

Beurling's theorem for the Hardy operator on $L^2[0, 1]$

Jim Agler and John E. McCarthy *

July 5, 2022

Abstract

We prove that the invariant subspaces of the Hardy operator on $L^2[0, 1]$ are the spaces that are limits of sequences of finite dimensional spaces spanned by monomial functions.

1 Introduction

The space $L^2[0, 1]$ is a cornerstone of analysis. One way to analyze it is to use the exponential functions e^{itx} , which have the advantage of being eigenfunctions for differentiation. Another way is to use the monomial functions x^s . The Müntz-Szász theorem gives necessary and sufficient conditions for a collection of monomial functions to span $L^2[0, 1]$. Monomials are eigenfunctions for the Hardy operator H , defined by

$$Hf(x) = \frac{1}{x} \int_0^x f(t) dt.$$

Conversely, if T is a bounded linear operator on $L^2[0, 1]$ that has x^s as an eigenvector whenever x^s is in $L^2[0, 1]$, then T is a function of H ; specifically, it is of the form $\phi(H)$ for some function ϕ that is bounded and analytic on the disk $\mathbb{D}(1, 1) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - 1| < 1\}$ [2].

We shall use L^2 to denote $L^2[0, 1]$ throughout. Hardy proved in [9] that H is bounded on L^2 (and indeed on L^p for all $p > 1$). For a treatment of H consult the book [13]. What are its invariant subspaces?

Let \mathbb{S} denote the half plane $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(s) > -\frac{1}{2}\}$. Then if $s \in \mathbb{S}$, the monomial function x^s is in L^2 , and $Hx^s = \frac{1}{s+1}x^s$; moreover the monomials constitute all the eigenvectors of H . Any space that is the linear span of finitely many monomial functions is invariant for H . We shall call such a space a finite monomial space. It is the object of this note to prove that every invariant subspace of H is a limit of finite monomial spaces.

The Hardy operator is unitarily equivalent to $1 - S^*$, where S is the unilateral shift [7]. Its invariant subspaces are therefore described by the celebrated theorem of Beurling [5] which described the invariant subspaces of the shift using the beautiful theory of Hardy spaces of holomorphic functions. Using this theory, Theorem 1.4 below is well-known. It

*Partially supported by National Science Foundation Grant DMS 2054199

is proved as the Theorem on Finite Dimensional Approximation [16, p.37]. However, the point of this note is to describe the invariant subspaces of H without using any Hardy space theory, just using L^2 techniques and functional analysis. Our hope is that this approach will not only illuminate L^2 with a new light, but may also generalize to related spaces, such as L^p or weighted L^p spaces.

Definition 1.1. For S a finite subset of \mathbb{S} we let $\mathcal{M}(S)$ denote the span in L^2 of the monomials whose exponents lie in S , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{M}(S) = \left\{ \sum_{s \in S} a(s)x^s \mid a : S \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

We refer to sets in L^2 that have the form $\mathcal{M}(S)$ for some finite subset S of \mathbb{S} as finite monomial spaces.

Definition 1.2. If \mathcal{M} is a subspace of a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and $\{\mathcal{M}_n\}$ is a sequence of closed subspaces, we say that $\{\mathcal{M}_n\}$ tends to \mathcal{M} and write

$$\mathcal{M}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

if

$$\mathcal{M} = \{f \in \mathcal{H} \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) = 0\}.$$

Definition 1.3. We say that a subspace \mathcal{M} of L^2 is a monomial space if there exists a sequence $\{\mathcal{M}_n\}$ of finite monomial spaces such that $\mathcal{M}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.

Equipped with these definitions, we can now state our main theorem.

Theorem 1.4. Let \mathcal{M} be a closed non-zero subspace of L^2 . Then \mathcal{M} is invariant for H if and only if \mathcal{M} is a monomial space.

One way to construct a monomial space is to take the closed linear span of an infinite set of monomial functions,

$$\mathcal{M} = \vee \{x^{s_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}. \tag{1.5}$$

The Müntz-Szász theorem (proved in [15, 18] for integer exponents, and in [19] for general real exponents) characterizes when such a space is a proper subspace of L^2 . See [6] for a thorough treatment.

Theorem 1.6. (Müntz-Szász)

$$\vee \{x^{s_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\} = L^2 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \sum_k \frac{2\text{Re } s_k + 1}{|s_k + 1|^2} = \infty.$$

Not every monomial space looks like (1.5). It is easy to see that for any $0 < s < 1$, the space $\{f \in L^2 : f = 0 \text{ a.e. on } [0, s]\}$ is invariant for H , and hence is a monomial space. (For an explicit construction of finite monomial spaces that converge to this subspace, see [1].)

Our goal is to give a real analysis proof of Theorem 1.4. To do this, we first need some preliminary results. In Section 2 we state two theorems about Hilbert spaces that we will use.

The first, due to von Neumann in 1929, describes isometries on a Hilbert space. The second, due to Quiggin in 1993, gives a sufficient condition to extend partially defined multipliers of a reproducing kernel Hilbert space without increasing the norm. We apply Quiggin's theorem to the commutant of the Hardy operator in Section 4.

In Section 3 we describe the Laguerre basis for L^2 , the basis obtained by evaluating the Laguerre polynomials on $\log \frac{1}{x}$, which are also the functions obtained by applying $(1 - H^*)^n$ to the constant function 1. In section 5 we deal with multiplicity; this corresponds to generalizing the notion of finite monomial space to allow not just monomials x^s , but also functions of the form $(\log x)^m x^s$. In Section 6 we prove that certain rational functions are cyclic for H^* . Finally in Section 7 we prove Theorem 1.4. Our strategy to prove that an invariant subspace \mathcal{M} of H is a monomial space is to look at the projection η of the constant function 1 onto \mathcal{M}^\perp , and show that the function η uniquely characterizes \mathcal{M} . We then approximate η by functions that arise in a similar way from finite monomial spaces, and show that this proves that the finite monomial spaces coverge to \mathcal{M} in the sense of Definition 1.2.

