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## § 1. Introduction.

Let $R$ be a complete (not necessarily separable) Hilbert space. We shall use the following notations:
$f, g, \ldots \ldots$, the elements of $R$.
$\lambda, \mu, \ldots .$. , complex numbers.
$\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}, \ldots \ldots$, the conjugate complex numbers of $\lambda, \mu, \ldots \ldots$.
$(f, g) \quad$, the inner product of $f$ and $g$.
$\|f\| \quad$, the non-negative numbers $(f, f)^{1 / 2}$.
$T, K . \ldots .$. , bounded, linear transformations in $R$, that is (for $T$ ), $\|T f\| \leq M\|f\|$ for a certain $M \geq 0$ and $T(\lambda f+\mu g)=$ $=\lambda T f+\mu T g$ for arbitrary $\lambda, \mu, f, g$.
$T^{*}, K^{*}, \ldots \ldots$, the adjoint transformations of $T, K, \ldots \ldots$, we have therefore (for $T$ ) $(T f, g)=\left(f, T^{*} g\right)$ for arbitrary $f, g$.
$H$, a bounded, positive, self-adjoint transformation, that is, a bounded, linear transformation satisfying $(H f, g)=$ $=(f, H g)$ and $(H f, f) \geq 0$ for arbitrary $f, g$.
$H^{1 / 2} \quad$, the uniquely determined, bounded, positive, self-adjoint transformation, satisfying $\left(H^{1 / 3}\right)^{2}=H$.
$N(f) \quad$, the non-negative number $(H f, f)^{1 / 2}=\left\|H^{1 / 2} f\right\|$.
$I \quad$, the identical transformation, If $=f$ for every $f$.
$O \quad$, the nulltransformation, $O f=0$ for every $f$.
We suppose that $H \neq O$. Then the set of all elements $t$, satisfying $H f=0$, is a subspace [ $L$ ], not identical with the whole space $R$. The orthogonal subspace will be denoted by $[M]$. As well-known, every element $f \in R$ can be written uniquely in the form $f=h+g$ with $h \in[L]$ and $g \in[M]$. By $g=E f$ the projection $E$ on $[M]$ is defined; the projection on $[L]$ is $I-E$, and we have $E \neq O$. From $H(I-E) f=0$ for every $f \in R$ follows $H f=H E f$, so that $H=H E$.

Two elements $f$ and $g$ will be called H-orthogonal when $(H f, g)=0$, and the system $\mathbf{Q}$ of elements is called $H$-orthonormal when, for $\varphi \in \mathbf{Q}$, $\psi \in Q$, we have $(H \varphi, \psi)=1$ for $\varphi=\psi$, and $=0$ for $\varphi \neq \psi$. The elements $f_{1}, f_{2}, \ldots, f_{n}$ will be called $H$-independent when $H \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} f_{i}=0$ implies $\lambda_{1}=\lambda_{2}=\ldots=\lambda_{n}=0$. Evidently, if $f_{1}, f_{2}, \ldots, f_{n}$ are $H$-inde-
pendent, they are linearly independent. It is also not difficult to prove that if the elements $\varphi_{1}, \ldots, \varphi_{n}$ form an $H$-orthonormal system, they are $H_{-}$ independent.

If $T f=\lambda f$ for an element $f \neq 0$, this element is called a characteristic element of the transformation $T$, belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$. The set of all characteristic elements, belonging to the same characteristic value $\lambda$, is a subspace of $R$, and the dimension of this subspace is called the multiplicity of the characteristic value $\lambda$.

The bounded, linear transformation $K$ is said to be completely continuous when every bounded, infinite set of elements contains a sequence $f_{n}$ such that the sequence $K f_{n}$ converges. We shall assume the following theorems about transformations of this kind to be known:

Theorem 1. If $K$ is completely continuous, the same is true of $K^{*}$.
Theorem 2. If $K$ is completely continuous, every characteristic value $\hat{\lambda} \neq 0$ of $K$ has finite multiplicity. The number of different characteristic values $\lambda_{n}$ is finite or enumerable and in this last case $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n}=0$.

Theorem 3. If $K$ is completely continuous, and $\lambda \neq 0$ is a characteristic value of $K$, having a certain multiplicity, then $\bar{\lambda}$ is a characteristic value of $K^{*}$ with the same multiplicity. In this case the equation $K f-\lambda f=g$ has, for a given element $g$, a solution $f$ for those and only those elements $g$ that ate orthogonal to all characteristic elements of $K^{*}$, belonging to the characteristic value $\bar{\lambda}$. In the same way the equation $K^{*} f-\bar{\lambda} f=g$ has, for a given element $g$, a solution for those and only those elements $g$ that are crthogonal to all characteristic elements of $K$, belonging to the characteristic value 2.

