

On the generalized Langevin equation and the Mori projection operator technique

Christoph Widder¹, Johannes Zimmer², Tanja Schilling¹

¹ Institute of Physics, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Hermann-Herder-Straße 3, 79104 Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany

² Department of Mathematics, Technische Universität München, Boltzmannstr. 3, 85748 Garching, Germany

E-mail: christoph.widder@phyik.uni-freiburg.de,
tanja.schilling@physik.uni-freiburg.de

27 March 2025

Abstract. In statistical physics, the Mori-Zwanzig projection operator formalism (also called Nakajima-Zwanzig projection operator formalism) is used to derive a linear integro-differential equation for observables in Hilbert space, the generalized Langevin equation (GLE). This technique relies on the splitting of the dynamics into a projected and an orthogonal part. We prove that the GLE together with the second fluctuation dissipation theorem (2FDT) uniquely define the fluctuating forces as well as the memory kernel. The GLE and 2FDT are an immediate consequence of the existence and uniqueness of solutions of linear Volterra equations. They neither rely on the Dyson identity nor on the concept of orthogonal dynamics. This holds true for autonomous as well as non-autonomous systems. Further results are obtained for the Mori projection for autonomous systems, for which the fluctuating forces are orthogonal to the observable of interest. In particular, we prove that the orthogonal dynamics is a strongly continuous semigroup generated by $\overline{Q\mathcal{L}Q}$, where \mathcal{L} is the generator of the time evolution operator, and $\mathcal{P} = 1 - \mathcal{Q}$ is the Mori projection operator. As a consequence, the corresponding orbit maps (e.g. the fluctuating forces) are the unique mild solutions of the associated abstract Cauchy problem. Furthermore, we show that the orthogonal dynamics is a unitary group, if \mathcal{L} is skew-adjoint. In this case, the fluctuating forces are stationary. In addition, we present a proof of the GLE by means of semigroup theory, and we retrieve the commonly used definitions for the fluctuating forces, memory kernel, and orthogonal dynamics. Our results apply to general autonomous dynamical systems, whose time evolution is given by a strongly continuous semigroup. This includes large classes of systems in classical statistical mechanics.

1. Introduction

In statistical physics the method called "projection operator formalism", "Mori-Zwanzig formalism" or "Nakajima-Zwanzig-formalism" is a well-established method to reduce the dimension of a dynamical system. (For textbooks see ref. [18, 61, 26], for original texts see ref. [57, 59, 37, 58, 62, 60, 36, 28, 31].) The basic idea of this method is to start out with the complete description of a microscopic system in terms of its Liouville-von Neumann equation and to produce the evolution equations of a set of observables of interest by means of a projection. The resulting evolution equations are called Generalized Langevin Equations (GLE).

Since the 1960s there has been considerable research effort in analyzing the properties of the GLE and in developing methods to infer the parameters of the GLE from experimental data (for didactic introductions to the topic see e.g. [47, 46, 50, 7, 21]). In the physics literature, authors who write about the projection operator formalism usually base their arguments on an operator identity which they associate with the names Kawasaki, Dyson or Duhamel (depending on the authors' scientific background). This operator identity serves to handle the "orthogonal dynamics", i.e. the dynamics of degrees of freedom orthogonal to the projection [57, 36, 17, 23, 11]. Surprisingly, there is hardly any literature in which the origin and range of validity of this operator identity or the properties of the orthogonal dynamics are mentioned. To our knowledge, there is just one article which gives a proof of existence for the orthogonal dynamics [15]. We have the impression that large parts of the statistical physics community have accepted the Dyson identity as a justification of the GLE without questioning its mathematical background. This impression is supported by a statement in the work of Givon, Hald and Kupferman who motivate their existence proof by writing "The validity of the Mori-Zwanzig formalism relies on the well-posedness of the orthogonal dynamics equation, which has always been taken for granted." [15]. Also Zhu, Dominy, and Venturi remark "When estimating the M[ori]Z[wanzig] memory integral, we need to deal with the semigroup e^{tLQ} . It turns out to be extremely difficult to prove strong continuity of such a semigroup in general..." [56]. (In this quotation, the term e^{tLQ} stands for the orthogonal dynamics.)

Here, we will fill this gap. First we show that the Dyson identity is not needed to derive the GLE in the first place. The GLE can be obtained in a straight-forward manner from the theory of linear Volterra equations without making assumptions on the properties of the orthogonal dynamics. Then we discuss some properties of the GLE for the case of the projection operator introduced by Mori [36]. We reinterpret the fluctuating forces as unique mild solutions of an abstract Cauchy problem. After that we specify conditions under which the orthogonal dynamics is a strongly continuous semigroup after all, i.e. we show a non-trivial case for which the line of argument presented in the statistical physics literature actually holds. Finally, we address the case of non-autonomous systems (e.g. systems under time-dependent external driving or active matter) and show that the non-stationary GLE [33, 27, 34, 35, 49, 55] also

follows from the theory of Volterra equations.

2. Generalized Langevin equation

Throughout this article, let H be a complex Hilbert space, and let (\cdot, \cdot) denote the scalar product with complex conjugation in its second argument. Let $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a strongly continuous semigroup on H such that the time evolution for some state vector $x \in H$ is given by the orbit map $t \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(t)x$. The generator is denoted by $(\mathcal{L}, D(\mathcal{L}))$. Further, let \mathcal{P} be an orthogonal projection on H . Its complemented projection is denoted by $\mathcal{Q} := 1 - \mathcal{P}$.

2.1. Linear Volterra equations

The following derivation of the GLE by means of the theory of Volterra equations is inspired by the existence proof for the orthogonal dynamics for finite-rank projections within the context of Hamiltonian vector fields given by Givon et al. [15, Theorem 4.1] in 2005.

Theorem 1 (Generalized Langevin equation I). *Let $0 \neq z \in D(\mathcal{L}) \cap D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$. Let the memory kernel $K : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be defined by the unique continuous solution of the Volterra equation*

$$K(t) = (\mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z)(z, z)^{-1} - \int_0^t K(t-s)(\mathcal{U}(s)z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z)(z, z)^{-1} ds. \quad (2.1)$$

Let the fluctuating forces $\eta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow H$ be defined according to

$$\eta_t := \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z - \int_0^t K(t-s)\mathcal{U}(s)z ds. \quad (2.2)$$

Then, the orbit map $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(t)z \in H$ solves the generalized Langevin equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{U}(t)z = \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}z + \eta_t + \int_0^t K(t-s)\mathcal{U}(s)z ds, \quad (2.3)$$

and for $K(t)$ and η_t

$$K(t) = (\eta_t, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z)(z, z)^{-1} \quad (2.4)$$

holds. Furthermore, the memory kernel K and the fluctuating forces η are uniquely determined by eqs. (2.3) and (2.4).

Proof. Since $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is strongly continuous, the orbit maps $t \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(t)x$ are continuous for all $x \in H$. Hence, by the continuity of the scalar product, the coefficient functions of the Volterra equation (2.1) are continuous. Thus, there exists a unique continuous solution K [6, p. 25, Theorem 2.1.1], i.e. K is well-defined. Hence, the integrals of vector-valued functions in the sense of Bochner [1, 22] are well-defined and the integral interchanges with the scalar product [12, p. 650, Theorem 8].

Computing the time-derivative of the orbit map $t \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(t)z$ immediately yields the *generalized Langevin equation*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{U}(t)z &= \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{L}z \\ &= \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}z + \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z \\ &\stackrel{(2.2)}{=} \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}z + \eta_t + \int_0^t K(t-s)\mathcal{U}(s)z ds. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, eq. (2.4) holds:

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta_t, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z) &\stackrel{(2.2)}{=} (\mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z) - \left(\int_0^t K(t-s)\mathcal{U}(s)z ds, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z \right) \\ &= (\mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z) - \int_0^t K(t-s)(\mathcal{U}(s)z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z) ds \\ &\stackrel{(2.1)}{=} K(t)(z, z). \end{aligned}$$

It is left to show that K and η are uniquely determined by eqs. (2.3) and (2.4). Clearly, the GLE (2.3) holds, if and only if η is given by eq. (2.2). Furthermore, inserting η into eq. (2.4) yields the Volterra equation (2.1). Hence, the assertion follows by the uniqueness of the solution of eq. (2.1) [6, p. 25, Theorem 2.1.1]. \square

Remarks

- The assumptions of theorem 1 seem to be rather mild. In general, however, the 'size' of the domain intersection $D(\mathcal{L}) \cap D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ is a subtle issue [2].
- In the physics literature eq. (2.4) is called 'second fluctuation dissipation theorem' [31], which often abbreviated as 2FDT. This name is inappropriate, as eq. (2.4) is not a theorem, but rather an implicit definition for the memory kernel. To see this, observe that eq. (2.1) and eq. (2.4) are equivalent for any continuous function $t \rightarrow K(t)$. This means that the fluctuating forces and memory kernel are chosen such that the desired GLE including the 2FDT hold by definition. Moreover, this choice is unique. Nonetheless, we will keep the name that is common in physics and use the abbreviation 2FDT for eq. (2.4).
- Theorem 1 suggests that the same line of argument applies to the non-stationary generalized Langevin equation (nsGLE), which is often used to model the dynamics of observables in non-autonomous systems. This is indeed the case, see sec. 5.
- We have not yet specified the projection operator. The arguments presented up to here hold for any of the projection operators commonly used in statistical physics, such as the one introduced by Zwanzig [59], by Robertson [42] or by Mori [36]. The Zwanzig-projection operator is widely used in the context of coarse-grained modeling of polymers and biomolecules [46], because the resulting GLE has an intuitive interpretation in terms of thermodynamic quantities. However, as it is an

operator of infinite rank [15, 56], it is rather difficult to make statements that go much beyond theorem 1. Hence, when using the Zwanzig projection operator in combination with the Dyson identity, as is done e.g. in ref. [53, 21, 25, 24, 16], it should be noted that it is currently unclear how the required operator identities can be proven rigorously.

For the rest of this article, we restrict our discussion to the Mori projection operator.

Definition 1 (Mori projection operator). For some fixed $0 \neq z \in H$, let \mathcal{P} be the orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}(z)$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{P} := (\cdot, z)(z, z)^{-1}z.$$

Corollary 1.1. *Under the assumptions of theorem 1, we have*

$$(\eta_t, z) = 0.$$

Proof. Since H is reflexive, the adjoint semigroup $\{\mathcal{U}(t)^\dagger\}_{t \geq 0}$ is strongly continuous [52, p. 6, Corollary 1.3.2]. Furthermore, the generator of the adjoint semigroup $\{\mathcal{U}(t)^\dagger\}_{t \geq 0}$ is equal to \mathcal{L}^\dagger [52, p. 6, Theorem 1.3.3], see also [10, p. 43-44, p. 61-64]. Since $z \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$, for all $x \in H$ the map $t \rightarrow (\mathcal{U}(t)x, z) = (x, \mathcal{U}(t)^\dagger z)$ is continuously differentiable with derivative $t \rightarrow (\mathcal{U}(t)x, \mathcal{L}^\dagger z)$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(\eta_t, z) &\stackrel{(2.2)}{=} \frac{d}{dt}(\mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, z) - \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t K(s)(\mathcal{U}(t-s)z, z)ds \\ &= (\eta_t, \mathcal{L}^\dagger z) - K(t)(z, z) \\ &\stackrel{(2.4)}{=} (\eta_t, \mathcal{L}^\dagger z) - (\eta_t, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z) \\ &= (\eta_t, \mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z) \\ &= (\eta_t, z)(\mathcal{L}^\dagger z, z)^*(z, z)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we applied the Leibniz rule. This implies

$$(\eta_t, z) = (\eta_0, z)e^{t(\mathcal{L}^\dagger z, z)^*(z, z)^{-1}}.$$

However, since \mathcal{Q} is the orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}(z)^\perp$, we have

$$(\eta_0, z) = (\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, z) = 0.$$

Hence, we conclude $(\eta_t, z) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. □

2.2. Semigroup approach

Since the Mori projection operator \mathcal{P} is of finite rank, the bounded perturbation theorem [10, p. 158, Theorem 1.3] allows us to prove the GLE solely by means of semigroup theory. The bounded perturbation theorem is also used to derive semigroup estimates for the orthogonal dynamics, see Zhu et al. [56, Eq. 21b].

