INVARIANT SUBSPACES OF THE QUASINILPOTENT DT-OPERATOR

KEN DYKEMA AND UFFE HAAGERUP

ABSTRACT. In [4] we introduced the class of DT-operators, which are modeled by certain upper triangular random matrices, and showed that if the spectrum of a DT-operator is not reduced to a single point, then it has a nontrivial, closed, hyperinvariant subspace. In this paper, we prove that also every DT-operator whose spectrum is concentrated on a single point has a nontrivial, closed, hyperinvariant subspace. In fact, each such operator has a one-parameter family of them. It follows that every DT-operator generates the von Neumann algebra $L(\mathbf{F}_2)$ of the free group on two generators.

1. Introduction

Let \mathcal{H} be a separable, infinite dimensional Hilbert space and let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be the algebra of bounded operators on \mathcal{H} . Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. An invariant subspace of A is a subspace $\mathcal{H}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that $A(\mathcal{H}_0) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_0$, and a hyperinvariant subspace of A is a subspace \mathcal{H}_0 of \mathcal{H} that is invariant for every operator $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ that commutes with A. A subspace of \mathcal{H} is said to be nontrivial if it is neither $\{0\}$ nor \mathcal{H} itself. The famous invariant subspace problem for Hilbert space asks whether every operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ has a closed, nontrivial, invariant subspace, and the hyperinvariant subspace problem asks whether every operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ that is not a scalar multiple of the identity operator has a closed, nontrivial, hyperinvariant subspace.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a von Neumann algebra, a closed subspace \mathcal{H}_0 of \mathcal{H} is affiliated to \mathcal{M} if the projection p from \mathcal{H} onto \mathcal{H}_0 belongs to \mathcal{M} . It is not difficult to show that every closed, hyperinvariant subspace of A is affiliated to the von Neumann algebra, $W^*(A)$, generated by A. The question of whether every element of a von Neumann algebra \mathcal{M} has a nontrivial invariant subspace affiliated to \mathcal{M} is called the invariant subspace problem relative to the von Neumann algebra \mathcal{M} .

In [3], we began using upper triangular random matrices to study invariant subspaces for certain operators arising in free probability theory, including Voiculescu's circular operator. In the sequel [4], we introduced the DT-operators; these form a class of operators including all those studied in [3]. (We note that the DT-operators were defined in terms of approximation by upper triangular random matrices, and have been shown in [6] to solve a maxmimization problem for free entropy.) We showed that DT-operators are decomposable in the sense of Foiaş, which entails that those DT-operators whose spectra contain more than one point have nontrivial, closed, hyperinvariant subspaces. In this paper, we show that also DT-operators whose spectra are singletons have (a continuum of) closed, nontrivial, hyperinvariant subspaces. These operators are all scalar translates of scalar multiples of a single operator, the DT(δ_0 , 1)-operator, which we will denote by T.

Date: 10 January, 2003.

The first author was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0070558. The second author is affiliated with MaPhySto, Centre for Mathematical Physics and Stochastics, which is funded by a grant from The Danish National Research Foundation.

The free group factor $L(\mathbf{F}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is generated by a semicircular element X and a free copy of $L^{\infty}[0,1]$, embedded via a normal *-homomorphism $\lambda: L^{\infty}[0,1] \to L(\mathbf{F}_2)$ such that $\tau \circ \lambda(f) = \int_0^1 f(t)dt$, where τ is the tracial state on $L(\mathbf{F}_2)$. Thus X and the image of λ are free with respect to τ and together they generate $L(\mathbf{F}_2)$. As proved in $[4, \S 4]$, the $\mathrm{DT}(\delta_0,1)$ -operator T can be obtained by using projections from $\lambda(L^{\infty}[0,1])$ to cut out the "upper triangular part" of X; in the notation of $[4,\S 4]$, $T = \mathrm{UT}(X,\lambda)$. It is clear from this construction that each of the subspaces $\mathcal{H}_t = \lambda(1_{[0,t]})\mathcal{H}$ is an invariant subspace of T. We will show that each of these subspaces is affiliated to $W^*(T)$ by proving $D_0 \in W^*(T)$, where $D_0 = \lambda(\mathrm{id}_{[0,1]})$ and $\mathrm{id}_{[0,1]}$ is the identity function from [0,1] to itself. Since $X = T + T^*$, this will also imply $W^*(T) = L(\mathbf{F}_2)$. We will then show that each \mathcal{H}_t is actually a hyperinvariant subspace of T, by characterizing \mathcal{H}_t as the set of vectors $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|T^k\xi\|$ has a certain asymptotic property as $k \to \infty$.

2. Preliminaries and statement of results

In [4, §8], we showed that the distribution of T^*T is the probability measure μ on [0, e] given by

$$d\mu(x) = \varphi(x)dx$$

where $\varphi \colon (0, e) \to \mathbf{R}^+$ is the function given uniquely by

$$\varphi\left(\frac{\sin v}{v}\exp(v\cot v)\right) = \frac{1}{\pi}\sin v\exp(-v\cot v), \qquad 0 < v < \pi.$$
 (2.1)

Proposition 2.1. Let $F(x) = \int_0^x \varphi(t)dt, x \in [0, e]$. Then

$$F\left(\frac{\sin v}{v}\exp(v\cot v)\right) = 1 - \frac{v}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\pi}\frac{\sin^2 v}{v}, \qquad 0 < v < \pi.$$
 (2.2)

Proof. From the proof of [4, Thm. 8.9] we have that

$$\sigma \colon v \mapsto \frac{\sin v}{v} \exp(v \cot v)$$
 (2.3)

is a decreasing bijection from $(0, \pi)$ onto (0, e). Hence

$$\begin{split} F(\sigma(v)) &= \int_0^{\sigma(v)} \varphi(t) dt = -\int_v^\pi \varphi(\sigma(u)) \sigma'(u) du \\ &= -[\varphi(\sigma(u)) \sigma(u)]_v^\pi + \int_v^\pi \left(\frac{d}{du} \varphi(\sigma(u))\right) \sigma(u) du \\ &= -\frac{1}{\pi} \left[\frac{\sin^2 u}{u}\right]_v^\pi + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_v^\pi \frac{u}{\sin u} \cdot \frac{\sin u}{u} \, du = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\sin^2 v}{v} + 1 - \frac{v}{\pi}. \quad \Box \end{split}$$

The following is the central result of this paper.

Theorem 2.2. Let $S_k = k((T^k)^*T^k)^{\frac{1}{k}}, \ k = 1, 2, ...$ Then $\sigma(S_k) = [0, e]$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{k \to \infty} ||F(S_k) - D_0||_2 = 0$ for $k \to \infty$.

In particular $D_0 \in W^*(T)$. Therefore $\mathfrak{H}_t = 1_{[0,t]}(D_0)\mathfrak{H} = \lambda(1_{[0,t]})\mathfrak{H}$, 0 < t < 1 is a one-parameter family of nontrivial, closed, T-invariant subspaces affiliated with $W^*(T)$.

Corollary 2.3. $W^*(T) \cong L(\mathbf{F}_2)$. Moreover, if Z is any DT-operator, then $W^*(Z) \cong L(\mathbf{F}_2)$.

Proof. As described in the introduction, with $T = \mathfrak{UT}(X,\lambda) \in W^*(X \cup \lambda(L^{\infty}[0,1])) = L(\mathbf{F}_2)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have $D_0 \in W^*(T)$. Since clearly $X \in W^*(T)$, we have $W^*(T) = L(\mathbf{F}_2)$. By [4, Thm. 4.4], Z can be realized as Z = D + cT for some $D \in \lambda(L^{\infty}[0,1])$ and c > 0. By [4, Lem. 6.2], $T \in W^*(Z)$, so $W^*(Z) = L(\mathbf{F}_2)$.

We now outline the proof of Theorem 2.2. Let M be a factor of type II_1 with tracial state tr, and let $A, B \in M_{sa}$. By $[1, \S 1]$, there is a unique probability measure $\mu_{A,B}$ on $\sigma(A) \times \sigma(B)$, such that for all bounded Borel functions f, g on $\sigma(A)$ and $\sigma(B)$, respectively, one has

$$\operatorname{tr}(f(A)g(B)) = \iint_{\sigma(A)\times\sigma(B)} f(x)g(y)d\mu_{A,B}(x). \tag{2.4}$$

The following lemma is a simple consequence of (2.4) (cf. [1, Proposition 1.1]).

Lemma 2.4. Let A, B and $\mu_{A,B}$ be as above, then for all bounded Borel functions f and g on $\sigma(A)$ and $\sigma(B)$, respectively,

$$||f(A) - g(B)||_2^2 = \iint_{\sigma(A) \times \sigma(B)} |f(x) - g(y)|^2 d\mu_{A,B}(x,y).$$
 (2.5)

We shall need the following key result of Śniady [7]. Strictly speaking, the results of [7] concern an operator that can be described as a generalized circular operator with a given variance matrix. It's not entirely obvious that the operator T studied in [4] and in the present article is actually of this form. A proof is supplied in Appendix A below.

Theorem 2.5. [7, Thm. 5] Let $E_{\mathcal{D}}$ be the trace preserving conditional expectation of $W^*(D_0, T)$ onto $\mathcal{D} = W^*(D_0)$, which we identify with $L^{\infty}[0,1]$ as in [7]. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(P_{k,n})_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be the sequence of polynomials in a real variable x determined by:

$$P_{k,0}(x) = 1 (2.6)$$

$$P_{k,n}^{(k)}(x) = P_{k,n-1}(x+1), \qquad n = 1, 2, \dots$$
 (2.7)

$$P_{k,n}(0) = P'_{k,n}(0) = \dots = P^{(k-1)}_{k,n}(0) = 0, \qquad n = 1, 2, \dots$$
 (2.8)

where $P_{k,n}^{(\ell)}$ denotes the ℓ th derivative of $P_{k,n}$. Then for all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}(((T^k)^*T^k)^n)(x) = P_{k,n}(x), \qquad x \in [0,1].$$

Remark 2.6. The above Theorem is equivalent to [7, Thm. 5] because

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}(((T^k)^*T^k)^n)(x) = E_{\mathcal{D}}((T^k(T^k)^*)^n)(1-x), \quad x \in [0,1].$$

Śniady used Theorem 2.5 to prove the following formula, which was conjectured in [4, §9].

