

Invariant Subspaces for Generalized Differentiation and Volterra Operators

Alexandru Aleman, Alex Bergman

March 12, 2025

Abstract

In this paper we provide a far-reaching generalization of the existent results about invariant subspaces of the differentiation operator $D = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ on $C^\infty(0, 1)$ and the Volterra operator $Vf(t) = \int_0^t f(s)ds$, on $L^2(0, 1)$. We use an abstract approach to study invariant subspaces of pairs D, V with $DV = I$, where V is compact and quasi-nilpotent and D is unbounded densely defined and closed on the same Hilbert space. Our results cover many differential operators, like Schrödinger operators and a large class of other canonical systems, as well as the so-called compact self-adjoint operators with removable spectrum recently studied in [6]. Our methods are based on a model for such pairs which involves de Branges spaces of entire functions and plays a crucial role in the development. However, a number of difficulties arise from the fact that our abstract operators do not necessarily identify with the usual operators on such spaces, but with rank one perturbations of those, which, in terms of invariant subspaces creates a number of challenging problems.

1 Introduction

The motivation for the study initiated in this paper goes back to the invariant subspaces of the Volterra operator V defined on the Hilbert space $L^2(0, 1)$ by

$$Vf(t) = \int_0^t f(s)ds,$$

as well as the invariant subspaces of its unbounded left inverse

$$Df(x) = f'(x),$$

when restricted to $C^\infty(0, 1)$. In 1938 Gelfand [16] posed the problem of determining the invariant subspaces of V . This problem has a rich history and has been studied by many authors. The, by now well known result, that each such subspace consists of functions which vanish a.e. on a fixed interval $(0, a)$, has been originally proved by Agmon, [1] and independently by Brodskii [12] and Donoghue [15]. Later, among others, Sarason [38] gave a different proof based on properties of the backward shift operator on the Hardy space on the upper half plane.

The study of invariant subspaces of D on $C^\infty(0, 1)$ has been initiated much later by the first author and B. Korenblum ([3], 2008). The structure of these subspaces is much more complicated. They can be classified according to the spectrum of the restriction of D which can be either void, or a discrete set in \mathbb{C} , or the entire complex plane. The first category, also called *residual subspaces* is

fully described in [3] and are of primary interest for this work, It turns out, that a residual subspace consists of functions in $C^\infty(0, 1)$ that vanish on a compact subinterval. This interval may reduce to a point in which case we have that the functions together with all their derivatives vanish at that point. This is clearly related to the invariant subspaces of right inverses of D , that is, Volterra operators of the type

$$V_a f(t) = \int_a^t f(s) ds, \quad a \in [0, 1].$$

The case of differentiation invariant subspaces where the spectrum of the restriction is discrete is related to the appropriate version of *spectral synthesis* in this context. This subtle problem was investigated by the first author, A. Baranov and Y. Belov in [2] and completely solved subsequently by A. Baranov and Y. Belov in [5]. The structure of the remaining type of D -invariant subspaces is not understood.

The ideas related to invariant subspaces of the Volterra operator have been extended to other classes of integral operators. The closest to the subject of this paper is the direction suggested by C. Remling in his book [36], namely to describe the invariant subspaces of Green's operators associated to canonical systems, for example, Schrödinger operators. We shall provide a description of these objects in Section 5. The reason for our particular interest is the interplay between invariant subspaces of these operators and the so-called residual subspaces of their left inverses which, in this case, are differential operators.

It is the aim of this paper to study such situations in a very general context. More precisely, we are interested in invariant subspaces for pairs of Hilbert space operators D, V satisfying $DV = I$ together with certain abstract conditions which mimic the situations described above and cover a large class of examples of interest. The formal definition is as follows.

Definition 1. *Let H be a separable Hilbert space. A pair of operators D and V will be called admissible if*

- (i) $D : \mathcal{D}(D) \subset H \rightarrow H$ is a densely defined closed operator,
- (ii) D has a one-dimensional kernel
- (iii) D has a self-adjoint restriction with compact resolvent,
- (iv) $V : H \rightarrow H$ is compact and quasi-nilpotent, that is, $\sigma(V) = \{0\}$,
- (v) $\text{Ran}(V) \subset \mathcal{D}(D)$ and $DV = I$.

The assumption that V is compact is actually redundant, since it follows from the compactness of the resolvent of the self-adjoint operator in (iii).

In this setup the operator V plays the role of the Volterra operator and D of the derivative multiplied by appropriate constants to ensure (iii). Other typical examples of pairs of admissible operators are given by second order differential operators with one fixed boundary condition and their Green's operators (solution operators). We give a large class of examples including Schrödinger operators and canonical systems of differential equations in Section 2. Finally, these conditions cover also the class of self-adjoint operators with removable spectrum introduced in [6]. These are compact self-adjoint operators having a rank one perturbation which is quasi-nilpotent. We shall discuss in detail these examples in Section 2.

The key tool in our investigation is a functional model which is obtained in a similar way to the approaches in spectral theory. More precisely, it turns out that D possesses a family $\{\phi_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$ of

eigenvectors such that the function $\lambda \mapsto \phi_\lambda$ is an entire H -valued function, so that the *generalized Fourier transform* \mathcal{W} defined on H by

$$\mathcal{W}x(\lambda) = \langle x, \phi_{\overline{\lambda}} \rangle, \quad x \in H$$

induces a unitary map onto a Hilbert space of entire functions. Our first main theorem identifies this space as a shifted de Branges space, that is,

$$\mathcal{W}H = e^{-i\alpha z} \mathcal{H}(E), \quad (1)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, E is a regular Hermite-Biehler function and $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is the corresponding de Branges space of entire functions (see Section 3 for details). Here and throughout by the usual abuse of notation we write z for both a point in \mathbb{C} as well as for the identity function on \mathbb{C} . While in spectral theory of certain differential operators such models yield a "diagonalization", in our case the situation is more complicated; $\mathcal{W}D\mathcal{W}^{-1}$ is just an extension of M_z^* , where M_z is multiplication by the independent variable and $\mathcal{W}V^*\mathcal{W}^{-1}$ is a rank one perturbation of the backward shift $f \mapsto \frac{f-f(0)}{z}$.

De Branges spaces have attracted renewed attention in recent years and have been an instrumental tool in resolving many open problems in operator theory, complex analysis, harmonic analysis, and spectral theory, see e.g. [8, 9, 11, 19, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34] for some examples of this.

The fact that the lattice of invariant subspaces of the Volterra operator is totally ordered by inclusion has been extended in many ways. Such operators are called *unicellular*. Kalisch [20] and Kisilevskii [21] proved unicellularity of a large class of integral operators whose kernels do not vanish on the diagonal. Another interesting class consists of operators with positive imaginary part. Kisilevskii [21] proved that a cyclic irreducible operator V with positive and nuclear imaginary part is unicellular. A very good account for results of this type is the book of Gohberg and Krein [17]. We should point out that none of the conditions above apply to the operators V considered in this paper.

Clearly, D has many right inverses which are all compact since by assumption (ii) above they differ by a rank one operator. In Section 5 we shall show that among these, the quasi-nilpotent ones form a one-parameter family V_β , $|\beta + \alpha| \leq \tau(E)$. They generalize the Volterra-type operators

$$f \mapsto \int_\beta^t f(s) ds, \quad \beta \in [0, 1],$$

which are unicellular if and only if $\beta = 0$, or $\beta = 1$. It turns out that a similar result holds in the general context as well. This is due to the fact that the invariant subspaces of these operators can be described in terms of the model space. More precisely, their "Fourier transforms" have the form

$$\mathcal{W}M = (e^{i\gamma z} \mathcal{H}(F))^\perp, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{R},$$

where the de Branges space $\mathcal{H}(F)$ is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}(E)$. These subspaces always form a chain. Moreover for fixed β as above, γ must satisfy

$$|\gamma + \alpha| \leq \tau(E) - \tau(F), \quad |\beta - \gamma| \leq \tau(F). \quad (2)$$

This leads to a general unicellularity theorem. For an entire function f we denote by $\tau(f)$ its exponential type.

Theorem 1. *Let D and V be an admissible pair. Then D has at most two (and at least one) unicellular quasi-nilpotent right-inverses given by*

$$V_+ f = Vf + \langle f, \mathcal{W}^{-1} s_+ \rangle \phi_0,$$

and

$$V_- f = Vf + \langle f, \mathcal{W}^{-1} s_- \rangle \phi_0,$$

where

$$s_{\pm} = \frac{1 - e^{i\beta_{\pm}z}}{z} \in \mathcal{WH},$$

and

$$\beta_+ = \tau(E) - \alpha, \text{ and } \beta_- = -(\tau(E) + \alpha).$$

These operators coincide if and only if $\tau(E) = \alpha = 0$.

In particular, the original operator V is unicellular if and only if $|\alpha| = \tau(E)$. These general results have a number of applications which are presented in §5.1. These include the result mentioned above regarding invariant subspaces of Green's operators associated to canonical systems, as suggested by C. Remling in [36]. It turns out, that for singular Hamiltonians these are again given by functions that vanish on a.e. on interval $(0, c)$. The non-singular case is more involved. Here we show that every such Green's operator has a rank one perturbation which is a Green's operator as well and is unicellular.

The unicellularity result applies to compact self-adjoint operators with removable spectrum as defined above. We show that under some natural assumptions, such operators possess a quasi-nilpotent rank one perturbation which is also unicellular. This completes the recent work of Baranov and Belov [6] on the subject.

The more difficult problem within this circle of ideas is to describe the invariant subspaces of D . The first step is to restrict D to an appropriate space where it acts as a continuous operator. This is the natural analogue of C^∞ defined by

$$C^\infty(D) = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{D}(D^n)$$

which becomes a Fréchet space with respect to the translation invariant metric

$$d(f, g) = \sum_j 2^{-j} \frac{\|D^j f - D^j g\|_H}{1 + \|D^j f - D^j g\|_H}.$$

As in the classical case, we prove that the invariant subspaces of D split naturally into three categories according to the spectrum of the restriction of D . Theorem 10 shows that if $\mathcal{J} \subset C^\infty(D)$ is closed and D -invariant then $\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}})$ is either void, or a discrete set of eigenvalues, or the whole complex plane.

In this paper we focus on closed D -invariant subspaces $\mathcal{J} \subset C^\infty(D)$ with $\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}}) = \emptyset$. These subspaces are called *residual*. Our approach differs essentially from the approach in [3], which built heavily on the self-adjoint operator of multiplication by independent variable, $Mf(x) = xf(x)$ on $L^2(a, b)$. A possible analogue in the general context would be a solution of the Heisenberg commutation relation

$$DM - MD = I.$$

Unfortunately, it turns out (see for example [39, 40] or Chapter 12 of [10]) that the admissible pairs for which the commutator equation has a self-adjoint solution are essentially unitarily equivalent to the classical one. Thus this technique is not available to us and instead our approach is based on the theory of nearly invariant subspaces of de Branges spaces discussed in Section 3.

Intuitively, the description of residual D -invariant subspaces is related to finding the appropriate analogue of the space of C^∞ -functions vanishing on a nontrivial interval, or vanish at one point

together with all their derivatives. The idea developed in this paper is to describe such subspaces using Volterra-invariance. Thus:

1) C^∞ -functions vanishing on an interval can be interpreted as

$$\mathcal{J}_M = \{x \in C^\infty(D) : D^j x \in M\},$$

where $M \subset H$ is invariant for a quasi-nilpotent right inverse of D , In this case, by (2) there exists a compact interval $J \subset [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$, such that M is invariant for all operators $V_\beta, \beta \in J$. 2) C^∞ -functions vanishing together with all their derivatives at a given point can be interpreted as

$$\mathcal{J}_M = \{x \in C^\infty(D) : D^j x \in M\},$$

where this time $M = V_\beta C^\infty(D)$ for some fixed $\beta \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$.

Remarkably enough this leads to a complete description of residual subspaces in this quite general context.

Theorem 2. *Every D -invariant residual subspace \mathcal{J} of $C^\infty(D)$ is of the form \mathcal{J}_M . The subspace \mathcal{J} has the form 1) above if and only if \mathcal{J} is not dense in H . In this case, the subspace $M \subset H$ is the closure of \mathcal{J} in H .*

A very natural and basic question which arises is whether subspaces of the form 1) are intersections of subspaces of form 2). More precisely, if \mathcal{J}_M is of the form 1) with corresponding interval J , it is true that

$$\mathcal{J}_M = \bigcap_{\beta \in J} V_\beta C^\infty(D)?$$

The answer is negative in this generality, and the reason is that the representation $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_M$ is not unique despite the fact that the interval J in 1) is uniquely determined by \mathcal{J} . This is a quite subtle phenomenon which we discuss is discussed at the end of §6.3. However, in Theorem 13 we prove that given an interval $J \subset [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$, with nonvoid interior,

$$\mathcal{J}_0 = \bigcap_{\beta \in J} V_\beta C^\infty(D),$$

is the largest residual subspace corresponding to this interval. In the standard case this is also the unique such subspace and it turns out that this continues to hold for other cases as well, more precisely, when the chain of de Branges subspaces of $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is *thin* in the sense of Belov and Borichev [7].

The opposite situation occurs when the Hermite-Biehler function E in our model has exponential type zero. In this case all intervals above reduce to $\{0\}$ and in Corollary 8 we prove that the set of residual subspaces is totally ordered. For example (see Corollary 9), this implies that for any regular Schrödinger operator D on $[a, b]$ with a separated boundary condition at a , a residual subspace consists of functions that vanish on $[a, c]$, $a < c < b$, or when $c = a$, it has the form described in 2) with $\beta = a$.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains a list of examples of admissible pairs which will be used to illustrate the general results. Section 3 contains preliminary material regarding de Branges spaces of entire functions and their connection to canonical systems. Section 4 regards the model associated to an admissible pair. Unicellularity of generalized Volterra operators and their invariant subspaces are considered in Section 5. Section 6 regards the invariant subspaces of D , especially the structure of residual subspaces.

2 Examples

We begin by providing a large class of examples of admissible pairs D and V .

2.1 The classical case

Let $D = -i\frac{d}{dx}$ be defined on the absolutely continuous functions on $(0, 1)$,

$$\mathcal{D}(D) = \{f \in AC(0, 1) : f, Df \in L^2(0, 1)\}.$$

It is well known that D has simple eigenvalues at each point in the plane with eigenfunction $e^{i\lambda x}$ and self-adjoint restrictions with compact resolvent. Also it is clear that the classical Volterra operator

$$Vf(x) = i \int_0^x f(t)dt,$$

is a quasi-nilpotent right inverse of D .

