) = \mathcal{Z}(\tilde{K}_n)$.

Proof: Let σ belong to $\mathcal{Z}(K_n)$. By Lemma 2.7, the matrix $\hat{s} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^{2n} d\sigma(\lambda)$ admits a representation (2.24) with a positive semidefinite matrix $\hat{R}_0 \leq R$ vanishing on \mathcal{L} . In view of (2.26), $\hat{R}_0 \leq R_0$. Therefore, $\hat{s} \leq s$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{Z}(\tilde{K}_n)$. So, $\mathcal{Z}(K_n) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\tilde{K}_n)$. The converse inclusion follows from the inequality $s \leq s_{2n}$. \square

Remark 2.9. By Lemmas 2.5 and 2.8, we can assume without loss of generality that the Pick matrix of the **HMP** belongs to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$.

Otherwise we replace the block s_{2n} (which is necessarily of the form (2.22)) by the block $\tilde{s}_{2n} = s$ defined by (2.24), (2.26). By Lemma 2.5, $\tilde{K}_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$ and we describe the set $\mathcal{Z}(\tilde{K}_n)$ of solutions of this new moment problem, which coincides, by Lemma 2.8, with $\mathcal{Z}(K_n)$.

3. THE COEFFICIENT MATRIX OF THE PROBLEM

The coefficient matrix Θ of the nondegenerate **HMP** given by the formula (1.13) is the matrix polynomial of $\deg \Theta = n + 1$ and (1.13) is a realization of Θ with state space equal $\mathbb{C}^{m(n+1)}$. In this section we obtain some special decomposition (see formula (3.13) below) of the state space which will allow us to construct the analogue of (1.13) for K_n not strictly positive (formula (3.23)). The idea is simple: to replace in (1.13) the inverse of the matrix K_n (which does not exist for the degenerate case) by its pseudoinverse. However after this replacement the function Θ may lose its J -properties (1.10) which are essential for the description (1.14) to be in force. This suggests the following question: is there exist a pseudoinverse matrix $K_n^{[-1]}$ of the form (2.8) such that the function

$$\Theta(z) = I_{2m} + z \begin{pmatrix} M^* \\ -U^* \end{pmatrix} (I - zF_{m,n}^*)^{-1} K_n^{[-1]} (U, M)$$

still belongs to the class **W**? We show in Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 below that such a pseudoinverse exists if (and in fact, only if) the Pick matrix K_n belongs to the class $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$. Recall that for the degenerate matricial Schur problem such a pseudoinverse always exists (see [4]).

Lemma 3.1. Let $T_n = (t_{i+j})_{i,j=0}^n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{l,n}$ ($t_i \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times l}$), let $t_0 > 0$ and let \hat{T}_{n-1} be the block matrix defined as

$$\hat{T}_{n-1} = D_n^{-1} \{ \mathbf{S} - \mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n^* \} D_n^{-*} \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$D_n = \begin{pmatrix} t_0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ t_1 & & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ t_{n-1} & \dots & t_1 & t_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{S} = (t_{i+j})_{i,j=1}^n, \quad \mathcal{T}_n = \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \\ \vdots \\ t_n \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

Then \hat{T}_{n-1} is a Hankel block matrix:

$$\hat{T}_{n-1} = (\hat{t}_{i+j})_{i,j=0}^{n-1} \quad (3.3)$$

and moreover, $\hat{T}_{n-1} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{l,n-1}$.

Proof: Let $F_{l,n-1}$ be the matrix defined via formula (1.7) and let

$$\tilde{U} := (I_l, 0, \dots, 0)^* \in \mathbb{C}^{ln \times l}. \quad (3.4)$$

We begin with the identities

$$D_n F_{l,n-1} = F_{l,n-1} D_n, \quad \tilde{U}^* F_{l,n-1} = 0, \quad D_n \tilde{U} - F_{l,n-1} \mathcal{T}_n = \tilde{U} t_0 \quad (3.5)$$

and

$F_{l,n-1}(\mathbf{S} - \mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n^*) - (\mathbf{S} - \mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n^*) F_{l,n-1}^* = \mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} \tilde{U}^* D_n^* - D_n \tilde{U} t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n^*$
which follow immediately from (1.7), (3.2) and (3.4). Using these identities we get

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{l,n-1}^* (F_{l,n-1} \hat{T}_{n-1} - \hat{T}_{n-1} F_{l,n-1}^*) F_{l,n-1} \\ &= F_{l,n-1}^* D_n^{-1} \left\{ F_{l,n-1} (\mathbf{S} - \mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n^*) - (\mathbf{S} - \mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n^*) F_{l,n-1}^* \right\} D_n^{-*} F_{l,n-1} \\ &= F_{l,n-1}^* D_n^{-1} \left\{ \mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} \tilde{U}^* D_n^* - D_n \tilde{U} t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n^* \right\} D_n^{-*} F_{l,n-1} \\ &= F_{l,n-1}^* D_n^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} \tilde{U}^* F_{l,n-1} - F_{l,n-1}^* \tilde{U} t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n^* F_{l,n-1} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and (3.3) follows by Lemma 2.1. Since D_n is invertible, the factorization formula

$$T_n = \begin{pmatrix} I_l & 0 \\ \mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} & D_n \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{T}_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_l & t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n^* \\ 0 & D_n^* \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.6)$$

implies that $\hat{T}_{n-1} \geq 0$ and thus, $\hat{T}_{n-1} \in \mathcal{H}_{l,n-1}$. It remains to verify that