Theorem 2.7. [7, Thm. 7] For all $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\operatorname{tr}(((T^k)^*T^k)^n) = \frac{n^{nk}}{(nk+1)!} \,. \tag{2.9}$$

Śniady proved that Theorem 2.5 implies Theorem 2.7 by a tricky and clever combinatorial argument. In the course of proving Theorem 2.2, we also obtained a purely analytic proof of Thm. $2.5 \Rightarrow$ Thm. 2.7 (see (3.2) and Remark 4.3). Note that it follows from Theorem 2.7 that $S_k^k = k^k (T^k)^* T^k$ has the same moments as $(T^*T)^k$. Hence the distribution measures

 μ_{S_k} and μ_{T^*T} in Prob(**R**) are equal. In particular their supports are equal. Hence, by [4, Thm. 8.9],

$$\sigma(S_k) = \sigma(T^*T) = [0, e]. \tag{2.10}$$

We will use Theorem 2.5 to derive in Theorem 2.8 an explicit formula for the measure μ_{D_0,S_k} defined in (2.4). The formula involves Lambert's W function, which is defined as the multivalued inverse function of the function $\mathbb{C} \ni z \mapsto ze^z$. We define a function ρ by

$$\rho(z) = -W_0(-z), \quad z \in \mathbf{C} \setminus [\frac{1}{e}, \infty), \tag{2.11}$$

where W_0 is the principal branch of Lambert's W-function. By $[2, \S 4]$, ρ is an analytic bijection of $\mathbf{C} \setminus [\frac{1}{e}, \infty)$ onto

$$\Omega = \{x + iy \mid -\pi < y < \pi, \ x < y \cot y\},\$$

where we have used the convention $0 \cot 0 = 1$. Moreover, ρ is the inverse function of the function f defined by

$$f(w) = we^{-w}, \quad w \in \Omega.$$

Note that f maps the boundary of Ω onto $\left[\frac{1}{e}, \infty\right)$, because

$$f(\theta \cot \theta \pm i\theta) = f\left(\frac{\theta}{\sin \theta}e^{\pm i\theta}\right) = \frac{\theta}{\sin \theta}e^{-\theta \cot \theta}$$
 (2.12)

and $\theta \mapsto \frac{\sin \theta}{\theta} e^{\theta \cot \theta}$ is a bijection of $(0, \pi)$ onto (0, e) (see [4, §8]). By (2.12), it also follows that if we define functions $\rho^+, \rho^- : [\frac{1}{e}, \infty) \to \mathbf{C}$ by

$$\rho^{\pm} \left(\frac{\theta}{\sin \theta} e^{-\theta \cot \theta} \right) = \theta \cot \theta \pm i\theta, \qquad 0 \le \theta < \pi, \tag{2.13}$$

then

$$\rho^{\pm}(x) = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} \rho(x \pm iy), \qquad x \in \left[\frac{1}{e}, \infty\right).$$

In particular $\rho^+\left(\frac{1}{e}\right) = \rho^-\left(\frac{1}{e}\right) = 1$.

Theorem 2.8. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. Define for $t > \frac{1}{e}$ and j = 0, ..., k the functions $a_j(t)$, $c_j(t)$ by

$$\begin{cases}
 a_0(t) = \rho^+(t) \\
 a_j(t) = \rho \left(t \exp\left(i\frac{2\pi j}{k}\right) \right), \quad 1 \le j \le k - 1 \\
 a_k(t) = \rho^-(t)
\end{cases}$$
(2.14)

and

$$c_j(t) = -ka_j(t) \prod_{\ell \neq j} \frac{a_\ell(t)}{a_\ell(t) - a_j(t)}$$
 (2.15)

Then the probability measure μ_{D_0,S_k} on $\sigma(D_0) \times \sigma(S_k) = [0,1] \times [0,e]$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the 2-dimensional Lebesgue measure and, with φ as in (2.1), has density

$$\frac{d\mu_{D_0,S_k}(x,y)}{dxdy} = \varphi(y) \left(\sum_{j=0}^k c_j(y^{-1}) e^{ka_j(y^{-1})x} \right)$$
(2.16)

for $x \in (0,1)$ and $y \in (0,e)$.

We will prove Theorem 2.2 by combining Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 2.8 (see Section 6). Finally, we will prove the following characterization of the subspaces \mathcal{H}_t (see Section 7).

Theorem 2.9. For every $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathcal{H}_t = \{ \xi \in \mathcal{H} \mid \limsup_{n \to \infty} \left(\frac{k}{e} ||T^k \xi||^{2/k} \right) \le t \}. \tag{2.17}$$

In particular, \mathcal{H}_t is a closed, hyperinvariant subspace of T.

3. Proof of Theorem 2.8 for k=1

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.8 in the special case k = 1, which is somewhat easier than in the general case. For k = 1 it is easy to solve equations (2.6)–(2.8) explicitly to obtain

$$P_{1,n}(x) = \frac{1}{n!}x(x+n)^{n-1}, \qquad (n \ge 1).$$
(3.1)

From (3.1) one immediately gets (2.9) for k = 1, because

$$\operatorname{tr}((T^*T)^n) = \int_0^1 P_{1,n}(x)dx = \left[\frac{1}{(n+1)!}(x-1)(x+n)^n\right]_0^1 = \frac{n^n}{(n+1)!}.$$
 (3.2)

Lemma 3.1. For $x \in \mathbf{R}$ and $z \in \mathbf{C}$, $|z| < \frac{1}{\epsilon}$, one has

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P_{1,n}(x)z^n = e^{\rho(z)x}$$

where $\rho \colon \mathbf{C} \setminus \left[\frac{1}{e}, \infty\right) \to \mathbf{C}$ is the analytic function defined in §2.

Proof. Note that $\rho(0) = 0$, $\rho'(0) = 1$. Let $\rho(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma_n z^n$ be the power series expansion of ρ in $B\left(0, \frac{1}{e}\right)$. The convergence radius is $\frac{1}{e}$, because ρ is analytic in $B\left(0, \frac{1}{e}\right)$ and $\frac{1}{e}$ is a singular point for ρ . Hence for $|z| < \frac{1}{e}$ and $x \in \mathbb{C}$, the function $(z, x) \mapsto e^{\rho(z)x}$ has a power series expansion

$$e^{\rho(z)x} = \sum_{\ell,m=0}^{\infty} c_{\ell m} z^{\ell} x^{m}.$$

Since

$$e^{\rho(z)x} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \rho(z)^m x^m$$

and since the first non-zero term in the power series for $\rho(z)^m$ is z^m , we have $c_{\ell m}=0$ for $\ell < m$. Hence

$$e^{\rho(z)x} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} Q_{\ell}(x)z^{\ell} \tag{3.3}$$

where $Q_{\ell}(x)$ is the polynomial $\sum_{m=0}^{\ell} c_{\ell m} x^m$. Putting z=0 in (3.3) we get $Q_0(x)=1$ and putting x=0 in (3.3) we get $Q_n(0)=0$ for $n\geq 1$. Moreover since $\rho(z)e^{-\rho(z)}=z$ for $\mathbb{C}\setminus \left[\frac{1}{e},\infty\right)$, we get

$$\frac{d}{dx}(e^{\rho(z)x}) = \rho(z)e^{\rho(z)x} = \rho(z)e^{-\rho(z)}e^{\rho(z)(x+1)} = ze^{\rho(z)(x+1)}.$$

Hence differentiating (3.3), we get

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} Q'_{\ell}(x)z^{\ell} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} Q_{\ell}(x+1)z^{\ell+1} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} Q_{\ell-1}(x+1)z^{\ell}, \qquad |z| < \frac{1}{e}.$$

Therefore $Q'_{\ell}(x) = Q_{\ell-1}(x+1)$ for $\ell \geq 1$. Together with $Q_0(x) = 1$, $Q_{\ell}(x) = 0$, $(\ell \geq 1)$, this proves that $Q_{\ell}(x) = P_{1,\ell}(x)$ for $\ell \geq 0$.

Remark 3.2. From Lemma 3.1 and (3.1) we can find the power series expansion of $\rho(z)$, namely

$$\rho(z) = ze^{\rho(z)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P_{1,n}(1)z^{n+1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(n+1)^{n-1}}{n!}z^{n+1} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n^{n-2}}{(n-1)!}z^n.$$
 (3.4)

Similarly one gets

$$\frac{1}{\rho(z)} = \frac{1}{z}e^{-\rho(z)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P_{1,n}(-1)z^{n-1} = \frac{1}{z} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(n-1)^{n-1}}{n!}z^{n-1} = \frac{1}{z} - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{n^n}{(n+1)!}z^n. \quad (3.5)$$

The latter formula was also found in [4, §8] by different means. Actually, both formulae can be obtained from the Lagrange Inversion Formula, (cf. [9, Example 5.44]).

Lemma 3.3. For every $x \in [0,1]$ there is a unique probability measure ν_x on [0,e] such that

$$\int_0^e y^n \ d\nu_x(y) = P_{1,n}(x), \qquad n \in \mathbf{N}_0.$$
 (3.6)

Proof. The uniqueness is clear by Weierstrass' approximation theorem. For existence, recall that $\sigma(D) = [0,1]$ and, by $[4,\S 8]$, $\sigma(T^*T) = [0,e]$. Let now $\mu = \mu_{D_0,T^*T}$ denote the joint distribution of D_0 and T^*T in the sense of (2.4). For x=0, $\nu_x=\delta_0$ (the Dirac measure at 0) is a solution of (3.6). Assume now that x>0 and let $\varepsilon \in (0,x)$. Then for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\int_{x-\varepsilon}^{x} P_{1,n}(x')dx' = \int_{0}^{1} 1_{[x-\varepsilon,x]}(x')P_{1,n}(x')dx' = \operatorname{tr}(1_{[x-\varepsilon,x]}(D)E_{\mathcal{D}}((T^{*}T)^{n}))$$
$$= \operatorname{tr}(1_{[x-\varepsilon,x]}(D)(T^{*}T)^{n}) = \int_{[0,1]\times[0,e]} 1_{[x-\varepsilon,x]}(x')y^{n} d\mu(x',y).$$

Let $\nu_{\varepsilon,x}$ denote the Borel measure on [0,e] given by $\nu_{\varepsilon,x}(B) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mu([x-\varepsilon,x]\times B)$ for any Borel set B in [0,e]. Then by the above calculation,

$$\int_0^e y^n \ d\nu_{\varepsilon,x}(y) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{x-\varepsilon}^x P_{1,n}(x') dx', \qquad n \in \mathbf{N}_0.$$
 (3.7)

Since $P_{1,0}(x') = 1$, $\nu_{\varepsilon,x}$ is a probability measure. By (3.7), $\nu_{\varepsilon,x}$ converges as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the w^* -topology on Prob([0,e]) to a measure ν_x satisfying (3.6).