2 Some results from operator theory

An operator V defined on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is called an isometry if it preserves norms; a co-isometry is the adjoint of an isometry. An isometry V is called pure if $\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \text{ran}(V^*)^n = 0$. The von Neumann-Wold decomposition describes the structure of isometeries [20, 21]. We state it not in its most general form, but in a way that will be useful below.

Theorem 2.1. (*von Neumann - Wold*)

- (i) Every isometry is the direct sum of a unitary operator and a pure isometry.
- (ii) If V is a pure isometry on the space \mathcal{H} , and $\mathcal{M} = \ker V^*$, then $\mathcal{H} = \vee \{T^j m : m \in \mathcal{M}\}$. The dimnsion of \mathcal{M} is called the multiplicity of V .
- (iii) If V is a pure isometry of multiplicity 1 and f is any non-zero vector in \mathcal{H} then

$$\mathcal{H} = \vee \{V^i f, (V^*)^j f : i, j \geq 0\}.$$

We shall also need a result on extending the adjoints of multiplication operators, due to Quiggin [17]. We say that a sesquilinear form $\ell(x, y)$ has one positive square if for any finite set of points $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$, the self-adjoint N -by- N matrix $\ell(x_i, x_j)$ has one positive eigenvalue.

Theorem 2.2. (*Quiggin*): Let (\mathcal{H}, k) be a reproducing kernel Hilbert space on a set X . A sufficient condition that every bounded operator T defined on $\vee \{k_x : x \in X_0\}$ for some subset $X_0 \subseteq X$ that has the form

$$Tk_x = \alpha(x)k_x, \quad x \in X_0$$

extend to a bounded operator $\tilde{T} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ that has the form

$$\tilde{T}k_x = \tilde{\alpha}(x)k_x, \quad x \in X_0$$

and satisfies $\|\tilde{T}\| = \|T\|$ is that the reciprocal $\frac{1}{k(x, y)}$ has exactly one positive square.

In the form stated, the converse to Quiggin's theorem is not true. However, if one requires norm-preserving extensions in the vector-valued case too, then the condition that $\frac{1}{k(x,y)}$ has one positive square is both necessary and sufficient. This was proved by McCullough [14] in a different context, and put in a unified context in [3]. See also the paper by Knese [11] for an elegant proof of necessity, and [4] for a discussion in a book.

3 The Laguerre basis for L^2

The following identity is a special case of one in [10]. In our case, it is easily proved by checking on polynomials; see e.g. [1].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $f \in L^2$. Then*

$$\|f\|^2 = \|(1 - H)f\|^2 + \left| \int_0^1 f(x) dx \right|^2$$

Consequently, $1 - H$ is a co-isometry with one dimensional kernel. As

$$(1 - H)^k x^n = \left(\frac{n}{n+1} \right)^k x^n,$$

we see that $1 - H^*$ is a pure isometry of multiplicity 1. Let us state this for future use.

Proposition 3.2. *(Brown, Halmos, Shields) The operator $(1 - H^*)$ is a pure isometry of multiplicity one.*

Proposition 3.2 was first proved in [7]. If we apply powers of $(1 - H^*)$ to the constant function 1, we get a useful orthonormal basis. This was first found explicitly in [12].

Lemma 3.3.

$$(H^*)^j 1 = (-1)^j \frac{(\log x)^j}{j!} \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. We proceed by induction. Clearly, (3.4) holds when $j = 0$. Assume $j \geq 0$ and (3.4) holds. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (H^*)^{j+1} 1 &= H^*((H^*)^j 1) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^j}{j!} H^*(\log x)^j \\ &= \frac{(-1)^j}{j!} \int_x^1 \frac{(\log t)^j}{t} dt \\ &= \frac{(-1)^j}{j!} \int_{\log x}^0 u^j du \\ &= (-1)^{j+1} \frac{(\log x)^{j+1}}{(j+1)!} \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.5.

$$(1 - H^*)^n 1 = \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} \frac{(\log x)^j}{j!}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - H^*)^n 1 &= \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} (H^*)^j 1 \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \left((-1)^j \frac{(\log x)^j}{j!} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} \frac{(\log x)^j}{j!}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We have proved that the functions

$$e_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} \frac{(\log x)^j}{j!} \tag{3.6}$$

are orthonormal. To see that they are complete, note that their closed linear span \mathcal{M} is invariant under H^* and contains the function 1. Since the constant functions are the kernel of the pure co-isometry $(1 - H)$, this means $\mathcal{M} = L^2$ by the von Neumann-Wold Theorem 2.1. So we have proved the following result, which was first proved in [12].

Theorem 3.7. (*Kaiblinger, Maligranda, Persson*) *The functions e_n defined by (3.6) form an orthonormal basis for L^2 .*

The Laguerre polynomials are the polynomials

$$p_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \frac{(x)^j}{j!}.$$

These are orthogonal polynomials for $L^2[0, \infty)$ with the weight function e^{-x} . As $e_n(x) = p_n(\log \frac{1}{x})$, the change of variables $t = \log \frac{1}{x}$ is an alternative way to prove that e_n are orthonormal.

