

As example, let us consider the "position operator" $\hat{x}: \psi(x) \mapsto x\psi(x)$

with domain $\mathcal{D}(\hat{x}) = \{ \psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) : x\psi(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \}$.

When is the resolvent $(\hat{x}-z)^{-1}$ bounded? Need $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, so $\sigma(\hat{x}) = \mathbb{R}$.

Now for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{x}-\lambda$ has dense image: we could, for $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ just use

$$\varphi_n(x) := \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [\lambda - \frac{1}{n}, \lambda + \frac{1}{n}]}(x) \frac{\psi(x)}{x-\lambda}, \text{ i.e., } (x-\lambda)\varphi_n(x) \rightarrow \psi(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}).$$

So \hat{x} has only continuous spectrum: $\sigma(\hat{x}) = \sigma_c(\hat{x}) = \mathbb{R}$.

Note that the same holds true for the "momentum operator" $\hat{p} = -i \frac{d}{dx}$, since $\hat{p} = \mathcal{F} \hat{x} \mathcal{F}^{-1}$,

and $T-z$ bijective $\Leftrightarrow U(T-z)U^{-1}$ bijective for U unitary.

Next, let us establish more properties of the resolvent. After that, will put it to use for the question of self-adjointness (especially Kato-Rellich).

Lemma 3.100: Let $(T, \mathcal{D}(T))$ be a densely defined linear operator. Then

a) $\rho(T)$ is open, i.e., $\sigma(T)$ is closed

b) The map $\rho(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, $z \mapsto R_z(T)$ is analytic

(i.e., it can be written as $R_z(T) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (z-z_0)^n \underbrace{R_{z_0}^{n+1}}_{\in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})}$ for some $z_0 \in \rho(T)$ with non-zero radius of convergence)

c) For $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, we have $|z| \leq \|T\| \quad \forall z \in \sigma(T)$ and thus $\sigma(T)$ is compact.

d) The first resolvent identity holds: for $z, w \in \rho(T)$, we have

$$R_z(T) - R_w(T) = (z-w)R_w(T)R_z(T).$$

Thus, in particular $R_w(T)R_z(T) = R_z(T)R_w(T)$, i.e., the resolvents commute.

Proof. The proof uses the Neumann series from Homework 8, Problem 3:

(*) Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ with $\|T\| < 1$ and X a Banach space. Then $1-T$ is continuously invertible and

$$(1-T)^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T^n \quad \text{and} \quad \| (1-T)^{-1} \| \leq (1-\|T\|)^{-1}.$$

a) Let $z_0 \in \rho(T)$ and choose z s.t. $|z-z_0| < \|R_{z_0}(T)\|^{-1}$. Then

$$T-z = T-z_0 + (z_0-z) = (T-z_0) \left(1 - (z-z_0)R_{z_0}(T) \right). \quad \text{Since } \|(z-z_0)R_{z_0}(T)\| < 1 \text{ by}$$

assumption, (*) tells us that $1 - (z-z_0)R_{z_0}(T)$ is continuously invertible, and thus also

$T-z$. So also $z \in \rho(T)$.

b) This again follows from (*): With the same notation as in a), we have

$$R_z(T) = (1 - (z-z_0)R_{z_0}(T))^{-1} R_{z_0}(T) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (z-z_0)^n R_{z_0}(T)^{n+1}.$$

c) If $|z| > \|T\|$, then $\|\frac{T}{z}\| < 1$, i.e., $1 - \frac{T}{z}$ is invertible, and thus also $T-z$, so $z \in \rho(T)$. So $z \notin \rho(T) \Rightarrow |z| \leq \|T\|$.

d) We compute: $R_z(T) - R_w(T) = R_z(T) \underbrace{(T-w)}_{=id} R_w(T) - \underbrace{R_z(T)(T-z)}_{=id} R_w(T)$

$$= (z-w) R_z(T) R_w(T). \quad \square$$

Self-adjoint operators have real spectrum, and there is a simple bound for the resolvent:

Lemma 3.102: Let H be self-adjoint. Then $\sigma(H) \subset \mathbb{R}$ and for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\|(H-z)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{|\operatorname{Im} z|}.$$

Proof: Let us write $z = \lambda + i\mu$ with $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \mu \neq 0$. Then $\frac{H-\lambda}{\mu}$ is still self-adjoint (with the same domain) and thus with Theorem 3.78:

$$\{0\} = \ker\left(\frac{H-\lambda}{\mu} - i\right) = \ker\left(\overbrace{H-\lambda}^{H-z} - i\mu\right), \text{ so } H-z \text{ is injective, and}$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \operatorname{im}\left(\frac{H-\lambda}{\mu} - i\right) = \operatorname{im}\left(\overbrace{H-\lambda}^{H-z} - i\mu\right), \text{ so } H-z \text{ is surjective.}$$

So $H-z: \mathcal{D}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is bijective.

Furthermore: $\|\overbrace{(H-\lambda-i\mu)}^{H-z} \psi\|^2 = \|(H-\lambda)\psi\|^2 + \|\mu\psi\|^2 \geq \mu^2 \|\psi\|^2$, so

with $\psi = (H-z)^{-1} \varphi$ we find that $\|(H-z)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{|\mu|}$. □

Note: One can actually show something stronger, namely that $\|(H-z)^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}(z, \sigma(H))}$.

Finally, let us state Kato-Rellich. The idea is that we often consider operators $H = H_0 + V$, where we know that H_0 is self-adjoint with domain $\mathcal{D}(H_0)$ and we want to know whether also H is self-adjoint. Often the V 's are such that they do not disturb $\mathcal{D}(H_0)$ too much, i.e., they do not introduce new boundary points. For example, $H_0 = -\Delta$ and $V = \frac{1}{|x|}$ for the hydrogen atom.

Definition: Let A, B be densely defined linear operators with $\mathcal{D}(A) \subset \mathcal{D}(B)$ and such that there are $a, b \geq 0$ s.t.

$\|B\varphi\| \leq a\|A\varphi\| + b\|\varphi\| \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. Then B is called relatively bounded by A (or A -bounded), and the infimum over all permissible a is called the relative bound.

If the relative bound = 0, B is called infinitesimally A -bounded.

Note: In Homework 10, Problem 4, we show that one can equivalently ask for

$$\|B\varphi\|^2 \leq \tilde{a}\|A\varphi\|^2 + \tilde{b}\|\varphi\|^2; \text{ this leads to the same relative bound.}$$

Finally:

Theorem (Kato-Rellich): Let A be self-adjoint, B symmetric and A -bounded with relative bound $a < 1$. Then $A+B$ is self-adjoint on $\mathcal{D}(A+B) = \mathcal{D}(A)$ and essentially self-adjoint on every core of A .

Proof: Next time.