Lemma 3.4. Let $x \in [0, 1]$.

(a) For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, e]$, the Stieltjes transform (or Cauchy transform) of ν_x is given by

$$G_x(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \exp\left(\rho\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)x\right).$$
 (3.8)

(b) If $x \in (0,1], d\nu_x(y) = h_x(y)dy$, where

$$h_x(y) = \frac{1}{\pi y} \operatorname{Im}\left(\exp\left(\rho^+\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)x\right)\right), \qquad y \in (0, e].$$
(3.9)

Proof. (a). Since $G_x(\lambda) = \int_0^e \frac{1}{\lambda - y} d\nu_x(y)$ is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, e]$, it is sufficient to check (3.8) for $|\lambda| > e$. In this case, we get from Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.1 that

$$G_x(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^{n+1}} \int_0^e y^n \ d\nu_x(y) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda^{-n} P_n(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \exp\left(\rho\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) x\right).$$

(b). For $y \in (0, e]$, put

$$h_x(y) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{z \to 0^+} \operatorname{Im}(G_x(y+iz)) = -\frac{1}{\pi y} \operatorname{Im}\left(\exp\left(\rho^-\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)x\right)\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{\pi y} \operatorname{Im}\left(\exp\left(\rho^+\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)x\right)\right).$$

It is easy to see that the above convergence is uniform for y in compact subsets of (0, e], so by the inverse Stieltjes transform, the restriction of ν_x to (0, e] is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and has density $h_x(y)$. It remains to be proved that $\nu_x(\{0\}) = 0$. But

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 0^-} \lambda G_x(\lambda) = \nu_x(\{0\}) + \lim_{\lambda \to 0^-} \left(\int_{(0,e]} \frac{|\lambda|}{|\lambda| + y} d\nu_x(y) \right) = \nu_x(\{0\}).$$

However, $\lambda G_x(\lambda) = \exp\left(\rho\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)x\right) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0^-$, because x > 0 and $\lim_{y \to -\infty} \rho(y) = -\infty$. Hence $\nu_x(\{0\}) = 0$, which completes the proof of (b).

Proof of Theorem 2.8 for k = 1. Put $\mu = \mu_{D_0,T^*T}$ as defined in (2.4). For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we get from Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4,

$$\iint_{[0,1]\times[0,e]} x^m y^n \ d\mu(x,y) = \operatorname{tr}(D_0^m (T^*T)^n) = \operatorname{tr}(D_0^m E_{\mathcal{D}}((T^*T)^n)) = \int_0^1 x^m P_{1,n}(x) dx$$

$$= \int_0^1 x^m \int_0^e y^n \ d\nu_x(y) dx = \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^e x^m y^n h_x(y) dy \right) dx.$$

Hence by the Stone–Weierstrass Theorem, μ is absolutely continuous with respect to the two dimensional Lebesgue measure on $[0,1] \times [0,e]$, and for $x \in (0,1)$, $y \in (0,e)$, we have

$$\frac{d\mu(x,y)}{dxdy} = h_x(y) = \frac{1}{\pi y} \operatorname{Im}\left(\exp\left(\rho^+\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)x\right)\right). \tag{3.10}$$

We now have to compare (3.10) with (2.16) in Theorem 2.8. Putting k=1 in (2.14) and (2.15) one gets for $t>\frac{1}{e}$,

$$a_0(t) = \rho^+(t), \quad a_1(t) = \overline{\rho^+(t)}$$

and

$$c_0(t) = \frac{|\rho^+(t)|^2}{2i \operatorname{Im}(\rho^+(t))}, \quad c_1(t) = -\frac{|\rho^+(t)|^2}{2i \operatorname{Im}(\rho^+(t))}.$$

Hence the RHS of (2.16) becomes

$$\varphi(y)c_0\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)\left(\exp\left(\rho^+\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)x\right) - \exp\left(\overline{\rho^+\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)}x\right)\right) =$$

$$= \frac{\varphi(y)\left|\rho^+\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)\right|^2}{\operatorname{Im}\,\rho^+\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)}\operatorname{Im}\left(\exp\left(\rho^+\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)x\right)\right).$$

Substituting now $y = \frac{\sin v}{v} e^{v \cot v}$ with $0 < v < \pi$ as in (2.3), by (2.13) and (2.1) we get

$$\frac{\varphi(y)\left|\rho^{+}\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)\right|^{2}}{\operatorname{Im}\,\rho^{+}\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)} = \frac{1}{\pi v}\left(\sin v e^{-v\cot v} \cdot \frac{v^{2}}{\sin^{2} v}\right) = \frac{1}{\pi y}.$$
(3.11)

Hence (3.10) coincides with (2.16) for k = 1.

4. A generating function for Śniady's polynomials for $k \geq 2$

Throughout this section and Section 5, k is a fixed integer, $k \geq 2$.

Lemma 4.1. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ be distinct complex numbers and put

$$\gamma_j = \prod_{\ell \neq j} \frac{\alpha_\ell}{\alpha_\ell - \alpha_j}, \qquad j = 1, \dots, n.$$
(4.1)

Then

$$\begin{cases}
\sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j = 1 \\
\sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j \alpha_j^p = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad p = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1.
\end{cases}$$
(4.2)

Proof. We can express (4.2) as

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & & \alpha_k \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ \alpha_1^{k-1} & \dots & \alpha_k^{k-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 \\ \gamma_2 \\ \vdots \\ \gamma_k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$(4.3)$$

where the determinant of the coefficient matrix is non-zero (Vandermonde's determinant), so we just have to check that (4.1) is the unique solution to (4.3). Let A denote the coefficient matrix in (4.3). Then the solution to (4.3) is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 \\ \gamma_2 \\ \vdots \\ \gamma_k \end{bmatrix} = A^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence $\gamma_j = (-1)^{j+1} \frac{\det(A_{1j})}{\det(A)}$, where A_{1j} is the (1,j)th minor of A. By Vandermonde's formula,

$$\det A = \prod_{\ell < m} (a_m - a_\ell)$$

and

$$\det(A_{1j}) = (\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_{j-1})(\alpha_{j+1} \cdots \alpha_k) \prod_{\substack{\ell < m \\ \ell, m \neq j}} (a_m - a_\ell).$$

Hence

$$\gamma_j = \frac{(-1)^{j+1} \prod_{\ell \neq j} \alpha_\ell}{\prod_{\ell < j} (\alpha_j - \alpha_\ell) \prod_{\ell > j} (\alpha_\ell - \alpha_j)} = \prod_{\ell \neq j} \frac{\alpha_\ell}{\alpha_\ell - \alpha_j}. \quad \Box$$

We prove next a generalization of Lemma 3.1 to $k \geq 2$.

Proposition 4.2. Let $(P_{k,n})_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be the sequence of polynomials defined Theorem 2.5. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $|z| < \frac{1}{e}$ and $j = 1, \ldots, k$, put

$$\alpha_j(z) = \rho(ze^{i\frac{2\pi j}{k}}) \tag{4.4}$$

$$\gamma_j(z) = \begin{cases} \prod_{\ell \neq j} \frac{\alpha_j(z)}{\alpha_\ell(z) - \alpha_j(z)}, & z \neq 0\\ 1/k, & z = 0. \end{cases}$$

$$(4.5)$$

Then

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (kz)^{nk} P_{k,n}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j(z) e^{k\alpha_j(z)x}$$
(4.6)

for all $z \in B\left(0, \frac{1}{e}\right)$ and all $x \in \mathbf{R}$.

Proof. Since ρ is analytic and one-to-one on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\left[\frac{1}{e},\infty\right)$, it is clear that $\alpha_j(z)$ is analytic in $B\left(0,\frac{1}{e}\right)$ and $\gamma_j(z)$ is analytic in $B\left(0,\frac{1}{e}\right)\setminus\{0\}$. Using $\rho(0)=0$ and $\rho'(0)=1$, one gets

$$\lim_{z \to 0} \gamma_j(z) = \prod_{\ell \neq j} \frac{1}{1 - \exp\left(i\frac{2\pi(j-\ell)}{k}\right)} = \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} \left(1 - \exp\left(i\frac{2\pi m}{k}\right)\right)^{-1}.$$

But the numbers $\exp\left(i\frac{2\pi m}{k}\right)$, $m=1,\ldots,k-1$ are precisely the k-1 roots of the polynomial

$$S(z) = \frac{z^{k} - 1}{z - 1} = z^{k-1} + z^{k-2} + \dots + 1.$$

Hence

$$\lim_{z \to 0} \gamma_j(z) = \frac{1}{S(1)} = \frac{1}{k} = \gamma_j(0).$$

Thus γ_j is analytic in $B\left(0,\frac{1}{e}\right)$. The RHS of (4.6) is equal to

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \beta_{\ell}(z) x^{\ell}$$

where

$$\beta_{\ell}(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j(z) k^{\ell} \alpha_j(z)^{\ell}.$$

Since $\alpha_j(0) = 0$, the coefficients to $1, z, \ldots, z^{\ell-1}$ in the power series expansion of $\beta_{\ell}(z)$ are equal to 0. Hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j(z) e^{k\alpha_j(z)x} = \sum_{\ell,m=0}^{\infty} \beta_{\ell,m} x^{\ell} z^m$$

$$\tag{4.7}$$

where $\beta_{\ell,m}=0$ when $m<\ell$. But, by the definition of $\alpha_j(z)$ and $\gamma_j(z)$ the LHS of (4.7) is invariant under the transformation $z\to e^{i\frac{2\pi}{k}}z$. Hence $\beta_{\ell,m}=0$ unless m is a multiple of k. Therefore

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j(z) e^{k\alpha_j(z)x} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R_n(x) z^{nk}$$

$$\tag{4.8}$$

where

$$R_n(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{nk} \beta_{\ell,nk} x^{\ell} \tag{4.9}$$

is a polynomial of degree at most nk. To complete the proof of Proposition 4.2, we now have to prove, that the sequence of polynomials

$$Q_n(x) = k^{-nk} R_n(x), \qquad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$
 (4.10)

satisfies the same three conditions (2.6)–(2.8) as $P_{k,n}$. Putting z=0 in (4.8) we get

$$Q_0(x) = R_0(x) = \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j(0) = 1.$$

Moreover by (4.5)

$$\frac{d^k}{dx^k} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R_n(x) z^{nk} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j(z) k^k \alpha_j(z)^k e^{k\alpha_j(z)x}.$$

By definition of ρ , $\rho(z)e^{-\rho(z)}=z$ for all $z\in \mathbb{C}\setminus \left(\frac{1}{e},\infty\right)$. Hence

$$(\alpha_j(z)e^{-\alpha_j(z)})^k = (ze^{i\frac{2\pi}{k}j})^k = z^k, \qquad j = 1, \dots, k.$$