If $\lambda \neq 0$ is no characteristic value of $K$, both the equations $K f-\lambda f=g$ and $K^{*} f-\bar{\lambda} f=g$ have uniquely determined solutions for every element $g$. In this case the complex number $\lambda$ will be called a regular value of $K$.
§ 2. Bounded, symmetrisable transformations.
The bounded, linear transformation $K$ is called symmetrisable (to the left, and relative to the transformation $H$ ), if the transformation $H K$ is self-adjoint, that is, if $(H K f, g)=(f, H K g)$ for arbitrary $f, g$.

Theorem 4. If $K$ is symmetrisable, the same is true of $T=E K$. Further $H f=0$ implies $T f=0$.

Proof. From $H=H E$ follows $H T=H E K=H K$; if therefore $H K$ is self-adjoint, the same is true of $H T$.

Further $(H T g, f)=(g, H T f)$ or $(T g, H f)=(g, H T f)$ for arbitrary $f, g$; the relation $H f=0$ implies therefore $(g, H T f)=0$ for every $g \in R$, hence $H T f=0$. Then however $T f \in[L]$, so that, since also $T f=E K f \in[M]$, we have $T f=0$.

Theorem 5. Let the symmetrisable transformation $K$ be such that $H f=0$ implies $K f=0$. Then the characteristic values of $K$ are real and
characteristic elements, belonging to different characteristic values, are $H$-orthogonal.

Proof. Let $f \neq 0$ and $K f=\lambda f$. If $\quad(H f, f)=0$ we see, since $(H f, f)=\left\|H^{\prime / 2} f\right\|^{2}$, that $H^{1_{2}} f=0$, so that $H f=0$ or, by hypothesis, $\lambda f=K f=0$, from which follows, on account of $f \neq 0$, that $\lambda=0$. If $(H f, f) \neq 0$ we find $\lambda(H f, f)=(H \lambda f, f)=(H K f, f)=(f, H K f)=$ $=(f, H \lambda f)=\bar{\lambda}(H f, f)$ or $\lambda=\bar{\lambda}$, which shows that $\lambda$ is real.

Let now $\lambda \neq \mu, f \neq 0, g \neq 0, K f=\lambda f$ and $K g=\mu g$. Then $\lambda(H f, g)=(H K f, g)=(f, H K g)=\bar{\mu}(f, H g)=\mu(H f, g)$ or $(\lambda-\mu)$ $(H f, g)=0$, from which follows, since $2-\mu \neq 0$, that $(H f, g)=0$.

Remark. Since, even if $H f=0$ does not imply $K f=0$ for the symmetrisable transformation $K$, it does imply $T f=E K f=0$ by Theorem 4, Theorem 5 is in any case valid for the symmetrisable transformation $T=E K$.

In what follows now, we shall assume that $K$, and therefore also $T=E K$, is symmetrisable, while, moreover, $T=E K$ is completely continuous. Then the following theorems hold 1 ):

Theorem 6. If $H K \neq O$, the transformation $T=E K$ has a chatacteristic value $\lambda \neq 0$, that is, there exists an element $\varphi \neq 0$ such that $T \varphi=\hat{\lambda} \varphi$. In the particular case that $H f=0$ implies $K f=0$, the transformation $K$ itself has also the characteristic value $\lambda$ with characteristic element $\psi=\varphi+\lambda^{-1}(I-E) K \varphi$, hence $K \psi=\lambda \psi$.

Theorem 7. In the case that $H f=0$ implies $K f=0$, the relations $\varphi=E_{\psi}, \psi=\varphi+\lambda^{-1}(I-E) K_{\varphi}$ define a one-to-one correspondence between all characteristic elements $\psi$ of $K$, belonging to the characteristic values $\neq 0$, and all characteristic elements $p$ of $T=E K$, belonging to the characteristic values $\neq 0$. Corresponding elements have the same chatacteristic value.