Theorem 2 (Generalized Langevin equation II). *Let $z \in D(\mathcal{L}) \cap D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$. Then, the orbit map $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto \mathcal{U}(t)z \in D(\mathcal{L})$ solves the integro-differential equation*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{U}(t)z = \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}z + \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z + \int_0^t K(t-s)\mathcal{U}(s)z ds, \quad (2.5)$$

$$K(t) := (\mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z)(z, z)^{-1}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\{\mathcal{G}(t) := \mathcal{Q}e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous family of bounded linear operators, and $\{e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}\}_{t \geq 0}$ denotes the strongly continuous semigroup generated by $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$.

Proof. Since $z \in D(\mathcal{L})$, the operator $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{P}$ is bounded. Thus, by the bounded perturbation theorem [10, p. 158, Theorem 1.3], the operator $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{L}\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup. Since \mathcal{Q} is bounded, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{G}(t)x = \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}x = \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}(t)x,$$

for all $x \in D(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q})$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_n &:= n[\mathcal{U}(1/n) - 1], \\ \mathcal{U}_n(t) &:= e^{\mathcal{L}_n t}. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{L}_n is bounded, $\{\mathcal{U}_n(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a uniformly continuous semigroup [10, Chapter I.3], for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{U}_n(t)z = \mathcal{U}_n(t)\mathcal{L}_n z = \mathcal{U}_n(t)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}_n z + \mathcal{U}_n(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z. \quad (2.7)$$

Since $z \in D(\mathcal{L})$, we have $\mathcal{Q}D(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq D(\mathcal{L})$, i.e. $D(\mathcal{L})$ is an invariant subspace under the map \mathcal{Q} . Furthermore, $D(\mathcal{L})$ is an invariant subspace under the maps $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ [10, p. 50, Lemma 1.3]. Thus, $D(\mathcal{L})$ is an invariant subspace under the maps $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z \in D(\mathcal{L}) \cap \mathcal{Q}H \subseteq D(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}) = \{x \in H : \mathcal{Q}x \in D(\mathcal{L})\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z \in D(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q})$, this implies

$$\frac{d}{ds}\mathcal{U}_n(s)\mathcal{G}(t-s)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z = \mathcal{U}_n(s)(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L})\mathcal{G}(t-s)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z.$$

Integrating over $[0, t]$ yields

$$\mathcal{U}_n(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z - \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z = \int_0^t \mathcal{U}_n(s)(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L})\mathcal{G}(t-s)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z ds, \quad (2.8)$$

where we use the Bochner integral [1, 22, 12]. Note that this is a version of Duhamel's principle, where $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is the homogeneous part, see e.g. [12, p. 49]. This is similar to Ball's variation of constants formula [3], but with a different order of the operators,

and furthermore, we did not yet establish the semigroup property of the orthogonal dynamics $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. Inserting eq. (2.8) into eq. (2.7) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{U}_n(t)z = \mathcal{U}_n(t)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}_nz + \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_nz + \int_0^t \mathcal{U}_n(s)(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L})\mathcal{G}(t-s)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_nz ds. \quad (2.9)$$

The plan is to take the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $T > 0$ arbitrary. According to the exponential formula [38, p. 32, Theorem 8.1], for all $x \in H$, the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}_n(t)x = \mathcal{U}(t)x \quad (2.10)$$

converges uniformly on $[0, T]$, and $\|\mathcal{U}_n(t)\|$ is uniformly bounded for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, T]$. Hence, since $z \in D(\mathcal{L})$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $n > N$ and $t \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{U}_n(t)z - \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{U}(t)z \right\| &= \|\mathcal{U}_n(t)\mathcal{L}_nz - \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{L}z\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{U}_n(t)\| \|(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L})z\| + \|(\mathcal{U}_n(t) - \mathcal{U}(t))\mathcal{L}z\| < \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the triangle inequality. In other words, the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{U}_n(t)z = \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{U}(t)z \quad (2.11)$$

converges uniformly on bounded intervals. Similarly, we show that the limits

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}_n(t)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}_nz = \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}z, \quad (2.12)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_nz = \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z \quad (2.13)$$

converge uniformly on bounded intervals. Taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ of eq. (2.9) and inserting eqs. (2.11)-(2.13) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{U}(t)z = \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}z + \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \mathcal{U}_n(s)(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L})\mathcal{G}(t-s)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_nz ds. \quad (2.14)$$

Now let $x \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ arbitrary. Recall that $\{\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger\}_{s \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup with generator \mathcal{L}^\dagger [52, 10]. Hence, using the exponential formula [38, p. 32, Theorem 8.1], it is straightforward to show that the limits

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}_n(s)^\dagger x = \mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x, \quad (2.15)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_n^\dagger \mathcal{U}_n(s)^\dagger x = \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x \quad (2.16)$$

converge uniformly on bounded intervals. Moreover, since $z \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$, and since $D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ is an invariant subspace under the maps $\{\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger\}_{s \geq 0}$, we have $QD(\mathcal{L}^\dagger) \subseteq D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ and $Q\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$. Thus, since Q is bounded and \mathcal{L}^\dagger is densely defined, we have

$$[Q\mathcal{L}]^\dagger = \mathcal{L}^\dagger Q, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x \in D([Q\mathcal{L}]^\dagger), \quad (2.18)$$

where we used [44, p. 330, Theorem 13.2]. For all $x \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \mathcal{U}_n(s) (\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}) \mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z \, ds, x \right) \\
 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t (\mathcal{U}_n(s) (\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}) \mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z, x) \, ds \\
 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t ((\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}) \mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z, \mathcal{U}_n(s)^\dagger x) \, ds \\
 &\stackrel{(2.15)}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t ((\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}) \mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z, \mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x) \, ds \\
 &\stackrel{(2.18)}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t (\mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z, (\mathcal{L}_n^\dagger - [\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}]^\dagger) \mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x) \, ds \\
 &\stackrel{(2.16)}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t (\mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z, (\mathcal{L}^\dagger - [\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}]^\dagger) \mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x) \, ds \\
 &\stackrel{(2.17)}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t (\mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z, \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{P}\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x) \, ds \\
 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t (\mathcal{L}_n z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{G}(t-s)^\dagger \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{P}\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x) \, ds \\
 &\stackrel{(2.10)}{=} \int_0^t (\mathcal{L}z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{G}(t-s)^\dagger \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{P}\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x) \, ds \\
 &= \int_0^t (\mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{P}\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x) \, ds \\
 &= \int_0^t (\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{P}\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x) \, ds \\
 &= \int_0^t (\mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{P}\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x) \, ds \\
 &= \int_0^t (\mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z) (z, z)^{-1} (\mathcal{U}(s)^\dagger x, z)^* \, ds \\
 &\stackrel{(2.6)}{=} \int_0^t K(t-s) (\mathcal{U}(s)z, x) \, ds \\
 &= \left(\int_0^t K(t-s) \mathcal{U}(s)z \, ds, x \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ is dense in H , we conclude

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \mathcal{U}_n(s) (\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}) \mathcal{G}(t-s) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}_n z \, ds = \int_0^t K(t-s) \mathcal{U}(s)z \, ds.$$

Inserting into eq. (2.14) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{U}(t)z = \mathcal{U}(t) \mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}z + \mathcal{G}(t) \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z + \int_0^t K(t-s) \mathcal{U}(s)z \, ds,$$

for all $t \geq 0$. This concludes the proof. \square

From the bounded perturbation theorem [10, p. 158, Theorem 1.3], it is clear that the orthogonal dynamics $\{\mathcal{G}(t) := \mathcal{Q}e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}\}_{t \geq 0}$ from theorem 2 is a strongly continuous family of bounded linear operators. However, we did not yet establish the semigroup property. Hence, it is not immediately clear that the orbit maps of the orthogonal dynamics are the unique mild solutions of the associated abstract Cauchy problem, see e.g. [4]. Therefore, the physical interpretation of the orthogonal dynamics solely by means of theorem 2 is ambiguous. Nevertheless, due to theorem 1, we may identify the fluctuating forces with an orbit map of the orthogonal dynamics, i.e. for $z \in D(\mathcal{L}) \cap D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ and $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\eta_t = \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z. \quad (2.19)$$

Furthermore, the definitions for the memory kernel $K(t)$ from theorems 1 and 2 are equivalent.

In the next section, we prove several properties of the orthogonal dynamics. In particular, we show that $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup with generator $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$. As a consequence, the orbit maps $t \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(t)x$ are the unique mild solutions of the associated abstract Cauchy problem [10, p. 146, Proposition 6.4].

3. Orthogonal dynamics

First, let us introduce the abstract Cauchy problem for the orthogonal dynamics. For $x \in H$ and $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \rightarrow u(t) \in H$, the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} u(0) = x, \\ \frac{d}{dt}u(t) = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}u(t), \quad t \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

is called abstract Cauchy problem associated to $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ [10, p. 145].

Definition 2 (Mild solutions). Let $x \in H$. Suppose $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \rightarrow u(x, t) \in H$ is continuous and satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u(x, 0) = x, \\ u(x, t) = x + \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} \int_0^t u(x, s) ds, \quad t \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Then, $u(x, \cdot)$ is called mild solution of the abstract Cauchy problem associated to $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ [10, p. 146].

Recall that the existence and uniqueness of mild solutions for all initial values $x \in H$ is guaranteed, provided that $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup [10, p. 146, Proposition 6.4]. Hence, we have to show that $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup that constitutes the desired orthogonal dynamics. In view of theorem 1, it is clear that the orbit maps of the orthogonal dynamics have to be defined via unique continuous solutions of linear Volterra equations. Afterwards, all desired properties of the orthogonal dynamics can be proven directly from its definition.

Theorem 3. Let $z \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ and $x \in H$. Let $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \rightarrow f(x, t) \in \mathbb{C}$ be defined by the unique continuous solution of the Volterra equation

$$f(x, t) = (\mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{Q}x, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z)(z, z)^{-1} - \int_0^t f(x, t-s)(\mathcal{U}(s)z, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z)(z, z)^{-1} ds. \quad (3.3)$$

Let $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \rightarrow u(x, t) \in H$ be defined according to

$$u(x, t) := \mathcal{P}x + \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{Q}x - \int_0^t f(x, t-s)\mathcal{U}(s)z ds. \quad (3.4)$$

Then, $u(x, \cdot)$ is a mild solution of the abstract Cauchy problem associated to $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$. Additionally, we have $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q})^\dagger$.