Thus

$$\frac{d^k}{dx^k} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R_n(z) z^{nk} \right) = (kz)^k \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j(z) e^{k\alpha_j(z)(x+1)} = (kz)^k \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R_n(x+1) z^{nk}$$
$$= k^k \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} R_{n-1}(x+1) z^{nk}$$

so differentiating termwise, we get

$$R_n^{(k)}(x) = k^k R_{n-1}(x+1), \qquad n \ge 1$$

and thus $Q_n^{(k)}(x) = Q_{n-1}(x+1)$ for all $n \ge 1$. We next check the last condition (2.8) for the Q_n , i.e.

$$Q_n(0) = Q'_n(0) = \dots = Q_n^{(k-1)}(0) = 0, \qquad n \ge 1.$$

If we put x = 0 in (4.5), we get

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R_n(x) z^{nk} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j(z) = 1,$$

where the last equality follows from (4.2) in Lemma 4.1. Hence $Q_n(0) = R_n(0) = 0$ for $n \ge 1$. For p = 1, ..., k-1 we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} R_n^{(p)}(0) z^{nk} = \frac{d^p}{dx^p} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j(z) e^{k\alpha_j(z)x} \right) \Big|_{x=0} = k^p \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j(z) \alpha_j(z)^p = 0,$$

where we again use (4.2) from Lemma 4.1. Hence $Q_n^{(p)}(0) = k^{-nk} R_n^{(p)}(0) = 0$ for all n = 0, 1, 2, ... and p = 1, ..., k - 1.

Altogether we have shown that $(Q_n(x))_{n=0}^{\infty}$ satisfies the defining relations (2.6)–(2.8) for $P_{k,n}(x)$, and hence $Q_n(x) = P_{k,n}(x)$ for all n and. This proves (4.6).

Remark 4.3. Based on Proposition 4.2, we give a new proof of the implication Theorem 2.5 \Rightarrow Theorem 2.7. Put

$$s_{k,n} = tr(((T^k)^*T^k)^n) = \int_0^1 P_{k,n}(x)dx.$$

Then by (4.6)

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} s_{k,n}(kz)^{nk} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j(k) \int_0^1 e^{k\alpha_j(z)x} dx$$
 (4.11)

for all $z \in B\left(0, \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$. By definition, the function ρ satisfies

$$\rho(s)e^{-\rho(s)} = s, \quad s \in \mathbf{C} \setminus [\frac{1}{e}, \infty).$$

Therefore,

$$\alpha_i(z)^k e^{-k\alpha_j(z)} = (ze^{i\frac{2\pi j}{k}})^k = z^k$$

for all $z \in B\left(0, \frac{1}{e}\right)$. Hence for $z \in B\left(0, \frac{1}{e}\right) \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\int_0^1 e^{k\alpha_j(z)x} dx = \frac{1}{k\alpha_j(z)} (e^{k\alpha_j(z)} - 1) = \frac{1}{kz^k} \alpha_j(z)^{k-1} - \frac{1}{k\alpha_j(z)} .$$

By Lemma 4.1, we have $\sum_{j=0}^{k} \gamma_{j}(z)\alpha_{j}(z)^{k-1} = 0$. Hence by (4.11),

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} s_{k,n}(kz)^{nk} = -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{\gamma_j(z)}{\alpha_j(z)} . \tag{4.12}$$

To compute the right hand side of (4.12), we apply the residue theorem to the rational function $f(s) = \frac{1}{s^2} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\alpha_\ell}{\alpha_\ell - s}$, $s \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k\}$. In the following computation z is fixed, so let us put $\alpha_j = \alpha_j(z)$, $\gamma_j = \gamma_j(z)$. Note that f has simple poles at $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ and

$$Res(f; \alpha_j) = -\frac{1}{\alpha_j} \prod_{\ell \neq j} \frac{\alpha_\ell}{\alpha_\ell - \alpha_j} = -\frac{\gamma_j}{\alpha_j}.$$

Moreover f has a second order pole at 0 and Res(f;0) is the coefficient of s in the power series expansion of $s^2f(s) = \prod_{\ell=1}^k (1 - \frac{s}{\alpha_\ell})^{-1}$ i.e.

$$Res(f;0) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{\alpha_j}$$
.

Since $f(s) = O(|s|^{-(k+2)})$ as $|s| \to \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{R \to \infty} \int_{\partial B(0,R)} f(s)ds = 0.$$

Hence, by the residue Theorem, $Res(f;0) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} Res(f;\alpha_j) = 0$, giving

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{\gamma_j}{\alpha_j} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j^{-1}.$$
 (4.13)

Thus, by (4.12), we get

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} s_{k,n}(kz)^{nk} = -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j(z)^{-1} = -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \rho(ze^{i\frac{2\pi j}{k}})^{-1}.$$
 (4.14)

By (3.5), $\rho(z)^{-1} = \frac{1}{z} - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{m^m}{(m+1)!} z^m$ whenever $0 < |z| < \frac{1}{e}$. Hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \rho(ze^{i\frac{2\pi j}{k}})^{-1} = -k \sum_{k|m} \frac{m^m}{(m+1)!} z^m = -k \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(nk)^{nk}}{(nk+1)!} z^{nk} . \tag{4.15}$$

So by comparing the terms in (4.14) and (4.15), we get $s_{kn} = \frac{n^{nk}}{(nk+1)!}$ as desired.

5. Proof of Theorem 2.8 for $k \ge 2$

Lemma 5.1. Put $\Omega_k = \{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid z^k \notin [e^{-k}, \infty)\}$ and define $\alpha_j(z)$, $\gamma_j(z)$, $j = 1, \ldots, k$ by (4.4) and (4.5) for all $z \in \Omega_k$. Then for every $x \in \mathbf{R}$, the function

$$M_x(z) = \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j(z)e^{k\alpha_j(z)x}$$
(5.1)

is analytic in Ω_k and for every $t \in \left[\frac{1}{e}, \infty\right)$, the following two limits exist:

$$M_x^+(t) = \lim_{\substack{z \to t \\ \text{Im } z > 0}} M_x(z), \quad M_x^-(t) = \lim_{\substack{z \to t \\ \text{Im } z < 0}} M_x(z).$$

Let $a_j(t)$ and $c_j(t)$ for $t > \frac{1}{e}$ and $j = 0, \ldots, k$ be as in Theorem 2.8. Then for $t > \frac{1}{e}$,

Im
$$M_x^+(t) = \frac{\text{Im } \rho^+(t)}{k|\rho^+(t)|^2} \sum_{j=0}^k c_j(t) e^{ka_j(t)x}$$
. (5.2)

Proof. Since ρ : $\mathbb{C}\setminus \left[\frac{1}{e},\infty\right)\to \mathbb{C}$ is one-to-one and analytic, it is clear, that M_x is defined and analytic on Ω_k . Moreover for $t\geq \frac{1}{e}$,

$$\lim_{\substack{z \to t \\ \text{Im } z > 0}} \alpha_j(z) = \begin{cases} \rho(te^{i\frac{2\pi j}{k}}), & j = 1, \dots, k - 1 \\ \rho^+(t), & j = k \end{cases}$$
$$= \begin{cases} a_j(t), & j = 1, \dots, k - 1 \\ a_0(t), & j = k \end{cases}$$

and similarly

$$\lim_{\substack{z \to t \\ \text{Im } z < 0}} \alpha_j(z) = a_j(t), \qquad j = 1, \dots, k.$$

Moreover

$$\lim_{\substack{z \to t \\ \operatorname{Im} z > 0}} \gamma_j(z) = \begin{cases} \prod_{\substack{0 \le \ell \le k - 1 \\ \ell \ne j}} \frac{a_\ell(t)}{a_\ell(t) - a_j(t)}, & j = 1, \dots, k - 1 \\ \prod_{\substack{0 \le \ell \le k - 1 \\ \ell \ne 0}} \frac{a_\ell(t)}{a_\ell(t) - a_j(t)}, & j = k \end{cases}$$

$$\lim_{\substack{z \to t \\ \operatorname{Im} z < 0}} \gamma_j(z) = \prod_{\substack{1 \le \ell \le k \\ \ell \ne j}} \frac{a_\ell(t)}{a_\ell(t) - a_j(t)}, & j, \dots, k.$$

Hence the two limits $M_x^+(t)$ and $M_x^-(t)$ are well defined and by relabeling the kth term to be the 0th term in case of $M_x^+(t)$ one gets:

$$M_{\lambda}^{+}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\prod_{\substack{0 \le \ell \le k-1 \\ \ell \ne j}} \frac{a_{\ell}(t)}{a_{\ell}(t) - a_{j}(t)} \right) e^{ka_{j}(t)x}$$
 (5.3)

$$M_{\lambda}^{-}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left(\prod_{\substack{1 \le \ell \le k \\ \ell \ne j}} \frac{a_{\ell}(t)}{a_{\ell}(t) - a_{j}(t)} \right) e^{ka_{j}(t)x}.$$
 (5.4)

It is clear, that $M_x(\bar{z}) = \overline{M_x(z)}, z \in \Omega_k$. Therefore $M_{\lambda}^-(t) = \overline{M_{\lambda}^+(t)}$ and

Im
$$M_{\lambda}^{+}(t) = \frac{1}{2i}(M_{\lambda}^{+}(t) - M_{\lambda}^{-}(t)).$$

Hence for $t > \frac{1}{e}$,

$$\operatorname{Im} M_{\lambda}^{+}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} b_{j}(t)e^{ka_{j}(t)x}$$

where

$$b_0(t) = \frac{1}{2i} \prod_{1 \le \ell \le k-1} \frac{a_\ell(t)}{a_\ell(t) - a_0(t)}$$

$$b_j(t) = \frac{1}{2i} \left(\frac{a_0(t)}{a_0(t) - a_j(t)} - \frac{a_k(t)}{a_k(t) - a_j(t)} \right) \prod_{1 \le \ell \le k-1} \frac{a_\ell(t)}{a_\ell(t) - a_0(t)}$$

$$b_k(t) = -\frac{1}{2i} \prod_{1 \le \ell \le k-1} \frac{a_\ell(t)}{a_\ell(t) - a_k(t)}.$$

Using (2.15) and the identity

$$\frac{a_0(t)}{a_0(t) - a_j(t)} - \frac{a_k(t)}{a_k(t) - a_j(t)} = \frac{a_j(t)(a_k(t) - a_0(t))}{(a_0(t) - a_j(t))(a_k(t) - a_j(t))},$$

one observes that for all $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$

$$b_j(t) = \frac{1}{2i} \frac{a_0(t) - a_k(t)}{k a_0(t) a_k(t)} c_j(t) = \frac{\operatorname{Im} \rho^+(t)}{k |\rho^+(t)|^2} c_j(t) .$$

This proves (5.2).

