

12.1. Spectra of shifts

Let $S: \ell^2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C})$ be the right shift on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C})$, i.e.,

$$S((x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)) = (0, x_1, x_2, \dots) \quad \text{for all } (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C}).$$

- (a) Calculate the operator norm $\|S\|_{L(\ell^2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C}), \ell^2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C}))}$ and the spectral radius r_S of S .
- (b) Determine the point spectrum $\sigma_p(S)$, the continuous spectrum $\sigma_c(S)$ and the residual spectrum $\sigma_r(S)$ of S .
- (c) Do the same for S^* , the left shift.

12.2. Fredholm's alternative (on Hilbert spaces)

Let H be a Hilbert space and let $K \in L(H)$ be a compact operator. Prove the following statements. (The goal of this exercise lies in (d) and (e) below.)

- (a) $\dim(\ker(I - K)) < \infty$.
- (b) $\text{im}(I - K)$ is closed.
- (c) $\text{im}(I - K) = (\ker(I - K^*))^\perp$.
- (d) $\ker(I - K) = \{0\}$ if and only if $\text{im}(I - K) = H$.

Hint: For “ (\Rightarrow) ”, assume that $\ker(I - K) = \{0\}$ and $\text{im}(I - K) \neq H$. Show that this assumption leads to the following chain of proper inclusions: $H \supsetneq (I - K)(H) \supsetneq (I - K)^2(H) \supsetneq (I - K)^3(H) \supsetneq \dots$; choose now $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq H$ such that $\|x_k\| = 1$, $x_k \in (I - K)^k(H)$, $x_k \in ((I - K)^{k+1}(H))^\perp$ and show that $Kx_k - Kx_l$ has norm greater or equal than 1 whenever $k < l$ because $Kx_k - Kx_l$ can be written as the difference of x_k and an element of $(I - K)^{k+1}(H)$. For “ (\Leftarrow) ”, dualize.

- (e) $\dim(\ker(I - K)) = \dim(\ker(I - K^*))$.

Hint: Assume for a contradiction that $\dim(\ker(I - K)) < \dim(\text{im}(I - K)^\perp)$. Construct an injective compact map $A_0: \ker(I - K) \rightarrow \text{im}(I - K)^\perp$. Show that this map is not surjective. Extend A_0 to a compact map $A: H \rightarrow \text{im}(I - K)^\perp$ with $\text{im}(A) = \text{im}(A_0)$ by setting $A|_{(\ker(I - K))^\perp} \equiv 0$. Show that $\ker(I - K - A) = \{0\}$, but $\text{im}(I - K - A) \neq H$. This contradiction now shows $\dim(\ker(I - K)) \geq \dim(\text{im}(I - K)^\perp)$. Finish by dualizing.

Remark. The statement remains true in the Banach space setting. (The proof gets slightly more technical.) In particular, we just saw – as mentioned earlier – that the extra symmetry assumption on the kernel k in Problem 11.5 (*Integral operators*) was not really necessary.

12.3. Symmetry vs. self-adjointness

Let H be a \mathbb{C} -Hilbert space and let $A: D_A \subseteq H \rightarrow H$ be a densely defined symmetric linear operator. Prove that the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) A is self-adjoint.
- (ii) A is closed and $\ker(A^* + i) = \{0\} = \ker(A^* - i)$.
- (iii) $\operatorname{im}(A + i) = H = \operatorname{im}(A - i)$.

12.4. Special construction of self-adjoint operators

Let H and K be \mathbb{K} -Hilbert spaces (with $\mathbb{K} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$) and let $J \in L(K, H)$ be an injective operator with dense range.

- (a) Prove that $JJ^* \in L(H)$ is an injective operator with dense range.
- (b) Prove that $S := (JJ^*)^{-1}$ (i.e., the operator $S: D_S \subseteq H \rightarrow H$, defined by $D_S = \operatorname{im}(JJ^*)$ and $S(JJ^*x) = x$ for all $x \in H$) is self-adjoint.

Hint: For (b), prove that S is symmetric and use Problem 12.3.

12.5. Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle

Let $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H)$ be a Hilbert space over \mathbb{C} . Let $D_A, D_B \subseteq H$ be dense subspaces and let $A: D_A \subseteq H \rightarrow H$ and $B: D_B \subseteq H \rightarrow H$ be symmetric linear operators. Assume that

$$A(D_A \cap D_B) \subseteq D_B \quad \text{and} \quad B(D_A \cap D_B) \subseteq D_A,$$

and define the *commutator* of A and B as

$$[A, B]: D_{[A, B]} \subseteq H \rightarrow H, \quad [A, B](x) := A(Bx) - B(Ax),$$

where $D_{[A, B]} := D_A \cap D_B$.

- (a) Prove that

$$\left| \langle x, [A, B]x \rangle_H \right| \leq 2\|Ax\|_H \|Bx\|_H \quad \text{for every } x \in D_{[A, B]}.$$

(b) Define now the *standard deviation* of A

$$\varsigma(A, x) := \sqrt{\langle Ax, Ax \rangle_H - \langle x, Ax \rangle_H^2}$$

at each $x \in D_A$ with $\|x\|_H = 1$. Verify that $\varsigma(A, x)$ is well-defined for every x (i.e. that the radicand is real and non-negative) and prove that for every $x \in D_{[A,B]}$ with $\|x\|_H = 1$ there holds

$$\left| \langle x, [A, B]x \rangle_H \right| \leq 2\varsigma(A, x) \varsigma(B, x).$$

Remark. The possible *states* of a quantum mechanical system are given by elements $x \in H$ with $\|x\|_H = 1$. Each *observable* is given by a symmetric linear operator $A: D_A \subseteq H \rightarrow H$. If the system is in state $x \in D_A$, we measure the observable A with uncertainty $\varsigma(A, x)$.

(c) Let $A: D_A \subseteq H \rightarrow H$ and $B: D_B \subseteq H \rightarrow H$ be as above. A, B is called *Heisenberg pair* if

$$[A, B] = i \text{Id}|_{D_{[A,B]}}.$$

Show that, if A, B is a Heisenberg pair with B continuous (and $D_B = H$), then A cannot be continuous.

(d) Consider the Hilbert space $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H) = (L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{C}), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2})$ and the subspace

$$C_0^1([0, 1], \mathbb{C}) := \{f \in C^1([0, 1], \mathbb{C}) \mid f(0) = 0 = f(1)\}.$$

Recall that $C_0^1([0, 1], \mathbb{C}) \subseteq L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{C})$ is a dense subspace. The operators

$$P: C_0^1([0, 1], \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{C}), \quad Q: L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{C})$$
$$f(s) \mapsto if'(s) \qquad \qquad \qquad f(s) \mapsto sf(s)$$

correspond to the observables *momentum* and *position*. Check that P and Q are well-defined, symmetric operators. Check that $[P, Q]: C_0^1([0, 1], \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{C})$ is well-defined.

Show that P and Q form a Heisenberg pair and conclude that the *uncertainty principle* holds: for every $f \in C_0^1([0, 1], \mathbb{C})$ with $\|f\|_{L^2([0,1],\mathbb{C})} = 1$ there holds

$$\varsigma(P, f) \varsigma(Q, f) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus we conclude: *The more precisely the momentum of some particle is known, the less precisely its position can be known, and vice versa.*