2.2 Regular Schrödinger operators

Let $-\infty < a < b < \infty$ and consider the Schrödinger operator $D = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + q$, where $q \in L^1(a, b)$ is real-valued. For the facts to come we refer the reader to any one of the references [30, 42, 41]. The papers [35, 24, 26] also treat Schrödinger equations with a similar flavor to our work. For $f \in L^2(a, b)$ consider the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} (D - \lambda)u = f \\ u(a) = 0 \\ \dot{u}(a) = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (3)$$

By a solution to (3) we shall mean a function u belonging to the maximal domain of D

$$\mathcal{D}(D) = \{u \in AC(a, b) : \dot{u} \in AC(a, b) \text{ and } u, -\ddot{u} + qu \in L^2(a, b)\},$$

satisfying $(D - \lambda)u = f$ pointwise a.e. on (a, b) and $u(a) = \dot{u}(a) = 0$. It is well known that the Cauchy problem has a unique solution $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{D}(D)$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $f \in L^2(a, b)$ and $\|u_\lambda\|_2 \leq C_\lambda \|f\|_2$, where $C_\lambda > 0$ is a constant not depending on f . Also the map $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda(t)$ is entire for each fixed t . In particular the map $V_\lambda f = u_\lambda$ defines a bounded linear operator, such that $(D - \lambda)V_\lambda f = f$ for all $f \in L^2(a, b)$. We let $V = V_0$. The operator V_λ is a Hilbert-Schmidt integral operator. Indeed if v_λ and u_λ are any two linear independent solutions and $W(u_\lambda, v_\lambda)$ is their Wronskian, then

$$V_\lambda f(x) = \frac{1}{W(u_\lambda, v_\lambda)} \int_a^x (u_\lambda(x)v_\lambda(t) - u_\lambda(t)v_\lambda(x)) f(t)dt. \quad (4)$$

Note that the integral kernel vanishes on the diagonal. It is not difficult to see that V is quasi-nilpotent. By separated boundary condition (α) , $0 \leq \alpha < \pi$, at a we mean the functions in the maximal domain $\mathcal{D}(D)$ satisfying

$$u(a) \cos(\alpha) - \dot{u}(a) \sin(\alpha) = 0.$$

We define separated boundary conditions at b analogously. Selecting any separated boundary condition at a gives an admissible pair D, V .

2.3 Canonical systems

The following class of examples provides a far-reaching generalization of the regular Schrödinger operators from above.

Fix $0 < \ell < \infty$. Let $\mathbf{H} : (0, \ell) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ be a positive, $\mathbf{H} \geq 0$, real-matrix valued function on $(0, \ell)$. To simplify the exposition we assume that \mathbf{H} has constant trace equal to 1 on $(0, \ell)$. A canonical system is a differential equation of the form

$$\Omega \partial_t X(t) = \lambda \mathbf{H}(t) X(t), \quad \Omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (5)$$

The matrix-valued function \mathbf{H} is called the *Hamiltonian* of the canonical system.

Let $L^2((0, \ell); \mathbf{H})$ be the weighted L^2 -space on $(0, \ell)$ with norm

$$\|f\|_{L^2((0, \ell); \mathbf{H})}^2 = \int_0^\ell \langle \mathbf{H}(x) f(x), f(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx < \infty,$$

where we identify elements f, g with with $\|f - g\|_{L^2((0, \ell); \mathbf{H})} = 0$.

In order to construct admissible pairs, the simplest case is when $\det(\mathbf{H}) \neq 0$ a.e.. In this case, the unbounded operator D given by

$$D = \mathbf{H}^{-1} \Omega \frac{d}{dt}$$

with maximal domain of definition is closed. Self-adjoint restrictions with compact resolvent can be easily found using boundary conditions.

Now define V by

$$Vf(x) = -\Omega \int_0^x \mathbf{H}(t) f(t) dt, \quad f \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (6)$$

and note that it satisfies $DV = I$.

Proposition 1. *The operator V defined by (6) is compact and quasi-nilpotent on $L^2((0, \ell); \mathbf{H})$.*

Proof. Since $\text{trace}(\mathbf{H}) = 1$ we have $\mathbf{H}(x) \leq I$ and

$$\|Vf\| \leq \int_0^x \sqrt{\langle \mathbf{H}f(t), f(t) \rangle} dt.$$

With a standard argument we conclude for any bounded sequence (f_n) in $L^2((0, \ell); \mathbf{H})$, that (Vf_n) is uniformly bounded and equicontinuous, hence by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, it has a uniformly subsequence. This implies the compactness of V .

To see that V is quasi-nilpotent it suffices to check that V has no eigenvalues. Obviously, 0 is not an eigenvalue. If $(I - \lambda V)f = 0$, note that both 0 and f are solutions to the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \Omega X' = \lambda \mathbf{H} X \\ X(0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

which gives $f = 0$ a.e. and completes the proof. \square

The case when \mathbf{H} is not invertible a.e. is more involved because it requires an appropriate modification of the definition of D , which will then lead to a modified definition of the underlying Hilbert space. Here we shall only give a brief overview of the necessary steps and refer the reader to Section 2 of [37] or the first few chapters of [36] for a detailed account. Let us note from the

beginning that if \mathbf{H} is singular on a set of positive measure any element $f \in L^2((0, \ell); \mathbf{H})$ is identified with its projection on the range of \mathbf{H} .

We start with the following technical definition which plays an important role.

Definition 2. *A singular interval is an interval $I = (a, b) \subset (0, \ell)$, such that $\mathbf{H}(x) = \langle \cdot, e_\alpha \rangle e_\alpha$, a.e. for some $e_\alpha = (\cos(\alpha), \sin(\alpha))^T$ and (a, b) is contained in no larger interval where the same is true. A point $t \in (0, \ell)$ is called singular if it belongs to the interior of a singular interval, otherwise it is called regular.*

Let us consider the closed subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}}$ of $L^2((0, \ell); H)$ consisting of functions which are constant a.e. on singular intervals, that is,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}} = \bigcap_{I \text{ singular}} \{f \in L^2((0, \ell); \mathbf{H}) : \mathbf{H}f|_I \text{ is constant a.e.}\}.$$

Next we define the domain of D as the subspace $\mathcal{D}(D) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}}$ consisting of $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}}$ with

- (i) f is absolutely continuous on $(0, \ell)$,
- (ii) there exists $g \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\Omega f' = Hg$,
- (iii) $\langle f(0), (0, 1)^T \rangle = 0$.

The main problem which arises here is that this domain is not necessarily dense in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}}$. However, one can address this difficulty with help of some natural assumptions. A straightforward modification of the arguments in the proofs of Corollary 2, Theorem 2 in Section 2 of [37] (by just omitting one boundary condition) leads to the following result.

Theorem 3. *If \mathbf{H} satisfies*

- (i) *There exists no $\epsilon > 0$, such that $H(x) = \langle \cdot, e_{\pi/2} \rangle e_{\pi/2}$ a.e. on $(0, \epsilon)$, with $e_{\pi/2} = (0, 1)^T$.*
- (ii) *There exists no $\epsilon > 0$, such that $(\ell - \epsilon, \ell)$ is a singular interval,*

then $\mathcal{D}(D)$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}}$ and the operator $D : \mathcal{D} \mapsto \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}}$ by $Df = g$, with g given by (ii) is well-defined, closed and possesses a self-adjoint restriction.

Finally, note that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}}$ is invariant for V . Indeed, let I be a singular interval and let $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}}$. Then since $\Omega e_\alpha \in \ker \mathbf{H}(x)$, $x \in I$, it is easily seen that $Vf \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}}$. Then Proposition 1 shows that D, V is an admissible pair.

2.4 Self-adjoint operators with removable spectrum

Let A be an injective compact self-adjoint operator with simple removable spectrum, i.e. there exists $x, y \in H$, such that the rank one perturbation

$$Vu = Au + \langle u, x \rangle y, \quad u \in H, \tag{7}$$

is quasi-nilpotent. Such operators were studied in [6]. Let us assume that $y \notin \text{Ran}(A)$ and define $\mathcal{D}(D) = \text{Ran}(A) + \mathbb{C}y$ and

$$D : \mathcal{D}(D) \subset H \rightarrow H, \quad D(Au + cy) = u. \tag{8}$$

Proposition 2. *Let A be an injective compact self-adjoint operator with simple removable spectrum, let V be the quasi-nilpotent operator given by (7) and assume that $y \notin \text{Ran}(A)$. If D is given by (8), then D, V is an admissible pair.*

Proof. To verify condition (i) note that $\mathcal{D}(D)$ is dense in H , since $\text{Ran}(A)$ is. To see that D is closed, assume that $u_n = Av_n + c_n y \in \mathcal{D}$ and $v_n = Du_n$ converge to u respectively to v . Then (c_n) converges to $c \in \mathbb{C}$, i.e. $u = Av + cy \in \mathcal{D}$ and $Du = v$. (ii) is obvious, as well as (iv) and (v). To see (iii), define the unbounded operator B on H by $\mathcal{D}(B) = \text{Ran}(A)$ and $BAu = u$. Recall that $0 \notin \sigma(A)$ and let $\{u_\lambda, \lambda \in \sigma(A)\}$ be an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of A . Then each $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{D}(B)$ and $Bu_\lambda = \lambda^{-1}u_\lambda$, which easily implies that B is self-adjoint, and obviously, a restriction of D . \square

3 Preliminaries

We shall use standard notations for the usual function spaces on the upper half-plane \mathbb{C}_+ . Thus $H^2 = H^2(\mathbb{C}_+)$ is the Hardy space and equals the (inverse) Fourier transform of $L^2(0, \infty)$. Equivalently $H^2(\mathbb{C}_+)$ consists of analytic functions f in \mathbb{C}_+ with

$$\|f\|_2^2 = \sup_{y>0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x + iy)|^2 dx < \infty.$$

$H^\infty = H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)$ denotes the space of bounded analytic functions in \mathbb{C}_+ . $N(\mathbb{C}_+)$ denote the functions of bounded type, or the Nevanlinna class in the upper-half plane, i.e. analytic functions of the form $f = g/h$, with $g, h \in H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)$. All three spaces have identical definitions in the lower half-plane \mathbb{C}_- .

The mean-type of functions h analytic in \mathbb{C}_\pm is defined as

$$\text{m.t.}(h) = \limsup_{y \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{\log|h(iy)|}{y}.$$

For example, the mean-type of a function, f , of bounded type is given by minus the exponent of $e^{i\alpha z}$ appearing in the inner-outer factorization of f .

For entire functions f one defines the (exponential) type $\tau(f)$ as

$$\tau(f) = \limsup_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log|f(z)|}{|z|}.$$

These notions are connected by a famous theorem of Krein (see [22], p. 115, or [18], Part 2).

Theorem 4. *Let f be an entire function of bounded type in both half planes, \mathbb{C}_\pm . Then f is of finite exponential type and its exponential type is equal to the maximum of its mean-type in the upper and lower half-planes.*

We now turn to de Branges spaces of entire functions and start with Hermite-Biehler, briefly HB functions. These are entire functions $E : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, such that $|E(z)| > |E(\bar{z})|$, for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$.

To any HB function E we associate the de Branges $\mathcal{H}(E)$ consisting of entire functions f satisfying

- (i) $f/E \in H^2(\mathbb{C}_+)$,
- (ii) $f^\# / E \in H^2(\mathbb{C}_+)$,

where, as usual, for entire functions f we denote $f^\#(z) = \overline{f(\bar{z})}$. The norm on $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is the one inherited from $L^2(|E(t)|^{-2}dt)$,

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}(E)} = \|f/E\|_2 = \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(t)E(t)^{-1}|^2 dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

For the theory of de Branges spaces we refer to de Branges' book [14]. Other good references for the subject include [36, 37]. From property (i) we see that $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space where the kernel is given by

$$k_\lambda^E(z) = \frac{E(z)\overline{E(\lambda)} - E^\#(z)\overline{E^\#(\lambda)}}{2\pi i(\bar{\lambda} - z)}.$$

Of course, de Branges spaces are characterized by kernels of this form. The most classical examples are the Paley-Wiener spaces which are the Fourier transforms of $L^2(-a, a)$. In this particular case, $E(z) = e^{-iaz}$, $a > 0$.

It is important to note that de Branges spaces can also be introduced in an axiomatic way (see [14]).

Theorem 5. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space consisting of entire functions satisfying*

(i) *For $w \in \mathbb{C}$ the linear functional $f \mapsto f(w)$ is bounded.*

(ii) *For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, such that $f(\lambda) = 0$ we have $\frac{z-\bar{\lambda}}{z-\lambda}f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\|\frac{z-\bar{\lambda}}{z-\lambda}f\| = \|f\|$.*

(iii) *$f^\#(z) = \bar{f}(\bar{z}) \in \mathcal{H}$, and $\|f\| = \|f^\#\|$.*

Then there exists a HB function E , such that $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(E)$ as Hilbert spaces.

A subspace, X of $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is called a *de Branges subspace* if it is a de Branges space with respect to the norm inherited from $\mathcal{H}(E)$. Equivalently, in view of the previous theorem, X satisfies (i)-(iii) in that statement, hence it has the form $\mathcal{H}(F)$ for some HB function F .

When E has no real zeros the de Branges subspaces of $\mathcal{H}(E)$ have the following remarkable ordering property due to de Branges (see [36, 37, 14]).

Theorem 6. *Suppose E is a HB function. If $\mathcal{H}(F)$ and $\mathcal{H}(W)$ are two de Branges subspaces of $\mathcal{H}(E)$, and the corresponding HB functions F and W have no real zeros, then either $\mathcal{H}(F) \subset \mathcal{H}(W)$ or $\mathcal{H}(W) \subset \mathcal{H}(F)$.*

For a HB function E with no real zeros we define $\text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ to be the collection of de Branges subspaces, whose HB functions have no real zeros. In general we call a collection of de Branges spaces a de Branges chain if it is totally ordered with respect to isometric inclusion.

A de Branges space $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is called *regular* (or short) if it is invariant under the backward shift operator, $Lf(z) = z^{-1}(f(z) - f(0))$. This is equivalent to the condition

$$\frac{1}{(z+i)E(z)} \in H^2(\mathbb{C}_+).$$

By extension we call E a regular HB function.

An important property of such spaces is the following result ([37], Theorem 9, see also [36, 14]).

Theorem 7. *Let $\mathcal{H}(E)$ be a regular de Branges space. If $\mathcal{H}(F)$ is a de Branges subspace and F has no real zeros, then $\mathcal{H}(F)$ is regular.*

It follows that if E is a regular HB function then it is of finite exponential type $\tau(E)$ which equals its mean-type in \mathbb{C}_+ defined above.