We next prove results analogous to Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 for $k \geq 2$.

Lemma 5.2. For every $x \in [0,1]$, there is a unique probability measure ν_x on $[0,e^k]$, such that

$$\int_0^{e^k} u^n \ d\nu_x(u) = k^{nk} P_{k,n}(x), \qquad n \in \mathbf{N}_0.$$
 (5.5)

For $\lambda \in \mathbf{C} \setminus [0, e^k]$, the Cauchy transform of ν_x is given by

$$G_x(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{k}}) e^{k\alpha_j(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{k}})x}$$
(5.6)

where α_j, γ_j are given by (4.4) and (4.5) and $\lambda^{-1/k}$ is the principal value of $(\sqrt[k]{\lambda})^{-1}$. Moreover, the restriction of ν_x to $(0, e^k]$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, and its density is given by

$$\frac{d\nu_x(u)}{du} = \frac{u^{\frac{1}{k}-1}\varphi(u^{1/k})}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k c_j(u^{-1/k})e^{ka_j(u^{-1/k})x}$$
(5.7)

for $u \in (0, e^k)$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.5

$$k^{nk}P_{k,n}(x) = E_D(k^{nk}((T^k)^*T^k)^n)(x) = E_D(S_k^{nk})(x), \qquad x \in [0,1].$$

Moreover $\sigma(S_k^k) = \sigma(S_k)^k = [0, e^k]$ by (2.10). Hence the existence and uniqueness of ν_x can be proved exactly as in Lemma 3.3. From Proposition 4.2, we get that for $|\lambda| > e^k$, the Stieltjes transform $G_x(\lambda)$ of ν_x is given by

$$G_x(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{-n} k^{nk} P_{k,n}(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{k}}) e^{k\alpha_j(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{k}})x}.$$

Let $M_x(z), z \in \Omega_k$ and $M_x^+(t), M_x^-(t), t \ge 1/e$ be as in Lemma 5.1. Then it is easy to see that the function

$$\widetilde{M}_x(z) = \begin{cases} M_x(z), & z \in \Omega_K \\ M_x^-(z), & z \in [1/e, \infty) \end{cases}$$

is a continuous function on the set

$$\left\{ x + iy \mid x \ge 0, \frac{-1}{ke} \le y \le 0 \right\}.$$

Hence, by applying the inverse Stieltjes transform, we get that the restriction of ν_x to $(0, e^k]$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure with density

$$h_x(u) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{v \to 0^+} \operatorname{Im}(G_x(u+iv)) = -\frac{1}{\pi u} \lim_{\substack{z \to u^{-1/k} \\ \operatorname{Im} z < 0}} \left(\operatorname{Im} \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j(z) e^{k\alpha_j(z)x} \right)$$
$$= -\frac{1}{\pi u} \operatorname{Im} M_x^-(u^{-1/k}) = \frac{1}{\pi u} \operatorname{Im} M_x^+(u^{-1/k}).$$

Hence, by Lemma 5.1 we get that for $u \in (0, e^k)$,

$$h_x(u) = \frac{1}{\pi u} \frac{\operatorname{Im} (\rho^+(u^{-1/k}))}{k|\rho^+(u^{-1/k})|^2} \sum_{j=0}^k c_j(u^{-1/k}) e^{ka_j(u^{-1/k})x}.$$

By (3.11),

$$\varphi(y) = \frac{1}{\pi y} \frac{\text{Im } (\rho^+(1/y))}{|\rho^+(1/y)|^2}, \qquad 0 < y < e.$$

Hence

$$h_x(u) = \frac{u^{\frac{1}{k}-1}\varphi(u^{1/k})}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k c_j(u^{-1/k}) e^{ka_j(u^{-1/k})x}.$$
 (5.8)

Remark 5.3. In order to derive Theorem 2.8 from Lemma 5.2, we will have to prove $\nu_x(\{0\}) = 0$ for almost all $x \in [0,1]$ w.r.t. Lebesgue measure. This is done in the proof of Lemma 5.4 below. Actually it can be proved that $\nu_x(\{0\}) = 0$ for all x > 0. This can be obtained from the formula

$$\nu_x(\{0\}) = \lim_{\lambda \to 0^-} \lambda G_x(\lambda)$$

(cf. proof of Lemma 3.4) together with the following asymptotic formula for $\rho(z)$ for large values of |z|:

$$\rho(z) = -\log(-z) + \log(\log(-z)) + O\left(\frac{\log(\log|z|)}{\log|z|}\right) ,$$

where $\log(-z)$ is the principal value of the logarithm. The latter formula can also be obtained from [2, pp. 347–350] using (2.11).

Lemma 5.4. Let $\nu = \mu_{D_0, S_k^k}$ be the measure on $[0,1] \times [0,e^k]$ defined in (2.4). Then ν is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesque measure, and its density is given by

$$\frac{d\nu(x,u)}{dxdu} = h_x(u), \quad x \in (0,1), \quad u \in (0,e^k),$$

where $h_x(u)$ is given by (5.8).

Proof. For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have from Lemma 5.2 and Theorem 2.5 that

$$\iint_{[0,1]\times[0,e^k]} x^m u^n \ d\nu(x,u) = \operatorname{tr}(D_0^m S_k^{kn}) = \operatorname{tr}(D_0^m E_D(S_k^{kn}))$$
(5.9)

$$= \int_0^t x^m (k^{nk} P_{k,n}(x)) dx = \int_0^1 x^m \left(\int_e^{e^k} u^n \ d\nu_x(u) \right) dx.$$

Put $g(x) = \nu_x(\{0\})$, $x \in [0,1]$. From the definition of ν_x it is clear that $x \to \nu_x$ is a w^* -continuous function from [0,1] to $Prob([0,e^k])$, i.e.

$$x \to \int_0^{e^k} f(u) \ d\nu_x(u), \qquad x \in [0, 1]$$

is continuous for all $f \in C([0, e^k])$. Put for $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$f_j(u) = \begin{cases} j, & 0 \le u \le 1/j \\ 0, & u > 1/j. \end{cases}$$

Then $g(x) = \lim_{j \to \infty} \left(\int_0^{e^k} f_j(u) d\nu_x(u) \right)$, and hence g is a Borel function on [0,1]. Putting now m = 0 in (5.9) we get

$$\operatorname{tr}(S_k^{kn}) = \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^{e^k} u^n h_x(u) du \right) dx, \qquad n = 1, 2, \dots$$
 (5.10)

and for n = 0 we get

$$1 = \int_0^1 g(x)dx + \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^{e^k} h_x(u)du \right) dx.$$
 (5.11)

Let $\lambda \in \text{Prob}([0, e^k])$ be the distribution of S_k^k . Then

$$\int_0^{e^k} u^n \ d\lambda(u) = \operatorname{tr}(S_k^{kn})$$

so by (5.10) and (5.11), $\lambda(\{0\}) = \int_0^1 g(x) dx$ and λ is absolutely continuous on $(0, e^k]$ w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, with density $u \to \int_0^1 h_x(u) dx$, $u \in (0, e^k)$. However by (2.9) S_k^k and $(T^*T)^k$ have the same moments. Thus S_k^k and $(T^*T)^k$ have the same distribution measure. By ([4, §8]), $\ker(T^*T) = \ker(T) = \{0\}$. Hence $\lambda(\{0\}) = 0$, which implies that g(x) = 0 for almost all $x \in [0, 1]$. Thus, using (5.9), we have for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\int_{[0,1]\times[0,e^k]} x^m u^n \ d\nu(x,u) = \int_0^1 x^m \left(\int_0^{e^k} u^n h_x(u) \ du \right) dx.$$

Hence by Stone–Weierstrass Theorem, ν is absolutely continuous w.r.t. two dimensional Lebesgue measure, and

$$\frac{d\nu(x,u)}{dx\,du} = h_x(u), \qquad x \in (0,1), \quad u \in (0,e^k). \quad \Box$$

Proof of Theorem 2.8 for $k \geq 2$. Let f, g be bounded Borel functions on [0, 1] and [0, e] respectively, and put

$$g_1(u) = g(u^{1/k}), \qquad u \in [0, e^k].$$

By Lemma 5.4,

$$\operatorname{tr}(f(D_0)g(S_k)) = \operatorname{tr}(f(D_0)g_1(S_k^k)) = \iint_{[0,1]\times[0,e^k]} f(x)g_1(u)h_x(u)dxdu$$
$$= \iint_{[0,1]\times[0,e]} f(x)g(y)h_x(y^k)ky^{k-1}dxdy$$

where the last equality is obtained by substituting $u = y^k$, $y \in [0, e]$. Hence the measure μ_{D_0, S_k} is absolutely continuous with respect to the two dimensional Lebesgue measure, and by (5.8) the density is given by

$$h_x(y^k)ky^{k-1} = \varphi(y)\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)e^{ka_j\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)x}$$

for $x \in (0,1), y \in (0,e)$.

6. Proof of Theorem $2.8 \Rightarrow$ Theorem 2.2

Lemma 6.1. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ band let a_0, \ldots, a_k be distinct numbers in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and put

$$b_j = \prod_{\substack{\ell=0\\\ell\neq j}}^k \frac{a_\ell}{a_\ell - a_j}.$$

Then

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} b_j a_j^p = 0 \quad p = 1, 2, \dots, k$$
(6.1)

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} b_j = 1 (6.2)$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} b_j a_j^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{k} a_j^{-1} \tag{6.3}$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} b_j a_j^{-2} = \sum_{0 \le i \le j \le k} (a_i a_j)^{-1}.$$
 (6.4)

Proof. By applying Lemma 4.1 to the k+1 numbers a_0, \ldots, a_k , we get (6.1) and (6.2). Moreover, (6.3) follows from the residue calculus argument in Remark 4.3 (cf. (4.13)), and (6.4) follows by a similar argument. Indeed, letting q be the rational function

$$g(s) = \frac{1}{s^3} \prod_{\ell=0}^k \left(\frac{a_\ell}{a_\ell - s} \right), \qquad s \in \mathbf{C} \setminus \{0, a_0, \dots, a_k\},$$

we have $\operatorname{Res}(g; a_j) = -\frac{1}{a_j^2} \prod_{\ell \neq j} \frac{a_\ell}{a_\ell - a_j} = -b_j a_j^{-2}$ and $\operatorname{Res}(g; 0)$ is the coefficient of s^2 in the power series expansion of

$$s^{3}g(s) = \prod_{\ell=0}^{k} \left(1 - \frac{s}{a_{\ell}}\right)^{-1} = \prod_{\ell=0}^{k} \left(1 + \frac{s}{a_{\ell}} + \frac{s^{2}}{a_{\ell}^{2}} + \ldots\right).$$

Hence $\operatorname{Res}(g;0) = \sum_{0 \le i \le j \le k} (a_i a_j)^{-1}$. Since $g(s) = O(|s|^{-(k+4)})$ as $|s| \to \infty$, as in Remark 4.3 we get

$$Res(g; 0) + \sum_{j=0}^{k} Res(g; a_j) = 0.$$

This proves (6.4).