The functions e_n are generalized eigenvectors of H at 1. Later we shall need the following.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $s \in \mathbb{S}$. The $(n + 1)^{\text{st}}$ generalized eigenvector of H with eigenvalue $\frac{1}{s+1}$ is in the linear span of $\{x^s, (\log x)x^s, \dots, (\log x)^n x^s\}$.*

PROOF: We want to prove

$$\text{Ker}\left(H - \frac{1}{s+1}\right)^{n+1} = \vee\{x^s, (\log x)x^s, \dots, (\log x)^n x^s\}. \quad (3.9)$$

This is true when $n = 0$, since

$$Hx^s = \frac{1}{s+1}x^s. \quad (3.10)$$

Differentiate both sides of (3.10) with respect to s . We get

$$H(\log x)x^s = \frac{1}{s+1}(\log x)x^s - \frac{1}{(s+1)^2}x^s. \quad (3.11)$$

Now we proceed by induction. The inductive hypothesis is that

$$H(\log x)^n x^s = \frac{1}{s+1}(\log x)^n x^s + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_j(s)(\log x)^j x^s \quad (3.12)$$

for some functions c_j . We have proved (3.12) for $n = 0$ and 1. (The $n = 1$ case we proved just for expositional clarity). Assume the hypothesis holds up to n . Differentiate (3.12) with respect to s and we get

$$H(\log x)^{n+1} x^s = \frac{1}{s+1}(\log x)^{n+1} x^s - \frac{1}{(s+1)^2}(\log x)^n x^s + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c'_j(s)(\log x)^j x^s + c_j(s)(\log x)^{j+1} x^s.$$

Thus by induction, (3.12) holds for all n , and hence so does (3.9). \square

4 Commutant Lifting for the Hardy operator

Suppose $T : L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ commutes with H . Then it must have the same eigenvectors, and so be a monomial operator of the form

$$T : x^s \mapsto \alpha(s)x^s. \quad (4.1)$$

When is such an operator bounded?

Theorem 4.2. *The operator T commutes with H and has norm at most M if and only if T is of the form (4.1) and, for any finite set $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{S}$, the matrix*

$$\left(\frac{M^2 - \overline{\alpha(s_i)}\alpha(s_j)}{1 + \overline{s_i} + s_j} \right)_{i,j=1}^N \quad (4.3)$$

is positive semidefinite.

T may be defined by (4.1) just on some subspace of L^2 . The positivity of (4.3) on this set is necessary and sufficient to lift T from the span of $\{x^{s_i}\}$ to an operator on all of L^2 that commutes with T and has the same norm. Without loss of generality we can take $M = 1$.

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose that for some subset $\mathbb{S}_0 \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ there is an operator*

$$\begin{aligned} T : \vee\{x^s : s \in \mathbb{S}_0\} &\rightarrow \vee\{x^s : s \in \mathbb{S}_0\} \\ T : x^s &\mapsto \alpha(s)x^s. \end{aligned}$$

A necessary and sufficient condition for T to extend to an operator from L^2 to L^2 that commutes with H and has norm at most one is that for every finite set $\{s_i\} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_0$, we have

$$\left(\frac{1 - \overline{\alpha(s_i)}\alpha(s_j)}{1 + \overline{s_i} + s_j} \right) \geq 0.$$

Notice that Theorem 4.2 is a special case of Theorem 4.4, so we shall just prove the latter theorem.

PROOF: (of Theorem 4.4.) Necessity: We have that $1 - T^*T \geq 0$. Therefore

$$\langle (1 - T^*T)x^{s_j}, x^{s_i} \rangle = \left(\frac{1 - \overline{\alpha(s_i)}\alpha(s_j)}{1 + \overline{s_i} + s_j} \right) \quad (4.5)$$

is a positive semi-definite matrix for any subset of \mathbb{S}_0 .

Sufficiency: Suppose that (4.5) is positive semi-definite for every finite subset of \mathbb{S}_0 . Then T commutes with $H|_{\vee\{x^s : s \in \mathbb{S}_0\}}$. Let us define a kernel on \mathbb{S} by

$$\begin{aligned} k(s, t) &= \int_0^1 x^t \overline{x^s} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + t + \overline{s}}. \end{aligned}$$

The reciprocal of k is the sesquilinear form

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(s, t) &= \left(\frac{1}{2} + t \right) + \overline{\left(\frac{1}{2} + s \right)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{3}{2} + \overline{s} \right) \left(\frac{3}{2} + t \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \overline{s} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} - t \right). \end{aligned}$$

So for any $N \geq 2$ the matrix $[\ell(s_i, s_j)]_{i,j=1}^N$ is a rank 2 symmetric matrix, with one positive and one negative eigenvalue. By Theorem 2.2, T extends to an operator of norm 1 on all of L^2 that has each x^s as an eigenvector, and hence commutes with H . \square

5 Monomial spaces with multiplicity

If one takes the two dimensional monomial spaces $\mathcal{M}(s, s + h)$ and lets $h \rightarrow 0$, the spaces converge to the two-dimensional space spanned by x^s and $\frac{\partial}{\partial s}x^s = (\log x)x^s$. So if we have a multi-set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$, where each s_j appears m_j times, we will define

$$\mathcal{M}(S) = \vee\{x^{s_1}, (\log x)x^{s_1}, \dots, (\log x)^{m_1-1}x^{s_1}, \dots, x^{s_n}, (\log x)x^{s_n}, \dots, (\log x)^{m_n-1}x^{s_n}\}. \quad (5.1)$$

We shall call a set of the form (5.1) a generalized finite monomial space.

Proposition 5.2. *Every generalized finite monomial space is a limit of finite monomial spaces.*

PROOF: Fix $m \geq 2$. Let

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \vee\{x^s, (\log x)x^s, \dots, (\log x)^{m-1}x^s\}.$$

Let ω be a primitive m^{th} root of unity, and let h be a small positive number. Let

$$\mathcal{M}_2 = \vee\{x^{s+\omega^j h} : 0 \leq j \leq m-1\}.$$

We shall prove that there is a constant C , which depends on s and m but not h , so that

$$f \in \mathcal{M}_1 \Rightarrow \text{dist}(f, \mathcal{M}_2) \leq Ch^m \quad (5.3)$$

$$f \in \mathcal{M}_2 \Rightarrow \text{dist}(f, \mathcal{M}_1) \leq Ch. \quad (5.4)$$

As every generalized monomial space of the form (5.1) is the sum of finitely many spaces of the form \mathcal{M}_1 , this will prove the proposition.

In the proof we shall use C for a constant that depends on m but not h , and which may change from one line to the next.