As a consequence of Theorem 2, it is possible to range the characteristic values $\neq 0$ of $T$ into a sequence $\lambda_{n}$ such that every characteristic value $\neq 0$ occurs in this sequence as many times as denoted by its multiplicity, while moreover $\left|\lambda_{1}\right| \geq\left|\lambda_{2}\right| \geq \ldots$. Choosing now in the unitary space (space of finite dimension) of all characteristic elements belonging to a certain characteristic value $\lambda \neq 0$ a maximal system of linearly independent elements, we see readily that these elements, say $\chi_{1}, \ldots, \chi_{p}$, are $H$-independent. Indeed, $H \Sigma a_{i} \chi_{i}=0 \quad\left(a_{i}\right.$ complex) implying $T \Sigma a_{i} \chi_{i}=0$ or $\Sigma \lambda a_{i} \chi_{i}=0$, we find in virtue of $\lambda \neq 0$ and the linear independence of $\chi_{1}, \ldots, \chi_{p}$ that $a_{1}=\ldots=a_{p}=0$. Applying now to the elements $\chi_{1}, \ldots, \chi_{p}$ a process, wholly similar to Schmidt's well-known orthogonalization process, we obtain an $H$-orthonormal system, consisting of $p$ elements, such that the unitary space determined by this system is identical with the
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unitary space of all characteristic elements belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$. Doing this for all characteristic values $\neq 0$, we may range the elements of all these $H$-orthonormal systems into a sequence $\varphi_{n}$, such that for every value of $n$ the element $\varphi_{n}$ belongs to the characteristic value $\lambda_{n}$. Evidently the whole sequence $\varphi_{n}$ is also $H$-orthonormal, since for $\lambda_{m}=\lambda_{n}$ the relation $\left(H_{\varphi_{m}, \varphi_{n}}\right)=0$ follows from our definition of the sequence $\varphi_{n}$ and for $\lambda_{m} \neq \lambda_{n}$ this relation follows from Theorem 5. In the special case that $H f=0$ implies $K f=0$, the transformations $K$ and $T=E K$ have, by Theorem 7, the same characteristic values $\neq 0$, and it may be verified readily that every characteristic value $\neq 0$ has, for $K$ and $T$, the same multiplicity. Consequently, denoting by $\psi_{n}$ the characteristic element of $K$. corresponding by Theorem 7 with the characteristic element $\varphi_{n}$ of $T$, we obtain the $H$-orthonormal sequence $\psi_{n}$.

Then we have ${ }^{2}$ )
Theorem 8. $\left|\lambda_{n}\right|=\max N(K f) / N(f)$ for all $f$ satisfying the conditions $N(f) \neq 0$ and $\left(H f, \varphi_{1}\right)=\ldots=\left(H f, \varphi_{n-1}\right)=0$. For $f=\varphi_{n}$ the maximum is attained. Further $H K f=0$ or, which comes to the same thing, $N(K f)=0$ if and only if $\left(H f, \varphi_{n}\right)=0$ for every value of $n$.

In the particular case that $H f=0$ implies $K f=0$, the elements $\varphi$ may be replaced by the corresponding elements $\psi$ in both parts of the theorem.

Theorem 9. If $a_{n}=\left(H f, \varphi_{n}\right)$, then

$$
\begin{gathered}
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} N\left(K f-\sum_{n=1}^{k} \lambda_{n} a_{n} f_{n}\right)=0 \quad(\text { Expansion Theorem }) \\
(H K f, f)=\Sigma \lambda_{n}\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

for any element $f$.
In the particular case that $H f=0$ implies $K f=0$, the elements $\varphi_{n}$ may be replaced by the corresponding elements $\psi_{n}$.

Theorem 10. Let $\lambda_{n_{i}}(i=1,2, \ldots)$ be the subsequence of all positive characteristic values where $\lambda_{n_{1}} \geq \lambda_{n_{2}} \geq \ldots$ Then $\lambda_{n_{i}}=\max (H K f, f) / N^{2}(f)$ for all $f$ satisfying the conditions $N(f) \neq 0$ and $\left(H f, \varphi_{n_{1}}\right)=\ldots=$ $=\left(H f, \varphi_{n_{i-1}}\right)=0 . F o r f=\varphi_{n_{i}}$ the maximum is attained.
A similar statement holds for the subsequence of all negative characteristic values:

In the particular case that $H f=0$ implies $K f=0$, we may replace the elements $\varphi$ by the corresponding elements $\psi$.

In the last theorem the characteristic value $\lambda_{n_{i}}$ was characterized by a certain maximum property. It is a disadvantage however that for this characterization the elements $\varphi_{n_{1}}, \ldots, \varphi_{n_{i-1}}$ must be known. The question arises therefore whether this may be avoided. That this is indeed the case, is shown by the following theorem:

Theorem 11. Let the elements $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{i-1}$ be arbitrarily given and let $\mu_{i}=$ upper bound $(H K f, f) / N^{2}(f)$ for all $f$ satisfying the conditions

[^1]$N(f) \neq 0$ and $\left(H f, p_{1}\right)=\ldots=\left(H f, p_{i-1}\right)=0$. The number $\mu_{i}$ depends evidently on the elements $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{i_{-1}}$. Letting now these elements run through the whole space $R$, we have $\lambda_{n_{i}}=\min \mu_{i}$.