Regular HB functions are related to canonical systems in the following way. Let \mathbf{H} be a Hamiltonian as in §2.3 and $\Theta = (\Theta_+, \Theta_-)^T$ be the unique solution to the canonical system

$$\Omega \partial_t X(t) = z \mathbf{H}(t) X(t), \quad t \in (0, \ell),$$

satisfying $\Theta(0) = (1, 0)^T$. Then $E_t(z) = \Theta_+(t, z) + i\Theta_-(t, z)$ is a regular HB function for each $t \in (0, \ell]$, except in the degenerate case

$$\mathbf{H}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{for almost every } s \in (0, t).$$

In addition,

$$\text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E_t)) = \{\mathcal{H}(E_s) : s \in (0, t], s \text{ is regular}\},$$

Conversely, it is a deep theorem due to de Branges that to every regular de Branges space $\mathcal{H}(E)$ with $E(0) = 1$ there exists a (essentially unique) Hamiltonian \mathbf{H} with constant trace equal to 1 and an interval $(0, t]$, such that $E = E_t$ and

$$\text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E)) = \{\mathcal{H}(E_s) : s \in (0, t], s \text{ is regular}\}.$$

For each regular HB function E with no real zeros, $E(0) = 1$, the type of E may also be calculated from the associated canonical system using the following Krein-de Branges formula

$$\tau(E) = \int_0^\ell \sqrt{\det \mathbf{H}(x)} dx, \quad (9)$$

see [36, 13, 37, 14].

Remark 1. Any $f \in \mathcal{H}(E)$ satisfies $\tau(f) \leq \tau(E)$. In particular, if the exponential type of E is zero then the exponential type of all elements in $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is zero.

This connection to canonical systems can be used to establish the existence of de Branges subspaces of a given type. We include a proof of the result for the sake of completeness. A variant can be found in de Branges' book [14] as well.

Lemma 1. *Let E be a regular HB function with $\tau(E) > 0$. Then for each $0 < h < \tau(E)$ there exists a HB function F zero free on \mathbb{R} with $\tau(F) = h$ and $\mathcal{H}(F)$ is a de Branges subspace of $\mathcal{H}(E)$.*

Proof. We may suppose $E(0) = 1$. Let \mathbf{H} be a canonical system associated with E . Then

$$\tau(E) = \int_0^\ell \sqrt{\det \mathbf{H}(x)} dx.$$

The right-hand side is continuous in ℓ and therefore it is possible to find $\delta > 0$, such that

$$\tau(E) - \epsilon = \int_0^{\ell - \delta} \sqrt{\det \mathbf{H}(x)} dx.$$

It is also possible to choose δ , such that $\ell - \delta$ does not belong to a singular interval, since $\det(\mathbf{H}(x)) = 0$, almost everywhere on singular intervals. Then the canonical system \mathbf{H} on $(0, \ell - \delta)$ gives a de Branges subspace, $\mathcal{H}(E_\epsilon)$ of $\mathcal{H}(E)$ with $\tau(E_\epsilon) = \tau(E) - \epsilon$. \square

Finally, we discuss the concept of *associated functions* to a given de Branges space.

Definition 3. *An entire function S is said to be associated with a de Branges spaces $\mathcal{H}(E)$ if whenever $S(\lambda) \neq 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}(E)$, we have*

$$\frac{f(z)S(\lambda) - f(\lambda)S(z)}{z - \lambda} \in \mathcal{H}(E).$$

Examples of associated functions include E , $A = 2^{-1}(E + E^\#)$, and $B = -i2^{-1}(E - E^\#)$. An entire function S is associate with the de Branges space $\mathcal{H}(E)$ if and only if S/E , $S^\#/E$ are of bounded type, non-positive mean-type in \mathbb{C}_+ and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+t^2} \frac{|S(t)|^2}{|E(t)|^2} dt < \infty.$$

This characterization can be reformulated as follows.

Proposition 3. *The entire function S is associated to $\mathcal{H}(E)$ if and only if $S \in \mathcal{H}((z+i)E)$. In particular, if E is regular then for $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, the exponential function $z \mapsto e^{i\beta z}$ is associated to $\mathcal{H}(E)$ if and only if $|\beta| \leq \tau(E)$.*

4 The model

We now turn to the construction of the analytic model for an admissible pair D and V . The idea is fairly straightforward and reminiscent from the spectral theory of linear differential operators. It is based on the simple observation given in the lemma below. The more subtle part is to identify the objects resulting from the constructions.

Throughout in what follows we shall denote by A the densely defined self-adjoint restriction of D given in assumption (iii) and by $\Lambda = \sigma(A)$. Moreover, let ϕ_0 a non-zero vector in $\ker D$. Recall that by assumption (ii) ϕ_0 spans $\ker(D)$.

Lemma 2. *For each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $\ker(D - \lambda I)$ is spanned by*

$$\phi_\lambda = (I - \lambda V)^{-1} \phi_0.$$

Moreover, the set

$$\{u_\lambda = \frac{1}{\|\phi_\lambda\|} \phi_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\},$$

is an orthonormal basis of H .

Proof. The statement is almost self-explanatory. We have that

$$\phi_\lambda = (I - \lambda V)^{-1} \phi_0 = \phi_0 + \lambda V(I - \lambda V)^{-1} \phi_0 = \phi_0 + \lambda V \phi_\lambda,$$

so that $\phi_\lambda \in \mathcal{D}(D)$ and $D\phi_\lambda = \lambda DV\phi_\lambda = \lambda\phi_\lambda$, i.e. $\phi_\lambda \in \ker(D - \lambda I)$. Conversely, if $Du = \lambda u$, it follows that $D(I - \lambda V)u = 0$, i.e. u is a multiple of ϕ_λ . The second part follows from the first, the fact that the resolvent of A is compact, and the spectral theorem. □

With the lemma in hand we can proceed to construct our model.

Let \mathcal{H} be the space of entire functions

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ \hat{f} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C}) : \hat{f}(\lambda) = \langle f, \phi_{\bar{\lambda}} \rangle_H, \text{ for some } f \in H \right\}. \quad (10)$$

The second part of Lemma 2 shows that \hat{f} is uniquely determined by f , as well as by the values $\hat{f}(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$. In particular, we can define a norm on \mathcal{H} by

$$\|\hat{f}\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|f\|_H, \quad (11)$$

which makes the map $\mathcal{W} : H \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{W}f = \hat{f}$ unitary.

The unitary map \mathcal{W} can be seen as a generalized Fourier transform associated to the operator D . If $D = -id/dx$, then \mathcal{W} is the classical (inverse) Fourier transform and if D is a regular Schrödinger operator it is nothing but the classical Weyl-Titchmarsh transform. The usual gain from considering such analytic models is a much more tractable form of the operators involved in the process.

We shall relate the operators D, V and the self-adjoint restriction A of D acting on H , to the forward and backward shifts M_z, L acting on \mathcal{H} . More precisely, we consider the operator M_z of multiplication by the independent variable acting on \mathcal{H} ($M_z f = zf$), with the maximal domain of definition

$$\mathcal{D}(M_z) = \{f \in \mathcal{H} : zf \in \mathcal{H}\},$$

and the backward shift L on \mathcal{H} formally defined by

$$Lg(z) = \frac{g(z) - g(0)}{z}, \quad g \in \mathcal{H}, z \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (12)$$

Proposition 4. *With the above notations we have:*

- (i) $\mathcal{W}V^*\mathcal{W}^{-1} = L$,
- (ii) If $x \in \mathcal{D}(D^*)$ then $\mathcal{W}x \in \mathcal{D}(M_z)$ and $\mathcal{W}D^*x = M_z\mathcal{W}x$.
- (iii) M_z is a closed symmetric operator with

$$(M_z - \lambda I)\mathcal{D}(M_z) = \{f \in \mathcal{H} : f(\lambda) = 0\}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C},$$

Proof. (i) If $x \in H$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}V^*x(\lambda) &= \langle x, V\phi_{\bar{\lambda}} \rangle = \langle x, V(1 - \bar{\lambda}V)^{-1}\phi_0 \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda}(\langle x, (1 - \bar{\lambda}V)^{-1}\phi_0 \rangle - \langle x, \phi_0 \rangle) = L\mathcal{W}x(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) If $x \in \mathcal{D}(D^*)$ then

$$\mathcal{W}D^*x(\lambda) = \langle x, D\phi_{\bar{\lambda}} \rangle = \lambda\mathcal{W}x(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C},$$

which gives the assertion.

(iii) If (f_n) is a sequence in $\mathcal{D}(M_z)$ with $f_n \rightarrow f$, $M_z f_n \rightarrow g$ in \mathcal{H} we use the continuity of point evaluations on \mathcal{H} to obtain

$$g(\lambda) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda f_n(\lambda) = \lambda \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(\lambda) = \lambda f(\lambda),$$

which shows that the graph of M_z is closed. To see that M_z is symmetric we use the following claim:

If $x, y \in H$ satisfy $\langle x, \phi_0 \rangle = \langle y, \phi_0 \rangle = 0$ then $\langle V^*x, y \rangle = \langle x, V^*y \rangle$. By (i), an equivalent formulation is: If $u, v \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfy $u(0) = v(0) = 0$ then

$$\langle Lu, v \rangle = \langle u, Lv \rangle \quad (13)$$

With (13) in hand, for $f, g \in \mathcal{D}(M_z)$ write $f = Lu$, $g = Lv$ with $u = M_z f$, $v = M_z g$ and since $u(0) = v(0) = 0$, an application of (13) gives the symmetry of M_z .

To verify the claim, recall that H has an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of A which have the form

$$e_\lambda = c_\lambda (I - \lambda V)^{-1} \phi_0, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

We have

$$(I - \lambda V)^{-1} \phi_0 = \phi_0 + \lambda V (I - \lambda V)^{-1} \phi_0,$$

and from $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\langle x, \phi_0 \rangle = \langle y, \phi_0 \rangle = 0$ we obtain

$$\langle V^* x, y \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \langle x, V e_\lambda \rangle \langle e_\lambda, y \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{\lambda} \langle x, e_\lambda \rangle \lambda \langle V e_\lambda, y \rangle = \langle x, V^* y \rangle$$

which gives the claim and concludes the proof. \square

Another piece of information of crucial importance regards the structure of the underlying model space \mathcal{H} . This is described in the main result of this section. Recall that the HB function E is called regular if $[(z + i)E]^{-1} \in H^2(\mathbb{C}_+)$.

Theorem 8. *There exists a regular HB function, E , with no real zeros, and a constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $e^{i\alpha z} \mathcal{W}H = \mathcal{H}(E)$ as Hilbert spaces.*

The result can be seen as a theorem related to the axiomatic definition of de Branges spaces of entire functions described in Theorem 5. More precisely, Theorem 8 can be deduced from the description of Hilbert spaces of entire functions which only satisfy the first two conditions characterizing de Branges spaces but not necessarily the third.

Theorem 9. *Let \mathcal{N} be a Hilbert space of entire functions without common zeros and satisfying*

(i) *For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ the linear functional $f \mapsto f(\lambda)$ is bounded,*

(ii) *For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, such that $f(\lambda) = 0$ we have $\frac{z - \bar{\lambda}}{z - \lambda} f \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\|\frac{z - \bar{\lambda}}{z - \lambda} f\| = \|f\|$.*

Then there exists a zero free entire function u , satisfying $uu^\# \equiv 1$ and a HB function E with no real zeros, such that

$$u\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{H}(E),$$

and multiplication by u is a unitary map from \mathcal{N} onto $\mathcal{H}(E)$. If, in addition, one of the following conditions holds

1. \mathcal{N} is a subspace of a de Branges space $\mathcal{H}(W)$,
2. \mathcal{N} is invariant for the backward shift L and $\sigma(L|\mathcal{N}) = \{0\}$,

then $u(z) = e^{i\alpha z}$, for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Moreover, if the second assumption holds then E is regular and $|\alpha| \leq \tau(E)$.

Proof. By assumption (i), \mathcal{N} has a reproducing kernel $k^\mathcal{N}$. By Theorem 4.1 in [4], or by the proof of Theorem 23 in [14] it follows that $k^\mathcal{N}$ has the form

$$k^\mathcal{N}(z, \lambda) = k_\lambda^\mathcal{N}(z) = \frac{F(z)\overline{F(\lambda)} - G(z)\overline{G(\lambda)}}{2\pi i(\bar{\lambda} - z)}, \quad (14)$$

where F and G are the entire functions given by

$$\begin{cases} F(z) = \sqrt{\pi}k_i^{\mathcal{N}}(z)k_i^{\mathcal{N}}(i)^{-1/2}(z+i) \\ G(z) = \sqrt{\pi}k_{-i}^{\mathcal{N}}(z)k_{-i}^{\mathcal{N}}(-i)^{-1/2}(z-i) \end{cases} . \quad (15)$$

Note that (14) together with the assumption that \mathcal{N} has no common zeros implies that F and G have no common zeros in \mathbb{C} . Indeed, by (14) $F(\lambda) = G(\lambda) = 0$ implies $k_\lambda^{\mathcal{N}} \equiv 0$ which contradicts this assumption on \mathcal{N} .

Now set $\lambda = \bar{z} \in \mathbb{C}$ in (14) and note that since the denominator in (14) vanishes, the numerator must vanish as well, i.e.

$$F(\bar{z})\overline{F(z)} = G(\bar{z})\overline{G(z)} \Leftrightarrow F^\#(z)F(z) = G^\#(z)G(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (16)$$

In particular, neither F nor G can have a real zero x , otherwise from $|F(x)|^2 = |G(x)|^2$ we would conclude that x is a common zero of these functions which cannot hold by the above argument. Moreover, from above if $F(\lambda) = 0$, then $G(\lambda) \neq 0$, hence by (16) it follows that $G^\#(\lambda) = 0$ and the order of the zero λ for $G^\#$ is at least as large as the order of the zero λ for F . Thus the function $v = G^\#/F$ is entire and similarly, $F^\#/G = 1/v^\#$ is entire, i.e. v has no zeros in \mathbb{C} . Finally, from the equality $|F(x)|^2 = |G(x)|^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we see that $|v| = 1$ on \mathbb{R} . Equivalently, $vv^\# = 1$.

Set $u = v^{1/2}$ and $E = uF$. Then E is zero-free on \mathbb{R} , $E^\# = u^\#F^\# = \frac{F^\#}{u}$ and the inequality $|E(z)| > |E^\#(z)|$, $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ is equivalent to

$$|u(z)|^2|F(z)| = |G^\#(z)| > |F^\#(z)|, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

which follows from

$$0 < |k_\lambda^{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda)| = \frac{|F(\lambda)|^2 - |G(\lambda)|^2}{4\operatorname{Im} \lambda}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_-.$$

Thus, E is a HB function and the equalities

$$u(z)\overline{u(\lambda)}k_\lambda^{\mathcal{N}}(z) = k_\lambda^E(z), \quad k_\lambda^{\mathcal{N}}(z) = \frac{1}{u(z)\overline{u(\lambda)}}k_\lambda^E(z),$$

give that multiplication by u is unitary.