Proof of (5.3). (i) First take $s = 0$. By Taylor's theorem, for any unimodular number τ and any $x > 0$ we have

$$|x^{\tau h} - \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \frac{(\tau h)^n}{n!} (\log x)^{n-1}| \leq \frac{h^m}{m!} (\log x)^m x^{-h}. \quad (5.5)$$

Consider the function $f(x) = (\log x)^n$, for some $n \leq m-1$. We shall approximate this by the function $g \in \mathcal{M}_2$ given by

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{m} \frac{n!}{h^n} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \bar{\omega}^{nj} x^{\omega^j h}.$$

The choice of arguments for the coefficients means that if one adds together the Taylor series for each $x^{\omega^j h}$, all the terms cancel except for the ones that are $n \bmod m$ one, so

$$|g(x) - (\log x)^n| \leq Ch^m (\log x)^{m+n} x^{-h} \quad (5.6)$$

where C is independent of x . Integrating the square of (5.6) we get that $\text{dist}((\log x)^n, \mathcal{M}_2) \leq Ch^m$. As the functions $(\log x)^n$ form a basis for \mathcal{M}_1 , we deduce that (5.3) holds.

(ii) For general s , the above argument shows that for each function $x^s (\log x)^n$ there is a function g in \mathcal{M}_2 that satisfies the pointwise estimate

$$|g(x) - x^s (\log x)^n| \leq Ch^m (\log x)^{m+n} x^{\text{Re } s - h}.$$

As long as h is small enough that $\text{Re } s - h > -\frac{1}{2}$, we again can deduce (5.3).

Proof of (5.4). (i) First take $s = 0$. From (5.5), we get that $\text{dist}(x^{\omega^j h}, \mathcal{M}_1) \leq Ch^m$. So the result will follow if we prove that whenever $\sum c_j x^{\omega^j h}$ is in the unit ball of \mathcal{M}_2 , then $c_j = O(\frac{1}{h^{m-1}})$. This in turn will follow if we can show that

$$\text{dist}(x^{\omega^\ell h}, \vee\{x^{\omega^i h} : 0 \leq i \leq m-1, i \neq \ell\}) \geq Ch^{m-1} \quad (5.7)$$

for some non-zero C , as this proves that the functions $x^{\omega^i h}$ are not too colinear. For definiteness, we will prove (5.7) for $\ell = 0$. Let $G(i, j)$ denote the Gram matrix with (i, j) entry $\langle x^{\omega^i h}, x^{\omega^j h} \rangle = \frac{1}{1 + \omega^i h + \bar{\omega}^j h}$. Then

$$\text{dist}(x^h, \vee_{1 \leq i \leq m-1} \{x^{\omega^i h}\})^2 = \det G(i, j)_{i,j=0}^{m-1} / \det G(i, j)_{i,j=1}^{m-1}. \quad (5.8)$$

By Cauchy's formula for determinants

$$\det\left(\frac{1}{1 + \omega^i h + \bar{\omega}^j h}\right) = \frac{\prod_{j < i} |\omega^i h - \bar{\omega}^j h|^2}{\prod_{i,j} (1 + \omega^i h + \bar{\omega}^j h)}.$$

Putting this into (5.8), we get

$$\text{dist}(x^h, \vee_{1 \leq i \leq m-1} \{x^{\omega^i h}\})^2 = \frac{h^{2m-2} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} |\omega^i - 1|^2}{(1 + 2h) \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} |1 + (1 + \omega^i)h|^2}.$$

This equation yields (5.7) for $\ell = 0$, and by symmetry for all ℓ .

(ii) For general $s \in \mathbb{S}$, a similar argument gives $\text{dist}(x^{s+\omega^\ell h}, \mathcal{M}_1) \leq Ch^m$, and

$$\text{dist}(x^{s+h}, \vee_{1 \leq i \leq m-1} \{x^{s+\omega^i h}\})^2 = \frac{h^{2m-2} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} |\omega^i - 1|^2}{(1 + 2\text{Re } s + 2h) \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} |1 + 2\text{Re } s + (1 + \omega^i)h|^2}.$$

□

With more work, one can improve (5.4) to $O(h^m)$, but we do not need a sharper estimate.

Corollary 5.9. *Any space that is a limit of generalized finite monomial spaces is a monomial space.*

6 Some cyclic vectors for H^*

We know from Proposition 3.2 that the spectrum of H is $\overline{\mathbb{D}(1, 1)}$, and for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}(1, 1)$ that $H - \lambda$ is Fredholm with index 1. It follows that $1 + sH$ and $1 + sH^*$ are invertible if and only if $s \in \mathbb{S}$.

Lemma 6.1. *If $s \in \mathbb{S}$, then*

$$x^s = (1 + sH^*)^{-1}1.$$

PROOF: We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (1 + sH^*)x^s, x^t \rangle &= \langle x^s, (1 + \bar{s}\frac{1}{t+1}x^t) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\bar{t} + 1} \\ &= \langle 1, x^t \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^N c_j x^{s_j}$, where each $s_j \in \mathbb{S}$. If f is not orthogonal to any monomial x^t for $t \in \mathbb{S}$, then f is cyclic for H^* .*

PROOF: By Lemma 6.1, we have

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^N c_j (1 + s_j H^*)^{-1} 1.$$

Define a rational function $r(z)$ by

$$r(z) = \sum_{j=0}^N c_j \frac{1}{1 + s_j z},$$

and let p, q be polynomials with no common factors and $r = p/q$. The zeroes of q are at the points $\{-\frac{1}{s_j} : 1 \leq j \leq N\}$. We have

$$f = p(H^*)q(H^*)^{-1}1. \quad (6.3)$$

Claim: p has no roots in $\mathbb{D}(1, 1)$.

Indeed, suppose $p(z_0) = 0$ for some $z_0 \in \mathbb{D}(1, 1)$. Let $t_0 = \frac{1 - \bar{z}_0}{z_0} \in \mathbb{S}$. Factor p as $p(z) = (z - z_0)\tilde{p}(z)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, x^{t_0} \rangle &= \langle (H^* - z_0)\tilde{p}(H^*)q(H^*)^{-1}1, x^{t_0} \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{p}(H^*)q(H^*)^{-1}1, (\frac{1}{t_0 + 1} - \bar{z}_0)x^{t_0} \rangle \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This would contradict the assumption that $\langle f, x^t \rangle \neq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{S}$.