Lemma 6.2. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed and let $a_j(t)$, $c_j(t)$ for $t \in \left(\frac{1}{e}, \infty\right)$ and $j = 0, \ldots, k$ be defined as in (2.14) and (2.15). Put

$$H(x,t) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j(t)e^{ka_j(t)x}, \qquad x \in \mathbf{R}, \quad t > 1/e,$$
 (6.5)

$$m(t) = -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k} a_j(t)^{-1}, \tag{6.6}$$

$$v(t) = \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{j=0}^{k} a_j(t)^{-2}.$$
(6.7)

Then

$$\int_{0}^{1} H(x,t)dx = 1. \tag{6.8}$$

Moreover, if $k \geq 2$, then

$$\int_0^1 x H(x,t) dx = m(t) \tag{6.9}$$

and if $k \geq 3$, then

$$\int_0^1 x^2 H(x,t) dx = m(t)^2 + v(t). \tag{6.10}$$

Proof. For a fixed $t \in (\frac{1}{e}, \infty)$, we will apply Lemma 6.1 to the numbers $a_j(t)$, $j = 0, \ldots, k$ and

$$b_j(t) = \prod_{\ell \neq j} \frac{a_\ell(t)}{a_\ell(t) - a_j(t)}.$$
 (6.11)

Note that by (2.15)

$$c_j(t) = -ka_j(t)b_j(t). (6.12)$$

Since t is fixed, we will drop the t in $a_j(t)$, $b_j(t)$ and $c_j(t)$ in the rest of this proof. We have

$$\int_0^1 H(x,t)dx = \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{c_j}{ka_j} (e^{ka_j} - 1) = \sum_{j=0}^k b_j (1 - e^{ka_j}).$$
 (6.13)

Recall that

$$\begin{cases} a_0 = \rho^+(t) \\ a_j = \rho(te^{i\frac{2\pi j}{k}}), & 1 \le j \le n \\ a_k = \rho^-(t) \end{cases}$$

where $t \in (\frac{1}{e}, \infty)$. Since $\rho(z)e^{-\rho(z)} = z$ for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [\frac{1}{e}, \infty)$ we get in the limit $z \to t$ with Im z > 0, respectively Im z < 0, that also

$$\rho^+(t)e^{-\rho^+(t)} = \rho^-(t)e^{-\rho^-(t)} = t.$$

Hence

$$(a_j e^{-a_j})^k = (t e^{i\frac{2\pi j}{k}})^k = t^k, \qquad j = 0, \dots, k,$$

which shows

$$e^{ka_j} = \left(\frac{a_j}{t}\right)^k, \qquad j = 0, \dots, k. \tag{6.14}$$

Hence by (6.13), (6.1) and (6.2) we get

$$\int_0^1 H(x,t)dx = \sum_{j=0}^k b_j - \frac{1}{t^k} \sum_{j=0}^k b_j a_j^k = 1,$$

which proves (6.8). Moreover,

$$\int_0^1 x H(x,t) dx = \sum_{i=0}^k (-ka_i b_i) \left[x \frac{e^{ka_i x}}{ka_i} - \frac{e^{ka_j x}}{(ka_j)^2} \right]_0^1.$$

Using (6.14), (6.1) and (6.3) we get

$$\int_0^1 x H(x,t) dx = -\frac{1}{t^k} \sum_{j=0}^k b_j a_j^k + \frac{1}{kt^k} \sum_{j=0}^k b_j a_j^{k-1} - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{b_j}{a_j} = -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{1}{a_j} = m(t)$$

provided $k \geq 2$. This proves (6.9). Similarly

$$\int_0^1 x^2 H(x,t) dx = \sum_{j=0}^k (-ka_j b_j) \left[x^2 \frac{e^{ka_j x}}{ka_j} 2x \frac{e^{ka_j x}}{(ka_j)^2} + 2 \frac{e^{ka_j x}}{(ka_j)^3} \right]_0^1$$

$$= -\frac{1}{t^k} \sum_{j=0}^k b_j a_j^k + \frac{2}{kt^k} \sum_{j=0}^k b_j a_k^{k-1} - \frac{2}{k^2 t^k} \sum_{j=0}^k b_j a_j^{k-2} + \frac{2}{k^2} \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{b_j}{a_j^2}.$$

Hence by (6.1) and (6.4), we get for $k \geq 3$

$$\int_0^1 x^2 H(x,t) dx = \frac{2}{k^2} \sum_{0 \le i \le j \le k} (a_i a_j)^{-1} = \frac{1}{k^2} \left(\left(\sum_{j=0}^k a_j^{-1} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=0}^k a_j^{-2} \right) = m(t)^2 + v(t).$$

The functions H, m, v, a_j, c_j in Lemma 5.2 depend on $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore we will in the rest of this section rename them $H_k, m_k, v_k, a_{kj}, c_{kj}$. Let $F(y) = \int_0^y \varphi(u) du, y \in [0, e]$ as in Proposition 2.1. Since φ is the density of a probability measure on [0, e], we have

$$0 \le F(y) \le 1, \qquad y \in [0, e].$$
 (6.15)




FIGURE 1. The contour C_{ϵ} .

Lemma 6.3. For $t \in (\frac{1}{e}, \infty)$,

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} m_k(t) = F\left(\frac{1}{t}\right) \tag{6.16}$$

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} v_k(t) = 0. \tag{6.17}$$

Proof.

$$m_k(t) = -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k a_{kj}(t)^{-1} = -\frac{1}{k} \left(\sum_{j=0}^k f\left(\frac{j}{k}\right) \right),$$

where $f: [0,1] \to \mathbf{C}$ is the continuous function

$$f(u) = \begin{cases} \rho^{+}(t)^{-1}, & u = 0\\ \rho(te^{i2\pi u})^{-1}, & 0 < u < 1\\ \rho^{-}(t)^{-1}, & u = 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} m_k(t) = -\int_0^1 f(u)du = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{\rho(te^{i\theta})} d\theta = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial B(0,t)} \frac{1}{z\rho(z)} dz.$$
 (6.18)

To evaluate the RHS of (6.18) we apply the residue theorem to compute the integral of $(z\rho(z))^{-1}$ along the closed path C_{ε} , $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{e}$, which is drawn in Figure 1. Since $\rho(z) \neq 0$ when $z \neq 0$ we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_{\varepsilon}} \frac{dz}{z\rho(z)} = \operatorname{Res}\left(\frac{1}{z\rho(z)}; 0\right)$$

and by (3.5), Res $\left(\frac{1}{z\rho(z)},0\right)=-1$. Thus, taking the limit $\varepsilon\to 0^+$, we get

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{1/e}^{t} \frac{dt}{t\rho^{+}(t)} + \int_{\partial B(0,t)} \frac{dz}{z\rho(z)} + \int_{t}^{1/e} \frac{dt}{t\rho^{-}(t)} \right) = -1.$$

Since $\rho^-(t) = \overline{\rho^+(t)}$, we get by (3.11)

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial B(0,t)} \frac{dz}{z\rho(z)} = -1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{1/e}^{t} \frac{1}{s} \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{1}{\rho^{+}(s)}\right) ds = -1 + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{1/e}^{t} \frac{\operatorname{Im} \rho^{+}(s)}{s|\rho^{+}(s)|^{2}} ds$$

$$= -1 + \int_{1/e}^{t} \frac{1}{s^{2}} \varphi\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) ds = -1 + \int_{1/t}^{e} \varphi(u) du$$

$$= -1 + F(1) - F(1/t) = -F(1/t).$$

Hence (6.16) follows from (6.18). In the same way we get

$$v_k(t) = \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{j=0}^{k} f\left(\frac{j}{k}\right)^2.$$

Hence

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} k v_k(t) = \int_0^1 f(u)^2 du,$$

so in particular

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} v_k(t) = 0. \quad \Box$$

Proof of Theorem 2.2. By Lemma 2.4, Theorem 2.8 and (6.5),

$$||D_0 - F(S_k)||_2^2 = \iint_{[0,1]\times[0,e]} |x - F(y)|^2 \varphi(y) H_k\left(x, \frac{1}{y}\right) dx dy.$$

Moreover by (6.8)–(6.10) we have for $y \in (0, e)$ and $k \ge 3$,

$$\int_0^1 (x - F(y))^2 H_k(x, \frac{1}{y}) dx = \left(v_k(\frac{1}{y}) + m_k(\frac{1}{y})^2\right) - 2m_k(\frac{1}{y}) F(y) + F(y)^2$$
$$= \left(m_k(\frac{1}{y}) - F(y)\right)^2 + v_k(\frac{1}{y}).$$

Hence for $k \geq 3$

$$||D_0 - F(S_k)||_2^2 = \int_0^e \left((m_k(\frac{1}{y}) - F(y))^2 + v_k(\frac{1}{y}) \right) \varphi(y) dy.$$

Since $\varphi(y)H_k(x,\frac{1}{y})$ is a continuous density function for the probability measure $\mu_{D_0S_k}$ on $(0,1)\times(0,e)$, and since $\varphi(y)>0$, 0< y< e, we have $H_k(x,t)\geq 0$ for all $x\in(0,1)$ and $t\in(\frac{1}{e},\infty)$. Thus by (6.8)–(6.10), $m_k(t)$ and $v_k(t)$ are the mean and variance of a probability measure on (0,1). In particular $0\leq m_k(t)\leq 1$ and $0\leq v_k(t)\leq 1$ for all t>1/e. Hence by (6.16), (6.17) and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} ||D_0 - F(S_k)||_2^2 = 0.$$

Hence $D_0 \in W^*(T)$. For 0 < t < 1, the subspace $\mathcal{H}_t = 1_{[0,t]}(D_0)\mathcal{H}$ is clearly T-invariant, and since $D_0 \in W^*(T)$, \mathcal{H}_t is affiliated with $W^*(T)$.