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker} \hat{T}_{n-2}} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{t}_n \\ \vdots \\ \hat{t}_{2n-2} \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

To this end, we first observe that

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker} T_{n-1}} (T_n, \mathbf{S}) = 0 \quad (3.8)$$

since $T_n \geq 0$. Using the factorization of T_{n-1} similar to (3.6) we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} s_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{T}_{n-2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -D_{n-1}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{n-1} t_0^{-1} & D_{n-1}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} T_{n-1} \begin{pmatrix} I & -t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{n-1}^* D_{n-1}^{-*} \\ 0 & D_{n-1}^* \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.9)$$

where D_{n-1} and \mathcal{T}_{n-1} are defined via (3.2). Upon applying Lemma 2.2 to the matrices

$$K = T_{n-1}, \quad V = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -D_{n-1}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{n-1} t_0^{-1} & D_{n-1}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A = (T_n, \mathbf{S}),$$

and making use of (3.8), (3.9) we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker} \hat{T}_{n-2}} D_{n-1}^{-1} (-\mathcal{T}_{n-1} t_0^{-1}, I_{mn}) (T_n, \mathbf{S}) = 0. \quad (3.10)$$

From the block decomposition $D_n = \begin{pmatrix} t_0 & 0 \\ \mathcal{T}_{n-1} & D_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$ we have

$$D_n^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} t_0^{-1} & 0 \\ -D_{n-1}^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{n-1} t_0^{-1} & D_{n-1}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.11)$$

Substituting (3.11) into (3.1) we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{t}_1 & \dots & \hat{t}_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \hat{t}_{n-1} & \dots & \hat{t}_{2n-2} \end{pmatrix} = (0, I_{m(n-1)}) \hat{T}_{n-1} = D_{n-1}^{-1} (-\mathcal{T}_{n-1} t_0^{-1}, I_{mn}) (\mathbf{S} - \mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} \mathcal{T}_n^*) D_n^{-*}.$$

The last equality both with (3.10) implies

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker} \hat{T}_{n-2}} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{t}_1 & \dots & \hat{t}_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \hat{t}_{n-1} & \dots & \hat{t}_{2n-2} \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

and, in particular, (3.7), which completes the proof of lemma. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $K_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$ and let $\text{rank } K_n = r$. Then there exists $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times (n+1)m}$ such that*

$$QK_nQ^* > 0, \quad \text{rank } QK_nQ^* = \text{rank } K_n, \quad QF_{m,n} = NQ \quad (3.12)$$

for the shift $F_{m,n}$ defined by (1.7) and some matrix $N \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$. In other words, there exists a subspace $\mathcal{Q} = \text{Ran } Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{y \in \mathbb{C}^{m(n+1)} : y = fQ \text{ for some } f \in \mathbb{C}^r\}$ coinvariant with respect to $F_{m,n}$ and such that

$$\mathbb{C}^{m(n+1)} = \text{Ker } K \dot{+} \mathcal{Q}. \quad (3.13)$$

Proof: We prove this lemma by induction. Let $n = 0$ and let $\text{rank } s_0 = l \leq m$. Then there exists a unitary matrix $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ such that

$$\mathbf{v}s_0\mathbf{v}^* = \begin{pmatrix} t_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0_{m-l} \end{pmatrix} \quad (t_0 > 0), \quad (3.14)$$

and the matrix

$$g = (I_l, 0)\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times m} \quad (3.15)$$

(considered as Q) clearly satisfies (3.12).

Let us suppose that the statement of the lemma holds for all integers up to $n - 1$. Let as above, $\text{rank } s_0 = l$ and let \mathbf{v} and g be matrices defined by (3.14), (3.15). Since $K_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$, we have $\text{Ker } s_0 \subseteq \text{Ker } s_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, 2n$, and then we have from (3.14),

$$\mathbf{v}s_i\mathbf{v}^* = \begin{pmatrix} t_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0_{m-l} \end{pmatrix} \quad (t_i \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times l}; \quad i = 1, \dots, 2n). \quad (3.16)$$

In more detail, representations (3.16) for $i = 1, \dots, 2n - 1$ follow from positivity of K_n along with its Hankel structure. Since K_n belongs to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$, equality (2.12) holds. Upon substituting decompositions (3.14) and (3.16) (for $i = 1, \dots, 2n - 1$) into (2.12), one can easily see that s_{2n} is necessarily of the form $\mathbf{v}s_{2n}\mathbf{v}^* = \begin{pmatrix} t_{2n} & \gamma \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times (m-l)}$. Since s_{2n} is Hermitian, $\gamma = 0$ and representation (3.16) for s_{2n} follows.