A similar statement holds for the negative characteristic values.
Proof. We shall prove first that it is possible to find an element $f=\sum_{k=1}^{i} c_{k} \varphi_{n_{k}}$ such that the conditions $N(f)=1$ and $\left(H f, p_{1}\right)=\ldots=$ $=\left(H f, p_{i-1}\right)=0$ are satisfied. These conditions are equivalent with

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{i}\left|c_{k}\right|^{2}=1 \text { and } \sum_{k=1}^{i} c_{k}\left(H \varphi_{n_{k}}, p_{h}\right)=0 \quad(h=1, \ldots, i-1),
$$

and it follows immediately from a well-known theorem that the $i-1$ homogeneous linear equations

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{i} c_{k}\left(H \varphi_{n_{k}}, p_{h}\right)=0 \quad(h=1, \ldots, i-1)
$$

have indeed a solution $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{i}$ for which $\sum_{k=1}^{i}\left|c_{k}\right|^{2}=1$. Observing that

$$
\left(H K \varphi_{n_{k}}, \varphi_{n_{k}}\right)=\left(H T \varphi_{n_{k}}, \varphi_{n_{k}}\right)=\lambda_{n_{k}}, \text { and }
$$

$$
\left(H K \varphi_{n_{k}}, \varphi_{n_{l}}\right)=\left(H T \varphi_{n_{k}}, \varphi_{n_{l}}\right)=0
$$

for $k \neq l$, we find then for $f=\sum_{k=1}^{i} c_{k} \varphi_{n_{k}}$ the inequality
$(H K f, f) / N^{2}(f)=(H K f, f)=\sum_{k, l=1}^{i} c_{k} \bar{c}_{l}\left(H K \varphi_{n_{k}}, \varphi_{n_{l}}\right)=$

$$
=\sum_{k=1}^{i} \lambda_{n_{k}}\left|c_{k}\right|^{2} \geqslant \lambda_{n_{i}} \sum_{k=1}^{i}\left|c_{k}\right|^{2}=\lambda_{n_{i}}
$$

it is clear therefore that $\mu_{i} \geq \lambda_{n_{i}}$. On the other hand we have, by Theorem 10 , for

$$
p_{1}=\varphi_{n_{1}}, \ldots, p_{i-1}=\gamma_{n_{i-1}},\left(H f, p_{1}\right)=\ldots=\left(H f, p_{i-1}\right)=0
$$

the relation $\max (H K f, f) / N^{2}(f)=\lambda_{n_{i}}$. Hence $\left.\lambda_{n_{i}}=\min \mu_{i}{ }^{3}\right)$.
§ 3. Expression of the solutions of $T f-\lambda f=g$ and $K f-\lambda f=g$ in terms of the characteristic elements.

We suppose again the transformation $K$ to be symmetrisable and the transformation $T=E K$ to be completely continuous. Then, if $\lambda \neq 0$ is not one of the characteristic values $\lambda_{n} \neq 0$ of $T$, it is a regular value (see Theorem 3), on account of Theorem 3 the equation $T f$-if $=g$ has therefore a uniquely determined solution for every element $g$. If on the other hand $\lambda$ is identical with one of the characteristic values $\lambda n$, the equation $T f-\lambda f=g$ has a solution $f$ for those and only those elements

[^2]$g$ that are orthogonal to all characteristic elements of $T^{*}$, belonging to the characteristic value $\bar{\lambda}$. Since however all numbers $\lambda_{n}$ are real, we see that $g$ must be orthogonal to all characteristic elements of $T^{*}$, belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$.

Theorem 12. For $\lambda \neq 0$, the equation $T f-\lambda f=g$ has a solution $f$ for those and only those elements $g$ that are H-orthogonal to all characteristic elements of $T$, belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$. (If $\lambda$ is no characteristic value of $T$, this means that $g$ may be any element.)

In the case that $H f=0$ implies $K f=0$, the same statement holds for the transformation $K$.

Proof. We shall prove first that, if the $p$-dimensional unitary space of all characteristic elements of $T$, belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$, is determined by the linearly independent elements $\chi_{1}, \ldots, \chi_{p}$, the $p$-dimensional unitary space of all characteristic elements of $T^{*}$, belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$, is determined by $H_{\chi_{1}}, \ldots, H \chi_{p}$. Indeed, the relation $T_{\chi}=\lambda_{\chi}$ implies, for every $f$,
$\left(T^{*} H \chi, f\right)=(H \%, T f)=(\gamma, H T f)=(H T \chi, f)=\left(\lambda H_{\chi}, f\right) ;$
hence $T^{*} H_{\chi}=\lambda H_{\chi}$. The elements $H_{\chi_{1}}, \ldots H_{\chi_{p}}$ are therefore characteristic elements of $T^{*}$. We have still to show that they are linearly independent. This follows from the fact that