To prove the second part, we shall show that both conditions imply that u is of bounded type in \mathbb{C}_+ . Since $|u| = 1$ on the real line, it will follow that $u(z) = e^{i\alpha z}$, for some real number α and all $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

1. If \mathcal{N} is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}(W)$ then from the formulas defining F, G in (15) it follows that

$$u^2(z) = \frac{(k_{-i}^{\mathcal{N}})^\#(z)(k_{-i}^{\mathcal{N}}(-i))^{-1/2}}{k_i^{\mathcal{N}}(z)(k_i^{\mathcal{N}}(i))^{-1/2}}.$$

Since $k_i^{\mathcal{N}}$ and $k_{-i}^{\mathcal{N}}$ belong to $\mathcal{H}(W)$, it follows that $k_i^{\mathcal{N}}/W, (k_{-i}^{\mathcal{N}})^\#/W \in H^2(\mathbb{C}_+)$ and so as a quotient of two H^2 -functions, u^2 is of bounded type and obviously so is u .

2. Assume that \mathcal{N} is backward-shift invariant denote this operator by L and assume that $\sigma(L) = \{0\}$. A simple computation reveals that if $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, the operator $L(1 - \lambda L)^{-1}$ is given by

$$L(1 - \lambda L)^{-1}h(z) = \frac{h(z) - h(\lambda)}{z - \lambda}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

If $u\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{H}(E)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}(E)$, then from $uL(I - \lambda L)^{-1}u^\#f \in \mathcal{H}(E)$ we obtain after a direct computation using $uu^\# = 1$ that the function

$$z \rightarrow \frac{f(z)u(\lambda) - f(\lambda)u(z)}{z - \lambda}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{H}(E)$, that is, u is associated to $\mathcal{H}(E)$. By the definition of this space, it follows that $u^\#$ is associated to $\mathcal{H}(E)$ as well. Thus u/E , $u^\#/E \in (z+i)H^2(\mathbb{C}_+)$ and since $uu^\# = 1$, we have that

$$E^{-2} = \frac{u}{E} \frac{u^\#}{E} \in (z+i)^2 H^1(\mathbb{C}_+).$$

Then E is regular, in particular, of bounded type and consequently $u = E(u/E)$ is of bounded type in \mathbb{C}_+ . Then $u(z) = e^{i\alpha z}$ and $|\alpha| \leq \tau(E)$ because u is associated to $\mathcal{H}(E)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 8. By Proposition 4 (i) the space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{W}H$ is L -invariant with $\sigma(L|\mathcal{H}) = \sigma(V^*|H) = \{0\}$, hence by the previous theorem it will suffice to verify that \mathcal{H} satisfies the statements:

(i) For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ the linear functional $\lambda \mapsto f(\lambda)$ is bounded,

(ii) For $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, such that $f(\lambda) = 0$ we have $\frac{z-\bar{\lambda}}{z-\lambda}f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\|\frac{z-\bar{\lambda}}{z-\lambda}f\| = \|f\|$.

(i) is obvious by definition, since for $f = \mathcal{W}x$

$$|f(\lambda)| = |\langle x, \phi_{\bar{\lambda}} \rangle| \leq \|x\|_H \|\phi_{\bar{\lambda}}\|_H = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|\phi_{\bar{\lambda}}\|_H.$$

For part (ii) the equality

$$L(I - \lambda L)^{-1}f(z) = \frac{f(z) - f(\lambda)}{z - \lambda},$$

and the identity

$$\frac{z - \bar{\lambda}}{z - \lambda} = 1 + \frac{\lambda}{z - \lambda} - \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{z - \lambda},$$

show that $\frac{z-\bar{\lambda}}{z-\lambda}f \in \mathcal{H}$, when $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, such that $f(\lambda) = 0$. To verify the equality of norms, we use Proposition 4 (iii) and note that the equality is equivalent to the fact that the Cayley transform of the symmetric operator M_z is isometric. \square

Let us briefly discuss the applications of Theorem 8 to some of the situations considered in Section 2.

Examples 1. 1) *Standard differentiation and Volterra.* Here $H = L^2(a, b)$, $D = -i\frac{d}{dx}$ defined on the absolutely continuous functions in $[a, b]$ and

$$Vf(x) = i \int_a^x f(t)dt.$$

Since $\phi_z(t) = e^{i(t-a)z}$ a direct computation yields

$$\mathcal{W}f(z) = e^{-iaz} \int_a^b f(t)e^{itz} dt, \quad \mathcal{W}H = e^{i\frac{b-a}{2}z} PW\left(-\frac{b-a}{2}, \frac{b-a}{2}\right) = e^{i\frac{b-a}{2}z} \mathcal{H}(E),$$

with $E(z) = e^{-i\frac{b-a}{2}z}$.

2) *Regular Schrödinger operators.* In this case D and V are defined as in §2.2 The interesting fact

here is that $\mathcal{W}H$ is a de Branges space $\mathcal{H}(E)$, in particular, in the notation in Theorem 8 we have $\alpha = 0$. Indeed, it follows easily that in this case we have

$$\phi_{\bar{z}} = \overline{\phi_z}, \quad (17)$$

and since $H = L^2(a, b)$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{W}^{-1}(\mathcal{W}f)^\# = \bar{f}, \quad f \in L^2(a, b), \quad (18)$$

i.e. $g \rightarrow g^\#$ is an isometry on $\mathcal{W}H$. Then the claim follows by the above proof of Theorem 8 and Theorem 5.

3) *Canonical systems.* Here D, V are described in §2.3 with help of the Hamiltonian \mathbf{H} . The same argument as above shows that (17) and (18) continue to hold with obvious modifications, so that $\mathcal{W}H = \mathcal{H}(E)$ and $\alpha = 0$ in Theorem 8.

Even if assumption 1. in Theorem 9 is not directly involved in the description of our model space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{W}H$, the condition is interesting in its own right and the corresponding conclusion has useful applications related to the unicellularity of generalized Volterra operators as well as to the study of invariant subspaces of D .

Corollary 1. *Let \mathcal{N} be a Hilbert space of entire functions satisfying the assumptions (i) and (ii) in Theorem 9. Then $\mathcal{N} \subset e^{i\delta z}\mathcal{H}(G)$ for some $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and for some regular HB function G if and only if $\mathcal{N} = e^{i\gamma z}\mathcal{H}(F)$ for some $\mathcal{H}(F) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(G))$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with*

$$|\gamma - \delta| \leq \tau(G) - \tau(F).$$

The de Branges space $\mathcal{H}(F)$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ are uniquely determined by \mathcal{N} .

Proof. If $\mathcal{N} \subset e^{i\delta z}\mathcal{H}(G)$ we apply Theorem 9 to $e^{-i\delta z}\mathcal{N}$ to conclude that $e^{-i\delta z}\mathcal{N} = e^{i(\gamma-\delta)z}\mathcal{H}(F)$, with $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and F a HB function. If $f \in \mathcal{H}(F)$ we have $e^{i(\gamma-\delta)z}f \in \mathcal{H}(G)$ and also $(e^{i(\gamma-\delta)z}f)^\# = e^{-i(\gamma-\delta)z}f \in \mathcal{H}(G)$. This easily implies that $f \in \mathcal{H}(G)$, that is, $\mathcal{H}(F) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(G))$, since G is regular. In this case $F \in \mathcal{H}(z+i)G$ and if $f \in \mathcal{H}(F)$, from

$$e^{i(\gamma-\delta)z} \frac{f}{G} = e^{i(\gamma-\delta)z} \frac{f}{F} \frac{F}{G}$$

we see that the functions $e^{i(\gamma-\delta)z} \frac{f}{G}$, $e^{i(-\gamma+\delta)z} \frac{f^\#}{G}$ belong to $H^2(\mathbb{C}_+)$ if and only if the inequality in the statement holds. The converse is straightforward. Finally, for the uniqueness, use the above proof to conclude that $e^{i\gamma z}\mathcal{H}(F) = e^{i\delta z}\mathcal{H}(G)$ implies $\mathcal{H}(F) = \mathcal{H}(G)$, hence $\gamma = \delta$ from the inequality in the statement \square

Remark 2. The first part of the above proof shows that the general form $\mathcal{N} = e^{i\gamma z}\mathcal{H}(F)$ of nearly invariant subspaces \mathcal{N} of $e^{i\delta z}\mathcal{H}(G)$, without common zeros, remains true without the assumption that G is a regular HB function.

5 Generalized Volterra operators

The aim of this section is to explore invariant subspaces of right inverses of the generalized differentiation operator D , especially to characterize those which are unicellular. Let us begin with the observation that the construction of our model space \mathcal{H} depends essentially on the choice of the right

inverse V of the unbounded operator D considered in this paper. Of course, D has a collection of right inverses which are all rank-one perturbations of the chosen V . They have the form

$$V_x = V + \langle \cdot, x \rangle \phi_0, \quad (19)$$

where $x \in H$ is arbitrary but fixed. All of these operators are compact, but they are not necessarily quasi-nilpotent, and not necessarily unicellular. For example, if D is the classical differentiation operator with maximal domain in $L^2(a, b)$ and

$$Vf(t) = \int_a^t f(s)ds, \quad f \in L^2(a, b),$$

then $\sigma(V_x) = \{0\}$ if and only if

$$V_x f(t) = \int_x^t f(s)ds, \quad f \in L^2(a, b),$$

for some $c \in [a, b]$ and V_x is unicellular if and only if $x = a$, or $x = b$. It turns out that an analogous result continues to hold in the very general context as well. For this purpose it will be more convenient to represent V_x as operators acting on the model space. Since

$$V_x^* = V^* + \langle \cdot, \phi_0 \rangle x,$$

we obtain from Proposition 4 (i)

$$\mathcal{W}V_x^*\mathcal{W}^{-1}f(z) = \frac{f(z) - f(0)}{z} + f(0)\mathcal{W}x(z) = \frac{f(z) - f(0)(1 - z\mathcal{W}x(z))}{z}. \quad (20)$$

To establish the analogy to the standard example described above, we start by describing the quasi-nilpotent right inverses of D .

Proposition 5. *The compact operator V_x has spectrum $\{0\}$ if and only if there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\beta + \alpha| \leq \tau(E)$, such that $x = x_\beta$ with*

$$\mathcal{W}x_\beta(z) = \frac{1 - e^{i\beta z}}{z}.$$

Proof. Since V_x is compact, it is quasi-nilpotent if and only if V_x^* has no nonzero eigenvalues. A straightforward computation based on (20) shows that an eigenvector $y \in H$ of V_x^* corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfies

$$f(z) = \mathcal{W}y(z) = f(0) \frac{1 - z\mathcal{W}x(z)}{1 - \lambda z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Thus, $\sigma(V_x^*) = \{0\}$ if and only if the entire function $1 - z\mathcal{W}x(z)$ has no zeros in \mathbb{C} . Using Theorem 8 together with Theorem 4 we conclude that the function $g(z) = 1 - z\mathcal{W}x(z)$ is of exponential type, hence

$$g(z) = e^{az}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C},$$

for some fixed constant $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $z \rightarrow e^{i\alpha z}\mathcal{W}V_x^*\mathcal{W}^{-1}f(z)$, $z \rightarrow e^{i\alpha z}f(z)$ belong to $\mathcal{H}(E)$ it follows easily that

$$z \rightarrow \frac{e^{i\alpha z}g(z)}{E(z)} = \frac{e^{(a+i\alpha)z}}{E(z)} \in (z+i)H^2(\mathbb{C}_+). \quad z \rightarrow \frac{e^{-i\alpha z}g^\#(z)}{E(z)} = \frac{e^{(\bar{a}-i\alpha)z}}{E(z)} \in (z+i)H^2(\mathbb{C}_+).$$

Since E is regular, these can hold if and only if $a = i\beta$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|\beta + \alpha| \leq \tau(E)$, where the last inequality follows by comparing the mean-types of the functions involved. \square

For simplicity we shall denote the quasi-nilpotent left inverses of D described in Proposition 5 by V_β , $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $|\beta + \alpha| \leq \tau(E)$. Let us now turn to the unicellularity of these operators. Our main tool is Corollary 1 which immediately provides a complete characterization of the invariant subspaces of $\mathcal{W}V_\beta^*\mathcal{W}^{-1}$.

Proof of Theorem 1. V_β is unicellular if and only if $L_\beta = \mathcal{W}V_\beta^*\mathcal{W}^{-1}$ is unicellular. Since L_β is quasi-nilpotent, every nonzero closed invariant subspace \mathcal{N} is also invariant for $(I - \lambda L_\beta)^{-1}L_\beta$ given by

$$(I - \lambda L_\beta)^{-1}L_\beta f(z) = \frac{f(z) - f(\lambda)e^{i\beta(z-\lambda)}}{z - \lambda}, \quad z, \lambda \in \mathbb{C},$$

which shows that such a subspace \mathcal{N} is nearly invariant without common zeros. According to Corollary 1

$$\mathcal{N} = e^{i\gamma z}\mathcal{H}(F), \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{H}(F) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E)).$$

These subspaces are characterized by the inequalities in Corollary 1 and in Proposition 3, since L_β -invariance is equivalent to the fact that $e^{i(\beta-\gamma)z}$ is associated to $\mathcal{H}(F)$. The inequalities read

$$|\gamma + \alpha| \leq \tau(E) - \tau(F), \quad |\beta - \gamma| \leq \tau(F). \quad (21)$$

For example, if $\beta = \beta_+ = \tau(E) - \alpha$, we see that $|\gamma + \alpha| \leq \tau(E)$, and the second inequality gives $\gamma + \alpha \geq \tau(E) - \tau(F)$, that is, (21) is equivalent to

$$\gamma + \alpha = \tau(E) - \tau(F).$$

Thus if $\mathcal{N} = e^{i\gamma z}\mathcal{H}(F)$, $\mathcal{K} = e^{i\delta z}\mathcal{H}(G)$ are L_{β_+} -invariant with $\mathcal{H}(F), \mathcal{H}(G) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$, say $\mathcal{H}(F) \subset \mathcal{H}(G)$, then

$$|\gamma - \delta| = \tau(G) - \tau(F),$$

and another application of Corollary 1 gives $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{K}$, that is, L_{β_+} is unicellular. Similarly, it follows that L_{β_-} is unicellular.