Proof. Since $z \in \mathcal{L}^\dagger$, the operator $\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{P}$ is bounded. Furthermore, since \mathcal{L}^\dagger is the generator of the adjoint semigroup, it follows by the bounded perturbation theorem [10, p. 158, Theorem 1.3] that $\mathcal{L}^\dagger - \mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q}$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup. This implies that $\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q}$ is densely defined and closed [10, p. 51, Theorem 1.4]. Since \mathcal{Q} is bounded and \mathcal{L} is densely defined, this implies $[\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q}]^\dagger = [\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}]^{\dagger\dagger}$ [44, p. 330, Theorem 13.2]. Since $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}$ and $[\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}]^\dagger = \mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q}$ are densely defined, $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}$ is closable with closure $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}} = [\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}]^{\dagger\dagger}$ [41, p. 252, Theorem VIII.1]. Hence,

$$[\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q}]^\dagger = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}}. \quad (3.5)$$

Since $\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q}$ is densely defined and closed, this implies

$$\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}}^\dagger.$$

Furthermore, we have [44, p. 330, Theorem 13.2]

$$(\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q})^\dagger = [\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q}]^\dagger\mathcal{Q} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}.$$

Note that the Volterra equation (3.3) has continuous coefficient functions. Thus, $f(x, \cdot)$ is well-defined via the unique continuous solution [6, p. 25, Theorem 2.1.1]. In particular, $u(x, \cdot)$ is continuous. Furthermore, $f(x, \cdot)$ and $f(\mathcal{Q}x, \cdot)$ solve the same Volterra equation, i.e. f does not depend on $\mathcal{P}x$. More explicitly, we have

$$f(x, t) = f(x_\perp, t), \quad (3.6)$$

$$u(x, t) = \mathcal{P}x + u(x_\perp, t), \quad (3.7)$$

where $x_\perp := \mathcal{Q}x$. Moreover, we have

$$f(x, t) \stackrel{(3.3)(3.4)}{=} (u(x, t), \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z)(z, z)^{-1}. \quad (3.8)$$

The same way as in corollary 1.1, we show that $u(x_\perp, t) \in \mathcal{Q}H$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} (u(x_\perp, 0), z) &= 0, \\ \frac{d}{dt}(u(x_\perp, t), z) &\stackrel{(3.4)}{=} (u(x_\perp, t), \mathcal{L}^\dagger z) - f(x, t)(z, z) \\ &\stackrel{(3.8)}{=} (u(x_\perp, t), \mathcal{L}^\dagger z) - (u(x_\perp, t), \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z) \\ &= (u(x_\perp, t), \mathcal{P}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z) \\ &= (u(x_\perp, t), z)(\mathcal{L}^\dagger z, z)^*(z, z)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

we conclude

$$(u(x_\perp, t), z) = 0, \tag{3.9}$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Hence, for all $y \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{Q}) = \{y \in H : \mathcal{Q}y \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(u(x_\perp, t), y) &\stackrel{(3.9)}{=} \frac{d}{dt}(u(x_\perp, t), \mathcal{Q}y) \\ &\stackrel{(3.4)}{=} (u(x_\perp, t), \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{Q}y) - f(x_\perp, t)(z, \mathcal{Q}y) \\ &= (u(x_\perp, t), \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{Q}y). \end{aligned}$$

For all $y \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{Q})$, this implies

$$(u(x_\perp, t), y) = (u(x_\perp, 0), y) + \left(\int_0^t u(x_\perp, s) ds, \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{Q}y \right).$$

Since $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{Q} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger}$ is densely defined and closed, it follows by a lemma from Ball [3] that $\int_0^t u(x_\perp, s) ds \in D(\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger})$ and

$$u(x_\perp, t) = u(x_\perp, 0) + \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger} \int_0^t u(x_\perp, s) ds.$$

Since \mathcal{Q} is bounded, \mathcal{Q} interchanges with the Bochner integral [1, p. 427, Lemma 11.45]. Since $u(x_\perp, t) = \mathcal{Q}u(x, t)$, we obtain

$$u(x_\perp, t) = u(x_\perp, 0) + \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger} \mathcal{Q} \int_0^t u(x, s) ds.$$

Adding $\mathcal{P}x$ on both sides yields

$$u(x, t) \stackrel{(3.7)}{=} u(x, 0) + \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger} \mathcal{Q} \int_0^t u(x, s) ds,$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Therefore, $u(x, \cdot)$ is a mild solution of the abstract Cauchy problem associated to $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger}$. \square

Remark. Note that the bounded perturbation theorem is dispensable for the proof of theorem 3. Since $z \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$, and thus $\mathcal{Q}D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger) \subseteq D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$, it is straightforward to show that $\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{Q}$ is densely defined and closed.

For $z \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ and $x \in H$, we have now established the fact that the orbit map of the orthogonal dynamics $u(x, \cdot)$ as defined in theorem 3 is indeed a mild solution of the abstract Cauchy problem associated to $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$. Next, we show that $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ generates the strongly continuous semigroup $\{u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. If in addition $z \in D(\mathcal{L})$, then, $\{u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ coincides with the orthogonal dynamics $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ as defined in theorem 2.

Theorem 4. *Let $z \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ and let $u(x, t)$ be defined as in theorem 3. Then, $\{\mathcal{G}(t) := u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup of bounded linear operators on H .*

Proof. By theorem 3, the map $t \rightarrow u(x, t)$ is a mild solution for all $x \in H$. Thus, $\{u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is strongly continuous. Let $x, y \in H$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ arbitrary. It is easy to show that $t \rightarrow f(x, t) + \alpha f(y, t)$ and $t \rightarrow f(x + \alpha y, t)$ solve the same Volterra equation. Hence, by the uniqueness of a solution, we have for all $t \geq 0$

$$f(x + \alpha y, t) = f(x, t) + \alpha f(y, t).$$

This implies that $\{u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous family of linear operators. We have to show that $u(\cdot, t)$ is bounded for all $t \geq 0$. There exist constants $M \geq 1$, $\omega_0 \geq 0$ such that $\|\mathcal{U}(t)\| \leq Me^{\omega_0 t}$ for all $t \geq 0$ [10, p. 39, Proposition 5.5]. Hence, for all $x \in H$ and $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(x, t)\| &\stackrel{(3.4)}{=} \|\mathcal{P}x + \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{Q}x - \int_0^t f(x, t-s)\mathcal{U}(s)z ds\| \\ &\leq \|x\| + \|\mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{Q}x\| + \int_0^t |f(x, t-s)| \|\mathcal{U}(s)z\| ds \\ &\leq (1 + Me^{\omega_0 t})\|x\| + Me^{\omega_0 t}\|z\| \int_0^t |f(x, s)| ds \\ &\stackrel{(3.8)}{=} (1 + Me^{\omega_0 t})\|x\| + Me^{\omega_0 t}\|z\| \int_0^t |(u(x, s), \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z)(z, z)^{-1}| ds \\ &\leq (1 + Me^{\omega_0 t})\|x\| + \frac{Me^{\omega_0 t}\|\mathcal{L}^\dagger z\|}{\|z\|} \int_0^t \|u(x, s)\| ds \\ &\leq (1 + Me^{\omega_0 t})\|x\| \exp \left\{ \frac{tMe^{\omega_0 t}\|\mathcal{L}^\dagger z\|}{\|z\|} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Grönwall's inequality. Thus, $\{u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous family of bounded linear operators on H .

It is left to show that $\{u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup. Let $x_\perp \in \mathcal{Q}H$ arbitrary. Note

that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{U}(s)u(x_\perp, t) &\stackrel{(3.4)}{=} \mathcal{U}(s+t)x_\perp - \int_0^t f(x_\perp, t-r)\mathcal{U}(s+r)z \, dr \\
 &= \mathcal{U}(s+t)x_\perp - \int_s^{t+s} f(x_\perp, t+s-r)\mathcal{U}(r)z \, dr \\
 &\stackrel{(3.4)}{=} u(x_\perp, t+s) + \int_0^s f(x_\perp, t+s-r)\mathcal{U}(r)z \, dr, \\
 u(x_\perp, t+s) &= \mathcal{U}(s)u(x_\perp, t) - \int_0^s f(x_\perp, t+s-r)\mathcal{U}(r)z \, dr.
 \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$u(x_\perp, t+s) \stackrel{(3.4)}{=} u(u(x_\perp, t), s) + \int_0^s [f(u(x_\perp, t), s-r) - f(x_\perp, t+s-r)]\mathcal{U}(r)z \, dr. \quad (3.10)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &|f(u(x_\perp, t), s) - f(x_\perp, t+s)| \\
 &\stackrel{(3.8)}{=} |(u(u(x_\perp, t), s) - u(x_\perp, t+s), \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger z)(z, z)^{-1}| \\
 &\leq \frac{\|\mathcal{L}^\dagger z\|}{\|z\|^2} \|u(u(x_\perp, t), s) - u(x_\perp, t+s)\| \\
 &\stackrel{(3.10)}{\leq} \frac{\|\mathcal{L}^\dagger z\|}{\|z\|^2} \int_0^s |f(u(x_\perp, t), s-r) - f(x_\perp, t+s-r)| \|\mathcal{U}(r)z\| \, dr \\
 &\leq \frac{Me^{\omega_0 s} \|\mathcal{L}^\dagger z\|}{\|z\|} \int_0^s |f(u(x_\perp, t), r) - f(x_\perp, t+r)| \, dr.
 \end{aligned}$$

Again, Grönwall's inequality yields

$$|f(u(x_\perp, t), s) - f(x_\perp, t+s)| = 0,$$

for all $x_\perp \in \mathcal{Q}H$ and $t, s \geq 0$. Thus, eq. (3.10) simplifies to

$$u(x_\perp, t+s) = u(u(x_\perp, t), s), \quad (3.11)$$

for all $x_\perp \in \mathcal{Q}H$ and $t, s \geq 0$. Recall from eqs. (3.7), (3.9) that for all $x \in H$ and $t \geq 0$, we have $u(x, t) = \mathcal{P}x + u(\mathcal{Q}x, t)$, and $u(\mathcal{Q}x, t) \in \mathcal{Q}H$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(x, t+s) &= \mathcal{P}x + u(\mathcal{Q}x, t+s) \\
 &\stackrel{(3.11)}{=} \mathcal{P}x + u(u(\mathcal{Q}x, t), s) \\
 &= \mathcal{P}u(x, t) + u(\mathcal{Q}u(x, t), s) \\
 &= u(u(x, t), s),
 \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in H$ and $t, s \geq 0$. Thus, $\{u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup of bounded linear operators on H . \square

Corollary 4.1. *Let $z \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ and let $u(x, t)$ be defined as in theorem 3. Then, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ generates the strongly continuous semigroup $\{\mathcal{G}(t) := u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{A} be the generator of $\{u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. Let $x \in D(\mathcal{A})$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q})^\dagger$ is closed, and since $t \rightarrow u(x, t)$ is a continuous mild solution of the abstract Cauchy problem associated to $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}x &= \lim_{h \searrow 0} \frac{1}{h} [u(x, h) - x] \\ &= \lim_{h \searrow 0} \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} \frac{1}{h} \int_0^h u(x, s) ds \\ &= \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} \lim_{h \searrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \int_0^h u(x, s) ds \\ &= \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}x. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$. Now let $x \in D(\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}})$. Then, carrying out the same calculation backwards shows that $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Thus, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} = \mathcal{A}$ generates the strongly continuous semigroup $\{u(\cdot, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. \square

Corollary 4.2. *Let $z \in D(\mathcal{L}) \cap D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$. Then, for all $t \geq 0$, the fluctuating forces η_t from theorem 1 satisfy*

$$\eta_t = \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, \quad (3.12)$$

$$\eta_t = \eta_0 + \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} \int_0^t \eta_s ds, \quad (3.13)$$

where $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is the strongly continuous semigroup generated by $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$.