From (3.14)–(3.16) we obtain that $gs_i g^* = t_i$ ($i = 0, \dots, 2n$) and

$$T_n \equiv (t_{i+j})_{i,j=0}^n = G_n K_n G_n^*, \quad \text{rank } T_n = \text{rank } K_n, \quad (3.17)$$

where G_n is the $(n+1)l \times (n+1)m$ matrix defined by

$$G_n = \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 \\ & \ddots \\ 0 & g \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.18)$$

Since $K_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$, then it is readily seen that $T_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{l,n}$. Let \hat{T}_{n-1} , D_n and \mathcal{T}_n be matrices defined by (3.1), (3.2). Multiplying K_n on the left by the matrix

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} I_l & 0 \\ -D_n^{-1}\mathcal{T}_n t_0^{-1} & D_n^{-1} \end{pmatrix} G_n \quad (3.19)$$

and by Φ^* on the right we obtain, on account of (3.18) and (3.6),

$$\Phi K_n \Phi^* = \begin{pmatrix} t_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{T}_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.20)$$

By Lemma 3.1, $\widehat{T}_{n-1} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{l,n-1}$, and it follows from (3.17), (3.19) and (3.20) that $\text{rank } \widehat{T}_{n-1} = \text{rank } K_n - \text{rank } t_0 = r - l$. Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, there exist matrices $\widetilde{Q} \in \mathbb{C}^{(r-l) \times ln}$ and $\widetilde{N} \in \mathbb{C}^{(r-l) \times (r-l)}$ such that

$$\widetilde{Q}\widehat{T}_{n-1}\widetilde{Q}^* > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{Q}F_{l,n} = \widehat{N}\widehat{Q}. \quad (3.21)$$

We show that the matrices

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} I_l & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{Q} \end{pmatrix} \Phi \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times (n+1)}, \quad N = \begin{pmatrix} 0_l & 0 \\ \widetilde{Q}\widetilde{U}t_0^{-1} & \widetilde{N} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r} \quad (3.22)$$

(where \widetilde{U} is the matrix given by (3.4)) satisfy (3.12). Indeed, by (3.20)–(3.22),

$$QK_nQ^* = \begin{pmatrix} I_l & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{Q} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \widehat{T}_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_l & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{Q}^* \end{pmatrix} > 0$$

and

$$\text{rank } QK_nQ^* = \text{rank } t_0 + \text{rank } \widetilde{Q}\widehat{T}_{n-1}\widetilde{Q}^* = l + (r - l) = \text{rank } K_n.$$

We next make use of (3.19)–(3.21) and of the block decompositions

$$G_n = \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 \\ 0 & G_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad F_{m,n} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \widetilde{U} & F_{m,n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

to compute

$$QF_{m,n} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \widetilde{Q}D_n^{-1}G_{n-1}\widetilde{U} & \widetilde{Q}D_n^{-1}G_{n-1}F_{m,n-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \widetilde{Q}D_n^{-1}\widetilde{U}g & \widetilde{Q}D_n^{-1}F_{l,n-1}G_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} NQ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ (\widetilde{Q}\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{N}\widetilde{Q}D_n^{-1}\mathcal{T}_n)t_0^{-1}g & \widetilde{N}\widetilde{Q}D_n^{-1}G_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \widetilde{Q}D_n^{-1}(D_n\widetilde{U} - F_{l,n-1}\mathcal{T}_n)t_0^{-1}g & \widetilde{Q}F_{l,n-1}D_n^{-1}G_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We now invoke equalities (3.5) to verify that the right hand side matrices in the two last formulas coincide. Thus, $QF_{m,n} = NQ = 0$, and the matrices Q and N defined by (3.22) satisfy (3.12). This completes the proof. \square

In what follows, the indices will be omitted and by K and F we mean matrices K_n and $F_{m,n}$ given by (1.1) and (1.7) respectively.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $K \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$, let Q be any matrix satisfying (3.12) and let F, U, M, J and $K^{[-1]}$ be matrices given by (1.7), (1.8), (1.11) and (2.8). Then the $\mathbb{C}^{2m \times 2m}$ -valued function*

$$\Theta(z) = I_{2m} + z \begin{pmatrix} M^* \\ -U^* \end{pmatrix} (I - zF^*)^{-1} K^{[-1]}(U, M) \quad (3.23)$$

is of the class \mathbf{W} and moreover,

$$\Theta(z)^* J \Theta(z) - J = i(\bar{z} - z) \begin{pmatrix} U^* \\ M^* \end{pmatrix} K^{[-1]}(I - \bar{z}F)^{-1} K(I - zF^*)^{-1} K^{[-1]}(U, M), \quad (3.24)$$

$$J - \Theta(z)^{-*} J \Theta^{-1}(z) = i(\bar{z} - z) \begin{pmatrix} U^* \\ M^* \end{pmatrix} (I - \bar{z}F^*)^{-1} K^{[-1]}(I - zF)^{-1}(U, M). \quad (3.25)$$

Observe that the two first relations in (3.12) enable us to construct the pseudoinverse matrix $K^{[-1]}$ according to (2.8) and the third equality guarantees (3.24) and (3.25) to be in force.