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{p} a_{i} H \chi_{i}=0 \text { or } H \sum_{i=1}^{p} a_{i} \chi_{i}=0
$$

implies

$$
T \sum_{i=1}^{p} a_{i} \chi_{i}=0 \text { or } \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda a_{i} \chi_{i}=0
$$

so that, since $\lambda \neq 0$, we have $a_{1}=\ldots=a_{p}=0$. Finally we observe that, if $g$ is orthogonal to an element $H \%$, this means that $g$ and $\chi$ are $H$-orthogonal. The result is therefore that $T f-\lambda f=g$ has a solution $f$ for those and only those elements that are $H$-orthogonal to all characteristic elements of $T$, belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$. Evidently this solution is only determined to within an arbitrary linear combination of these characteristic elements. This completes the proof of the first part.

Let now $H f=0$ imply $K f=0$. Then, since $H=H E$ or $H(I-E)=O$, we have also $K(I-E)=O$ or $K=K E$. We shall prove now that if one of the equations $K f-\lambda f=g$ and $T f-\lambda f=g$ has a solution, so has the other. Indeed, from $K f-\lambda f=g$ follows, since $K=K E$,
$T E f-\lambda E f=E K E f-\lambda E f=E(K f-\lambda f)=E g=g-(I-E) g$,
hence $T E f-\lambda\left(E f-\lambda^{-1}(I-E) g\right)=g$ or, on account of $T(I-E) g=0$,

$$
T\left(E f-\lambda^{-1}(I-E) g\right)-\lambda\left(E f-\lambda^{-1}(I-E) g\right)=g
$$

The element $f_{1}=E f-\lambda^{-1}(I-E) g$ satisfies therefore the relation $T f_{1}-\lambda f_{1}=g$.

Conversely, from $T f-\lambda f=g$ we infer

$$
K f-\lambda f=E K f+(I-E) K f-\lambda f=g+(I-E) K f
$$

hence $K f-\lambda\left(f+\lambda^{-1}(I-E) K f\right)=g$ or, on account of $K(I-E) K f=0$, $K\left(f+\lambda^{-1}(I-E) K f\right)-\lambda\left(f+\lambda^{-1}(I-E) K f\right)=0$.
The element $f_{2}=f+\lambda^{-1}(I-E) K f$ satisfies therefore the relation $K f_{2}-\lambda f_{2}=g$.

Thus we find that the equation $K f-\lambda f=g$ has a solution $f$ for those and only those elements $g$ that are $H$-orthogonal to all characteristic elements $\varphi$ of $T$, belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$. Observing finally that $(H g, \varphi)=0$ is equivalent with $(H g, \psi)=0$, where $\psi$ is the characteristic element of $K$ corresponding with $\varphi$, we obtain the desired result. Evidently the solution of $K f-\lambda f=g$ is only determined to within an arbitrary linear combination of the characteristic elements of $K$, belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$.

Theorem 13. Let $\lambda \neq 0$, and let the element $g$ be H-orthogonal to all characteristic elements of $T$, belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$. (If $\lambda$ is no characteristic value, the element $g$ is therefore arbitrary.) Then every solution of $T f-\lambda f=g$ satisfies the relation

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} N\left(f+\frac{g}{\lambda}+\sum_{n=1}^{k} \frac{\lambda_{n}}{\lambda\left(\lambda-\lambda_{n}\right)} a_{n} p_{n}\right)=0,
$$

where $a_{n}=\left(H g, \varphi_{n}\right)$ for $\lambda_{n} \neq \lambda$, and where $\Sigma^{\prime}$ denotes that for those values of $n$ for which $\lambda_{n}=\lambda$ the coefficient of $\varphi_{n}$ has the value- $\left(H f, \varphi_{n}\right)$. For every set of arbitrarily prescribed values of the latter coefficients there exists a solution of $T f-\lambda t=g$.

In the case that $H f=0$ implies $K f=0$, every solution of $K f-\lambda f=g$ satisfies the relation

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} N\left(f+\frac{g}{\lambda}+\sum_{n=1}^{k} \frac{\lambda_{n}}{\lambda\left(\lambda-\lambda_{n}\right)} a_{n} \dot{\psi_{n}}\right)=0
$$

where $a_{n}=\left(H g, \psi_{n}\right)$ for $\lambda_{n} \neq \lambda$, and where $\Sigma^{\prime}$ denotes that for those values of $n$ for which $\lambda_{n}=\lambda$ the coefficient of $\psi_{n}$ has the value- $\left(H f, \psi_{n}\right)$. For every set of arbitrarily prescribed values of the latter coefficients there exists a solution of $K f-\lambda f=g$.