Proof. The definition of η_t from theorem 1 coincides with the definition of $u(\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, t)$ from theorem 3. By corollary 4.1, we have $u(\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, t) = \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z$. This proves eq. (3.12). Since $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup with generator $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$, the orbit map $t \rightarrow \eta_t = \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z$ is a mild solution of the abstract Cauchy problem associated to $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ [10, p. 146, Proposition 6.4]. This establishes eq. (3.13). \square

Lemma 5. *Let $z \in D(\mathcal{L}) \cap D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$. Then, for all $t \geq 0$*

$$\mathcal{G}(t) = \mathcal{Q}e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}, \quad (3.14)$$

where $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denotes the strongly continuous semigroup generated by $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$, and $\{e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}\}_{t \geq 0}$ denotes the strongly continuous semigroup generated by $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$.

Proof. Since $z \in D(\mathcal{L})$, the operator $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{P}$ is bounded, and it follows by the bounded perturbation theorem [10, p. 158, Theorem 1.3] that $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup. Let $x \in D(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q})$ arbitrary. Since \mathcal{Q} is bounded, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{Q}e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}x = (\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q})\mathcal{Q}e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}x.$$

This implies that $t \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}x$ is a mild solution of the abstract Cauchy problem associated to $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$. However, since $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup, the mild solution is unique [10, p. 146, Proposition 6.4]. Hence, we have

$$\mathcal{G}(t)x = \mathcal{Q}e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}x, \quad (3.15)$$

for all $x \in D(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q})$ and $t \geq 0$. Since $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup, $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$ is densely defined [10, p. 51, Theorem 1.4]. This implies

$$\|\mathcal{G}(t) - \mathcal{Q}e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}\| = 0,$$

for all $t \geq 0$. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark (Time reversal). Suppose the time evolution is given by a strongly continuous group $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. Then, $\{\mathcal{U}(\pm t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup with generator $\pm\mathcal{L}$ [10, p. 79]. This implies that all results remain valid under the replacements $\mathcal{U}(t) \mapsto \mathcal{U}(-t)$ and $\mathcal{L} \mapsto -\mathcal{L}$.

Lemma 6. *Let $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be a strongly continuous group and $z \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$. Then, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ generates a strongly continuous group.*

Proof. Since $\{\mathcal{U}(\pm t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup with generator $\pm\mathcal{L}$ [10, p. 79], it follows by corollary 4.1 that the operator $\pm\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup $\{\mathcal{G}(\pm t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. This implies that $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is a strongly continuous group with generator $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ [10, p. 79]. \square

3.1. Unitary time evolution

Suppose that the time evolution of observables is given by a strongly continuous unitary group $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. This includes e.g. large classes of classical systems in thermal equilibrium. Then, by Stone's theorem for one-parameter unitary groups [48, 51], the generator \mathcal{L} is skew-adjoint [20, p. 210, Theorem 10.15]. Note that the converse statement is also true [20, p. 208, Proposition 10.14]. In this case, the fluctuating forces are stationary. Moreover, the orthogonal dynamics is a strongly continuous unitary group.

Theorem 7. *Let \mathcal{L} be skew-adjoint and $z \in D(\mathcal{L})$. Then, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ generates a strongly continuous unitary group $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$.*

Proof. According to lemma 6, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ generates a strongly continuous group $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. Hence, it is left to show that $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is unitary.

Recall that according to corollary 4.1, we have $\mathcal{G}(t)x = u(x, t)$ for all $x \in H$ and $t \geq 0$, where $u(x, t)$ is defined as in theorem 3. Let $x, y \in \mathcal{QH}$, $t \geq 0$ and $s \leq t$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(-s)u(x, t) &\stackrel{(3.4)}{=} \mathcal{U}(-s) \left\{ \mathcal{U}(t)x - \int_0^t f(x, t-r)\mathcal{U}(r)z \, dr \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{U}(t-s)x - \int_0^t f(x, t-r)\mathcal{U}(r-s)z \, dr \\ &= \mathcal{U}(t-s)x - \int_{-s}^{t-s} f(x, t-s-r)\mathcal{U}(r)z \, dr \\ &\stackrel{(3.4)}{=} u(x, t-s) - \int_{-s}^0 f(x, t-s-r)\mathcal{U}(r)z \, dr. \end{aligned}$$

Applying $\mathcal{U}(s)$ on both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) &= \mathcal{U}(s)u(x, t-s) - \int_{-s}^0 f(x, t-s-r)\mathcal{U}(r+s)z \, dr \\ &= \mathcal{U}(s)u(x, t-s) - \int_0^s f(x, t-r)\mathcal{U}(r)z \, dr. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\frac{d}{ds}\mathcal{U}(s)u(x, t-s) = f(x, t-s)\mathcal{U}(s)z. \quad (3.16)$$

Furthermore, since $\mathcal{U}(t)$ is unitary for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{ds}(u(x, t-s), u(y, t-s)) \\ &= \frac{d}{ds}(\mathcal{U}(s)u(x, t-s), \mathcal{U}(s)u(y, t-s)) \\ &\stackrel{(3.16)}{=} f(x, t-s)(\mathcal{U}(s)z, \mathcal{U}(s)u(y, t-s)) + f(y, t-s)^*(\mathcal{U}(s)u(x, t-s), \mathcal{U}(s)z) \\ &= f(x, t-s)(z, u(y, t-s)) + f(y, t-s)^*(u(x, t-s), z) \\ &\stackrel{(3.9)}{=} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the orthogonality relation (3.9) from theorem 3. Hence, we have

$$(u(x, t-s), u(y, t-s)) = (u(x, t), u(y, t)), \quad (3.17)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{QH}$, $t \geq 0$ and $s \leq t$. Recall from eqs. (3.7), (3.9) that for all $x \in H$ and $t \geq 0$, we have $u(x, t) = \mathcal{P}x + u(\mathcal{Q}x, t)$, and $u(\mathcal{Q}x, t) \in \mathcal{QH}$. Thus, for all $x, y \in H$, $t \geq 0$ and $s \leq t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{G}(t-s)x, \mathcal{G}(t-s)y) &= (u(x, t-s), u(y, t-s)) \\ &= (u(\mathcal{Q}x, t-s), u(\mathcal{Q}y, t-s)) + (\mathcal{P}x, \mathcal{P}y) \\ &\stackrel{(3.17)}{=} (u(\mathcal{Q}x, t), u(\mathcal{Q}y, t)) + (\mathcal{P}x, \mathcal{P}y) \\ &= (u(x, t), u(y, t)) \\ &= (\mathcal{G}(t)x, \mathcal{G}(t)y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $x, y \in H$ and $s \leq 0$, we have

$$(\mathcal{G}(-s)x, \mathcal{G}(-s)y) = (x, y).$$

This implies that $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is a linear isometry for all $t \geq 0$.

Since $\mathcal{G}(t)$ has a right inverse, it follows that $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is a surjective isometry for all $t \geq 0$, i.e. $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is unitary for all $t \geq 0$ [39, p. 95]. Since $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is a group, this implies that $\mathcal{G}(-t) = \mathcal{G}(t)^{-1}$ is unitary for all $t \geq 0$. Hence, $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is a strongly continuous unitary group. \square

Corollary 7.1. *Let \mathcal{L} be skew-adjoint and $z \in D(\mathcal{L})$. Then, for all $r, s, t \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$(\eta_{t+r}, \eta_{s+r}) = (\eta_t, \eta_s),$$

where $\eta_t := \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z$ and $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is the strongly continuous unitary group generated by $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$.

The following theorem shows that there exists a dense subspace D , such that for all $z \in D$, the generator of the orthogonal dynamics is given by $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$. The main idea is to apply the spectral theory for closed symmetric operators following the work by Leinfelder [32].

Lemma 8. *Let \mathcal{L} be skew-adjoint and $z \in F(\mathcal{L})$, where*

$$F(\mathcal{L}) := \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \{x \in D^{\infty}(\mathcal{L}) : \|\mathcal{L}^n x\| \leq m^n \|x\| \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Then, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ is skew-adjoint.

Proof. Note that by theorem 7, we already know from Stone's theorem [10, p. 89, Theorem 3.24] that $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ is skew-adjoint. Hence, it is left to show that $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$. First, we show that $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ is well-defined and skew-adjoint.

Since $z \in D(\mathcal{L})$, it follows that $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$ is densely defined and closed, cf. theorem 3. Furthermore, $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$ is densely defined and skew-symmetric. This implies that $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$ is closable [41, p. 255]. Since $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$ is densely defined and skew-symmetric, we have [41, p. 252-255]

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q})^{\dagger} \subseteq -(\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q})^{\dagger} = -\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}^{\dagger}.$$

Hence, the operator

$$\mathcal{A} := \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$$

is densely defined, closed and skew-symmetric.

Let \mathcal{B} be densely defined, closed and skew-symmetric. Then, for all $\lambda \geq 0$, we obtain the closed, \mathcal{B} -invariant subspaces [32, Lemma 1],

$$F(\mathcal{B}, \lambda) := \{x \in D^{\infty}(\mathcal{B}) : \|\mathcal{B}^n x\| \leq \lambda^n \|x\| \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}. \quad (3.18)$$

Note that $F(\mathcal{B}, \lambda') \subseteq F(\mathcal{B}, \lambda)$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda' \geq 0$. Furthermore, \mathcal{B} is skew-adjoint, if and only if the union

$$F(\mathcal{B}) := \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} F(\mathcal{B}, m)$$

is dense in H [32, Lemma 4]. Hence, in order to show that \mathcal{A} is skew-adjoint, it suffices to show that $F(\mathcal{A})$ is dense in H .

Since $z \in F(\mathcal{L})$, there exists $\lambda' \geq 0$ such that $z \in F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda')$. Let $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ arbitrary. Now, we show by induction that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\|\mathcal{A}^n x\| \leq (2\lambda)^n \|x\|$ for all $x \in F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda)$. Base clause. Since $z \in F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda)$, we have for all $x \in F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}x\| &= \|\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}x\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}x\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{L}x\| + \|\mathcal{L}z\| |(x, z)(z, z)^{-1}| \\ (3.18) \quad &\leq 2\lambda \|x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Induction step. Suppose

$$\|\mathcal{A}^n x\| \leq (2\lambda)^n \|x\|, \quad (3.19)$$

for all $x \in F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda)$. Since $F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda)$ is \mathcal{L} -invariant [32, Lemma 1], we have $\mathcal{L}x, \mathcal{L}z \in F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda)$ for all $x \in F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda)$. Hence, for all $x \in F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}^{n+1}x\| &= \|\mathcal{A}^n \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}x\| \\ &= \|\mathcal{A}^n \mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}x\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{A}^n \mathcal{L}x\| + \|\mathcal{A}^n \mathcal{L}z\| |(x, z)(z, z)^{-1}| \\ (3.19) \quad &\leq (2\lambda)^n \|\mathcal{L}x\| + (2\lambda)^n \|\mathcal{L}z\| \|x\| \|z\|^{-1} \\ (3.18) \quad &\leq \lambda(2\lambda)^n \|x\| + \lambda(2\lambda)^n \|x\| \\ &= (2\lambda)^{n+1} \|x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by induction, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\|\mathcal{A}^n x\| \leq (2\lambda)^n \|x\|,$$

for all $x \in F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda)$. Therefore, $F(\mathcal{L}, \lambda) \subseteq F(\mathcal{A}, 2\lambda)$. Since $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ is arbitrary, this implies $F(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq F(\mathcal{A})$. Since \mathcal{L} is skew-adjoint, $F(\mathcal{L})$ is dense in H [32, Lemma 4]. Hence, $F(\mathcal{A})$ is dense in H . Therefore, $\mathcal{A} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ is skew-adjoint [32, Lemma 4].