Since $q(H^*)$ is invertible, f is cyclic if and only if $p(H^*)1$ is cyclic. We now factor $p(z) = c \prod (z - z_j)$. If $z_j \notin \mathbb{D}(1, 1)$, then $(H^* - z_j)$ is invertible. If $z_j \in \partial\mathbb{D}(1, 1)$, then $(H^* - z_j)$ has dense range, since H has no eigenvectors on $\partial\mathbb{D}(1, 1)$. Therefore $p(H^*)$ has dense range, and in particular takes cyclic vectors to cyclic vectors. \square

If $\langle f, x^t \rangle = 0$, then f is in the range of $H^* - \frac{1}{1+t}$. We shall say that $\langle f, x^t \rangle$ vanishes to order m if f is orthogonal to $\{x^t, (\log x)x^t, \dots, (\log x)^{m-1}x^t\}$.

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^N c_j x^{s_j}$, where each $s_j \in \mathbb{S}$, and $f \neq 0$. Let*

$$\{t \in \mathbb{S} : \langle f, x^t \rangle = 0\} = \{t_1, \dots, t_m\},$$

counted with multiplicity. Let $z_i = \frac{1}{1+t_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then

$$f = \prod_{i=1}^m (H^* - z_i)g, \quad (6.5)$$

where g is cyclic for H^ .*

PROOF: Write $f = p(H^*)q(H^*)^{-1}1$ as in (6.3). Let $p^\cup(z) := \overline{p(\bar{z})}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle f, x^t \rangle &= \langle p(H^*)q(H^*)^{-1}1, x^t \rangle \\
&= \langle 1, p^\cup(H)q^\cup(H)^{-1}1 \rangle \\
&= \langle 1, \frac{p^\cup(\frac{1}{t+1})}{q^\cup(\frac{1}{t+1})}x^t \rangle \\
&= \frac{p(\frac{1}{t+1})}{q(\frac{1}{t+1})} \langle 1, x^t \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

So the roots of p that lie in $\mathbb{D}(1, 1)$ are exactly the points $\{z_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$. (Multiplicity is handled by Proposition 3.8). Factor p as $p(z) = \prod_{i=1}^m (z - z_i)\tilde{p}(z)$, where \tilde{p} has no roots in $\mathbb{D}(1, 1)$. Let $g = \tilde{p}(H^*)q(H^*)^{-1}1$. Then g is cyclic, and (6.5) holds. \square

Later we will need the next lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $z \in \mathbb{D}(1, 1)$. Then*

$$(H^* - z)[(\bar{z} - 1)H^* - \bar{z}]^{-1}$$

is an isometry.

PROOF: This follows by calculation, using the fact that $1 - H^*$ is isometric. \square

7 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Sufficiency is obvious. For necessity, let \mathcal{M} be a proper closed subspace of L^2 that is invariant for H . We must show that it is a monomial space.

Lemma 7.1. *Let \mathcal{M} be a finite dimensional subspace of L^2 , of dimension $n + 1$, that is invariant for H . Then \mathcal{M} is a generalized finite monomial space, i.e. there exist $n + 1$ points s_0, \dots, s_n , with multiplicity allowed, so that $\mathcal{M} = \vee \{x^{s_i} : 0 \leq i \leq n\}$.*

PROOF: Consider $H|_{\mathcal{M}}$, which leaves \mathcal{M} invariant. The space \mathcal{M} is spanned by the eigenvectors and generalized eigenvectors of H that lie in \mathcal{M} . Suppose the corresponding eigenvalues are s_j , with multiplicity m_j . By Proposition 3.8, the generalized eigenvectors are of the form $x^{s_j}, (\log x)x^{s_j}, \dots, (\log x)^{m_j-1}x^{s_j}$. Therefore \mathcal{M} is the generalized finite monomial space corresponding to the exponents s_j with multiplicity m_j . \square

To prove the full theorem, we use the idea of wandering subspace, due to Halmos [8]. Let

$$k_0 := \min\{k : e_k \notin \mathcal{M}\}.$$

Write \mathcal{N} for \mathcal{M}^\perp . Write $e_{k_0} = \xi + \eta$, where $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{N}$. The assumption that $e_{k_0} \notin \mathcal{M}$ means $\eta \neq 0$. Let $u = \frac{\eta}{\|\eta\|}$.

Lemma 7.2. *We have $u \perp (1 - H^*)\mathcal{N}$.*

PROOF: Let $f \in \mathcal{N}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle u, (1 - H^*)f \rangle &= \langle \|\eta\| e_{k_0}, (1 - H^*)f \rangle \\ &= \|\eta\| \langle (1 - H)e_{k_0}, f \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

If $k_0 = 0$, then $(1 - H)e_{k_0} = 0$. If $k_0 > 0$, then $(1 - H)e_{k_0} = e_{k_0-1} \in \mathcal{M}$. Either way, the inner product with f is 0. \square

Define an operator R in terms of the orthonormal basis e_n from (3.6) by

$$R : e_n \mapsto (1 - H^*)^n u. \quad (7.3)$$

Lemma 7.4. *The operator R defined by (7.3) is an isometry from L^2 onto \mathcal{N} .*

PROOF: The functions $\{(1 - H^*)^n u : n \geq 0\}$ form an orthonormal set. Indeed, by Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 7.2, if $m \geq n$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle (1 - H^*)^m u, (1 - H^*)^n u \rangle &= \langle (1 - H^*)^{m-n} u, u \rangle \\ &= \delta_{m,n}.\end{aligned}$$

As R maps an orthonormal basis to an orthonormal set, it must be an isometry onto its range.