If $\beta_- < \beta_+$, note first that $\tau(E)$ must be positive. Now choose $\beta \in (\beta_-, \beta_+)$ and use Lemma 1 to find $\mathcal{H}(F), \mathcal{H}(G) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ such that

$$\tau(F) = \frac{\beta - \beta_-}{2}, \quad \tau(G) = \frac{\beta_+ - \beta}{2},$$

and choose $\delta = \frac{\beta_+ + \beta}{2}$, $\gamma = \frac{\beta_- + \beta}{2}$. Then from

$$\beta - \gamma = \gamma - \beta_- = \frac{\beta - \beta_-}{2} = \tau(F), \quad \delta - \beta = \beta_+ - \delta = \frac{\beta_+ - \beta}{2} = \tau(G),$$

we deduce

$$\beta - \gamma = \tau(F), \quad |\gamma + \alpha| = \tau(E) - \tau(F), \quad \delta - \beta = \tau(G), \quad |\delta + \alpha| = \tau(G),$$

which shows that both spaces $\mathcal{N} = e^{i\gamma z}\mathcal{H}(F)$, $\mathcal{K} = e^{i\delta z}\mathcal{H}(G)$ are contained in $\mathcal{W}H$ and invariant for V_β . On the other hand,

$$\delta - \gamma = \tau(F) + \tau(G) > |\tau(F) - \tau(G)|,$$

hence, again by Corollary 1 we see that neither subspace is contained in the other subspace, that is V_β is not unicellular. \square

Corollary 2. *Let D and V be an admissible pair. Then V is unicellular if and only if $\tau(E) = |\alpha|$.*

A direct application of the proof gives the general form of V_β -invariant subspaces already mentioned in the Introduction.

Corollary 3. *If $\{0\} \neq \mathcal{M} \subset H$ is a V_β -invariant subspace, $|\beta + \alpha| \leq \tau(E)$, then there exist $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and a HB function F with $\mathcal{H}(F) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ such that*

$$\mathcal{WM} = (e^{i\gamma z} \mathcal{H}(F))^\perp, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$|\gamma + \alpha| \leq \tau(E) - \tau(F), \quad |\beta - \gamma| \leq \tau(F).$$

5.1 Some applications

Our first set of applications regards the situations described in Examples 1 and is based on the following observation. Given a positive definite measurable $n \times n$ matrix-valued function w on (a, b) , we denote as in Section 2 by $L^2((a, b), w)$ the corresponding weighted L^2 -space consisting of \mathbb{C}^n -valued functions with

$$\|f\|^2 = \int_a^b \langle wf(t), f(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} dt < \infty.$$

As usual we identify functions f, g with $wf = wg$ a.e..

Proposition 6. *Assume $H = L^2((a, b), w)$, V is unicellular and for every $c \in (a, b)$ the subspace*

$$M_c = \{f \in L^2((a, b), w) : wf|_{[a, c]} = 0 \text{ a.e.}\},$$

is invariant for V . Then every V -invariant subspace has the form M_c for some $c \in (a, b)$.

Proof. The reason is that the set of subspaces in the statement is a maximal totally ordered set. If M is V -invariant and nontrivial it must contain some M_c and is contained in some M_d for some $c, d \in (a, b)$, $c < d$ If

$$c_0 = \sup\{c : M_c \subset M\}, \quad d_0 = \inf\{d : M \subset M_d\},$$

then clearly, $c_0 = d_0$ and $M = M_{c_0} = M_{d_0}$ □

1) Of course, this gives a quick proof of the classical result on invariant subspaces of the standard Volterra operator.

2) Assume V is Green's operator V of a regular Schrödinger operator D on $[a, b]$. From 2) of Example 1, we know that the corresponding model is a de Branges space $\mathcal{H}(E)$. It is also well known that the eigenfunctions of a regular Schrödinger operator have order $1/2$, see, for example, [35] or [30], that is, the functions $\mathcal{H}(E)$ have order at most $1/2$, so that $\tau(E) = 0$ and by Corollary 2 the corresponding Green's operator is unicellular. In addition, $H = L^2(a, b)$ and the subspaces M_c in Proposition 6 are V -invariant. Thus, all invariant subspaces of this operators are of the form M_c , $c \in (a, b)$.

3) The admissible pairs (D, V) corresponding to a canonical system have a similar model (see 3) of Examples 1), that is $\mathcal{WH} = \mathcal{H}(E)$ for some HB function E , in particular, $\alpha = 0$. With the notations in §2.3, if \mathbf{H} is the Hamiltonian of the system then by Corollary 2 the operator V defined by

$$Vf(x) = -\Omega \int_0^x \mathbf{H}(t)f(t)dt, \quad f \in L^2((0, \ell); \mathbf{H}), \text{ or } f \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{H}}, \quad (22)$$

is unicellular if and only if the type of E is 0. The exponential type of E can be computed using the so called Krein-de Branges formula in terms of the associated Hamiltonian, see [37, 14, 36, 13] and (9) in Section 3, and it is given by

$$\tau(E) = \int_0^\ell \sqrt{\det(\mathbf{H}(x))} dx. \quad (23)$$

Since \mathbf{H} is positive definite, this implies that $\tau(E) = 0$ if and only if $\det \mathbf{H}(x) = 0$, for almost every x . Proposition 6 applies and we obtain the following result which actually contains the case of Green's operators of regular Schrödinger operators considered above.

Corollary 4. *Let V be the Green's operator, given by equation (22), corresponding to a canonical system on $(0, \ell)$. If $\det \mathbf{H}(x) = 0$ a.e. then the invariant subspaces of V are*

$$M_c = \{f \in L^2((0, \ell), \mathbf{H}) : f|_{[0, c]} = 0 \text{ a.e.}\}, \quad c \in (0, \ell).$$

If \mathbf{H} is not singular a.e. the situation is more complicated since V might fail to be unicellular. However, by Theorem 1 there always exist two rank one perturbations of V which are quasi-nilpotent and unicellular. These operators can be found with help of Proposition 5. Since $\alpha = 0$, it yields the equation

$$\int_0^\ell \langle \mathbf{H}(x)u_\pm(x), \phi_{\bar{z}}(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^2} dx = \frac{1 - e^{\pm i\tau(E)z}}{z}.$$

Although, $\tau(E)$ can be defined entirely in terms of the Hamiltonian via the Krein-de Branges formula (23) it seems to be a difficult task to find explicit solutions of this equation.

As pointed out in the introduction, the study of invariant subspaces of such Green's operators V was suggested by C. Remling ([36], notes to Chapter 5). One motivation is that understanding unicellularity in this context would lead to uniqueness theorems for Krein-de Branges canonical systems without appealing to the theory of de Branges spaces (given that said unicellularity was proven without de Branges spaces).

Let us now turn to self-adjoint operators with removable spectrum as considered in §2.4, that is, compact self-adjoint operators which possess a quasi-nilpotent rank one perturbation. We want to show that under natural assumptions such operators have rank one perturbations which are both quasi-nilpotent and unicellular.

Corollary 5. *Let A be an injective compact self-adjoint operator with simple spectrum on the separable Hilbert space H . Suppose there exists a rank one perturbation of A of the form*

$$V_{x,y}u = Au + \langle u, x \rangle y, \quad u \in H,$$

which is quasi-nilpotent and such that $y \notin \text{Ran}(A)$. Then there exists $z \in H$, such that the rank one perturbation

$$V_{z,y}u = Af + \langle u, z \rangle y, \quad u \in H,$$

is quasi-nilpotent and unicellular.

Proof of Theorem 5. Recall that A is an injective compact self-adjoint operator with removable spectrum. If $V_{x,y}$ is the quasi-nilpotent rank one perturbation in the statement with $y \notin \text{Ran}(A)$, define D by (8) and use Proposition 2 to conclude that $D, V_{x,y}$ is an admissible pair with $Dy = 0$. Then by Theorem 1 D has at least one unicellular quasi-nilpotent right inverse V which must have the form $V_{z,y}$ for some $z \in H$. \square

6 D -invariant subspaces

6.1 The space $C^\infty(D)$

We now turn our attention to the operator D and study some of its invariant subspaces. Following the classical case we first introduce our analogue of C^∞ using the simple observation below. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define inductively

$$\mathcal{D}(D^n) = \{x \in \mathcal{D}(D^{n-1}) : D^{n-1}x \in \mathcal{D}(D)\}.$$

Proposition 7. *We have*

$$\mathcal{D}(D^n) = \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k V^k \phi_0 + V^n x; a_k \in \mathbb{C}, 0 \leq k \leq n-1, x \in H \right\}.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{D}(D^n) \subset \mathcal{D}(D^{n-1})$. Moreover, each $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$ is a Hilbert space with respect to the norm

$$\|x\|_n^2 = \sum_{k=0}^n \|D^k x\|_H^2, \quad (24)$$

and the inclusion map from $\mathcal{D}(D^{n+1})$ into $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$ is compact.

Proof. Since $DV = I$, $Dx = y$ implies

$$x = Vy + a_0 \phi_0,$$

which gives the result for $n = 1$. If we assume the assertion holds true for $n-1$ then any $y \in \mathcal{D}(D^{n-1})$ has the form $y = p(V)\phi_0 + V^{n-1}x$ with p a polynomial of degree at most $n-2$. Then $D^{n-1}y \in \mathcal{D}(D)$, is equivalent to

$$x = c\phi_0 + Vz \Rightarrow y = c\phi_0 + Vp(V)\phi_0 + V^n z,$$

which concludes the proof of the first part. The remaining part is straightforward. For example, the compactness assertion follows directly from the compactness of V on H . \square

Remark 3. 1) The argument actually shows that $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$ is the maximal domain of D^n .

2) Obviously, $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$ is invariant for any right inverse of D . If the right inverse in question is quasi-nilpotent on H , the same will hold on $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$. Also, the compactness of the inclusion implies that the restriction of any right inverse of D to this space is compact as well.

Recall that the eigenvectors of D are $\phi_\lambda = (1 - \lambda V)^{-1} \phi_0$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ which obviously belong to $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Corollary 6. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\Phi(\lambda) = \phi_\lambda$ is an entire $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$ -valued function with*

$$\Phi^{(k)}(\lambda) = k! V^k (1 - \lambda V)^{-k-1} \phi_0,$$

and the linear span of $\{\Phi(\lambda) = \phi_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$ is dense in $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$.

Proof. The first part follows directly from the simple observation that $V|_{\mathcal{D}(D^n)}$ is quasi-nilpotent, since by (24) we have for $m > n$

$$\|V^m\|_n^2 = \sum_{k=0}^n \|V^{m-k} x\|_H^2.$$

To verify the density of $\bigvee\{\phi_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$, choose $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\{\phi_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is an orthogonal basis for H . Then every $x \in H$ belongs to the closed linear span of these vectors, hence by a repeated application of V , there exists a polynomial q such that

$$V^n x + q(V)\phi_0 \in \overline{\bigvee\{\phi_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}} \subset \overline{\bigvee\{\phi_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}}.$$

Now by the definition of the derivative,

$$\frac{1}{k!}\phi^{(k)}(0) = V^k \phi_0 \in \overline{\bigvee\{\phi_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}}, \quad k \geq 0,$$

hence the set on the right contains $p(V)\phi_0$ for any polynomial p and Proposition 7 gives the desired result. \square

Let us now turn to our analogue of C^∞ defined as

$$C^\infty(D) = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{D}(D^n). \quad (25)$$

The space appears naturally as a projective limit of the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$ (see [32], Chapter 3). Alternatively, the topology on $C^\infty(D)$ is given by the translation-invariant metric

$$d(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \frac{\|D^j x - D^j y\|_H}{1 + \|D^j x - D^j y\|_H}.$$

and $C^\infty(D)$ is complete and separable with respect to this metric. The operator D together with all its right inverses act continuously on $C^\infty(D)$. Moreover, $C^\infty(D)$ is a dense subspace of H , since it contains all eigenvectors ϕ_λ , $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ of D .

Recall from [32] that any continuous linear functional φ on $C^\infty(D)$ can be written in the form

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n \langle D^j x, y_j \rangle_H, \quad (26)$$

with $y_j \in H \setminus \{0\}$, $0 \leq j \leq n$ fixed. The representation is not unique and the smallest n for which such a representation holds will be called the *order* of φ . Obviously, φ has order at most n if and only if it extends to a continuous linear functional on $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$. The space of these continuous functionals will be denoted by $(C^\infty(D))'$.

As an application we prove the following proposition which collects basic density results that will be needed in the sequel.

Proposition 8. *We have*

- (i) $\{\phi_z\}_{z \in \mathbb{C}}$ has dense linear span in $C^\infty(D)$,
- (ii) For any $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, the set $\{[V(I - \lambda_0 V)^{-1}]^j \phi_{\lambda_0} : j \geq 0\}$ has dense linear span in $C^\infty(D)$.

Proof. (i) is a direct application of Corollary 6. (ii) If φ is a continuous linear functional on $C^\infty(D)$ which annihilates the set in the statement, by (26) and another application of Corollary 6 it follows that all derivatives of the entire function $\lambda \mapsto \varphi(\phi_\lambda)$ vanish at λ_0 . Then the function vanishes identically and the result follows by (i). \square

We shall extend our generalized Fourier transform \mathcal{W} from Section 4 to the dual of $C^\infty(D)$ by

$$\mathcal{W}\varphi(z) = \varphi(\phi_z)^\# = \sum_{j=0}^N \langle y_j, D^j \phi_z \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^N z^j \langle y_j, \phi_z \rangle. \quad (27)$$

The dual space $(C^\infty(D))'$ can be endowed with the weak-star topology, i.e. the smallest topology such that all maps $\varphi \mapsto \varphi(x)$, $x \in C^\infty(D)$ are continuous.

We shall use repeatedly the following results. The first is an appropriate version of the Krein-Smulian theorem and can be found in [32], Chapter 6.

Proposition 9. *For $r > 0$ let*

$$B(0, r)^\circ = \{\varphi \in (C^\infty(D))' : |\varphi(x)| \leq 1 \text{ whenever } d(x, 0) \leq r\}.$$

A convex set $C \subset (C^\infty(D))'$ is w^ -closed if and only if $C \cap B(0, r)^\circ$ is w^* -closed for all $r > 0$.*

Note that the separability of $C^\infty(D)$ implies that the w^* -topology on each polar set $B(0, r)^\circ$ is metrizable. For this reason, it is sufficient to prove the sequential closedness of the sets involved in the above proposition. The following observation is very useful in this sense.