Proof. Let $T f-\lambda f=g$. Writing $b_{n}=\left(H f, \varphi_{n}\right)$, we have by Theorem 9

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} N\left(T f-\sum_{n=1}^{k} \lambda_{n} b_{n} \varphi_{n}\right)=\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} N\left(K f-\sum_{n=1}^{k} \lambda_{n} b_{n} \varphi_{n}\right)=0
$$

hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} N\left(\lambda f+g-\sum_{n=1}^{k} \lambda_{n} b_{n} \varphi_{n}\right)=0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

From

$$
\left(H T f, \varphi_{n}\right)=\left(f, H T \varphi_{n}\right)=\left(H f, \lambda_{n} \varphi_{n}\right)=\lambda_{n} b_{n}
$$

we derive

$$
\lambda_{n} b_{n}=\left(H T f, \varphi_{n}\right)=\left(H(g+\lambda f), \varphi_{n}\right)=a_{n}+\lambda b_{n},
$$

so that for $\lambda_{n} \neq \lambda$ we find $b_{n}=-a_{n} /\left(\lambda-\lambda_{n}\right)$. It follows therefore from (1) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} N\left(f+\frac{g}{\lambda}-\sum_{n=1}^{k}\right. & \left.\frac{\lambda_{n}}{\lambda} b_{n} p_{n}\right)= \\
& =\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} N\left(f+\frac{g}{\lambda}+\sum_{n=1}^{k} \frac{\lambda_{n}}{\lambda\left(\lambda-\lambda_{n}\right)} a_{n} \varphi_{n}\right)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Since, if $g$ is given, $f$ is determined to within a linear combination of those elements $\varphi_{n}$ for which $\lambda_{n}=\lambda$, there exists a solution $f$ for every set of arbitrarily prescribed values of the coefficients $b_{n}=\left(H f, \varphi_{n}\right)$ for these values of $n$. This completes the proof of the first part.

The proof of the second part runs in a similar way, substituting everywhere $K$ for $T$ and $\psi_{n}$ for $\varphi_{n}$.
§ 4. Self-adjoint transformations as a special case of symmetrisable transformations.

Identifying the bounded, positive, self-adjoint transformation $H \neq O$ with the identical transformation $I$, we see that the subspace [ $L$ ] of all elements satisfying $H f=I f=0$ contains only the nullelement, so that the orthogonal subspace $[M]$ coincides with the whole space $R$. The projection $E$ on [ $M$ ] is therefore the transformation $I$. The notions of $\mathrm{H}-$ orthogonality and $H$-independence are now identical with the usual notions of orthogonality and linear independence, while $N(f)=\|f\|$. That the bounded linear transformation $K$ is symmetrisable means now that $I K=K$ is self-adjoint, further we have $T=E K=K$.

A bounded symmetrisable transformation $K$ such that $T=E K$ is completely continuous is therefore in this case simply a completely continuous self-adjoint transformation $K$. The condition that $H f=I f=0$ implies $K f=0$, is always satisfied. The Theorems 4 and 7 lose their meaning; we leave it to the reader to pronounce the other theorems for this case.
§ 5. Transformations of the form $K=A H$, where $A$ is self-adjoint.
Theorem 14. If $A$ is a bounded, self-adjoint transformation, the transtormation $K=A H$ is symmetrisable. Further $H f=0$ implies $K f=0$.

Proof. $\quad(H K f, g)=(H A H f, g)=(f, H A H g)=(f, H K g)$; the transformation $H K$ is therefore self-adjoint, in other words, $K$ is symmetrisable. The proof of the second part is trivial.

Making now the assumption that one at least of the transformations $A$ and $H$ is completely continuous, the transformation $K=A H$ is symmetrisable and completely continuous. The same holds then for $T=E K$. All theorems in $\S \S 2-3$ are therefore valid for the transformation $K$. It is possible, however, to prove somewhat more.

Theorem 15. (Expansion Theorem.) If $\psi_{i}$ is the H-orthonormal sequence of characteristic elements of $K=A H$, belonging to the sequence
of characteristic values $\lambda_{i} \neq 0$, and if $a_{i}=\left(H f, \psi_{i}\right)$, then