We know that the range of R is contained in \mathcal{N} . To see that it is all of \mathcal{N} , observe that by Lemma 7.2, we have that

$$\vee\{(1 - H)^m u : m \geq 1\}$$

is contained in $\mathcal{N}^\perp = \mathcal{M}$. As $1 - H$ is a pure isometry of multiplicity 1, by Theorem 2.1 for any non-zero vector f the vectors

$$\{(1 - H)^m f, (1 - H^*)^n f : m, n \geq 0\}$$

span L^2 . Therefore in particular, $\vee\{(H^*)^n u : n \geq 0\}$ and $\vee\{H^m u : m \geq 1\}$ span L^2 , so

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N} &= \vee\{(H^*)^n u : n \geq 0\} \\ \mathcal{M} &= \vee\{H^m u : m \geq 1\}.\end{aligned}$$

\square

Let us calculate $T = R^*$, the adjoint of R .

Lemma 7.5. *The adjoint of R is given by the operator*

$$T : x^s \mapsto (1 + s)\langle x^s, u \rangle x^s. \quad (7.6)$$

PROOF: We have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle R^* x^s, e_n \rangle &= \langle x^s, (1 - H^*)^n u \rangle \\ &= \langle (1 - H)^n x^s, u \rangle \\ &= \left(\frac{s}{s+1}\right)^n \langle x^s, u \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

We also have by Lemma 3.5

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle Tx^s, e_n \rangle &= (1+s)\langle x^s, u \rangle \langle x^s, (1-H^*)^n 1 \rangle \\
&= (1+s)\langle x^s, u \rangle \langle (1-H)^n x^s, 1 \rangle \\
&= \left(\frac{s}{s+1} \right)^n \langle x^s, u \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $T = R^*$. □

We want to approximate \mathcal{M} by monomial spaces. We shall do this by approximating u by linear combinations of monomials. We have proved that T is a co-isometry that commutes with H . This means by Theorem 4.4 that for each N , the matrix

$$\left(\frac{1 - (i+1)(j+1)\langle u, x^i \rangle \langle x^j, u \rangle}{1+i+j} \right)_{i,j=0}^N \geq 0.$$

We shall assume for the remainder of this section that N is large enough that $\langle u, x^i \rangle \neq 0$ for some $i \leq N$. Let $C_N \geq 1$ be the largest number C so that

$$\left(\frac{1 - C^2(i+1)(j+1)\langle u, x^i \rangle \langle x^j, u \rangle}{1+i+j} \right)_{i,j=0}^N \geq 0.$$

The hypothesis on N means C_N is finite, and $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} C_N = 1$. Define \tilde{T}_N by

$$\tilde{T}_N : x^i \mapsto C_N(i+1)\langle x^i, u \rangle x^i, \quad 0 \leq i \leq N.$$

By Theorem 4.4, this extends to an operator T_N that maps L^2 to L^2 , commutes with H , and has norm equal to 1. So T_N is of the form

$$T_N : x^s \mapsto \alpha_N(s)x^s. \tag{7.9}$$

Lemma 7.10. *The function $\alpha_N(s)$ is a rational function of degree at most N , and maps \mathbb{S} to \mathbb{D} .*

PROOF: We know that

$$\alpha_N(i) = C_N(i+1)\langle u, x^i \rangle, \quad 0 \leq i \leq N, \tag{7.11}$$

Let γ be a non-zero vector in the kernel of

$$\left(\frac{1 - C_N^2(i+1)(j+1)\langle u, x^i \rangle \langle x^j, u \rangle}{1+i+j} \right)_{i,j=0}^N \geq 0.$$

By Theorem 4.2, the matrix (4.3) has to be positive semidefinite when we augment the set $\{0, \dots, N\}$ by any other point s . This means by Lemma 7.14 that the first $N+1$ entries in the last column of the extended $(N+2)$ -by- $(N+2)$ matrix must be orthogonal to γ , so

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \frac{1 - \overline{\alpha_N(i)}\alpha_N(s)}{1+i+s} \gamma_i = 0.$$

This equation yields

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\overline{\alpha_N(i)} \gamma_i}{1+i+s} \right) \alpha_N(s) = \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\gamma_i}{1+i+s} \quad (7.13)$$

Let $R(s)$ denote the right-hand side of (7.13), and $L(s)$ denote the coefficient of $\alpha_N(s)$ on the left. Both R and L are rational functions, vanishing at infinity, with simple poles exactly in the set

$$\{-1-i : \gamma_i \neq 0\}.$$

Their ratio $\alpha_N = R/L$, therefore, is a rational function with poles at the zero set of L , and zeroes on the zero set of R . The degree will be at most N , since they both have zeroes at infinity.

As $\|Tx^s\| = |\alpha_N(s)| \|x^s\| \leq \|x^s\|$, we have $\alpha_N : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$. \square

We used the following lemma, whose proof is elementary linear algebra.

Lemma 7.14. *Suppose A is a positive semi-definite matrix, and γ is a non-zero vector in the kernel of A . If there is a vector β and a constant c so that*

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & \beta \\ \beta^* & c \end{pmatrix} \geq 0,$$

then $\langle \beta, \gamma \rangle = 0$.

Lemma 7.15. *Let α be a rational function of degree N with all its poles in the set $\{s : \operatorname{Re}(s) < -\frac{1}{2}\}$, and with no pole at ∞ .*

(i) *If $\alpha(-1) \neq 0$, then there exists a sequence $\{s_0, \dots, s_N\}$, with multiplicity allowed, and a function u_N in the generalized finite monomial space $\mathcal{M}(\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N\})$, so that*

$$\alpha(s) = (1+s) \langle x^s, u_N \rangle \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S}. \quad (7.16)$$

Moreover we can take $s_0 = 0$.