Proof: Using (3.23), (1.11) and (1.9) we have

$$\Theta(z)^* J \Theta(z) - J = i \begin{pmatrix} U^* \\ M^* \end{pmatrix} L(z)(U, M) \quad (3.26)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L(z) &= |z|^2 K^{[-1]} (I - \bar{z}F)^{-1} \{MU^* - UM^*\} (I - zF^*)^{-1} K^{[-1]} \\ &\quad + \bar{z}K^{[-1]} (I - \bar{z}F)^{-1} - z(I - zF^*)^{-1} K^{[-1]} \\ &= (\bar{z} - z)K^{[-1]} (I - \bar{z}F)^{-1} K (I - zF^*)^{-1} K^{[-1]} \\ &\quad + \bar{z}K^{[-1]} (I - \bar{z}F)^{-1} (I - KK^{[-1]}) - z(I - K^{[-1]}K) (I - zF^*)^{-1} K^{[-1]}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

It follows from (3.12) that $QF^j = N^j Q$ ($j = 0, 1, \dots$) which both with (2.8) implies

$$K^{[-1]} F^j (I - KK^{[-1]}) = Q^* (QKQ^*)^{-1} N^j Q (I - KQ(QKQ^*)^{-1} Q) = 0 \quad (3.28)$$

for $j = 0, 1, \dots$. Since $(I - zF^*)^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^n z^j F^{*j}$, then also

$$K^{[-1]} (I - zF)^{-1} (I - KK^{[-1]}) \quad (z \in \mathbb{C}). \quad (3.29)$$

Substituting (3.29) into (3.27) and (3.27) into (3.26), we obtain (3.24). Similarly,

$$\Theta(z) J \Theta(z)^* - J = i \begin{pmatrix} M^* \\ -U^* \end{pmatrix} (I - zF^*)^{-1} \tilde{L}(z) (I - \bar{z}F)^{-1} (M, -U) \quad (3.30)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}(z) &= \bar{z}(I - zF^*)K^{[-1]} - zK^{[-1]}(I - \bar{z}F) - |z|^2 K^{[-1]} \{MU^* - UM^*\} K^{[-1]} \\ &= (\bar{z} - z)K^{[-1]} + |z|^2 K^{[-1]} F (I - KK^{[-1]}) - |z|^2 (I - K^{[-1]}K) F^* K^{[-1]}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

Using (3.28) for $j = 1$ we obtain from (3.31) that $\tilde{L}(z) = (\bar{z} - z)K^{[-1]}$ and by (3.30),

$$\Theta(z) J \Theta(z)^* - J = i(\bar{z} - z) \begin{pmatrix} M^* \\ -U^* \end{pmatrix} (I - zF^*)^{-1} K^{[-1]} (I - \bar{z}F)^{-1} (M, -U). \quad (3.32)$$

Relations (1.10) follow from (3.32) and thus, $\Theta \in \mathbf{W}$. Since it Θ is J -unitary on \mathbb{R} , then by the symmetry principle,

$\Theta^{-1}(z) = J\Theta(\bar{z})^* J$ which both with (3.32) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} J - \Theta(z)^{-*} J \Theta^{-1}(z) &= J(J - \Theta(\bar{z})J\Theta(\bar{z})^*)J \\ &= i(z - \bar{z})J \begin{pmatrix} M^* \\ -U^* \end{pmatrix} (I - \bar{z}F^*)^{-1} K^{[-1]} (I - zF)^{-1} (M, -U)J \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

and implies (3.25). \square

4. PARAMETRIZATION OF ALL SOLUTIONS

In this section we parametrize the set $\mathcal{R}(K_n)$ of all solutions of the degenerate **HMP** in terms of a linear fractional transformation. The following theorem can be found in [7, 9].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_{11} & \theta_{12} \\ \theta_{21} & \theta_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ be the block decomposition of a $\mathbb{C}^{2m \times 2m}$ -valued function $\Theta \in \mathbf{W}$ into four $\mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ -valued blocks. Then all $\mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ -valued analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ solutions w to the inequality*

$$(w(z)^*, I_m) \frac{\Theta(z)^{-*} J \Theta^{-1}(z)}{i(\bar{z} - z)} \begin{pmatrix} w(z) \\ I_m \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \quad (4.1)$$

are parametrized by the formula

$$w(z) = (\theta_{11}(z)p(z) + \theta_{12}(z)q(z))(\theta_{21}(z)p(z) + \theta_{22}(z)q(z))^{-1} \quad (4.2)$$

when the parameter $\{p, q\}$ varies in the set \mathbf{N}_m of all Nevanlinna pairs and satisfies

$$\det(\theta_{21}(z)p(z) + \theta_{22}(z)q(z)) \neq 0; \quad (4.3)$$

Moreover, two Nevanlinna pairs lead via (4.2) to the same function w if and only if these pairs are equivalent.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\{p, q\} \in \mathbf{N}_m$ be a Nevanlinna pair. Then*

$$\det(p(z) + iq(z)) \neq 0, \quad (4.4)$$

the function

$$S(z) = (p(z) - iq(z))(p(z) + iq(z))^{-1} \quad (4.5)$$

is a $\mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ -valued contraction in \mathbb{C}_+ and moreover, two different pairs lead by (4.5) to the same s if and only if they are equivalent.