7. Hyperinvariant subspaces for T

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.9. The proof relies on the following four results. Lemma 7.2 is probably well known, but we include a proof for convenience.

Lemma 7.1. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $||T^k|| = (\frac{e}{k})^{k/2}$.

Proof. By (2.10),
$$||T^k||^2 = ||(T^*)^k T^k|| = k^{-k} ||S^k|| = (\frac{e}{k})^k$$
.

Lemma 7.2. Let $(S_{\lambda})_{{\lambda}\in\Lambda}$ be a bounded net of selfadjoint operators on a Hilbert space \mathfrak{H} which converges in strong operator topology to the selfadjoint operator $S\in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{H})$, and let $\sigma_p(S)$ denote the set of eigenvalues of S. Then for all $t\in \mathbf{R}\setminus\sigma_p(S)$, we have

$$\lim_{\lambda \in \Lambda} 1_{(-\infty,t]}(S_{\lambda}) = 1_{(-\infty,t]}(S), \tag{7.1}$$

where the limit is in strong operator topology.

Proof. There is a compact interval [a,b] such that $\sigma(S_{\lambda}) \subseteq [a,b]$ for all λ and $\sigma(S) \subseteq [a,b]$. Therefore, given a continuous function $\phi: \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$, approximating by polynomials we get

$$\lim_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \phi(S_{\lambda}) = \phi(S),$$

in strong operator topology. Let $t \in \mathbf{R}$, let $\epsilon > 0$ and choose a continuous function $\phi : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ such that $0 \le \phi \le 1$, $\phi(x) = 1$ for $x \le t - \epsilon$ and $\phi(x) = 0$ for $x \ge t$. Then for every $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\langle 1_{(-\infty,t-\epsilon]}(S)\xi,\xi\rangle \leq \langle \phi(S)\xi,\xi\rangle = \lim_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \langle \phi(S_{\lambda})\xi,\xi\rangle \leq \liminf_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \langle 1_{(-\infty,t]}(S_{\lambda})\xi,\xi\rangle.$$

Hence taking the limit as $\epsilon \to 0^+$, we get

$$\langle 1_{(-\infty,t)}(S)\xi, \xi \rangle \le \liminf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \langle 1_{(-\infty,t]}(S_{\lambda})\xi, \xi \rangle.$$
 (7.2)

Similarly, by using a continuous function $\psi: \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ satisfying $\psi(x) = 1$ for $x \leq t$ and $\psi(x) = 0$ for $x \geq t + \epsilon$, we get

$$\langle 1_{(-\infty,t]}(S)\xi,\xi\rangle \ge \limsup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \langle 1_{(-\infty,t]}(S_{\lambda})\xi,\xi\rangle. \tag{7.3}$$

If $t \notin \sigma_p(S)$, then $1_{(-\infty,t)}(S) = 1_{(-\infty,t]}(S)$, and thus by (7.2) and (7.3), we have

$$\lim_{\lambda \in \Lambda} 1_{(-\infty,t]}(S_{\lambda}) = 1_{(-\infty,t]}(S), \tag{7.4}$$

with convergence in weak operator topology. However, the weak and strong operator topologies coincide on the set of projections in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Hence we have convergence (7.1) in strong operator topology, as desired.

Proposition 7.3. Let $F:[0,e] \to [0,1]$ be the increasing function defined in Proposition 2.1 and fix $t \in [0,1]$. Let

$$\mathcal{L}_t = \{ \xi \in \mathcal{H} \mid \exists \xi_k \in \mathcal{H}, \lim_{k \to \infty} \|\xi_k - \xi\| = 0, \limsup_{k \to \infty} \left(\frac{k}{e} \|T^k \xi_k\|^{2/k} \right) \le t \}.$$

Then $\mathcal{L}_t = \mathcal{H}_{F(et)}$.

Proof. For t=1, we have by Lemma 7.1 that $\mathcal{L}_1=\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}_1=\mathcal{H}_{F(e)}$. Assume now $0 \leq t < 1$, and let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{F(et)}=1_{[0,F(et)]}(D_0)\mathcal{H}=1_{[0,et]}(F(D_0))\mathcal{H}$. Since $\sigma_p(D_0)=\emptyset$ and since F is one-to-one, we also have $\sigma_p(F(D_0))=\emptyset$. Hence, by Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 7.2,

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} 1_{[0,et]}(S_k)\xi = 1_{[0,et]}(F(D_0))\xi = \xi.$$

Let $\xi_k = 1_{[0,et]}(S_k)\xi$. Then as we just showed, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\xi - \xi_k\| = 0$. Moreover, since $(T^*)^k T^k = k^{-k} S_k^k$, we have

$$||T^k \xi_k||^2 = k^{-k} \langle S_k^k \xi_k, \xi_k \rangle \le k^{-k} (et)^k ||\xi_k||^2 \le \left(\frac{et}{k}\right)^k ||\xi||^2.$$

Hence $\limsup_{k\to\infty} \left(\frac{k}{e} \|T^k \xi_k\|^{2/k}\right) \leq t$, which proves $\mathcal{H}_{F(et)} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_t$. To prove the reverse inclusion, let $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_t$ and choose $\xi_k \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \|\xi_k - \xi\| = 0, \qquad \limsup_{k \to \infty} \left(\frac{k}{e} \|T^k \xi_k\|^{2/k}\right) \le t. \tag{7.5}$$

By (2.10), $\sigma(S_k) = [0, e]$. Let E_k be the spectral measure of S_k and let

$$\gamma_k(B) = \langle E_k(B)\xi_k, \xi_k \rangle$$

for every Borel set $B \subseteq [0, e]$. Then γ_k is a finite Borel measure on [0, e] of total mass $\gamma_k([0, e]) = \|\xi_k\|^2$ and for all bounded Borel functions $f: [0, e] \to \mathbf{C}$, we have

$$\langle f(S_k)\xi_k, \xi_k \rangle = \int_0^e f d\gamma_k.$$
 (7.6)

In particular,

$$\langle S_k^k \xi_k, \xi_k \rangle = \int_0^e x^k d\gamma_k(x).$$

Let $0 < \epsilon < 1 - t$. By (7.5), there exists $k_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\frac{k}{e} ||T^k \xi_k||^{2/k} \le t + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for all $k \ge k_0$. Thus,

$$\int_0^e x^k d\gamma_k(x) = \langle S_k^k \xi_k, \xi_k \rangle = k^k ||T^k \xi_k||^2 \le (e(t + \frac{\epsilon}{2}))^k, \qquad (k \ge k_0).$$

Since $(\frac{x}{e(t+\epsilon)})^k \ge 1$ for $x \in [e(t+\epsilon), e]$, we have

$$\gamma_k([e(t+\epsilon),e]) \le \int_0^e \left(\frac{x}{e(t+\epsilon)}\right)^k d\gamma_k(x) \le \left(\frac{t+\frac{\epsilon}{2}}{t+\epsilon}\right)^k \|\xi_k\|^2.$$

Hence, by (7.6),

$$||1_{(e(t+\epsilon),\infty)}(S_k)\xi_k||^2 = \langle 1_{(e(t+\epsilon),\infty)}(S_k)\xi_k, \xi_k \rangle \le \left(\frac{t+\frac{\epsilon}{2}}{t+\epsilon}\right)^k ||\xi_k||^2,$$

which tends to zero as $k \to \infty$. Since $\|\xi_k - \xi\| \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, we get

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \|1_{(e(t+\epsilon),\infty)}(S_k)\xi\| = 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} 1_{[0,e(t+\epsilon)]}(S_k)\xi = \xi.$$

Hence, by Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 7.2,

$$1_{[0,F(e(t+\epsilon))]}(D_0)\xi = 1_{[0,e(t+\epsilon)]}(F(D_0))\xi = \xi,$$

i.e. $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{F(e(t+\epsilon))}$ for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1-t)$. Since

$$\mathcal{H}_{F(et)} = \bigcap_{s \in (F(et),1)} \mathcal{H}_s,$$

it follows that $\mathcal{L}_t \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{F(et)}$, which completes the proof of the proposition.

Lemma 7.4. Let $t \in (0,1)$ and define $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ recursively by

$$a_1 = F(et) \tag{7.7}$$

$$a_{n+1} = a_n F\left(\frac{et}{a_n}\right). (7.8)$$

Then $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a strictly decreasing sequence in [0,1] and $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n = t$.

Proof. The function $x \mapsto F(ex)$ is a strictly increasing, continuous bijection of [0,1] onto itself. By definition, the restriction of F to (0,e) is differentiable with continuous derivative

$$F'(x) = \phi(x), \quad x \in (0, e),$$

where ϕ is uniquely determined by

$$\phi\left(\frac{\sin v}{v}\exp(v\cot v)\right) = \frac{1}{\pi}\sin v\exp(-v\cot v).$$

As observed in the proof of [4, Thm. 8.9], the map $v \mapsto \frac{\sin v}{v} \exp(v \cot v)$ is a strictly decreasing bijection from $(0, \pi)$ onto (0, e). Moreover,

$$\frac{d}{dv}(\sin v \exp(-v \cot v)) = \frac{v}{\sin v} \exp(-v \cot v) > 0$$

for $v \in (0, \pi)$. Hence ϕ is a strictly decreasing function on (0, e), which implies that F is strictly convex on [0, e]. Hence

$$F(ex) > (1-x)F(0) + xF(e) = x, \qquad x \in (0,1). \tag{7.9}$$

With $t \in (0,1)$ and with $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ defined by (7.7) and (7.8), from (7.9) we have $a_1 = F(et) \in (t,1)$. If $a \in (t,1)$ and if $a' = aF(\frac{et}{a})$, then clearly a' < a. Moreover, by (7.9),

$$a' = aF\left(\frac{et}{a}\right) > a \cdot \frac{t}{a} = t.$$

Hence $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a strictly decreasing sequence in (t,1) and therefore converges. Let $a_{\infty} = \lim_{n \to \infty} a_n$. Then by the continuity of F on [0,e], we have

$$a_{\infty} = a_{\infty} F\left(\frac{et}{a_{\infty}}\right).$$

Hence $F(\frac{et}{a_{\infty}}) = 1$, which implies $a_{\infty} = t$.