Recall from theorem 3 that $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} = [\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q}]^\dagger$. Since \mathcal{L} and $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ are skew-adjoint, we have

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} = [\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}^\dagger\mathcal{Q}]^\dagger = -[\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}]^\dagger = -\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}^\dagger = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

It remains an open question if the assertion of lemma 8 still holds for all observables $z \in D(\mathcal{L})$. A notable counterexample for an infinite rank projection (rather than the Mori projection) is given by Givon et al. [15].

Example 9. Let $H := L^2(\mathbb{R})$, $\mathcal{L} := \partial_x$, $D(\mathcal{L}) := W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R})$, $\mathcal{Q}f(x) := \Theta(x)f(x)$, where \mathcal{L} is the weak derivative and Θ denotes the Heaviside function. Then,

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} \subsetneq -\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}^\dagger} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}},$$

and $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ does not generate a strongly continuous unitary group.

Proof. The proof is given in appendix Appendix A. □

4. Classical statistical mechanics

In this section, we demonstrate how the previous results can be applied to statistical ensembles of (possibly non-Hamiltonian) classical systems. Let the state space be given by $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ and μ be the Lebesgue measure on (Ω, Σ) , where Σ denotes the Lebesgue σ -algebra. Let $\rho \in L^1(\mu)$ be nonnegative and normalized. The space of real valued observables $L^2(P)$ is the set of square integrable random variables for the probability measure P ,

$$P(\mathcal{M}) := \int \rho \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{M}} d\mu, \quad \mathcal{M} \in \Sigma, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{M}}$ denotes the indicator function. The space $L^2(P)$ is a real Hilbert space [29, p. 153, Corollary 7.22] equipped with the scalar product

$$(x, y)_{L^2(P)} := \mathbb{E}[xy] := \int xy dP = \int xy \rho d\mu, \quad (4.2)$$

where \mathbb{E} denotes the expectation value. The complex Hilbert space of observables H is introduced according to

$$\begin{aligned} H &:= \mathbb{C} \otimes L^2(P), \\ (\alpha x, \beta y) &:= \alpha \beta^* \cdot (x, y)_{L^2(P)}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in L^2(P)$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$.

Now, let $\mathbf{F} : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be continuously differentiable with bounded derivative. Then, there exists a continuous flow $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \mapsto \Omega$, such that [10, p. 91]

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_0 &= \text{id}_\Omega, \\ \varphi_{t+s} &= \varphi_t \circ \varphi_s, \\ \frac{d}{dt} \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{F} \circ \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned}$$

for all $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. Let X be the Banach space of continuous functions that vanish at infinity,

$$\begin{aligned} X &:= C_0(\Omega), \\ \|x\|_X &:= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} |x(\mathbf{x})|. \end{aligned}$$

The composition operator (Koopman operator [30])

$$\mathcal{K}(t)x := x \circ \varphi_t, \quad x \in X, \quad (4.3)$$

is a strongly continuous group on X , where the generator is given by the closure of $(\mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla, C_c^1(\Omega))$ in X , and $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is a core of the generator [10, p. 91-92].

Theorem 10. *Let $\rho \in L^1(\mu)$ be nonnegative and normalized. Let $\mathbf{F} : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be continuously differentiable with bounded derivative. Let $\rho\mathbf{F} \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ such that $\omega_0 := \frac{1}{2}\|\rho^{-1}\operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{F})\|_{L^\infty(P)} < \infty$. Then,*

- $\overline{\mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla}^{L^2(P)}$ generates a strongly continuous group $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ on $L^2(P)$
- $\|\mathcal{U}(t)\| \leq e^{\omega_0|t|}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$
- $\mathcal{U}(t)x = \mathcal{K}(t)x$ for all $x \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$

If in addition $\operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{F}) = 0$, then,

- $\mathcal{U}(t)$ is a linear isometry on $L^2(P)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$
- P is invariant under the map φ_t for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$
- $\mathcal{U}(t)x = x \circ \varphi_t$ for all $x \in L^2(P)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$

Proof. The proof is given in appendix Appendix B. □

For simplicity, let us outline the main results for the case of stationary classical systems. Under the assumptions of theorem 10 with $\operatorname{div}(\rho\mathbf{F}) = 0$, the time evolution of observables is described by the strongly continuous unitary group $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ generated by $\mathcal{L} := \overline{\mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla}^H$. In this case, for any observable $0 \neq z \in D(\mathcal{L})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}[z \circ \varphi_t] &= \omega[z \circ \varphi_t] + \eta_t + \int_0^t K(t-s)[z \circ \varphi_s] ds, \\ \omega &:= (\mathcal{L}z, z)(z, z)^{-1}, \\ \eta_t &:= \mathcal{G}(t)\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}z, \\ K(t) &:= -(\eta_t, \eta_0)(z, z)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is the strongly continuous unitary group generated by $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ and \mathcal{Q} is the orthogonal projection onto $\operatorname{span}(z)^\perp$. Note that the drift term ω vanishes for real observables, since \mathcal{L} is skew-adjoint. Further, we have $(\eta_t, z) = 0$, and $(\eta_{t+r}, \eta_{s+r}) = (\eta_t, \eta_s)$. Moreover, we have $\mathcal{G}(t) = \mathcal{Q}e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}$, where $\{e^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ denotes the strongly continuous group generated by $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$. If in addition $z \in F(\mathcal{L})$, where $F(\mathcal{L})$ be defined as in lemma 8, we have $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$.

5. Non-autonomous systems

Finally, we ask whether the GLE also holds for systems that evolve under time-dependent dynamics such as systems subjected to time-dependent external forces or active matter.

For a time-dependent flow $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$, where Ω denotes some configuration space, we have $\varphi(t, s) \circ \varphi(s, r) = \varphi(t, s)$ and $\varphi(t, t) = \text{id}_\Omega$, for all $t, s, r \in \mathbb{R}$. If H is a complex Hilbert space of observables such that $x : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for all $x \in H$, then the time evolution of observables is given by the composition operator $\mathcal{U}(t, s)x := x \circ \varphi(t, s)$. Hence, due to the composition, $\{\mathcal{U}(t, s)\}_{t, s \in \mathbb{R}}$ is expected to resemble an evolution family with *reversed* order of its 'group properties'. This corresponds to the notion of *negatively time-ordered exponentials*.

Definition 3. Let $\{\mathcal{U}(t, s)\}_{t, s \in \mathbb{R}}$ be a strongly continuous family of bounded linear operators on H such that for all $r, s, t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathcal{U}(t, t) = 1, \quad (5.1)$$

$$\mathcal{U}(r, s)\mathcal{U}(t, r) = \mathcal{U}(t, s). \quad (5.2)$$

For all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathcal{L}(t)$ be defined by

$$\mathcal{L}(t)x := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} [\mathcal{U}(t+h, t)x - x], \quad (5.3)$$

$$D(\mathcal{L}(t)) := \{x \in H : \mathcal{L}(t)x \in H\}. \quad (5.4)$$

Further, let the subspace $D_{\mathcal{L}}$ be defined by

$$D_{\mathcal{L}} := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} D(\mathcal{L}(t)).$$

Note in particular, that for all $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in D_{\mathcal{L}}$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{U}(t, s)x \stackrel{(5.2)}{=} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathcal{U}(t, s) [\mathcal{U}(t+h, t) - 1]x \quad (5.5)$$

$$\stackrel{(5.3)}{=} \mathcal{U}(t, s) \mathcal{L}(t)x. \quad (5.6)$$

The following theorem is the analogue of theorem 1 for non-autonomous systems.

Theorem 11 (non-stationary generalized Langevin equation (nsGLE)). *Let $\{\mathcal{P}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, $\{\mathcal{Q}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be strongly continuous families of linear operators on H such that $\mathcal{P}(t) + \mathcal{Q}(t) = 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\|\mathcal{U}(\cdot, \cdot)\|, \|\mathcal{P}(\cdot)\|$ be uniformly bounded on compact sets. Let $t \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(t)z$ be continuous for some $0 \neq z \in D_{\mathcal{L}}$. For all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let the memory kernel $K(t, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be defined by the unique continuous solution of the Volterra equation*

$$K(t, s) = -(\mathcal{U}(t, s)\mathcal{Q}(t)\mathcal{L}(t)z, \mathcal{Q}(s)\mathcal{L}(s)z)_{st_0}^{-1}(z, z)_{st_0}^{-1} \\ + \int_s^t K(t, r)(\mathcal{U}(r, s)z, \mathcal{Q}(s)\mathcal{L}(s)z)_{st_0}^{-1}(z, z)_{st_0}^{-1} dr, \quad (5.7)$$

$$(x, y)_{st_0} := (\mathcal{U}(s, t_0)x, \mathcal{U}(s, t_0)y). \quad (5.8)$$

Let the fluctuating forces $\eta : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow H$ be defined by

$$\eta_{tt_0} := \mathcal{U}(t, t_0) \mathcal{Q}(t) \mathcal{L}(t) z - \int_{t_0}^t K(t, r) \mathcal{U}(r, t_0) z dr. \quad (5.9)$$

Then, $t \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(t, t_0) z$ solves the non-stationary generalized Langevin equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{U}(t, t_0) z = \mathcal{U}(t, t_0) \mathcal{P}(t) \mathcal{L}(t) z + \eta_{tt_0} + \int_{t_0}^t K(t, s) \mathcal{U}(s, t_0) z ds, \quad (5.10)$$

and the equation

$$K(t, s) = -(\eta_{ts}, \eta_{ss})_{st_0} (z, z)_{st_0}^{-1}, \quad (5.11)$$

holds. Furthermore, the memory kernel K and the fluctuating forces η are uniquely determined by eqs. (5.10) and (5.11).

Proof. Under the given assumptions, one easily verifies that for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the coefficient functions of the Volterra equation (5.7) are continuous. Hence, $K(t, \cdot)$ is well-defined by the unique continuous solution of the Volterra equation (5.7) [6, p. 25, Theorem 2.1.1]. Further, the vector-valued integrals are well-defined and interchange with the scalar product. Computing the time derivative of $t \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(t, t_0) z$ immediately yields the nsGLE, eq. (5.10),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{U}(t, t_0) z &\stackrel{(5.6)}{=} \mathcal{U}(t, t_0) \mathcal{L}(t) z \\ &= \mathcal{U}(t, t_0) \mathcal{P}(t) \mathcal{L}(t) z + \mathcal{U}(t, t_0) \mathcal{Q}(t) \mathcal{L}(t) z, \\ &\stackrel{(5.9)}{=} \mathcal{U}(t, t_0) \mathcal{P}(t) \mathcal{L}(t) z + \eta_{tt_0} + \int_{t_0}^t K(t, s) \mathcal{U}(s, t_0) z ds. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, inserting η_{tt_0} into eq. (5.11) yields eq. (5.7). Hence, eq. (5.11) holds.

It is left to show that K and η are uniquely determined by eqs. (5.10) and (5.11). Clearly, eq. (5.10) holds, if and only if η_{tt_0} is given by eq. (5.9). Furthermore, for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$, inserting η_{tt_0} into eq. (5.11) yields the Volterra equation (5.7). Hence, the assertion follows by the uniqueness of the solution of eq. (5.7). \square

In the following, we continue with the time-dependent version of the Mori projection operator. Similar to corollary 1.1, we find that the orthogonality relation between the fluctuating forces η_{ts} and the observable of interest z holds. As a consequence, the non-stationary version of the 2FDT holds.