The proof is given in [7]. Observe that by (4.4), every Nevanlinna pair $\{p, q\}$ satisfies the dual nondegeneracy property (compare with Definition 1.2)

$$\det(p(z)p(z)^* + q(z)q(z)^*) \neq 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\{p, q\} \in \mathbf{N}_m$ be a Nevanlinna pair such that $(I_\nu, 0) p(z) \equiv 0$ ($\nu \leq m$). Then $\{p, q\}$ is equivalent to a pair*

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{p}(z) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} I_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{q}(z) \end{pmatrix} \right\} \quad \text{for some } \{\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}\} \in \mathbf{N}_{m-\nu}. \quad (4.7)$$

Proof: By the assumption assumption, p and q are of the form

$$p(z) = \begin{pmatrix} 0_\nu & 0 \\ p_{21}(z) & p_{22}(z) \end{pmatrix}, \quad q(z) = \begin{pmatrix} q_{11}(z) & q_{12}(z) \\ q_{21}(z) & q_{22}(z) \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.8)$$

and in view of (4.6), $\text{rank}(q_{11}(z), q_{12}(z)) = m$ at almost all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Multiplying $(q_{11}(z), q_{12}(z))$ by an appropriate unitary matrix U on the right we obtain

$$(q_{11}(z), q_{12}(z)) U = (\tilde{q}_{11}(z), \tilde{q}_{12}(z)), \quad \det \tilde{q}_{11}(z) \neq 0.$$

The pair $\{p, q\}$ is equivalent to the pair $\{p_1, q_1\}$ defined as

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_1(z) \\ q_1(z) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p(z) \\ q(z) \end{pmatrix} U \Phi(z) \quad \text{where} \quad \Phi(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{q}_{11}^{-1}(z) & -\tilde{q}_{11}^{-1}(z)\tilde{q}_{12}(z) \\ 0 & I_{m-\nu} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows from (4.8) that the functions p_1 and q_1 are of the form

$$p_1(z) = \begin{pmatrix} 0_\nu & 0 \\ \tilde{p}_1(z) & \tilde{p}(z) \end{pmatrix} \quad q_1(z) = \begin{pmatrix} I_\nu & 0 \\ \tilde{q}_1(z) & \tilde{q}(z) \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.9)$$

and it remains to show that $\{p_1, q_1\}$ is equivalent to the pair defined in (4.7). Indeed, (4.9) implies that $\{\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}\} \in \mathbf{N}_{m-\nu}$ and therefore, $\det(\tilde{p}(z) + i\tilde{q}(z)) \neq 0$. Substituting the pair (4.9) into (4.5) gives

$$\begin{aligned} S(z) &= (p_1(z) - iq_1(z))(p_1(z) + iq_1(z))^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -iI & 0 \\ \tilde{p}_1 - i\tilde{q}_1 & \tilde{p} - i\tilde{q} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} iI & 0 \\ \tilde{p}_1 + i\tilde{q}_1 & \tilde{p} + i\tilde{q} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} & -I & & 0 \\ i(\tilde{p} - i\tilde{q})(\tilde{p} + i\tilde{q})^{-1}(\tilde{p}_1 + i\tilde{q}_1) - i(\tilde{p}_1 - i\tilde{q}_1) & & & (\tilde{p} - i\tilde{q})(\tilde{p} + i\tilde{q})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -I & 0 \\ 0 & (\tilde{p} - i\tilde{q})(\tilde{p} + i\tilde{q})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

(to obtain the last equality we used the following: if the function $S = \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 \\ s_2 & -I \end{pmatrix}$ is contractive valued, then $s_2 \equiv 0$). It is easily seen that the pair (4.7) being substituted into (4.5), leads to the same function S . By Lemma 4.2, the pairs (4.5) and (4.9) are equivalent. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Let $R \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times 2m}$ be a J -neutral matrix (i.e. $RJR = 0$) and let $\text{rank } R = \nu \leq \min(m, l)$. Then there exist a J -unitary matrix Ψ and an invertible T such that*

$$TR\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} I_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.10)$$

Proof: Since $\text{rank } R = \nu$, there exists an invertible matrix T such that

$$TR = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{R} \\ 0_{(m-\nu) \times 2m} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.11)$$

where \hat{R} is a full rank J -neutral matrix. Let us endow the space $\mathbb{C}^{1 \times 2m}$ with the indefinite inner product $[x, y] = yJx^*$. By (1.11), the subspace

$$\mathcal{G} = \{g \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times 2m} : g = (\hat{g}, 0) \text{ for some } \hat{g} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times \nu}\}$$

is J -neutral. The subspace $\mathcal{F} = \{f \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times 2m} : f = \hat{g}\hat{R}, \hat{g} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times \nu}\}$ J -neutral as well. Let us introduce the operator $\hat{\Psi} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ by $\hat{g}\hat{R}\hat{\Psi} = (\hat{g}, 0)$. Since \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are J -neutral and $\dim \mathcal{F} = \dim \mathcal{G}$, the operator $\hat{\Psi}$ is J -isometric and has equal defect numbers. Furthermore, $\hat{\Psi}$ is invertible and therefore, it admits a J -unitary extension Ψ to all of $\mathbb{C}^{1 \times 2m}$ ([6]). The matrix Ψ of this extended operator in the standard basis is J -unitary and satisfies $\hat{R}\Psi = (I_\nu, 0)$ which both with (4.11) implies (4.10). \square

Remark 4.5. Let $R = (R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times 2m}$ be a J -neutral matrix: $R_1R_2^* - R_2R_1^* = 0$. Then $\text{rank } R = \text{rank}(R_1 + iR_2)$. Indeed,

$$\text{rank}(R_1 + iR_2) = \text{rank}(R_1 + iR_2)(R_1 + iR_2)^* = \text{rank}(R_1R_1^* + R_2R_2^*) = \text{rank } RR^* = \text{rank } R.$$