(ii) *If $\alpha(-1) = 0$, then there exists a sequence $\{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$, with multiplicity allowed, and a function u_N in the generalized finite monomial space $\mathcal{M}(\{s_1, \dots, s_N\})$, so that*

$$\alpha(s) = (1+s) \langle x^s, u_N \rangle \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{S}. \quad (7.17)$$

PROOF: Expand $\alpha(s)/(s+1)$ by partial fractions to get

$$\frac{\alpha(s)}{s+1} = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{r=1}^{m_j} \frac{(r-1)! c_j^r}{(s-\lambda_j)^r}.$$

There is no constant term, since the left-hand side vanishes at ∞ . We can assume that $c_j^{m_j} \neq 0$ for each j . In case (i), there is a pole, which we denote λ_1 , at -1 , and $\sum_{j=1}^p m_j = N+1$. In case (ii) there is no pole at -1 , and $\sum_{j=1}^p m_j = N$.

The inverse Laplace transform of $\alpha(s)/(s+1)$ is

$$F(t) = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{r=1}^{m_j} c_j^r t^{r-1} e^{\lambda_j t}.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}
u_N(x) &= \frac{1}{x} \overline{F\left(\log \frac{1}{x}\right)} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{r=1}^{m_j} \bar{c}_j^r \left(\log \frac{1}{x}\right)^{r-1} x^{-\bar{\lambda}_j-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.18}$$

Then, making the substitution $e^{-t} = x$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle x^s, u_N \rangle &= \int_0^1 x^s \overline{u_N(x)} dx \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-st} F(t) dt \\
&= (\mathcal{L}F)(s) \\
&= \frac{\alpha(s)}{s+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that each point $-1 - \bar{\lambda}_j$ is in \mathbb{S} . We now define the multiset $\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N\}$ (respectively, $\{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$) by taking m_j copies of the point $-\bar{\lambda}_j - 1$ for each j . \square

We shall prove in Lemma 7.22 that case (ii) cannot occur for α_N .

Lemma 7.18. *Let $\mathcal{K} = \ker(1 - T_N T_N^*)$. Then \mathcal{K} is H^* invariant.*

PROOF: As H commutes with T_N and $(1 - H)(1 - H^*) = 1$ by Lemma 3.1, we have

$$T_N = (1 - H)T_N(1 - H^*).$$

So if $g \in \mathcal{K}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g\|^2 &= \|T_N^* g\|^2 \\
&= \langle (1 - H)T_N^*(1 - H^*)g, T_N^* g \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

As $\|1 - H^*\|$ and $\|T_N^*\|$ are both equal to 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_N^*(1 - H^*)g\| &= \|(1 - H^*)g\| \\
&= \|g\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(1 - H^*)g$ is also in \mathcal{K} , and hence \mathcal{K} is H^* invariant. \square

Lemma 7.19. *The operator T_N is a co-isometry.*

PROOF: Let γ be as in the proof of Lemma 7.10. Let $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^N \gamma_j x^j$. Then $(1 - T_N^* T_N)f = 0$, so T_N attains its norm on f . Let

$$g = T_N f = \sum_{j=0}^N \gamma_j \alpha(j) x^j.$$

As $f = T_N^* T_N f$, we have $g = T_N T_N^* g$.

To prove T_N is a co-isometry, we must show that

$$\mathcal{K} = \ker(1 - T_N T_N^*)$$

is all of L^2 . By Lemma 7.21, we know that \mathcal{K} is H^* invariant, and it contains the polynomial g . If g were not orthogonal to any x^t , then we would be done by Lemma 6.2.

As $\langle x^t, g \rangle$ is a non-zero rational function of t , it can only have finitely many zeroes in \mathbb{S} ; label these $\{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$, counting multiplicity. By Lemma 6.4 we have

$$g = \prod_{i=1}^m (H^* - z_i) h_1,$$

where h_1 is cyclic for H^* and $z_i = \frac{1}{1+t_i}$. Let

$$h_2 = \prod_{i=1}^m [(\bar{z}_i - 1)H^* - \bar{z}_i] h_1.$$

Then h_2 is cyclic since it is an invertible operator applied to h_1 . Let

$$r(z) = \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{z - z_i}{(\bar{z}_i - 1)z - \bar{z}_i}.$$

By Lemma 6.6, $r(H^*)$ is an isometry, and we have $r(H^*)h_2 = g$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_2\| &= \|r(H^*)h_2\| \\ &= \|T_N T_N^* r(H^*)h_2\| \\ &\leq \|T_N^* r(H^*)h_2\| \\ &= \|r(H^*)T_N^* h_2\| \\ &= \|T_N^* h_2\| \\ &\leq \|h_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $h_2 \in \mathcal{K}$, and since \mathcal{K} is H^* invariant and h_2 is cyclic, we get that \mathcal{K} is all of L^2 and hence T_N^* is an isometry. \square

Let $R_N = T_N^*$. A similar calculation to the proof of Lemma 7.5 yields:

Lemma 7.21. *The operator R_N maps e_n to $(1 - H^*)^n u_N$.*

We are now ready to define \mathcal{M}_N . Let α_N be as in (7.9). Apply Lemma 7.15 to α_N to get, in case (i), a space $\mathcal{M}(\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N\})$ that contains u_N given by (7.18) and satisfies (7.16), and in case (ii) a space $\mathcal{M}(\{s_1, \dots, s_N\})$ that contains u_N given by (7.18) and satisfies (7.17).

We show that Case (ii) of Lemma 7.15 cannot occur.