$$
K f=\Sigma \lambda_{i} a_{i} \psi_{i}+p
$$

where $H p=0$. For $n \geq 2$ we have

$$
K^{n} f=\Sigma \lambda_{i}^{n} a_{i} \psi_{i}
$$

Proof ${ }^{4}$ ). We observe first that, the system $y^{\prime} i$ being $H$-orthonormal, the system $H^{1 / 2} y_{1}^{\prime}$ is orthonormal, since $\left(H_{y^{\prime}, ~}^{1, y^{\prime} k}\right)=\left(H^{1 / 2} \psi_{i}, H^{1 / 2} \psi_{k}\right)$. Writing $a_{i}=\left(g, H^{1 / 2} \psi_{i}\right)$ for an arbitrary $g$, the sums $s_{k}=\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{i} H^{1 / 2} \psi_{i}$ converge therefore to an element $h$. Taking $g=H^{1_{2}} f$, we find then $\Sigma a_{i} H^{1 /=} \psi_{i}=h$, where $a_{i}=\left(H^{1 / 2} f, H^{1 / 2 y^{\prime} i}\right)=\left(H f, \psi_{i}\right)$. From this we derive

$$
A H^{1 / 2} h=A H^{1 / 2} \Sigma a_{i} H^{1 / 2} \psi_{i}=\Sigma a_{i} A H \psi_{i}=\Sigma \lambda_{i} a_{i} \psi_{i}
$$

The convergence of the series $\Sigma \lambda_{i a_{i} \psi_{i}}$ enables us now to make $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the relation

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} N\left(K f-\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_{i} a_{i} \psi_{i}\right)=0,
$$

proved in Theorem 9. Writing $K f-\Sigma \hat{\lambda}_{i} a_{i} y_{i}=p$, we obtain then $N(p)=0$; hence, $N(p)=0$ being equivalent with $H p=0$,

$$
K f=\Sigma \lambda_{i} a_{i} y_{i}+p,
$$

where $H p=0$.
From this we deduce

$$
K^{2} f=\Sigma \lambda_{i} a_{i} K \psi_{i}+K p=\Sigma \lambda_{i}^{2} a_{i} \psi_{i}+K p,
$$

but, since $H p=0$, we have $K p=A H p=0$; hence

$$
K^{2} t=\Sigma \lambda_{i}{ }^{2} a_{i} y_{i} .
$$

The relation

$$
K^{n} f=\Sigma \lambda_{i}^{n} \mathbf{a}_{i} \psi_{i}
$$

for $n>2$ follows easily by induction.
It may be asked whether the element $p$, occurring in Theorem 15, is not always identical with the nullelement. The answer to this question is given by

Theorem 16. The element $p$ in Theorem 15 is not necessarily identical with the nullelement.

Proof. Let $R$ be a complete, separable Hilbert space in which $\varphi_{n}$ is a complete orthonormal system, and let $\mu_{3}, \mu_{4}, \ldots$ and $\nu_{3}, \nu_{4}, \ldots$ be sequences of positive numbers for which $\lim \mu_{n}=\lim \nu_{n}=0$ and $\mu_{3}>\mu_{4}>\ldots$, $\nu_{3}>\nu_{4}>\ldots$. Defining the positive, self-adjoint transformation $H$ and the self-adjoint transformation $A$ by

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
H \varphi_{1}=\varphi_{1}, H \varphi_{2}=0 . \quad H \varphi_{i}=\mu_{i} \varphi_{i} & (i=3,4, \ldots) \\
A \varphi_{1}=\varphi_{2}, A \varphi_{2}=\varphi_{1}, A \varphi_{1}=v_{i} \varphi_{i} & (i=3,4, \ldots)
\end{array}
$$

[^3]it is not difficult to see that both $H$ and $A$ are completely continuous. We have
$$
A H \varphi_{1}=\varphi_{2}, A H \varphi_{2}=0, A H \varphi_{i}=v_{i} \mu_{i} p_{i} \quad(i=3,4, \ldots)
$$

To find the characteristic elements of $A H$ belonging to characteristic values $\neq 0$, we write $A H f=\lambda f$ for $f=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i} \varphi_{i}$ and $\lambda \neq 0$. From this we derive

$$
a_{1} \varphi_{2}+\sum_{3} v_{i} \mu_{i} a_{i} \varphi_{i}=\sum_{1} \lambda a_{i} \varphi_{i} ;
$$

hence $a_{1}=a_{2}=0$ and $\nu_{i} \mu_{i} a_{i}=\lambda a_{i}(i=3,4, \ldots)$. Since $\nu_{i} \mu_{i} \neq \nu_{k} \mu_{k}$ for $i \neq k$ we have therefore $\lambda=v_{k} \mu_{k}$ for a certain value of $k(\geq 3)$ and $a_{i}=0$ for $i \neq k$, which shows that the elements $a_{k} \varphi_{k}(k \geq 3)$ are the only characteristic elements with characteristic values $\neq 0$. Making them $H$-normal, we obtain $a_{k}=\mu_{k}^{-1 / 2}$, so that, by Theorem 15 ,

$$
A H f=\sum_{3} v_{i}\left(H f, \varphi_{i}\right) p_{i}+p
$$

for every $f$. Taking $f=\varphi_{1}$, we have (Hf, $\left.\varphi_{i}\right)=\left(H_{\varphi_{1}}, \varphi_{i}\right)=\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{i}\right)=0$ $(i \geq 3)$ and $A H f=A H \varphi_{1}=\varphi_{2} ;$ hence $p=\varphi_{2} \neq 0$.