The following theorem is the degenerate analogue of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 4.6. *Let the Pick matrix K_n of the HMP be in the class $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$ and let Θ be the $\mathbb{C}^{2m \times 2m}$ -valued function defined by (3.23). Then, there exists a J -unitary matrix $\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^{2m \times 2m}$ such that*

(1) All the functions $w \in \mathcal{R}(K_n)$ are obtained by the formula

$$w(z) = (a_{11}(z)p(z) + a_{12}(z)q(z))(a_{21}(z)p(z) + a_{22}(z)q(z))^{-1} \quad (4.12)$$

with the coefficient matrix $A(z) = (a_{ij}(z)) = \Theta(z)\Psi \in \mathbf{W}$ when the parameter $\{p, q\}$ varies in the set of all Nevanlinna pairs of the form

$$\{p(z), q(z)\} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{p}(z) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} I_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{q}(z) \end{pmatrix} \right\} \quad (4.13)$$

where $\{\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}\} \in \mathbf{N}_{m-\mu}$ and ν is the integer given by

$$\nu = \text{rank} \{(I_m, is_0, \dots, is_{n-1})\mathbf{P}_{KerK_n}\}.$$

(2) Two pairs lead to the same function w if and only if they are equivalent.

Proof: According to Theorem 1.1 the set $\mathcal{R}(K_n)$ coincides with the set of all solutions to the inequality (1.6) which is equivalent, by Lemma 2.4, to the following system

$$\frac{w(z) - w(z)^*}{z - \bar{z}} - (Uw(z) + M)^*(I - zF)^{-*}K^{[-1]}(I - zF)^{-1}(Uw(z) + M) \geq 0, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{KerK}(I - zF)^{-1}\{Uw(z) + M\} \equiv 0. \quad (4.15)$$

It is easily seen that (4.14) can be written as

$$(w(z)^*, I) \left\{ \frac{J}{i(\bar{z} - z)} - \begin{pmatrix} U^* \\ M^* \end{pmatrix} (I - zF^*)^{-1}K^{[-1]}(I - zF)^{-1}(U, M) \right\} \begin{pmatrix} w(z) \\ I \end{pmatrix} \geq 0$$

and is equivalent, in view of (3.25), to the inequality (4.1) with the function Θ defined by (3.23) which is of the class \mathbf{W} by Lemma 3.3. According to Theorem 4.1, all solutions w to the inequality (4.14) are parametrized by the linear fractional transformation (4.2) when the parameter $\{p, q\}$ varies in the set \mathbf{N}_m of all Nevanlinna pairs and satisfies (4.3). It remains to choose among these solutions all functions w which satisfy also identity (4.15). The rest of the proof is broken into four steps which we now specify.

Step 1: The function $w(z)$ of the form (4.2) stifies the identity (4.15) if and only if the corresponding parameter $\{p, q\}$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{P}_{KerK}\{Up(z) + Mq(z)\} \equiv 0. \quad (4.16)$$

Step 2: If a pair $\{p, q\} \in \mathbf{N}_m$ satisfies (4.16) then it also satisfies (4.3).

Step 3: If a pair $\{p, q\} \in \mathbf{N}_m$ satisfies (4.16) then it is equivalent to some pair $\{p_1, q_1\}$ of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_1(z) \\ q_1(z) \end{pmatrix} = \Psi \begin{pmatrix} 0_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{p}(z) \\ I_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{q}(z) \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} p(z) \\ q(z) \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.17)$$

for some J -unitary matrix $\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^{2m \times 2m}$ which depends only on K_n and a pair $\{\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}\} \in \mathbf{N}_{m-\nu}$, where $\nu = \text{rank} \mathbf{P}_{KerK}(U, M) = \text{rank} \mathbf{P}_{KerK}(U + iM)$.

Proof of Step 1: Let $\Theta = (\theta_{ij})$ be the function defined by (3.23) and let w be a function of the form (4.2) for some pair $\{p, q\} \in \mathbf{N}_m$ which satisfies (4.3). Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} w(z) \\ I \end{pmatrix} = \Theta(z) \begin{pmatrix} p(z) \\ q(z) \end{pmatrix} (\theta_{21}(z)p(z) + \theta_{22}(z)q(z))^{-1}$$

and therefore, identity (4.15) is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{P}_{KerK}(I - zF)^{-1}(U, M)\Theta(z) \begin{pmatrix} p(z) \\ q(z) \end{pmatrix} \equiv 0. \quad (4.18)$$

Using (1.9), (3.23) and the identity

$$K(I - zF^*)^{-1} - (I - zF)^{-1}K = z(I - zF)^{-1}(KF^* - FK)(I - zF^*)^{-1}$$

we get

$$(I - zF)^{-1}(U, M)\Theta(z) = K(I - zF^*)^{-1}K^{[-1]}(U, M) + (I - zF)^{-1}\{I - KK^{[-1]}\}(U, M).$$

Substituting the latter equality into (4.18) gives

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}(I - zF)^{-1}\{I - KK^{[-1]}\}(Up(z) + Mq(z)) \equiv 0$$

which on account of (2.9), can be written as

$$\{I + z\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}F(I - zF)^{-1}(I - KK^{[-1]})\}\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}(Up(z) + Mq(z)) \equiv 0. \quad (4.19)$$

Since the matrix $\{I + z\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}F(I - zF)^{-1}(I - KK^{[-1]})\}$ is nondegenerate, (4.19) implies (4.16).