Lemma 7.22. *We have $\alpha_N(-1) \neq 0$.*

PROOF: Let us assume that we are in Case (ii) of Lemma 7.15. Let $t_j = -\bar{\lambda}_j - 1$. In the sequence $\{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$ each t_j appears with multiplicity m_j , and no t_j is 0. We have

$$u_N = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{r=1}^{m_j} \bar{c}_j^r (-\log x)^{r-1} x^{t_j}.$$

Since R_N is isometric by Lemma 7.19, we have u_N is orthogonal to $(1 - H^*)^k u_N$ for every $k \geq 1$, and hence u_N is also orthogonal to $(1 - H)^k u_N$ for every $k \geq 1$. For each $j \geq 1$, let p_j^k be a polynomial that vanishes at 0, vanishes at t_i to order m_i if $i \neq j$, and vanishes at t_j to order k . Since each such polynomial vanishes at zero, we have

$$\langle u_N, p_j^k (1 - H) u_N \rangle = 0. \quad (7.23)$$

Consider

$$p_j^{m_j} (1 - H) u_N = \bar{c}_j^{m_j} x^{t_j}.$$

By (7.23), we conclude that $u_N \perp x^{t_j}$. Similarly $p_j^{m_j-1} (1 - H) u_N$ equals $\bar{c}_j^{m_j} (\log x) x^{t_j}$ plus some multiple of x^{t_j} . Therefore we conclude that u_N is also orthogonal to $(\log x) x^{t_j}$. Continuing in this way, we conclude that u_N is orthogonal to every function in $\mathcal{M}(\{s_1, \dots, s_N\})$. Since u_N itself is in this space, we conclude that $u_N = 0$, a contradiction. \square

Let $\mathcal{M}_N = \mathcal{M}(\{s_1, \dots, s_N\})$, in other words the space $\mathcal{M}(\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N\})$ with the multiplicity at 0 reduced by 1. Here is the final step.

Lemma 7.24. *The sequence \mathcal{M}_N tends to \mathcal{M} .*

PROOF: Let $t_j = -\bar{\lambda}_j - 1$, with $t_1 = 0$. We have

$$u_N = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{r=1}^{m_j} \bar{c}_j^r (-\log x)^{r-1} x^{t_j}.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 7.22, we conclude that u_N is orthogonal to $p(1 - H)\mathcal{M}(\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N\})$ for every polynomial p that vanishes at 0. So u_N is a constant multiple of the projection of e_{m_1-1} onto \mathcal{M}_N^\perp .

By Lemma 7.4, T_N^* is an isometry from L^2 onto \mathcal{M}_N^\perp . Therefore the projection $P_{\mathcal{M}_N}$ onto \mathcal{M}_N is given by $1 - T_N^* T_N$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} T_N : x^i &\mapsto (i + 1) \langle x^i, u_N \rangle x^i, & 0 \leq i \leq N \\ &= C_N (i + 1) \langle x^i, u \rangle x^i, & 0 \leq i \leq N. \end{aligned}$$

As $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have $u_N \rightarrow u$ weakly and so $T_N \rightarrow T$ in SOT. Therefore $P_{\mathcal{M}_N} \rightarrow P_{\mathcal{M}} = 1 - T^* T$ in WOT and hence also SOT (since a sequence of projections converges in the SOT if and only if it converges WOT). \square

8 Open Question

Let $1 < p < \infty$, and $p \neq 2$. The Hardy operator is bounded on $L^p[0, 1]$, and has x^s as an eigenvector whenever $s \in \mathbb{S}_p = \{s \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(s) > -\frac{1}{p}\}$. Any space that is the limit of finite monomial spaces (with powers in \mathbb{S}_p) is therefore invariant for H . Is every closed subspace of $L^p[0, 1]$ that is invariant for H of this form?

References

- [1] Jim Agler and John E. McCarthy. A generalization of Hardy's operator and an asymptotic Müntz-Szász theorem. Preprint, 2022 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.01856>.
- [2] Jim Agler and John E. McCarthy. Monomial operators. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, to appear.
- [3] Jim Agler and John E. McCarthy. Complete Nevanlinna-Pick kernels. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 175(1):111–124, 2000.
- [4] Jim Agler and John E. McCarthy. *Pick interpolation and Hilbert function spaces*, volume 44 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [5] Arne Beurling. On two problems concerning linear transformations in Hilbert space. *Acta Math.*, 81:239–255, 1948.
- [6] Peter Borwein and Tamás Erdélyi. *Polynomials and polynomial inequalities*, volume 161 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [7] Arlen Brown, P. R. Halmos, and A. L. Shields. Cesàro operators. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 26:125–137, 1965.
- [8] Paul R. Halmos. Shifts on Hilbert spaces. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 208:102–112, 1961.
- [9] G. H. Hardy. Note on a theorem of Hilbert. *Math. Z.*, 6(3-4):314–317, 1920.
- [10] N. Kaiblinger, L. Maligranda, and L.-E. Persson. Norms in weighted L^2 -spaces and Hardy operators. In *Function spaces (Poznań, 1998)*, volume 213 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 205–216. Dekker, New York, 2000.
- [11] Greg Knese. A simple proof of necessity in the McCullough-Quiggin theorem. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 148(8):3453–3456, 2020.
- [12] Natan Kruglyak, Lech Maligranda, and Lars-Erik Persson. Structure of the Hardy operator related to Laguerre polynomials and the Euler differential equation. *Rev. Mat. Complut.*, 19(2):467–476, 2006.
- [13] Alois Kufner, Lech Maligranda, and Lars-Erik Persson. *The Hardy inequality*. Vydavatelský Servis, Plzen, 2007. About its history and some related results.
- [14] S.A. McCullough. The local de Branges-Rovnyak construction and complete Nevanlinna-Pick kernels. In *Algebraic methods in Operator theory*, pages 15–24. Birkhäuser, 1994.
- [15] Chaim Herman Müntz. Über den Approximationssatz von Weierstrass. In *H.A. Schwartz Festschrift*, pages 303–312. Berlin, 1914.

- [16] N. K. Nikol'skii. *Treatise on the Shift Operator: Spectral Function Theory*, volume 273 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [17] P. Quiggin. For which reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces is Pick's theorem true? *Integral Equations and Operator Theory*, 16(2):244–266, 1993.
- [18] Otto Szász. Über die Approximation stetiger Funktionen durch lineare Aggregate von Potenzen. *Math. Ann.*, 77(4):482–496, 1916.
- [19] Otto Szász. On closed sets of rational functions. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 34:195–218, 1953.
- [20] John von Neumann. Allgemeine Eigenwerttheorie Hermitescher Funktionaloperatoren. *Math. Ann.*, 102:49–131, 1929.
- [21] H. Wold. *A study in the analysis of stationary time series*. Almqvist & Wiksells, Uppsala, 1938.