Theorem 17. Let $\lambda \neq 0$, and let the element $g$ be $H$-orthogonal to all characteristic elements of $K=A H$ belonging to the characteristic value $\lambda$. (If $\lambda$ is no characteristic value, the element $g$ is therefore arbitrary.) Then every solution of $K f-\lambda f=g$ satisfies a relation of the form

$$
f=-\frac{g}{\lambda}-\Sigma^{\prime} \frac{\lambda_{i}}{\lambda\left(\lambda-\lambda_{i}\right)} a_{i} \psi_{i}+q
$$

where $a_{i}=\left(H g, y_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ for $\lambda_{i} \neq \lambda, H q=0$, and where $\nu^{\prime}$ denotes that for those values of $i$ for which $\lambda_{i}=\lambda$ the coefficient of $\psi_{i}$ has the value ( $H f, \psi_{i}$ ). For every set of arbitrarily prescribed values of the latter coefficients there exists a solution of $K f-\lambda f=g$.

Proof. Let $K f-\lambda i f=g$. By Theorem 15 we have

$$
K f=A H f=\Sigma \lambda_{i} b_{i} y_{i}+p
$$

where $b_{i}=\left(H f, \psi_{i}\right)$ and $H p=0$. Since, as we have proved in Theorem 13, $b_{i}=-a_{i} /\left(\lambda-\lambda_{i}\right)$ for $\lambda_{i} \neq \lambda$, we obtain

$$
\lambda f+g=-\Sigma^{\prime} \frac{\lambda_{i}}{\lambda-\lambda_{i}} a_{i} \psi_{i}+p
$$

or

$$
f=-\frac{g}{\lambda}-\Sigma^{\prime} \frac{\lambda_{i}}{\lambda\left(\lambda-\lambda_{i}\right)} a_{i} \psi_{i}+q
$$

where we have written $q=p / \lambda$. The last statement of the theorem has been proved already in Theorem 13.

Theorem 18. The self-adjoint transformation $\widetilde{K}=H^{1 / 2} A H^{1 / 2}$ possesses the same sequence $\lambda_{i}$ of characteristic values $\neq 0$ as the transformation $K=A H$. If $\psi_{i}$ is an $H$-orthonormal sequence of characteristic elements
of $K$, corresponding with the characteristic values $\lambda_{i}$, then $H^{1 / 2} \psi_{i}$ is an orthonormal sequence of characteristic elements of $\widetilde{K}$, also corresponding with the characteristic values $\lambda_{i}$.
Proof. Let $K y=A H_{y}=\lambda y$ where $\lambda \psi \neq 0$. Then, writing $H^{1 / 2} \psi=\chi$. we have

$$
\widetilde{K} \chi=H^{1_{2}} A H \psi=\lambda H^{1_{2}} \psi=\lambda \chi
$$

where $\lambda \chi \neq 0$ since $\lambda \neq 0$ and $A H^{1_{2}} \chi=A H_{\psi}=\lambda \psi \neq 0$. Conversely, if $\widetilde{K_{\chi}}=\lambda \chi$ where $\lambda_{\chi} \neq 0$, we find, writing $\psi=\lambda^{-1} A H^{1 / 2} \chi$, that

$$
H^{1 / 2} \psi=\lambda-1 \widetilde{K} \chi=\chi
$$

hence

$$
K \psi=A H^{1 / 2} H^{1 / 2} \psi=A H^{1 / 2} \chi=\lambda \psi,
$$

where $\lambda \psi \neq 0$ since $H^{1 / 2} \lambda \psi=\lambda \chi \neq 0$. This shows that $K$ and $\widetilde{K}$ have the same characteristic values $\neq 0$, and that with the $H$-orthonormal sequence $\psi_{i}$ of characteristic elements of $K$ corresponds the orthonormal sequence $H^{1 / 2} \psi_{i}$ of characteristic elements of $\widetilde{K}$.


[^0]:    1) A. C. ZAANEN, Ueber vollstetige symmetrische und symmetrisierbare Operatoren.
[^1]:    $\left.{ }^{2}\right) \quad \mathrm{See}{ }^{1}$ ).

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ ) Compare R. Courant und D. Hilbert, Methoden der Math. Physik I, Ch. III, § 4, 3.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ ) This proof is simpler than that in ${ }^{1}$ ).