Corollary 11.1 (Orthogonality and 2FDT). *Under the assumptions of theorem 11, let in addition*

$$\mathcal{P}(t) := (\cdot, z)_{st_0} (z, z)_{st_0}^{-1} z. \quad (5.12)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta_{ts}, z)_{st_0} &= 0, \\ K(t, s) &= -(\eta_{tt_0}, \eta_{st_0}) (z, z)_{st_0}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{U}(t_0, s)\eta_{tt_0} &\stackrel{(5.9)}{=} \mathcal{U}(t_0, s) \left\{ \mathcal{U}(t, t_0)\mathcal{Q}(t)\mathcal{L}(t)z - \int_{t_0}^t K(t, r)\mathcal{U}(r, t_0)z \, dr \right\} \\
 &\stackrel{(5.2)}{=} \mathcal{U}(t, s)\mathcal{Q}(t)\mathcal{L}(t)z - \int_{t_0}^t K(t, r)\mathcal{U}(r, s)z \, dr \\
 &\stackrel{(5.9)}{=} \eta_{ts} - \int_{t_0}^s K(t, r)\mathcal{U}(r, s)z \, dr.
 \end{aligned}$$

Applying $\mathcal{U}(s, t_0)$ on both sides yields

$$\eta_{tt_0} \stackrel{(5.2)}{=} \mathcal{U}(s, t_0)\eta_{ts} - \int_{t_0}^s K(t, r)\mathcal{U}(r, t_0)z \, dr.$$

Taking the derivative w.r.t. s yields

$$\frac{d}{ds}\mathcal{U}(s, t_0)\eta_{ts} = K(t, s)\mathcal{U}(s, t_0)z. \tag{5.13}$$

With this, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d}{ds}(\eta_{ts}, z)_{st_0} &\stackrel{(5.8)}{=} \frac{d}{ds}(\mathcal{U}(s, t_0)\eta_{ts}, \mathcal{U}(s, t_0)z) \\
 &\stackrel{(5.13)(5.6)(5.8)}{=} K(t, s)(z, z)_{st_0} + (\eta_{ts}, \mathcal{L}(s)z)_{st_0} \\
 &\stackrel{(5.11)}{=} -(\eta_{ts}, \eta_{ss})_{st_0} + (\eta_{ts}, \mathcal{L}(s)z)_{st_0} \\
 &\stackrel{(5.9)}{=} -(\eta_{ts}, \mathcal{Q}(s)\mathcal{L}(s)z)_{st_0} + (\eta_{ts}, \mathcal{L}(s)z)_{st_0} \\
 &= (\eta_{ts}, \mathcal{P}(s)\mathcal{L}(s)z)_{st_0} \\
 &\stackrel{(5.12)}{=} (\eta_{ts}, z)_{st_0} (\mathcal{L}(s)z, z)_{st_0}^* (z, z)_{st_0}^{-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$(\eta_{ts}, z)_{st_0} = (\eta_{tt}, z)_{tt_0} \exp \left\{ \int_t^s (\mathcal{L}(r)z, z)_{rt_0}^* (z, z)_{rt_0}^{-1} \, dr \right\}.$$

The initial value is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\eta_{tt}, z)_{tt_0} &\stackrel{(5.9)}{=} (\mathcal{Q}(t)\mathcal{L}(t)z, z)_{tt_0} \\
 &= (\mathcal{L}(t)z, z)_{tt_0} - (\mathcal{P}(t)\mathcal{L}(t)z, z)_{tt_0} \\
 &\stackrel{(5.12)}{=} (\mathcal{L}(t)z, z)_{tt_0} - (\mathcal{L}(t)z, z)_{tt_0} (z, z)_{tt_0}^{-1} (z, z)_{tt_0} \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain the orthogonality relation

$$(\eta_{ts}, z)_{st_0} = 0. \tag{5.14}$$

Now, let us show that $r \rightarrow (\eta_{tr}, \eta_{sr})_{rt_0}$ is constant.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d}{dr}(\eta_{tr}, \eta_{sr})_{rt_0} &\stackrel{(5.8)}{=} \frac{d}{dr}(\mathcal{U}(r, t_0)\eta_{tr}, \mathcal{U}(r, t_0)\eta_{sr}) \\
 &\stackrel{(5.13)}{=} K(t, r)(\mathcal{U}(r, t_0)z, \mathcal{U}(r, t_0)\eta_{sr}) + K(s, r)^*(\mathcal{U}(r, t_0)\eta_{tr}, \mathcal{U}(r, t_0)z) \\
 &\stackrel{(5.8)}{=} K(t, r)(z, \eta_{sr})_{rt_0} + K(s, r)^*(\eta_{tr}, z)_{rt_0} \\
 &\stackrel{(5.14)}{=} 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 K(t, s) &\stackrel{(5.11)}{=} -(\eta_{ts}, \eta_{ss})_{st_0}(z, z)_{st_0}^{-1} \\
 &= -(\eta_{tr}, \eta_{sr})_{rt_0}(z, z)_{st_0}^{-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For $r = t_0$, this implies

$$K(t, s) = -(\eta_{tt_0}, \eta_{st_0})(z, z)_{st_0}^{-1}.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

6. Conclusion

The generalized Langevin equation holds for autonomous as well as non-autonomous systems irrespective of the properties of the orthogonal dynamics. This statement results directly from the properties of linear Volterra equations and it does not require the validity of the Dyson operator identity. However, to obtain this statement, we needed to change the definitions of the memory kernel and the fluctuating force of the GLE compared to the ones commonly given in the statistical physics literature. The second fluctuation dissipation theorem then holds by construction, independent of the choice of projection operator.

To characterize the properties of the GLE in more detail, we focused on the projection operator introduced by Mori, which is of finite rank. We briefly summarize the central statements: The Mori projection operator \mathcal{P} is the orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}(z)$, where z is a vector in a complex Hilbert space H . Suppose the time-evolution operator $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, which propagates the observable of interest z , is a strongly continuous semigroup on H with generator \mathcal{L} . Let $z \in D(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$. Then, the orbit maps of the orthogonal dynamics are well-defined by unique continuous solutions of linear Volterra equations. Without any additional assumptions, this allows us to prove that the orthogonal dynamics $\{\mathcal{G}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup generated by $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$, where $\mathcal{Q} := 1 - \mathcal{P}$. Let in addition $z \in D(\mathcal{L})$. Then, we have $\mathcal{G}(t) = \mathcal{Q} \exp\{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t\}$, where $\{\exp\{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t\}_{t \geq 0}$ denotes the strongly continuous semigroup generated by $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$, which is obtained from the bounded perturbation theorem. This means that $\{\mathcal{Q} \exp\{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}t\}\}_{t \geq 0}$ is again a semigroup. Moreover, the orbit maps of the orthogonal dynamics are the

unique mild solutions of the abstract Cauchy problem associated to \overline{QLQ} , for all initial values in H . In particular, the fluctuating forces can be unambiguously defined by the unique mild solution of the abstract Cauchy problem associated to \overline{QLQ} with initial value QLz .

Furthermore, we have presented an alternative proof of the GLE solely by means of semigroup theory. Nevertheless, the unambiguous interpretation of the orthogonal dynamics (and fluctuating forces) ultimately remains a consequence of the theory of linear Volterra equations.

In addition, we have shown that if \mathcal{L} is skew-adjoint, then, \overline{QLQ} generates a unitary group. In this case, the fluctuating forces are stationary, and there exists a dense subspace D , such that $\overline{QLQ} = \overline{QLQ}$ for all $z \in D$.

It is unclear whether any of these statements on the semigroup properties of the orthogonal dynamics also apply to the widely used non-linear version of the GLE, which contains a potential of mean force. The potential of mean force is usually expressed in terms of the Zwanzig projection operator, i.e. an operator of infinite rank.

In summary, when reducing the number of degrees of freedom of a complex system, the GLE provides the correct dynamics. For the Mori projection operator, we have specified minimal conditions under which the orthogonal dynamics is a strongly continuous unitary group. In this case, the fluctuating forces are stationary, which is a prerequisite for replacing them by a simple noise as commonly done in statistical physics and stochastic thermodynamics.

7. Acknowledgment

We acknowledge funding by the German Research Foundation (DFG) in project 535083866. We thank Carsten Hartmann, Thomas Franosch, Felix Höfling, Anja Seegebrecht, Fabian Koch and Klara Resch for useful feedback on our work.

Appendix A. Proof of example 9

Proof. Clearly, we have $Q^2 = Q$ and $\|Q\| \leq 1$. Since $Q \neq 0$, we have $\|Qf\| = \|f\|$ for some $f \in QH$. Hence $\|Q\| \geq 1$. Thus, Q is a projection of norm one. This implies that $Q = Q^\dagger$ is an orthogonal projection [54, p. 262, Satz (Theorem) V.5.9].

Recall that the weak derivative \mathcal{L} is skew-adjoint on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with domain $D(\mathcal{L}) = W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R})$. The space $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R})$ is the set of weakly differentiable functions with weak derivative in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, or equivalently, the space of absolutely continuous functions with point-wise derivative in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, the weak derivative coincides with the point-wise derivative almost everywhere. Next, observe that $Qf \in D(\mathcal{L})$, if and only if f is absolutely continuous on \mathbb{R}_+ with point-wise derivative in $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $f(0) = 0$.

More explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}) &= \{f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) : \mathcal{Q}f \in D(\mathcal{L})\} \\ &= L^2(\mathbb{R}_-) \oplus W_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+), \\ W_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+) &:= \{f \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+) : f(0) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Further, it is straightforward to show that $D(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q})$ is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Hence, $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$ is densely defined and skew-symmetric. This implies that $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}$ is closable, and $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ is again skew-symmetric [41, p. 252-255], cf. lemma 8. The adjoint of $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ is given by

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}^\dagger = (\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q})^\dagger = (\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q})^\dagger \mathcal{Q} = -(\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L})^\dagger \mathcal{Q} = -\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}},$$

where we used [41, p. 252, Theorem VIII.1] and [44, p. 330, Theorem 13.2]. One might expect, that $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ is skew-adjoint and generates a strongly continuous unitary group. However, this is not the case [15].

We have to show that $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} \subsetneq -\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}^\dagger$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}$ is densely defined, closed, and skew-symmetric, we have [41, p. 255]

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}} \subseteq -\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}^\dagger.$$

Hence, it suffices to find a function $f \in D(\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}^\dagger)$, but $f \notin D(\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}})$. Let $f(x) := \Theta(x)e^{-x}$. For all $g \in D(\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}})$, there exists a sequence $D(\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}) \ni g_n \rightarrow g$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}g_n = \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}g$. Note that $W_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ is given by the closure of $C_c^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ in $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ [5, p. 217, Theorem 8.12]. Hence, $C_c^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ is dense in $W_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Thus, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a sequence $C_c^1(\mathbb{R}_+) \ni \phi_{mn} \rightarrow g_n \in W_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Thus, we find

$$\begin{aligned} (f, \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}g) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (f, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}g_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty f(x) \partial_x g_n(x) dx \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty f(x) \phi'_{mn}(x) dx \\ &= - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty f'(x) \phi_{mn}(x) dx \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty f(x) g_n(x) dx \\ &= (f, g), \end{aligned}$$

where $'$ denotes the point-wise derivative. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}^\dagger f, \\ f &\in \mathcal{N}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{Q}}^\dagger - 1). \end{aligned}$$

According to von Neumann's formula [14, p. 82, Lemma 2.2], we have

$$D(\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}^\dagger}) = D(\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}}) \oplus_G \mathcal{N}(\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}^\dagger} - 1) \oplus_G \mathcal{N}(\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}^\dagger} + 1),$$

where \oplus_G denotes the orthogonal sum induced by the graph norm for $\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}^\dagger}$. This implies $f \in D(\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}^\dagger})$, but $f \notin D(\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}})$ as desired.