Proof of Theorem 2.9. Let $T = \mathcal{U}\mathcal{T}(X,\lambda)$ be constructed using [4, §4], as described in the introduction. For $t \in [0,1]$, let

$$\mathcal{K}_t = \{ \xi \in \mathcal{H} \mid \limsup_{n \to \infty} \left(\frac{k}{e} || T^k \xi ||^{2/k} \right) \le t \}.$$
 (7.10)

We will show

$$\mathcal{H}_t \subseteq \mathcal{K}_t \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{F(et)}, \qquad t \in [0, 1].$$
 (7.11)

The second inclusion in (7.11) follows immediately from Proposition 7.3. The first inclusion is trivial for t = 0, so we can assume t > 0. Letting $P_t = 1_{[0,t]}(D_0)$ be the projection onto \mathcal{H}_t , from [4, Lemma 4.10] we have

$$T_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} T \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{H}_t} = P_t T P_t = \mathfrak{UT}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} P_t X P_t, \lambda_t), \tag{7.12}$$

where $\lambda_t: L^{\infty}[0,1] \to P_t L(\mathbf{F}_2) P_t$ is the injective, normal *-homomorphism given by $\lambda_t(f) = \lambda(f_t)$, where

$$f_t(s) = \begin{cases} f(s/t) & \text{if } s \in [0, t] \\ 0 & \text{if } s \in (t, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, T_t is itself a DT(δ_0 , 1)-operator in $(P_t \mathcal{M} P_t, t^{-1} \tau \upharpoonright_{P_t \mathcal{M} P_t})$. Hence, by Lemma 7.1 applied to T_t , we have, for all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_t$,

$$||T^k\xi|| = t^{k/2}||T_t^k\xi|| \le \left(\frac{te}{k}\right)^{k/2}||\xi||.$$

Therefore, $\limsup_{k\to\infty} \left(\frac{k}{\epsilon} ||T^k\xi||^{2/k}\right) \leq t$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{K}_t$. This completes the proof of (7.11).

From (7.11), we have in particular $\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{H}_0 = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}$. Let $t \in (0,1)$ and let $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be the sequence defined by Lemma 7.4. We will prove by induction on n that $\mathcal{K}_t \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{a_n}$. By (7.11), $\mathcal{K}_t \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{a_1}$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume $\mathcal{K}_t \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{a_n}$. Then

$$\mathcal{K}_t = \{ \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{a_n} \mid \limsup_{k \to \infty} \left(\frac{k}{e} ||T^k \xi||^{2/k} \right) \le t \}$$
 (7.13)

$$= \{ \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{a_n} \mid \limsup_{k \to \infty} \left(\frac{k}{e} \| T_{a_n}^k \xi \|^{2/k} \right) \le \frac{t}{a_n} \}. \tag{7.14}$$

But the space (7.14) is the analogue of \mathcal{K}_{t/a_n} for the operator T_{a_n} . By (7.11) applied to the operator T_{a_n} , we have that \mathcal{K}_t is contained in the analogue of $\mathcal{H}_{F(et/a_n)}$ for T_{a_n} . Using (7.12) (with a_n instead of t), we see that this latter space is

$$\lambda_{a_n}(1_{[0,F(et/a_n)]})\mathcal{H}_{a_n} = \lambda(1_{[0,a_nF(et/a_n)]})\mathcal{H}_{a_n} = \lambda(1_{[0,a_{n+1}]})\mathcal{H}_{a_n} = \mathcal{H}_{a_{n+1}}.$$

Thus $\mathcal{K}_t \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{a_{n+1}}$ and the induction argument is complete.

Now applying Lemma 7.4, we get $\mathcal{K}_t \subseteq \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_{a_n} = \mathcal{H}_t$, as desired.

APPENDIX A. \mathcal{D} -Gaussianity of T, T^*

The operator T was defined in [4] as the limit in *-moments of upper triangular Gaussian random matrices, and it was shown in [4] that T can be constructed as $T = \mathcal{U}\mathcal{T}(X,\lambda)$ in a von Neumann algebra \mathcal{M} equipped with a normal, faithful, tracial state τ , from a semicircular element $X \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\tau(X) = 0$ and $\tau(X^2) = 1$ and an injective, unital, normal *-homomorphism $\lambda : L^{\infty}[0,1] \to \mathcal{M}$ such that $\{X\}$ and $\lambda(L^{\infty}[0,1])$ are free with respect to τ and $\tau \circ \lambda(f) = \int_0^1 f(t)dt$. (See the description in the introduction and [4, §4].) Let $\mathcal{D} = \lambda(L^{\infty}[0,1])$ and let $E_{\mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{D}$ be the τ -preserving conditional expectation onto \mathcal{D} . In [7], it was asserted that T is a generalized circular element with respect to $E_{\mathcal{D}}$ and with

In [7], it was asserted that T is a generalized circular element with respect to $E_{\mathcal{D}}$ and with a particular variance. It is the purpose of this appendix to provide a proof.

Lemma A.1. Let $f \in L^{\infty}[0,1]$. Then

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}(T\lambda(f)T^*) = \lambda(g), \tag{A.1}$$

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}(T^*\lambda(f)T) = \lambda(h), \tag{A.2}$$

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}(T\lambda(f)T) = 0, (A.3)$$

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}(T^*\lambda(f)T^*) = 0, (A.4)$$

where

$$g(x) = \int_{x}^{1} f(t)dt, \qquad h(x) = \int_{0}^{x} f(t)dt.$$
 (A.5)

Moreover,

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}(T) = 0. \tag{A.6}$$

Proof. From [4, §4], $\lim_{n\to\infty} ||T - T_n|| = 0$, where

$$T_n = \sum_{j=1}^{2^n - 1} p\left[\frac{j-1}{2^n}, \frac{j}{2^n}\right] X p\left[\frac{j}{2^n}, 1\right]$$

and $p[a, b] = \lambda(1_{[a,b]})$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} ||E_{\mathcal{D}}(T\lambda(f)T^*) - E_{\mathcal{D}}(T_n\lambda(f)T_n^*)|| = 0.$$

We have

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}(T_n\lambda(f)T_n^*) = \sum_{j=1}^{2^n-1} p[\frac{j-1}{2^n}, \frac{j}{2^n}] E_{\mathcal{D}}(Xp[\frac{j}{2^n}, 1]\lambda(f)X).$$

Fixing n and letting $a = \int_{j/2^n}^1 f(t)dt$, we have

$$Xp[\frac{j}{2^n}, 1]\lambda(f)X = X(p[\frac{j}{2^n}, 1]\lambda(f) - a)X + a(X^2 - 1) + a,$$

and from this we see that $E_{\mathcal{D}}(Xp[\frac{j}{2^n},1]\lambda(f)X)$ is the constant $\int_{j/2^n}^1 f(t)dt$. Therefore, we get $E_{\mathcal{D}}(T_n\lambda(f)T_n^*) = \lambda(g_n)$, where

$$g_n(x) = \begin{cases} \int_{j/2^n}^1 f(t)dt & \text{if } \frac{j-1}{2^n} \le x \le \frac{j}{2^n}, \ j \in \{1, \dots, 2^n - 1\} \\ 0 & \text{if } \frac{2^n - 1}{2^n} \le x \le 1. \end{cases}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$, we obtain (A.1) with g as in (A.5).

Equations
$$(A.2)$$
– $(A.4)$ and $(A.6)$ are obtained similarly.

Comparing Sniady's definition of a generalized circular element (with respect to \mathcal{D}) in [7] with Speicher's algorithm for passing from \mathcal{D} -cummulants to \mathcal{D} -moments in [8, §2.1 and §3.2], we see that an operator $S \in L(\mathbf{F}_2)$ is generalized circular if and only if all \mathcal{D} -cummulants of order $k \neq 2$ for the pair (S, S^*) vanish. Hence S is generalized circular if and only if the pair (S, S^*) is \mathcal{D} -Gaussian in the sense of [8, Def. 4.2.3]. Thus, in order to prove that T has the properties used in [7], it suffices to prove the following.

Proposition A.2. The distribution of the pair T, T^* with respect to $E_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a \mathcal{D} -Gaussian distribution with covariance matrix determined by (A.1)-(A.6).

Proof. Take $X_1, X_2, \ldots \in \mathcal{M}$, each a (0,1)-semicircular element such that

$$\mathcal{D}, \ \left(\{X_j\}\right)_{j=1}^{\infty}$$

is a free family of sets of random variables. Then the family

$$(W^*(\mathcal{D} \cup \{X_j\}))_{j=1}^{\infty}$$

of *-subalgebras of \mathcal{M} is free (over \mathcal{D}) with respect to $E_{\mathcal{D}}$. Let $T_j = \mathcal{UT}(X_j, \lambda)$. Then each T_j has \mathcal{D} -valued *-distribution (with respect to $E_{\mathcal{D}}$) the same as T. Therefore, by Speicher's \mathcal{D} -valued free central limit theorem [8, Thm. 4.2.4], the \mathcal{D} -valued *-distribution of $\frac{T_1+\cdots+T_n}{\sqrt{n}}$

converges as $n \to \infty$ to a \mathcal{D} -Gaussian *-distribution with the correct covariance. However, $\frac{X_1+\dots+X_n}{\sqrt{n}}$ is a (0,1)-semicircular element that is free from \mathcal{D} , and

$$\frac{T_1 + \dots + T_n}{\sqrt{n}} = \mathfrak{UT}(\frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{\sqrt{n}}, \lambda).$$

Thus $\frac{T_1+\cdots+T_n}{\sqrt{n}}$ itself has the same \mathcal{D} -valued *-distribution as T.

References

- 1. A. Connes, Classification of injective factors, Ann. of Math. 104 (1976), 73–115.
- 2. R.M. Corless, G.H. Gonnet, D.E.G. Hare, D.J. Jeffrey and D.E. Knuth, On the Lambert W function, Adv. Comput. Math. 5 (1996), 329-359.
- 3. K. Dykema, U. Haagerup, *Invariant subspaces of Voiculescu's circular operator*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **11** (2001), 693-741.
- 4. _____, DT-operators and decomposability of Voiculescu's circular operator, preprint, (2002).
- 5. M.L. Mehta, Random Matrices, second edition, Academic Press, 1991.
- 6. P. Śniady, Inequality for Voiculescu's free entropy in terms of Brown measure, Internat. Math. Res. Notices 2003, 51-64.
- 7. ______, Multinomial identities arising from the free probability, preprint, (February 2002).
- 8. R. Speicher, Combinatorial theory of the free product with amalgamation and operator-valued free probability theory, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 132 (1998), no. 627, x+88 pp.
- 9. R. Stanley, Enumerative Combinatorics, Vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

KEN DYKEMA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE STATION TX 77843-3368, USA

E-mail address: kjd@tamu.edu

Uffe Haagerup, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Southern Denmark, Campusuej 55, 5230 Odense M, Denmark

E-mail address: haagerup@imada.sdu.dk