Proof of Step 2: Let a pair $\{p, q\} \in \mathbf{N}_m$ satisfy the condition (4.16). We introduce the pair

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_0(z) \\ q_0(z) \end{pmatrix} = \Theta(z) \begin{pmatrix} p(z) \\ q(z) \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.20)$$

and show that $\det q_0(z) \neq 0$. Indeed, suppose that the point $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and the nonzero vector $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{C}^m$ are such that $\det \Theta(\lambda) \neq 0$ and

$$q_0(\lambda)\mathbf{h} = 0. \quad (4.21)$$

Since $\mathbf{h}^*(p(\lambda)^*, q(\lambda)^*)\Theta(\lambda)^*J\Theta(\lambda) \begin{pmatrix} p(\lambda) \\ q(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h}^*(p_0(\lambda)^*, 0)J \begin{pmatrix} p_0(\lambda) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{h} = 0$, then

$$0 \leq \mathbf{h}^*(p(\lambda)^*, q(\lambda)^*)J \begin{pmatrix} p(\lambda) \\ q(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h}^*(p(\lambda)^*, q(\lambda)^*)\{J - \Theta(\lambda)^*J\Theta(\lambda)\} \begin{pmatrix} p(\lambda) \\ q(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{h},$$

due to (1.12). Substituting (3.24) into this last inequality leads us to

$$K(I - \lambda F^*)^{-1}K^{[-1]}\{Up(\lambda) + Mq(\lambda)\}\mathbf{h} = 0. \quad (4.22)$$

It follows from (3.23) and (4.20) that

$$p_0(\lambda) = p(\lambda) + \lambda M^*(I - \lambda F^*)^{-1}K^{[-1]}\{Up(\lambda) + Mq(\lambda)\}. \quad (4.23)$$

Since $M = FKU$ (see (1.8)), then $\lambda M^*(I - \lambda F^*)^{-1} = U^*K(I - \lambda F^*)^{-1} - U^*K$. Substituting this last equality into (4.23) and taking into account (2.9), (4.16), (4.22) and the evident equalities $U^*U = I_m$ and $U^*M = 0$ we receive

$$\begin{aligned} p_0(\lambda)\mathbf{h} &= p(\lambda)\mathbf{h} - U^*KK^{[-1]}\{Up(\lambda) + Mq(\lambda)\}\mathbf{h} + U^*K(I - zF^*)^{-1}K^{[-1]}\{Up(\lambda) + Mq(\lambda)\}\mathbf{h} \\ &= U^*(I - KK^{[-1]})\{Up(\lambda) + Mq(\lambda)\}\mathbf{h} + (I - UU^*)p(\lambda) - U^*Mq(\lambda) \\ &= U^*(I - KK^{[-1]})\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}\{Up(\lambda) + Mq(\lambda)\}\mathbf{h} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\det \Theta(\lambda) \neq 0$, the equality $p_0(\lambda)\mathbf{h} = 0$ both with (4.20) and (4.21) implies

$$\begin{pmatrix} p(\lambda) \\ q(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{h} = \Theta(\lambda)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} p_0(\lambda) \\ q_0(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{h} = 0$$

and since λ is a arbitrary point, the latter equality contradicts to the nondegeneracy of the pair $\{p, q\}$.

Proof of Step 3: Using (1.9) we obtain that the matrix $\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}(U, M)$ is J -neutral:

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}(U, M)J \begin{pmatrix} U^* \\ M^* \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K} = i\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}(KF^* - FK)\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K} = 0.$$

Thus, by Remark 4.5,

$$\mu = \text{rank} (\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}(U, M)) = \text{rank} (\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}(U + iM)) = \text{rank} \{(I_m, is_0, \dots, is_{n-1})\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K_n}\}.$$

According to Lemma 4.4, there exist a J -unitary matrix Ψ and an invertible T such that

$$T\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K}(U, M)\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} I_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.24)$$

Let $\{p_2, q_2\}$ be the pair defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} p(z) \\ q(z) \end{pmatrix} = \Psi \begin{pmatrix} p_2(z) \\ q_2(z) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.25)$$

On account of (4.24) and (4.25), condition (4.3) can be rewritten as $(I_\nu, 0) \begin{pmatrix} p_2(z) \\ q_2(z) \end{pmatrix} \equiv 0$ and by Lemma 4.3, the pair $\{p_2, q_2\}$ is equivalent to some pair of the form (4.7), i.e.,

$$\begin{pmatrix} p(z) \\ q(z) \end{pmatrix} = \Psi \begin{pmatrix} p_2(z) \\ q_2(z) \end{pmatrix} \sim \Psi \begin{pmatrix} 0_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{p}(z) \\ I_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{q}(z) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p_1(z) \\ q_1(z) \end{pmatrix}$$

which completes the proof of Step 3.

Substituting (4.17) into (4.2) and taking into account that the equivalent pairs lead under the linear fractional transformation to the same function $w(z)$, we finish the proof of theorem. \square

By Remark 2.9, the condition $K_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$ is not restrictive and hence, the received in Theorem 3.3 description is applicable to the general situation $K_n \in \mathcal{H}_{m,n}$.