Hence, $\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}} \neq -\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}^\dagger}$. Thus, $\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}} = -\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}^\dagger}$ is not skew-adjoint. According to Stone's theorem [10, p. 89, Theorem 3.24], $\overline{\mathcal{QLQ}}$ does not generate a strongly continuous unitary group. \square

Appendix B. Proof of theorem 10

Proposition 12. *Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$, and μ be the Lebesgue measure on Ω . Let $f \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ and $g \in C_c^1(\Omega)$. Then, $fg \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$, $\partial_i(fg) = (\partial_i f)g + f(\partial_i g)$, and*

$$\int_{\Omega} f(\partial_i g) d\mu = - \int_{\Omega} (\partial_i f)g d\mu,$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, where ∂_i denotes the weak derivative.

Proof. There exists a sequence $C_c^\infty(\Omega) \ni f_n \rightarrow f \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ [5, p. 265, Theorem 9.2]. From Hölder's inequality [29, p. 152, Theorem 7.16], we know that $\phi \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \phi \psi d\mu$ is a bounded linear functional on $L^1(\Omega)$ for all $\psi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Since $\partial_i g, g \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, this implies

$$\int_{\Omega} f(\partial_i g) d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f_n(\partial_i g) d\mu = - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} (\partial_i f_n)g d\mu = - \int_{\Omega} (\partial_i f)g d\mu.$$

Suppose there exists a sequence $C_c^\infty(\Omega) \ni g_n \rightarrow g \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$. For all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we have [12, p. 246, Theorem 1]

$$\int_{\Omega} [(\partial_i f)g_n + f(\partial_i g_n)]\varphi d\mu = - \int_{\Omega} f g_n (\partial_i \varphi) d\mu.$$

Due to Hölder's inequality, the sequences $(\partial_i f)g_n, f(\partial_i g_n), f g_n$ are Cauchy in $L^1(\Omega)$. Since $\varphi, \partial_i \varphi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$\int_{\Omega} [(\partial_i f)g + f(\partial_i g)]\varphi d\mu = - \int_{\Omega} f g (\partial_i \varphi) d\mu.$$

Hence, $\partial_i(fg) = (\partial_i f)g + f(\partial_i g)$. Clearly, $fg \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$.

It is left to show that there exists a sequence $C_c^\infty(\Omega) \ni g_n \rightarrow g \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$. Let ρ_n be a sequence of mollifiers [5, p. 108], and set $g_n := \rho_n \star g$, where \star denotes the convolution. Since $g \in C_c(\Omega)$, $g_n \rightarrow g$ uniformly [5, p. 108, Proposition 4.21]. Since $g, \rho_n \in C_c^1(\Omega)$, it follows from the Leibniz integral rule [13, p. 56, Theorem 2.27] that $\partial_i g_n = \rho_n \star \partial_i g$. Since $\partial_i g \in C_c(\Omega)$, $\partial_i g_n \rightarrow \partial_i g$ uniformly [5, p. 108, Proposition 4.21]. Clearly, $g_n \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$. Hence, we have $C_c^\infty(\Omega) \ni g_n \rightarrow g \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$. This concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 13. *Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ and let P be the probability measure from eq. (4.1). Then, $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$.*

Proof. Suppose that P is regular on (Ω, Σ) . Since Ω is a locally compact Hausdorff space and $\mathcal{B}(\Omega) \subseteq \Sigma$, it follows by [8, p. 207, Proposition 7.4.3] that $C_c(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$. Further, the space $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is a subalgebra of $C_0(\Omega)$ which separates points, and for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ there exists a function in $C_c^1(\Omega)$ that does not vanish at \mathbf{x} . Hence, by the Stone-Weierstraß theorem [8, p. 392, Theorem D.23], it follows that $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is uniformly dense in $C_c(\Omega)$. Since $P(\Omega) = 1$, this implies that $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $C_c(\Omega)$ w.r.t. the norm on $L^2(P)$. Since $C_c(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$, this implies that $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$.

It is left to show that P is regular. Since P is a finite measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$, it follows by [8, p. 34, Proposition 1.5.6] that P is regular on $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$. Since Σ is the completion of $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ under the Lebesgue measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$ [8, p. 32, Proposition 1.5.2], for all $\mathcal{M} \in \Sigma$, there exists $\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{M}'' \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ such that $\mathcal{M}' \subseteq \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}''$ and $\mathcal{M}'' - \mathcal{M}'$ has Lebesgue measure zero. By definition, $P(\mathcal{M}'' - \mathcal{M}') = 0$. This implies $P(\mathcal{M}') = P(\mathcal{M}) = P(\mathcal{M}'')$. Since P is regular on $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$, and $\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{M}'' \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, it follows that P is regular on (Ω, Σ) . \square

Proposition 14. *Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ and Σ be the Lebesgue σ -algebra on Ω . Let $\mathbf{F} : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be continuously differentiable with bounded derivative. Then, the flow $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ generated by the vector field \mathbf{F} is Lipschitz continuous in Ω (uniformly on compact intervals) and Σ - Σ measurable (for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$).*

Proof. First, we show that \mathbf{F} is Lipschitz continuous. Let $\gamma(t) := t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}$ for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. Then, by the mean value theorem [43, p. 113, Theorem 15.19], we have for some $t_0 \in [0, 1]$

$$|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y})| \leq \left| \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{F}(\gamma(t)) \right|_{t=t_0} = |\mathbf{F}'(\gamma(t_0)) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})| \leq M|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|,$$

where $M := \sup_{\Omega} \|\mathbf{F}'\|$. Hence, \mathbf{F} is Lipschitz continuous. By the Picard-Lindelöf theorem [40, p. 214, Theorem 11], it follows that there exists a unique solution $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Omega$ of the initial value problem $\frac{d}{dt} \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{F}(\varphi_t(\mathbf{x}))$, $\varphi_0(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$, for all initial values $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. Further, it follows from Grönwall's inequality that φ_t is Lipschitz continuous (uniformly on compact intervals) [19, p. 47, Theorem 4.2]. Moreover, we have $\varphi_0 = \text{id}_{\Omega}$ and $\varphi_{t+s} = \varphi_t \circ \varphi_s$ [19, p. 42-43].

It is left to show that φ_t is Σ - Σ measurable. Since φ_t is continuous, φ_t is $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ - $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ measurable [8, p. 189, Lemma 7.2.1]. Since $\varphi_t^{-1} = \varphi_{-t}$ is Lipschitz continuous, φ_t^{-1} maps sets of Lebesgue measure zero onto sets of Lebesgue measure zero [45, p. 153, Lemma 7.25]. Since Σ is the completion of $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ under the Lebesgue measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$ [8, p. 32, Proposition 1.5.2], this implies that φ_t is Σ - Σ measurable for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

Proof of theorem 10. Let $X = (C_0(\Omega), \sup_{\Omega} |\cdot|)$. For $x, y \in L^2(P)$, we write $(x, y) := (x, y)_{L^2(P)}$. First, we show that the composition operator $(\mathcal{K}(t), C_c^1(\Omega))$ is a bounded linear operator on $L^2(P)$, where $\mathcal{K}(t)$ is defined by eq. (4.3). Let $x, y \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ arbitrary. Since convergence in X implies convergence in $L^2(P)$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\mathcal{K}(t)x, \mathcal{K}(t)y) = (\mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla \mathcal{K}(t)x, \mathcal{K}(t)y) + (\mathcal{K}(t)x, \mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla \mathcal{K}(t)y), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where we used the fact that $\{\mathcal{K}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is a strongly continuous group on X , and $(\mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla, C_c^1(\Omega))$ is a core of the generator [10, p. 91-92], cf. sec. 4. Since $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is a $\{\mathcal{K}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ -invariant subspace, we have $\mathcal{K}(t)x \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{K}(t)y \in C_c^1(\Omega)$. Since $\rho \mathbf{F} \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$, it follows by proposition 12 that $\rho \mathbf{F} \mathcal{K}(t)x \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{K}(t)x, \mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla \mathcal{K}(t)y) &\stackrel{(4.2)}{=} \int_{\Omega} [\mathcal{K}(t)x] \rho \mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla \mathcal{K}(t)y \, d\mu \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{F} \mathcal{K}(t)x) \mathcal{K}(t)y \, d\mu \\ &= -(\mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla \mathcal{K}(t)x, \mathcal{K}(t)y) - \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{F}) \mathcal{K}(t)x, \mathcal{K}(t)y \right). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting into eq. (B.1) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\mathcal{K}(t)x, \mathcal{K}(t)y) = - \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{F}) \mathcal{K}(t)x, \mathcal{K}(t)y \right). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

According to the Hölder inequality [29, p. 152, Theorem 7.16], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(\mathcal{K}(\pm t)x, \mathcal{K}(\pm t)x) &\leq 2\omega_0(\mathcal{K}(\pm t)x, \mathcal{K}(\pm t)x), \\ 2\omega_0 &= \left\| \rho^{-1} \operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{F}) \right\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq 0$, cf. [56, Sec. III.A][9]. Due to Grönwall's inequality, we conclude

$$\|\mathcal{K}(t)x\|_{L^2(P)}^2 \leq e^{2\omega_0|t|} \|x\|_{L^2(P)}^2, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

for all $x \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$, the composition operator $(\mathcal{K}(t), C_c^1(\Omega))$ is a densely defined, bounded linear operator on $L^2(P)$. Hence, we may define the time-evolution operator $\mathcal{U}(t)$ on $L^2(P)$ by the unique continuous extension of the composition operator [54, p. 52, Satz (Theorem) II.1.5], such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(t) &\in \mathcal{L}(L^2(P), L^2(P)), \\ \mathcal{U}(t)x &= \mathcal{K}(t)x, \quad x \in C_c^1(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Since $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$, we obtain the growth bound

$$\|\mathcal{U}(t)\| \stackrel{(B.3)}{\leq} e^{\omega_0|t|}.$$

For $C_c^1(\Omega) \ni x_n \rightarrow x \in L^2(P)$, we have

$$\mathcal{U}(t+s)x = \lim_n \mathcal{K}(t+s)x_n = \lim_n \mathcal{K}(t)\mathcal{K}(s)x_n = \lim_n \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{U}(s)x_n = \mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{U}(s)x.$$

Since $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$, $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is a group. Furthermore, for all $x \in C_c^1(\Omega)$, the orbit map $t \mapsto \mathcal{K}(t)x \in X$ is continuous. Thus, the orbit map $t \mapsto \mathcal{U}(t)x \in L^2(P)$ is continuous for all $x \in C_c^1(\Omega)$. Since $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$, it follows by [10, p. 38, Proposition 5.3c] that $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is a strongly continuous group. Let us denote its generator by $(\mathcal{L}, D(\mathcal{L}))$. Since $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$ and $\{\mathcal{U}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ -invariant, $(\mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla, C_c^1(\Omega))$ is a core of \mathcal{L} [10, p. 53, Proposition 1.7]. Since \mathcal{L} is closed, we conclude

$$\mathcal{L} = \overline{(\mathbf{F} \cdot \nabla, C_c^1(\Omega))}^{L^2(P)}.$$

Now, let $\operatorname{div}(\rho \mathbf{F}) = 0$ μ -almost everywhere. Then, we have for all $x, y \in C_c^1(\Omega)$