Proposition 10. *If (φ_n) converges weak-star to φ in $(C^\infty(D))'$ then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the order of φ_n is at most N for all $n \geq 1$. In addition, the extensions of φ_n to $\mathcal{D}(D^N)$ converge weak-star as well.*

Proof. By uniform boundedness (or Baire's theorem) there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $|\varphi_n(x)| \leq 1$ whenever $d(x, 0) \leq \delta$ and $n \geq 1$. Then if $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies $\sum_{j>N} 2^{-j} < \frac{\delta}{2}$, we have

$$d(x, 0) < \sum_{j=0}^N 2^{-j} \frac{\|D^j x\|_H}{1 + \|D^j x\|_H} + \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \sum_{j=0}^N \|D^j x\| + \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \sqrt{N} \|x\|_N + \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

This implies $|\varphi_n(x)| \leq 1$ whenever $\|x\|_N \leq \frac{\delta}{2\sqrt{N}}$ and $n \geq 1$, i.e. the order of φ_n is at most N for all $n \geq 1$. The sequence of restrictions of φ_n to $\mathcal{D}(D^N)$ is uniformly bounded and converges on a dense subspace of $\mathcal{D}(D^N)$. \square

6.2 Spectra of restrictions and annihilators of invariant subspaces

The main purpose of this section is to consider closed subspaces of $C^\infty(D)$ which are invariant under D . We shall denote by \mathcal{I} the collection of all such subspaces.

As in the case of standard differentiation on intervals contained in the real line, the structure of such subspaces is related to the spectrum of the restriction of the operator (see [3]). We begin with some typical examples of invariant subspaces for D and spectra of the corresponding restriction. To this end, it is useful to recall (see, for example, the proof of Proposition 7) that the solutions of $(D - \lambda I)x = y$ have the form

$$x = c\phi_\lambda + V(1 - \lambda V)^{-1}y, \quad c \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (28)$$

Examples 2. 1) Let K be one of the spaces H , $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$, $n \geq 1$, or $C^\infty(D)$, and let $M \subset K$ be a proper closed V -invariant subspace. Then

$$\mathcal{J}_M = \{x \in C^\infty(D) : D^j x \in M, \text{ for all } j \geq 0\}.$$

belongs to \mathcal{J} and satisfies $\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}_M}) = \emptyset$. To see this, note first that $\sigma(V|_{\mathcal{J}_M}) = \{0\}$. This is obvious when $K = H$, or when $K = \mathcal{D}(D^n)$, $n \geq 1$. In the case $K = C^\infty(D)$ apply the previous observation to the closure of M in $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$, $n \geq 1$ and use the fact that if $y \in C^\infty(D)$ the solution x of $(\lambda V - I)x = y$ belongs to $C^\infty(D)$ as well. Thus, M is invariant for $(V - \mu)(1 - \lambda V)^{-1}$, $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}$, in particular, it cannot contain any ϕ_λ , $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Otherwise, since $\phi_z = (I - \lambda V)(I - zV)^{-1}\phi_\lambda$, M would contain all such elements and equal H . This shows that and if $y \in \mathcal{J}_M$, the unique solution $x \in \mathcal{J}_M$ of the equation $(D - \lambda I)x = y$ is given by

$$x = V(1 - \lambda V)^{-1}y \in \mathcal{J}_M,$$

and the claim follows.

We also note that these assertions continue to hold if V is replaced by any other quasi-nilpotent right inverse of D .

2) The spectrum of D on the whole space $C^\infty(D)$ equals \mathbb{C} . In the classical case, i.e. $D = -i\frac{d}{dx}$ on $C^\infty(a, b)$, there are also smaller D -invariant subspaces with this property, for example

$$\mathcal{J} = \{f \in C^\infty(a, b) : f|_{I \cup J} = 0\},$$

where I, J are two disjoint closed subintervals of (a, b) .

3) Let A be a self-adjoint restriction of D with compact resolvent. Then there exists an orthogonal basis of eigenvectors $\{\phi_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \sigma(A)}$, where $\sigma(A) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is discrete.

For $\emptyset \neq \Lambda \subset \sigma(A)$, let \mathcal{J}_Λ be the closed span of $\{\phi_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ in $C^\infty(D)$. This space is D -invariant since D is continuous on $C^\infty(D)$, and for every finite linear combination

$$x = \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \phi_{\lambda_j}, \quad a_j \in \mathbb{C}, \lambda_j \in \Lambda,$$

we have $Dx \in \mathcal{J}_\Lambda$.

We claim that $\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}_\Lambda}) = \Lambda$. Indeed, it is easy to verify that for $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Lambda$, the linear map R_μ defined on the span of $\{\phi_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ by

$$R_\mu \left(\sum_{j=1}^m a_j \phi_{\lambda_j} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{a_j}{\lambda_j - \mu} \phi_{\lambda_j} \quad a_j \in \mathbb{C}, \lambda_j \in \Lambda,$$

extends continuously to \mathcal{J}_Λ and is an inverse of $(D - \mu I)|_{\mathcal{J}_\Lambda}$.

In the classical case when $D = -i\frac{d}{dx}$ on some interval on the real line, the three examples above describe completely the types of spectra that can occur for the restriction to an invariant subspace; \mathbb{C} , \emptyset or a discrete subset of a complex plane (see [3]). It turns out that this result continues to hold in the general case.

Theorem 10. *For each $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{J}$ the spectrum $\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}})$ is either the whole complex plane, \mathbb{C} , or the discrete (possibly void) set*

$$\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}}) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \phi_\lambda \in \mathcal{J}\}.$$

If $\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}}) \neq \mathbb{C}, \emptyset$ then each $\lambda \in \sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}})$ has spectral multiplicity one.

Proof. By Proposition 8 the set $\{\lambda : \phi_\lambda \in \mathcal{J}\}$ must be discrete. Therefore, it will be sufficient to prove that if $\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}}) \neq \mathbb{C}$, then for each $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, $(D - \mu I)|_{\mathcal{J}}$ is bijective whenever it is injective. The continuity of the inverse is automatic since \mathcal{J} is Fréchet. To this end, assume $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}$, $\lambda \neq \mu$,

are such that $(D - \lambda I)|_{\mathcal{J}}$ has the continuous inverse $R : \mathcal{J} \mapsto \mathcal{J}$, and $(D - \mu I)|_{\mathcal{J}}$ is injective, i.e. $\phi_\mu \notin \mathcal{J}$. We need to show that $(D - \mu I)|_{\mathcal{J}}$ is surjective. This is immediate in the case when $I + (\lambda - \mu)R$ is invertible on \mathcal{J} since $(I + (\lambda - \mu)R)^{-1}x$ is a solution of $(D - \mu I)x = y$.

The remainder of the proof consists in removing the above assumption on $I + (\lambda - \mu)R$. Observe that from $(D - \lambda I)R = I$ it follows that

$$Rx = \ell(x)\phi_\lambda + V(I - \lambda V)^{-1}x, \quad x \in \mathcal{J}, \quad (29)$$

where ℓ extends to a continuous linear functional on $C^\infty(D)$. Use (26) to choose $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that ℓ is a continuous linear functional on $\mathcal{D}(D^{n_0})$, and for $n \geq n_0$ and let \mathcal{J}_n be the closure of \mathcal{J} in $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$. By Proposition 7 (see also 2) of Remark 3) it follows that R extends to a compact operator on \mathcal{J}_n , $n \geq n_0$. Moreover, if $n > 1$ this extension satisfies

$$(D - \lambda I)Rx = x, \quad x \in \mathcal{J}_n.$$

Indeed, if (x_k) is a sequence in \mathcal{J} converging to $x \in \mathcal{J}_n$, then $Rx_k \rightarrow Rx$ in \mathcal{J}_n , and since D is continuous from $\mathcal{D}(D^n)$ to $\mathcal{D}(D^{n-1})$ we obtain

$$(D - \lambda I)Rx = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (D - \lambda I)Rx_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = x,$$

where the above limits are considered in $\mathcal{D}(D^{n-1})$. Now use the assumption that $\phi_\mu \notin \mathcal{J}$ to find $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi_\mu \notin \mathcal{J}_n$ if $n \geq n_1$. Then from above $I + (\lambda - \mu)R|_{\mathcal{J}_n}$ is injective if $n > n_1$, since for $x \in \mathcal{J}_n$, $I + (\lambda - \mu)Rx = 0$ implies

$$0 = (D - \lambda I)(I + (\lambda - \mu)R)x = (D - \mu I)x,$$

which implies $x = 0$. But then, using the compactness of R , we conclude that $I + (\lambda - \mu)R|_{\mathcal{J}_n}$ is invertible. Thus, for such n we obtain exactly as above that for each $y \in \mathcal{J}$, the equation $(D - \mu I)x = y$ has the solution

$$x_n = ((I + (\lambda - \mu)R)|_{\mathcal{J}_n})^{-1}y.$$

Finally, we observe that the solutions x_n, x_m differ only by a multiple of $\phi_m u$ and since $m, n > n_1$ we conclude that $x_n = x_m = x \in \mathcal{J}$. □

Let us now turn to annihilators of nontrivial D -invariant subspaces.

Proposition 11. *Let $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{J}$ and let $\varphi \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ have order $N \geq 0$.*

(i) *If $\bar{\lambda} \notin \sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}})$ and $\mathcal{W}\varphi(\lambda) = 0$, then the continuous linear functional given by*

$$\varphi_\lambda(x) = \varphi(V(I - \bar{\lambda}V)^{-1}fx),$$

annihilates \mathcal{J} , if $N > 0$ it has order $N - 1$, and satisfies

$$\frac{\mathcal{W}\varphi(z)}{z - \lambda} = \mathcal{W}\varphi_\lambda(z).$$

(ii) *If \mathcal{J}^\perp contains a nonzero functional φ such that $\mathcal{W}\varphi$ has infinitely many zeros in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}})}$. Then there exists a nonzero $y \in H$ which annihilates \mathcal{J} .*

Proof. If $\bar{\lambda} \notin \sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}})$ the resolvent $R = (D - \bar{\lambda}I|_{\mathcal{J}})^{-1}$ has the form

$$Rx = \ell(x)\phi_{\bar{\lambda}} + V(I - \bar{\lambda}V)^{-1}x,$$

with ℓ a continuous linear functional on $C^\infty(D)$. Since $\mathcal{W}\varphi(\lambda) = 0$ it follows that

$$\varphi_\lambda(x) = \varphi(V(I - \bar{\lambda}V)^{-1}x) = \varphi(Rx) = 0,$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{J}$. By the form of φ it follows easily that φ_λ has order $N - 1$ if $N > 0$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{W}\varphi_\lambda(z) = \varphi(V(I - \bar{\lambda}V)^{-1}\phi_z)^\# = \varphi((z - \bar{\lambda})^{-1}(\phi_z - \phi_{\bar{\lambda}}))^\# = \frac{\mathcal{W}\varphi(z)}{z - \bar{\lambda}}.$$

(ii) follows by a repeated application of (i). \square

6.3 Residual subspaces and their annihilators

As pointed out before, we are especially interested in D -invariant subspaces \mathcal{J} with $\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}}) = \emptyset$. Such subspaces will be called *residual*. They possess an alternative characterization based on the following simple observation.

Lemma 3. *If $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{J}$ and p is a polynomial then $p(D)\mathcal{J}$ is closed.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $(D - \lambda I)\mathcal{J}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is closed. Let (x_k) be a sequence in \mathcal{J} such that $(D - \lambda I)x_k \rightarrow y \in H$. Then there is a sequence (c_k) in \mathbb{C} such that

$$V(I - \lambda V)^{-1}(D - \lambda I)x_k = x_k - c_k\phi_\lambda \rightarrow V(I - \lambda V)^{-1}y, \quad (30)$$

when $k \rightarrow \infty$. If $\phi_\lambda \in \mathcal{J}$, it follows that (x_k) converges to $x \in \mathcal{J}$ and $y = (D - \lambda I)x \in (D - \lambda I)\mathcal{J}$. If $\phi_\lambda \notin \mathcal{J}$, let φ be a continuous linear functional in \mathcal{J}^\perp with $\varphi(\phi_\lambda) = 1$. Then applying φ to both sides of (30) we obtain that (c_k) converges and as above, we obtain that (x_k) converges to $x \in \mathcal{J}$ and $y = (D - \lambda I)x \in (D - \lambda I)\mathcal{J}$. \square

With the lemma in hand, the characterization of residual subspaces is as follows.

Proposition 12. *A subspace $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{J}$ is residual if and only if*

$$\mathcal{J} = \bigcap \{p(D)\mathcal{J} : p \text{ polynomial}\}.$$

Proof. If $\sigma(D|_{\mathcal{J}}) = \emptyset$ we have $(D - \lambda)\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}$ for all λ and the equality in the statement holds. Conversely, if the equality holds, then $(D - \lambda I)\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}$ for each λ . Suppose for a contradiction that $D - \lambda_0 I$ is not injective for some λ_0 . Then for each $j \geq 0$ there exists a nonzero $x_j \in \mathcal{J}$, such that $(D - \lambda_0)^j x_j = \phi_{\lambda_0}$. From this it follows that $V_{\lambda_0}^j \phi_{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{J}$ for all $j \geq 0$, and $\mathcal{J} = C^\infty(D)$ by Proposition 8 (ii). \square

Note that for every subspace $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{J}$ we can consider its *residual part*

$$\mathcal{J}_{res} = \bigcap \{p(D)\mathcal{J} : p \text{ polynomial}\}.$$

By the above proposition this is a closed residual subspace of \mathcal{J}

Let us now turn to annihilators of residual subspaces. It turns out that these spaces can be described using the generalized Fourier transform \mathcal{W} .