5. CORRECTION OF ERRATAE IN [2]

The following result was formulated in [2] (see Lemmas 2.5, 2.10 and 2.11 there).

Lemma 5.1. *Let $K_n = (s_{i+j})_{i,j=0}^n \in \mathcal{H}_{m,n}$ and let \mathcal{L} be the subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{1 \times m}$ given in (2.11). The following are equivalent:*

(1) K_n admits a positive semidefinite Hankel extension.

(2) $\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ker}K_{n-1}} \begin{pmatrix} s_{n+1} \\ \vdots \\ s_{2n} \end{pmatrix} = 0.$

(3) The block s_{2n} is of the form

$$s_{2n} = (s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})K_{n-1}^{[-1]}(s_n, \dots, s_{2n-1})^* + R \quad (5.1)$$

for some positive semidefinite matrix $R \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ which vanishes on the subspace \mathcal{L} and does not depend on the choice of $K_{n-1}^{[-1]}$.

(4) The associated truncated Hamburger moment problem admits an “exact” solution σ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^k d\sigma(\lambda) = s_k \quad (k = 0, \dots, 2n).$$

The proofs of implications (1) \Rightarrow (4) \Rightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) presented in [2] are correct; they are reproduced in Lemmas 2.10 and 2.11 above. To complete the proof, it suffices to justify (2) \Rightarrow (1), that is, in our current terminology, to show that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{m,n}^+. \quad (5.2)$$

This inclusion together with (2.17) implies that all three classes introduced in Section 2 coincide.

Proof of (5.2): Let $K_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{m,n}$. Plug in the Nevanlinna pair $\{p, q\} = \{0_m, I_m\}$ (which is certainly of the form (4.13)) into formula (4.12) to get a solution $w(z) = a_{12}(z)a_{22}(z)^{-1}$ from

$\mathcal{R}(K_n)$. This Pick function w is rational (since A is) and takes Hermitian values at every real point at which it is analytic (since A is J -unitary on \mathbb{R}). Then the measure σ from the Herglotz representation (1.4) of w is finitely atomic and therefore, the integrals $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^N d\sigma(\lambda)$ exists for every $N \geq 0$. Since this measure solves the associated **HMP**, it satisfies (1.2) and 1.3. By virtue of (2.18), the Hankel block matrix

$$\tilde{K}_n = \begin{pmatrix} & & & s_n & s_{n+1} \\ & & & \vdots & \vdots \\ & K_{n-1} & & s_{2n-1} & s_{2n} \\ s_n & \cdots & s_{2n-1} & s & s_{2n+1} \\ s_{n+1} & \cdots & s_{2n} & s_{2n+1} & s_{2n+2} \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive semidefinite, where we have set

$$s = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^{2n} d\sigma(\lambda), \quad s_{2n+1} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^{2n+1} d\sigma(\lambda), \quad s_{2n+2} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda^{2n+2} d\sigma(\lambda).$$

The Hankel block matrix $K_{n+1} := (s_{i+j})_{i,j=0}^{n+1}$ extends K_n and is positive semidefinite. Indeed, by (1.3), we have $K_{n+1} \geq \tilde{K}_n \geq 0$. Thus $K_n \in \mathcal{H}_{m,n}^+$ which completes the proof. \square

Remark 5.2. The proof of implication (2) \Rightarrow (1) presented in [2] does not rely on interpolation Theorem 4.6. The extending matrices s_{2n+1} and s_{2n+2} were constructed directly in terms of the given s_0, \dots, s_{2n} . Unfortunately, the construction turned out to be wrong. The author was very glad to learn that correct explicit proofs of the above implication have been recently obtained [5, 10].

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Akhiezer: *"The Classical Moment Problem"*, Oliver and Boyd, London, 1965.
- [2] V. Bolotnikov: *On degenerate Hamburger moment problem and extensions of nonnegative Hankel block matrices*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **25** (1996), no. 3, 253–276.
- [3] R. E. Curto and L. A. Fialkow, *Recursiveness, positivity, and truncated moment problems*, Houston J. Math. **17** (1991), no. 4, 603–635.
- [4] V. Dubovoj: *"Indefinite metric in the interpolation problem of Schur for analytic matrix functions"*, part IV, Theor. Funkcii, Funk. Anal. i Prilozen., Vol. 42, Vishcha Shkola (V. Marchenko - ed.), Kharkov, 1984, 46-57.
- [5] Y. M. Dyukarev, B. Fritzsche, B. Kirstein, C. Mädler and H. C. Thiele, *On Distinguished Solutions of Truncated Matricial Hamburger Moment Problems*, Complex Analysis and Operator Theory, to appear.
- [6] I. Iohvidov, M. Krein, H. Langer: *"Introduction to the spectral theory of operators in spaces with an indefinite metric"*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1982.
- [7] V. Katsnelson: *Methods of J-theory in continuous interpolation problems of analysis*, Private transl. by T. Ando, Sapporo, 1985.
- [8] A. Kheifets, *Hamburger moment problem: Parseval equality and Arov-singularity*, J. Funct. Anal. **141** (1996), no. 2, 374–420.
- [9] I. Kovalishina: *"Analytic theory of a class of interpolation problems"*, Math. USSR Izv., Vol. 22(1984), 419-463.
- [10] H. J. Woerdeman, *Private communication*.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG VA 23187-8795, USA