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\mathcal{K}(t)x, \mathcal{K}(t)y) \stackrel{(B.2)}{=} 0.$$

This implies for all $x, y \in C_c^1(\Omega)$

$$(\mathcal{K}(t)x, \mathcal{K}(t)y) = (x, y). \quad (B.4)$$

Since $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$, $\mathcal{U}(t)$ is a linear isometry on $L^2(P)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

We have to show that $P = P \circ \varphi_t^{-1}$, where $P \circ \varphi_t^{-1}$ denotes the image measure under the map φ_t [8, p. 75-76], and $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ is the flow introduced in sec 4. By proposition 14, φ_t is Σ - Σ measurable. In particular, the composition of a Lebesgue measurable function with φ_t is again Lebesgue measurable. Since $C_c^1(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^2(P)$, for all $\mathcal{M} \in \Sigma$, there exists a sequence $C_c^1(\Omega) \ni x_n \rightarrow \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{M}} \in L^2(P)$. Due to eq. (B.4) and [8, p. 76, Proposition 2.6.8], we have $x_n \rightarrow \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{M}} \in L^2(P \circ \varphi_t^{-1})$, and

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{M}) &= (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{M}}, \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{M}}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (x_n, x_m) \\ &\stackrel{(B.4)}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{K}(t)x_n, \mathcal{K}(t)x_m) \\ &\stackrel{(4.3)}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (x_n \circ \varphi_t, x_m \circ \varphi_t) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (x_n, x_m)_{L^2(P \circ \varphi_t^{-1})} \\ &= (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{M}}, \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{M}})_{L^2(P \circ \varphi_t^{-1})} \\ &= P \circ \varphi_t^{-1}(\mathcal{M}). \end{aligned}$$

This holds for all $\mathcal{M} \in \Sigma$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, thus, the measure P is invariant under the map φ_t for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e.

$$P = P \circ \varphi_t^{-1}. \quad (B.5)$$

This implies for all $x \in L^2(P)$

$$\|x \circ \varphi_t\|_{L^2(P)} \stackrel{(B.5)}{=} \|x \circ \varphi_t\|_{L^2(P \circ \varphi_{-t}^{-1})} = \|x \circ \varphi_t \circ \varphi_{-t}\|_{L^2(P)} = \|x\|_{L^2(P)},$$

where we used [8, p. 76, Proposition 2.6.8]. Hence, the composition $x \mapsto x \circ \varphi_t$ is a bounded linear operator on $L^2(P)$. Due to the uniqueness of a continuous extension [54, p. 52, Satz (Theorem) II.1.5], we conclude that $\mathcal{U}(t)x = x \circ \varphi_t$ for all $x \in L^2(P)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

- [1] Charalambos D. Aliprantis and Kim C. Border. *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker's Guide*, pages 403–432. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006.
- [2] Yury Arlinskiĭ and Christiane Tretter. Everything is possible for the domain intersection. *Advances in Mathematics*, 374:107383, 2020.
- [3] J. M. Ball. Shorter notes: Strongly continuous semigroups, weak solutions, and the variation of constants formula. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 63(2):370–373, 1977.
- [4] Richard Beals. On the abstract cauchy problem. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 10(3):281–299, 1972.
- [5] Haim Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*, pages 201–261. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2011.
- [6] T. A. Burton. Chapter 2 - linear equations. In *Volterra Integral and Differential Equations*, volume 202 of *Mathematics in Science and Engineering*, pages 23–68. Elsevier, 2005.
- [7] Alexandre J Chorin, Ole H Hald, and Raz Kupferman. Optimal prediction and the mori–zwanzig representation of irreversible processes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(7):2968–2973, 2000.
- [8] D. L. Cohn. *Measure Theory*. Birkhäuser New York, NY, 2013.
- [9] E. B. Davies. Semigroup growth bounds. *Journal of Operator Theory*, 53(2):225–249, 2005.
- [10] Klaus-Jochen Engel and Rainer Nagel. *One-Parameter Semigroups for Linear Evolution Equations*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2000. eBook 06 April 2006.
- [11] Denis J. Evans and G.P. Morriss. Equilibrium time correlation functions under gaussian isothermal dynamics. *Chemical Physics*, 87(3):451–454, 1984.
- [12] Lawrence C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*. American Mathematical Society, 1997.
- [13] Gerald B. Folland. *Real Analysis - Modern Techniques and Their Applications - Second Edition*. John Wiley and Sons, 1999.
- [14] Matteo Gallone, Alessandro Michelangeli, and Sergio Albeverio. *Self-adjoint extension schemes and modern applications to quantum Hamiltonians*. Springer Cham, 2023.
- [15] Dror Givon, Raz Kupferman, and Ole H. Hald. Existence proof for orthogonal dynamics and the mori-zwanzig formalism. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 145(1):221–241, Dec 2005.
- [16] Fabian Glatzel and Tanja Schilling. The interplay between memory and potentials of mean force: A discussion on the structure of equations of motion for coarse-grained observables. *Europhysics Letters*, 136(3):36001, 2022.
- [17] H. Grabert. Microdynamics and equations of motion for macrovariables. *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter*, 27(1):95–99, Mar 1977.
- [18] Hermann Grabert. *Projection operator techniques in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*, volume 95. Springer, 2006.
- [19] L. Grüne and O. Junge. *Gewöhnliche Differentialgleichungen*. Springer Spektrum Wiesbaden, 2016.
- [20] Brian C. Hall. *Quantum Theory for Mathematicians*, pages 201–226. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2013.
- [21] Carmen Hijón, Pep Español, Eric Vanden-Eijnden, and Rafael Delgado-Buscalioni. Mori–zwanzig formalism as a practical computational tool. *Faraday discussions*, 144:301–322, 2010.

- [22] E. Hille and R.S. Phillips. *Functional Analysis and Semi-groups*. American Mathematical Society: Colloquium publications. American Mathematical Society, 1957.
- [23] B. L. Holian and D. J. Evans. Classical response theory in the heisenberg picture. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 83(7):3560–3566, 10 1985.
- [24] Benjamin J A Héry and Roland R Netz. Derivation of a generalized langevin equation from a generic time-dependent hamiltonian. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 57(50):505003, nov 2024.
- [25] Sergei Izvekov. Microscopic derivation of particle-based coarse-grained dynamics. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 138(13), 2013.
- [26] Denis J Evans and Gary P Morriss. *Statistical mechanics of nonequilibrium liquids*. ANU Press, 2007.
- [27] Shinnosuke Kawai and Tamiki Komatsuzaki. Derivation of the generalized langevin equation in nonstationary environments. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 134(11), 2011.
- [28] K Kawasaki. Simple derivations of generalized linear and nonlinear langevin equations. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical, Nuclear and General*, 6(9):1289, sep 1973.
- [29] A. Klenke. *Probability Theory*. Springer Cham, 2020.
- [30] B. O. Koopman. Hamiltonian systems and transformation in hilbert space. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 17(5):315–318, 1931.
- [31] Ryogo Kubo. The fluctuation-dissipation theorem. *Reports on progress in physics*, 29(1):255, 1966.
- [32] Herbert Leinfelder. A geometric proof of the spectral theorem for unbounded self-adjoint operators. *Mathematische Annalen*, 242(1):85–96, Feb 1979.
- [33] MG McPhie, PJ DAVIS, Ian K Snook, J Ennis, and DJ Evans. Generalized langevin equation for nonequilibrium systems. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 299(3-4):412–426, 2001.
- [34] Hugues Meyer, Thomas Voigtmann, and Tanja Schilling. On the non-stationary generalized Langevin equation. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 147(21):214110, 12 2017.
- [35] Hugues Meyer, Thomas Voigtmann, and Tanja Schilling. On the dynamics of reaction coordinates in classical, time-dependent, many-body processes. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 150(17), 2019.
- [36] Hazime Mori. Transport, collective motion, and brownian motion. *Progress of theoretical physics*, 33(3):423–455, 1965.
- [37] Sadao Nakajima. On quantum theory of transport phenomena: Steady diffusion. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 20(6):948–959, 12 1958.
- [38] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*. Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer New York, 1983.
- [39] Gert K. Pedersen. *Analysis Now*, pages 79–125. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1989.
- [40] Jürgen Pöschel. *Etwas mehr Analysis: Eine Einführung in die mehrdimensionale Analysis*, pages 203–234. Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, Wiesbaden, 2014.
- [41] M. Reed and B. Simon. *I: Functional Analysis*. Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. Academic Press, revised and enlarged edition edition, 1980.
- [42] Baldwin Robertson. Equations of motion in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics. *Physical Review*, 144(1):151, 1966.
- [43] W. Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. International series in pure and applied mathematics. McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- [44] W. Rudin. *Functional Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, tmh edition edition, 1974.
- [45] Walter Rudin. *Real and Complex Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, 1987.
- [46] Tanja Schilling. Coarse-grained modelling out of equilibrium. *Physics Reports*, 972:1–45, 2022.
- [47] Ian Snook. *The Langevin and generalised Langevin approach to the dynamics of atomic, polymeric and colloidal systems*. Elsevier, 2006.
- [48] M. H. Stone. On one-parameter unitary groups in hilbert space. *Annals of Mathematics*,

- 33(3):643–648, 1932.
- [49] Michael Te Vrugt and Raphael Wittkowski. Mori-zwanzig projection operator formalism for far-from-equilibrium systems with time-dependent hamiltonians. *Physical Review E*, 99(6):062118, 2019.
 - [50] Michael te Vrugt and Raphael Wittkowski. Projection operators in statistical mechanics: a pedagogical approach. *European Journal of Physics*, 41(4):045101, 2020.
 - [51] J. v. Neumann. Über Einen Satz Von Herrn M. H. Stone. *Annals of Mathematics*, 33(3):567–573, 1932.
 - [52] Jan van Neerven. *The Adjoint of a Semigroup of Linear Operators*, pages 1–18. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1992.
 - [53] Hadrien Vroylandt. On the derivation of the generalized langevin equation and the fluctuation-dissipation theorem. *Europhysics Letters*, 140(6):62003, dec 2022.
 - [54] Dirk Werner. *Funktionalanalysis*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2018.
 - [55] Christoph Widder, Fabian Koch, and Tanja Schilling. Generalized Langevin dynamics simulation with non-stationary memory kernels: How to make noise. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 157(19):194107, 11 2022.
 - [56] Yuanran Zhu, Jason M. Dominy, and Daniele Venturi. On the estimation of the Mori-Zwanzig memory integral. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 59(10):103501, 09 2018.
 - [57] Robert Zwanzig. Ensemble method in the theory of irreversibility. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 33(5):1338–1341, 1960.
 - [58] Robert Zwanzig. Ensemble method in the theory of irreversibility. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 33(5):1338–1341, 11 1960.
 - [59] Robert Zwanzig. Memory effects in irreversible thermodynamics. *Phys. Rev.*, 124:983–992, Nov 1961.
 - [60] Robert Zwanzig. Nonlinear generalized langevin equations. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 9(3):215–220, Nov 1973.
 - [61] Robert Zwanzig. *Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics*. Oxford University Press, 2001.
 - [62] Robert Zwanzig, K. S. J. Nordholm, and W. C. Mitchell. Memory effects in irreversible thermodynamics: Corrected derivation of transport equations. *Phys. Rev. A*, 5:2680–2682, Jun 1972.