To state our result we use the same notation as in Theorem 8, that is $\mathcal{W}H = e^{-i\alpha z}\mathcal{H}(E)$, with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 11. *Let $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{J}$ be residual. Then:*

(i) *If for all $0 \neq \varphi \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$, $\mathcal{W}\varphi$ has finitely many zeros in \mathbb{C} , there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\beta + \alpha| \leq \tau(E)$ such that*

$$\mathcal{W}\mathcal{J}^\perp = \{pe^{i\beta z} : p \text{ polynomial}\},$$

(ii) *If there exists $0 \neq \varphi \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ such that $\mathcal{W}\varphi$ has infinitely many zeros in \mathbb{C} then there exists a HB function F such that $\mathcal{H}(F) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ and a compact interval $J \subset [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$, of length $2\tau(F)$ and with midpoint σ such that*

$$\mathcal{W}\mathcal{J}^\perp = \{pg : g \in e^{i\sigma z}\mathcal{H}(F), p \text{ polynomial}\} \cup \{qe^{i\beta z} : \beta \in J, q \text{ polynomial}\}.$$

(iii) *The real number β from (i), the interval J as well as the set $\{pg : g \in e^{i\sigma z}\mathcal{H}(F), p \text{ polynomial}\}$ from (ii) are uniquely determined by the residual subspace \mathcal{J} .*

(iv) *Every subspace of $(C^\infty(D))'$ of the form described in (i) or (ii) is the annihilator of a residual subspace of $C^\infty(D)$.*

Proof. We begin with some simple observations regarding functionals $\varphi_\beta \in (C^\infty(D))'$ with $\mathcal{W}\varphi_\beta(z) = e^{i\beta z}$ for some fixed $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

a) The parameter β must be real and satisfy $\beta \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$, since by (26)

$$\mathcal{W}\varphi_\beta(z) = \sum_{j=0}^n z^j \mathcal{W}x_j(z),$$

with $\mathcal{W}x_j \in \mathcal{W}H = e^{i\alpha z}\mathcal{H}(E)$.

b) For every $\beta \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$, φ_β has order at most one. Indeed, by a) and Proposition 5 the operator V_β is a bounded right inverse of D on H . If we fix $x_0 \in H$ with $\mathcal{W}x_0(0) = 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{W}x_0 - e^{i\beta z} = \langle V_\beta^* x_0, D\phi_z \rangle.$$

Then by the density of $\{\phi_z : z \in \mathbb{C}\}$ in $C^\infty(D)$ we obtain

$$\varphi_\beta(x) = \langle x, x_0 \rangle - \langle Dx, V_\beta^* x_0 \rangle, \quad x \in C^\infty(D).$$

Even if this will only be used later, note that since $\|V_\beta\|$ are uniformly bounded in β , the same holds true for the norms of φ_β as functionals on $\mathcal{D}(D)$. Now let \mathcal{J} be residual and $\varphi \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ be such that the entire function of finite exponential type $\mathcal{W}\varphi$ has finitely many zeros in \mathbb{C} . Then $\mathcal{W}\varphi(z) = p(z)e^{i\beta z}$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$, where p is a polynomial and $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$. By a repeated application of Proposition 11 (i) together with observation a) above, it follows that $\beta \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$, $\varphi_\beta \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ and $\varphi = \varphi_\beta \circ p(D)$.

If all $\varphi \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ satisfy this condition, that is, under the assumption in (i), β is uniquely determined by \mathcal{J} . Indeed, if $\varphi_\beta, \varphi_\gamma \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ then $\mathcal{W}\varphi_\beta - \mathcal{W}\varphi_\gamma$ either has infinitely many zeros in \mathbb{C} , or $\beta = \gamma$. This proves (i) and the corresponding uniqueness assertion in (iii).

Let us now assume that there exists $0 \neq \varphi \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ such that $\mathcal{W}\varphi$ has infinitely many zeros. Another repeated application of Proposition 11 (i) shows that \mathcal{J}^\perp contains nonzero functionals of order zero, i.e. the closure \mathcal{J}_H of \mathcal{J} in H is strictly contained in H . Then

$$\mathcal{N} = \{\mathcal{W}y : y \in \mathcal{J}_H^\perp\},$$

is a nonzero nearly invariant subspace of $\mathcal{W}H$ without common zeros. By Corollary 1 we have

$$\mathcal{N} = e^{i\sigma z} \mathcal{H}(F),$$

with $\mathcal{H}(F) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ and

$$|\sigma + \alpha| \leq \tau(E) - \tau(F),$$

Thus, the first set displayed in (ii) coincides with the set of $\varphi \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ such that $\mathcal{W}\varphi$ has infinitely many zeros and as such, it is uniquely determined by \mathcal{J} . The remaining set of functionals in \mathcal{J}^\perp is, of course, uniquely determined by \mathcal{J} as well. It consists of functionals $\varphi \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ such that $\mathcal{W}\varphi$ has finitely many zeros. By the discussion at the beginning of the proof $\mathcal{W}\varphi = qe^{i\beta z}$, where q is a polynomial and $\beta \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$. Note that since $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{J}^\perp$ is invariant under multiplication by polynomials, $\varphi_\beta \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ whenever $e^{i(\beta - \sigma)z}$ is associated to $\mathcal{H}(F)$, that is, whenever $|\beta - \sigma| \leq \tau(F)$. Conversely, if $\varphi_\gamma \in \mathcal{J}^\perp$ then $\mathcal{W}(\varphi_\gamma - \varphi_\sigma) = e^{i\gamma z} - e^{i\sigma z}$ has infinitely many zeros in \mathbb{C} . By observation b) above this immediately implies that $e^{i(\gamma - \sigma)z}$ is associated to $\mathcal{H}(F)$, hence $|\gamma - \sigma| \leq \tau(F)$. The proof of (i)-(iii) is now complete.

To see (iv) we need to show that any subspace described in (i) or (ii) is weak-star closed. By Proposition 9 we need to show that if (φ_n) is a weak-star convergent sequence in such a subspace and also in $B^\circ(0, r)$ for some $r > 0$, then its weak-star limit φ lies in the subspace as well. Assume first that for infinitely many n we have

$$\mathcal{W}\varphi_n(z) = p_n(z)e^{i\beta_n z},$$

with p_n polynomials and either $\beta_n = \beta$, or $\beta_n \in J$ for all such n . Then by Proposition 10 it follows that the degrees of p_n are bounded by N for all n and by passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $\beta_n \rightarrow \beta_0$ in the second case. From the pointwise convergence of $p_n e^{i\beta_n z}$ we infer that (p_n) is pointwise convergent to a polynomial of degree at most N and the assertion follows.

The remaining case is when there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{W}\varphi_n$ has infinitely many zeros for all $n \geq n_0$ and converges weak-star to φ . In this case, the subspace in question has the form displayed in (ii) with some HB function F and some interval $J = [\sigma - \tau(F), \sigma + \tau(F)]$. Again by Proposition 10, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that each φ_n has order at most N , hence for $n \geq n_0$ we have $\mathcal{W}\varphi_n(z) = f_n(z) \sum_{k=0}^N p_{kn} z^k$, with $f_n \in e^{i\sigma z} \mathcal{H}(F)$, or equivalently,

$$\varphi_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^N p_{kn} \langle D^k x, y_n \rangle_H,$$

with $\mathcal{W}y_n = f_n \in e^{i\sigma z} \mathcal{H}(F)$. Fix $\beta \in J$ and write

$$\varphi_n \circ V_\beta^N(x) = \left\langle x, \sum_{k=0}^N p_{kn} (V_\beta^*)^{N-k} y_n \right\rangle_H.$$

Since $e^{i\sigma z} \mathcal{H}(F)$ is invariant for V_β^* , this implies $\mathcal{W}\varphi_n \circ V_\beta^N \in e^{i\sigma z} \mathcal{H}(F)$. If (φ_n) converges weak-star to φ in $(C^\infty(D))'$, then by Proposition 10 we obtain that $\mathcal{W}\varphi \circ V_\beta^N \in e^{i\sigma z} \mathcal{H}(F)$ as well. By a direct computation we obtain

$$\mathcal{W}\varphi \circ V_\beta^N = \frac{\mathcal{W}\varphi - qe^{i\beta z}}{z^N}$$

with q a polynomial, that is,

$$\mathcal{W}\varphi = \mathcal{W}\varphi \circ V_\beta^N \circ D^N = z^N \mathcal{W}\varphi \circ V_\beta^N = \mathcal{W}\varphi - qe^{i\beta z}$$

and the proof of (iv) follows. \square

The singleton $\{\beta\}$ from (i), or the interval J from (ii) which may reduce to a point as well, will be called *the residual interval* of the residual subspace \mathcal{J} .

A somewhat surprising aspect is that the first set displayed in (ii) does not necessarily determine the de Branges space $\mathcal{H}(F)$ uniquely. This is a more subtle matter which we now address. The issue is related to the well known fact that (see [14]) in de Branges spaces, $\mathcal{D}(M_z)$, the domain of the operator M_z of multiplication by the independent variable may fail to be dense in the space. In order to state our result we recall the correspondence between de Branges spaces and canonical systems, respectively Hamiltonians described in Section 3. Let us denote by \mathbf{H}_E the Hamiltonian associated to $\mathcal{H}(E)$ that way.

Proposition 13. *Let E be a regular HB function. The following are equivalent:*

(i) *There exist HB functions F, G with $\mathcal{H}(F), \mathcal{H}(G) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ with*

$$\{pg : g \in \mathcal{H}(F), p \text{ polynomial}\} = \{pg : g \in \mathcal{H}(G), p \text{ polynomial}\},$$

(ii) *There exists a HB function G with $\mathcal{H}(G) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ such that $\mathcal{D}(M_z|\mathcal{H}(G))$ is not dense in $\mathcal{H}(G)$,*

(iii) *\mathbf{H}_E has singular intervals.*

Proof. (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) is Lemma 7 in [7]. If (ii) holds use the axiomatic definition of de Branges spaces to conclude that $\mathcal{D}(M_z|\mathcal{H}(G))$ is a de Branges subspace of $\mathcal{H}(G)$, hence it belongs to $\text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ and the equality in (i) holds with $\mathcal{H}(F) = \mathcal{D}(M_z|\mathcal{H}(G))$. Indeed, since

$$\frac{f - (f/g)(\lambda)g}{z - \lambda} \in \mathcal{H}(F), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{H}(G), g(\lambda) \neq 0,$$

it follows that $f, g \in \{pg : g \in \mathcal{H}(F), p \text{ polynomial}\}$ which proves the claim. Conversely, if (i) holds we can assume without loss that $\mathcal{H}(F) \subset \mathcal{H}(G)$. Let $f \in \mathcal{H}(G)$ with $f \notin \mathcal{H}(F)$. By assumption there exists a polynomial p and $g \in \mathcal{H}(F)$, such that $f = gp$. Hence $f/p = g \in \mathcal{H}(F)$. If we choose the polynomial p to have minimal degree, then $zf/p \notin \mathcal{H}(F)$. Thus, if L denotes the backward shift on $\mathcal{H}(E)$,

$$\mathcal{H}(F) \subsetneq \{f \in \mathcal{H}(G) : Lf \in \mathcal{H}(F)\}.$$

Using again the axiomatic characterization of de Branges spaces it follows easily that the right hand side is a de Branges subspace of $\mathcal{H}(E)$ which we denote by $\mathcal{H}(G_1)$. If $g_0 \mathcal{H}(G_1) \cap \mathcal{H}(F)^\perp \setminus \{0\}$ and $h \in \mathcal{D}(M_z|\mathcal{H}(G_1))$, then

$$\langle h, g_0 \rangle = \langle Lzh, g_0 \rangle = 0,$$

because $Lzh \in \mathcal{H}(F)$. This shows that $\mathcal{D}(M_z|\mathcal{H}(G_1))$ is not dense in $\mathcal{H}(G_1)$ and the proof is complete. \square

6.4 General form of residual subspaces

A direct application of Theorem 11 is the following description of residual subspaces which is a refined version of Theorem 2. The result also shows that the situation described in 1) of Examples 2,

$$\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_M = \{x \in C^\infty(D) : D^j x \in M\},$$

is generic. Here $M \subset H$, or $M \subset \mathcal{D}(D^n)$, $n \geq 1$, or $C^\infty(D)$ is a closed V_β -invariant subspace for some β with $|\beta + \alpha| \leq \tau(E)$. Recall that given a residual subspace $\mathcal{J} \subset C^\infty(D)$, we have denoted by \mathcal{J}_H its closure in H

Theorem 12. *If $\mathcal{J} \subset C^\infty(D)$ is residual then*

$$\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_M,$$

where $M = V_\beta C^\infty(D)$ for some $\beta \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$, if $\mathcal{J}_H = H$ and $M = \mathcal{J}_H$ if $\mathcal{J}_H \neq H$. In this case, with the notations in Theorem 11 we have $\mathcal{J}_H = \mathcal{H}(F)^\perp$ which is V_β -invariant for all $\beta \in I$. In all cases, for β as above and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ we have $((D - \lambda I)|\mathcal{J})^{-1} = V_\beta(1 - \lambda V_\beta)^{-1}$.

The proof is based on the following simple observation.

Lemma 4. *If $|\beta + \alpha| \leq \tau(E)$ then $V_\beta C^\infty(D)$ is closed in $C^\infty(D)$ and every $\varphi \in (V_\beta C^\infty(D))^\perp$ satisfies*

$$\mathcal{W}\varphi(z) = ce^{i\beta z},$$

for some fixed $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and all $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. The fact that $V_\beta C^\infty(D)$ is closed in $C^\infty(D)$ follows immediately since both operators D, V_β are continuous on this space and satisfy $DV_\beta = I$. To see the second part, let $\varphi \in (V_\beta C^\infty(D))^\perp$ and write

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n \langle D^j x, y_j \rangle, \quad x \in C^\infty(D).$$

From $\varphi(V_\beta \phi_\lambda) = 0$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ we obtain for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$

$$0 = \frac{\mathcal{W}y_0(\lambda) - \mathcal{W}y_0(0)e^{i\beta\lambda}}{\lambda} + \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda^{j-1} \mathcal{W}y_j(\lambda),$$

which implies $\mathcal{W}\varphi(\lambda) = \mathcal{W}y_0(0)e^{i\beta\lambda}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. □

Proof of Theorem 12. If \mathcal{J} is dense in H then the result follows immediately from Theorem 11 (i) and Lemma 4. The V_β -invariance, as well as the formula for the resolvent of $D|\mathcal{J}$ are straightforward.

If $\mathcal{J}_H \neq H$, use Theorem 11 (ii) and the notations therein to conclude that the image by \mathcal{W} of the orthogonal complement of \mathcal{J}_H equals $e^{i\sigma z} \mathcal{H}(F)$ which is $\mathcal{W}V_\beta^* \mathcal{W}^{-1}$ -invariant for all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $e^{i(\beta-\sigma)z}$ is associated to $\mathcal{H}(F)$, or equivalently for all $\beta \in J$. Then \mathcal{J}_H is V_β -invariant for all such β . In particular, it makes sense to consider the residual subspace $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{J}_H}$ of $C^\infty(D)$ which obviously contains \mathcal{J} . To see the reverse inclusion observe that the functionals of order zero in the annihilators of \mathcal{J} and $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{J}_H}$ coincide with the orthogonal complement of \mathcal{J}_H in H . Thus, by D -invariance, $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{J}_H}^\perp$ contains all polynomial multiples of functions in $e^{i\sigma z} \mathcal{H}(F)$ together with all polynomial multiples of the exponential functions $e^{i\beta z}$, such that $e^{i(\beta-\sigma)z}$ is associated to $\mathcal{H}(F)$, or equivalently the set $\{pe^{i\beta z} : \beta \in J, p \text{ polynomial}\}$. Consequently, by Theorem 11 (ii) $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{J}_H}^\perp$ contains $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{J}^\perp$ and the equality $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{J}_H}$ follows. Again, the V_β -invariance, for $\beta \in J$ and the formula for the resolvent of $D|\mathcal{J}$ are straightforward. □

We should point out that in most cases the examples of residual subspaces revealed by the theorem are not trivial. This happens whenever the interval J given in Theorem 11 (ii) is strictly contained in $[-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$. Even if $\tau(E) = 0$ and all these intervals reduce to a point, the space J is nontrivial whenever the assumption in Theorem 11 (i) holds, or when the space $\mathcal{H}(F)$ from (ii) is strictly contained in $\mathcal{H}(E)$.

6.5 Some special cases

It is interesting to compare the description of residual subspaces in this general context with the classical case when $D = -i\frac{d}{dx}$ on $C^\infty(a, b)$. Recall from [3] (see also the Introduction) that in this case the residual subspaces consist of functions which vanish on a fixed compact subinterval of (a, b) . The interval may reduce to a point in which case we require that all derivatives of the functions in the subspace vanish at that point as well. In order to give an interpretation of this result in the general case considered here, we need to find natural analogues to zeros of C^∞ -functions. Theorem 12 suggest the following two alternatives:

- 1) $x \in C^\infty(D)$ "vanishes" at $\beta \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$ if $\varphi_\beta(x) = 0$, or equivalently, by Lemma 4, $x \in V_\beta C^\infty(D)$. Recall that φ_β is defined by $\mathcal{W}\varphi_\beta(z) = e^{i\beta z}$.
- 2) $x \in C^\infty(D)$ "vanishes" on the compact interval $J \subset [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$ if for all $n \geq 0$, $D^n x$ belongs to the V_β -invariant subspace $(e^{i\sigma z}\mathcal{H}(F))^\perp$, where σ is the midpoint of J , $2\tau(F)$ is its length and β is an arbitrary point in J .

The second alternative is not ambiguous by the uniqueness statement in Theorem 11 (iii). However, the condition is less intuitive than, for example, the obvious generalization of 1):

- 2') $x \in C^\infty(D)$ "vanishes" on the compact interval $J \subset [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$ if $x \in \bigcap_{\beta \in J} V_\beta C^\infty(D)$, or equivalently, $\varphi_\beta(x) = 0, \beta \in J$.

By Theorem 11 (ii) it follows that 2) implies 2') in general. In the classical case the two conditions coincide due to the special structure of Volterra invariant subspaces of $L^2(a, b)$. The next result clarifies completely the condition 2') in the most general case.

Theorem 13. *Let $J \subset [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$ be a compact interval with non-void interior. Then*

$$\mathcal{J}_0 = \bigcap_{\beta \in J} V_\beta C^\infty(D),$$

is the largest residual subspace whose residual interval equals J .

Proof. It will be sufficient to prove that \mathcal{J}_0 is D -invariant and for each $\gamma \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)] \setminus I$, \mathcal{J}_0 is not contained in $V_\gamma C^\infty(D)$.

Indeed, if the above assertions hold, for $\beta \in I$ and $x = V_\beta y \in \mathcal{J}_0$, $V_\beta D x = V_\beta D V_\beta y = x$, that is $V_\beta = D^{-1}$. A similar argument shows that \mathcal{J}_0 is residual. The second assertion implies that the residual interval of \mathcal{J}_0 equals I . Finally, \mathcal{J}_0^\perp consists of the closed linear span of functionals of the form

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi_\beta(D^n x), \quad n \geq 0, x \in C^\infty(D).$$

By Theorem 11 (ii) \mathcal{J}_0^\perp is contained in the annihilator of any residual \mathcal{J} with residual interval J .

Let us now turn to the claims. Since \mathcal{J}_0^\perp is the w^* -closure of the linear span of $\{\varphi_\beta : \beta \in I\}$ in the dual of $C^\infty(D)$, to verify D -invariance, it will be sufficient to prove that for fixed $x \in C^\infty(D)$, the function $u_x(\beta) = \varphi_\beta(x)$ is differentiable on $[-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$ with

$$\frac{du_x}{d\beta}(\beta) = u_{Dx}(\beta) = \varphi_\beta(Dx). \quad (31)$$

To this end, recall from the observation b) in the proof of Theorem 11 that each φ_β has order at most one and that they form a bounded set of continuous functionals on $\mathcal{D}(D)$.

Now notice that the function u_x is twice continuously differentiable in $\beta \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$ whenever x is a finite linear combination of ϕ_z , $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and (31) obviously holds. Then for such x and $\beta < \beta' \in \beta \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$ we have

$$u_x(\beta') = u_x(\beta) + (\beta' - \beta) \frac{du_x}{d\beta}(\beta) + \int_\beta^{\beta'} \int_\beta^t \frac{d^2 u_x}{d\beta^2}(s) ds dt.$$

Using (31) and the above argument we arrive at the estimate

$$|\varphi_{\beta'}(x) - \varphi_{\beta}(x) - \varphi_{\beta}(Dx)| \leq M(\beta' - \beta)\|x\|_3,$$

for x in a dense subset of $C^\infty(D)$. This clearly implies (31) for all $x \in C^\infty(D)$, hence also the D -invariance of \mathcal{J}_0 .

Finally, let $\gamma \in [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)] \setminus J$. Then $\text{length}(J) < 2\tau(E)$ and by Lemma 1 there exists a HB function F with $\mathcal{H}(F) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$, $2\tau(F) = \text{length}(J)$. Obviously, if σ denotes the midpoint of J , $e^{i(\gamma-\sigma)z}$ is not associated to $\mathcal{H}(F)$, hence by Theorem 11 φ_γ does not belong to \mathcal{J}_M^\perp , where $M = (e^{i\sigma x}\mathcal{H}(F))^\perp$. Since this subspace contains the weak-star closure of the linear span of $\{\varphi_\beta : \beta \in J\}$, the second claim follows and the proof is complete. \square

There are cases when the subspace described in the theorem is the unique residual subspace with a given residual interval. For example, this happens when $\text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ is *thin* in the sense of [5]. This means that the map

$$\tau(t) = \tau(E_t), \tag{32}$$

is injective (and surjective onto $(0, \tau(E)]$). This covers the classical case $D = -i\frac{d}{dx}$, where the chain consists of Paley-Wiener spaces corresponding to nested intervals, but there are many other examples. For instance, in terms of the Hamiltonian of the associated canonical system, see §2.3, it is easy to decide if a de Branges chain is thin. Indeed, the de Branges chain is not thin if and only if $\det(H(x)) = 0$ on some interval. Chains of de Branges spaces are one of the main corner stones of the theory and have been studied extensively. For some recent developments in the theory of de Branges chains see [7].

In such cases theorem 12 reads as follows.

Corollary 7. *Assume that $\text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ is thin. If \mathcal{J} is a residual subspace then there exists a compact interval $J \subset [-\alpha - \tau(E), -\alpha + \tau(E)]$ such that*

$$\mathcal{J} = \bigcap_{\beta \in J} V_\beta C^\infty(D),$$

if J has non-trivial interior and if $J = \{\beta\}$ then

$$\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_{V_\beta C^\infty(D)}.$$

The opposite situation occurs when $\tau(E) = 0$. Note that in this case $\alpha = 0$ Theorem 9 part 2, and the only quasi-nilpotent right inverse of D on H is $V = V_0$. The next result gives a complete description of residual subspaces in this case.

Corollary 8. *Assume that $\tau(E) = 0$ and let \mathcal{J} be a residual subspace of $C^\infty(D)$. If \mathcal{J} is dense in H then $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_{V C^\infty(D)}$ and if \mathcal{J} is not dense in H then there exist $\mathcal{H}(F) \in \text{Chain}(\mathcal{H}(E))$ such that $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_{(\mathcal{H}(F))^\perp}$. In particular, residual subspaces are totally ordered by inclusion.*

Proof. The number β in Theorem 11 (i) is zero and the interval J in Theorem 11 (ii) is $\{0\}$. Also, an application of this theorem gives that the set

$$\{\mathcal{J}^\perp : \mathcal{J} \text{ residual}\},$$

is totally ordered by inclusion. The result follows by an application of Theorem 12. \square

A concrete example is provided by regular Schrödinger operators.

Corollary 9. Let $D = -d^2/dx + q$ be a regular Schrödinger operator on $[a, b]$ with any separated boundary condition at a . Let \mathcal{J} be a residual subspace for D . Then there exists $c \in [a, b)$ such that

$$\mathcal{J} = \{f \in C^\infty(D) : f([a, c]) = \{0\}\}, \text{ when } c > a,$$

and if $c = a$

$$\mathcal{J} = \left\{ f \in C^\infty(D) : D^k f(a) = (D^k f)'(a) = 0, \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \right\}.$$

References

- [1] S. Agmon. Sur un problème de translations. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 229:540–542, 1949.
- [2] A. Aleman, A. Baranov, and Y. Belov. Subspaces of C^∞ invariant under the differentiation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 268(8):2421–2439, 2015.
- [3] A. Aleman and B. Korenblum. Derivation-invariant subspaces of C^∞ . *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory*, 8(1-2):493–512, 2008.
- [4] A. Aleman, R. T. W. Martin, and W. T. Ross. On a theorem of Livsic. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 264(4):999–1048, 2013.
- [5] A. Baranov and Y. Belov. Synthesizable differentiation-invariant subspaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 29(1):44–71, 2019.
- [6] A. D. Baranov and D. V. Yakubovich. One-dimensional perturbations of unbounded selfadjoint operators with empty spectrum. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 424(2):1404–1424, 2015.
- [7] Y. Belov and A. Borichev. On the chain structure in the de Branges spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 284(2):Paper No. 109757, 23, 2023.
- [8] R. Bessonov and S. Denisov. Szegő condition, scattering, and vibration of Krein strings. *Invent. Math.*, 234(1):291–373, 2023.
- [9] R. V. Bessonov and S. A. Denisov. De Branges canonical systems with finite logarithmic integral. *Anal. PDE*, 14(5):1509–1556, 2021.
- [10] M. S. Birman and M. Z. Solomjak. *Spectral theory of selfadjoint operators in Hilbert space*. Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series). D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, 1987. Translated from the 1980 Russian original by S. Khrushchëv and V. Peller.
- [11] A. Borichev and M. Sodin. Weighted exponential approximation and non-classical orthogonal spectral measures. *Adv. Math.*, 226(3):2503–2545, 2011.
- [12] M. S. Brodskiĭ. On a problem of I. M. Gelfand. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk (N.S.)*, 12(no. 2(74)):129–132, 1957.
- [13] L. de Branges. Some Hilbert spaces of entire functions. II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 99:118–152, 1961.
- [14] L. de Branges. *Hilbert spaces of entire functions*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968.

- [15] W. F. Donoghue, Jr. The lattice of invariant subspaces of a completely continuous quasi-nilpotent transformation. *Pacific J. Math.*, 7:1031–1035, 1957.
- [16] I. M. Gelfand. Several problems on the theory of functions of real variable. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 5:232–234, 1938.
- [17] I. C. Gohberg and M. G. Kreĭn. *Theory and applications of Volterra operators in Hilbert space*, volume Vol. 24. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1970. Translated from the Russian by A. Feinstein.
- [18] V. Havin and B. Jöricke. *The uncertainty principle in harmonic analysis*, volume 28 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- [19] J. J. Holt and J. D. Vaaler. The Beurling-Selberg extremal functions for a ball in Euclidean space. *Duke Math. J.*, 83(1):202–248, 1996.
- [20] G. K. Kalisch. On similarity, reducing manifolds, and unitary equivalence of certain Volterra operators. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 66:481–494, 1957.
- [21] G. E. Kisilevskii. Invariant subspaces of Volterra dissipative operators with nuclear imaginary components. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, pages 3–23, 1968.
- [22] B. Y. Levin. *Lectures on entire functions*, volume 150 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996. In collaboration with and with a preface by Yu. Lyubarskii, M. Sodin and V. Tkachenko, Translated from the Russian manuscript by Tkachenko.
- [23] Y. I. Lyubarskii and K. Seip. Weighted Paley-Wiener spaces. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 15(4):979–1006, 2002.
- [24] N. Makarov and A. Poltoratski. Meromorphic inner functions, Toeplitz kernels and the uncertainty principle. In *Perspectives in analysis*, volume 27 of *Math. Phys. Stud.*, pages 185–252. Springer, Berlin, 2005.
- [25] N. Makarov and A. Poltoratski. Beurling-Malliavin theory for Toeplitz kernels. *Invent. Math.*, 180(3):443–480, 2010.
- [26] N. Makarov and A. Poltoratski. Two-spectra theorem with uncertainty. *J. Spectr. Theory*, 9(4):1249–1285, 2019.
- [27] N. Makarov and A. Poltoratski. Etudes for the inverse spectral problem. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 108(3):916–977, 2023.
- [28] M. Mitkovski and A. Poltoratski. Pólya sequences, Toeplitz kernels and gap theorems. *Adv. Math.*, 224(3):1057–1070, 2010.
- [29] M. Mitkovski and A. Poltoratski. On the determinacy problem for measures. *Invent. Math.*, 202(3):1241–1267, 2015.
- [30] M. A. Naimark. *Linear differential operators. Part I: Elementary theory of linear differential operators*. Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1967.
- [31] J. Ortega-Cerdà and K. Seip. Fourier frames. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 155(3):789–806, 2002.

- [32] M. S. Osborne. *Locally convex spaces*, volume 269 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [33] A. Poltoratski. Spectral gaps for sets and measures. *Acta Math.*, 208(1):151–209, 2012.
- [34] A. Poltoratski. Bernstein’s problem on weighted polynomial approximation. In *Operator-related function theory and time-frequency analysis*, volume 9 of *Abel Symp.*, pages 147–171. Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [35] C. Remling. Schrödinger operators and de Branges spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 196(2):323–394, 2002.
- [36] C. Remling. *Spectral theory of canonical systems*, volume 70 of *De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2018.
- [37] R. Romanov. Canonical systems and de Branges spaces, 2014.
- [38] D. Sarason. A remark on the Volterra operator. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 12:244–246, 1965.
- [39] K. Schmüdgen. On the Heisenberg commutation relation. I. *J. Functional Analysis*, 50(1):8–49, 1983.
- [40] K. Schmüdgen. On the Heisenberg commutation relation. II. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 19(2):601–671, 1983.
- [41] G. Teschl. *Mathematical methods in quantum mechanics*, volume 157 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2014. With applications to Schrödinger operators.
- [42] J. Weidmann. *Linear operators in Hilbert spaces*, volume 68 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1980. Translated from the German by Joseph Szücs.