

FRIEDRICHS EXTENSIONS FOR A CLASS OF SINGULAR DISCRETE LINEAR HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS

GUOJING REN AND GUIXIN XU

ABSTRACT. This paper is concerned with the characterizations of the Friedrichs extension for a class of singular discrete linear Hamiltonian systems. The existence of recessive solutions and the existence of the Friedrichs extension are proved under some conditions. The self-adjoint boundary conditions are obtained by applying the recessive solutions and then the characterization of the Friedrichs extension is obtained in terms of boundary conditions via linear independently recessive solutions.

Keywords: Discrete Hamiltonian system; Friedrichs extension; Disconjugacy; Recessive solution.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* 34B20, 39A70.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider the following singular discrete linear Hamiltonian system

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u(t) = A(t)u(t+1) + B(t)v(t), \\ \Delta v(t) = (C(t) - \lambda W(t))u(t+1) - A^*(t)v(t), \end{cases} \quad t \in \mathcal{I},$$

where Δ is the forward difference operator, i.e., $\Delta u(t) = u(t+1) - u(t)$; $A(t)$ is $n \times n$ complex matrix, $B(t)$, $C(t)$ and $W(t)$ are $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices satisfying

$$B(t) \geq 0, \quad W(t) \geq 0;$$

$\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is a spectral parameter; and $\mathcal{I} := [0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$. To ensure the existence and uniqueness of the solution of any initial value problem for (1.1), we always assume that

$$I_n - A(t) \text{ is invertible on } \mathcal{I},$$

where I_n is the $n \times n$ unit matrix.

Self-adjoint extension problems are most fundamental in the study of spectral problems for differential operators. There are two important theories available. One is the Weyl-Titchmarsh theory, which was started with Weyl's work in 1910 and it has been generalized to linear Hamiltonian differential systems (cf. [2, 11, 18, 33] and their references). The other is the GKN theory, which was established by Glazman, Krein, and Naimark in 1950's. Based on these two theories, the self-adjoint extensions for linear differential operators have been widely studied [29, 30, 31, 32].

Among all the self-adjoint extensions, there is a particular one which preserves the same lower bound when the associated minimal operator is bounded from below. This self-adjoint extension is known as the Friedrichs extension, which was initially constructed by K. Friedrichs for a densely defined operator in 1930's. His work has been widely developed by many authors to singular differential operators

using various approaches (cf. [13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20]). By using the existence of the principal solutions of linear Hamiltonian differential systems [21], a characterization of the Friedrichs extension of a class of singular Hamiltonian differential operators was given in terms of principal solutions [35]. Recently, the Friedrichs extension of a class of singular differential systems including non-symmetric cases was characterized [34].

Difference equations are usually regarded as the discretization of the corresponding differential equations. It has been found that the maximal operator corresponding to a formally self-adjoint difference equation is multi-valued, and the corresponding minimal operator is non-densely defined in general case [23, 26]. Not only that, this case can happen for general linear Hamilton differential systems [12]. Therefore, the classical spectral theory for symmetric operators, i.e., densely defined and Hermitian single-valued operators, are not available in the studying of the spectral properties of differential and difference equations in general case.

Due to the above reasons, some researchers began to focus on extending the theory of linear operators to linear non-densely defined or multi-valued operators (which are called linear relations or linear subspaces), and many good results have been obtained (cf. [8, 10, 28] and their references). E. A. Coddington successfully extended the von Neumann self-adjoint extension theory for symmetric operators to Hermitian subspaces [7]. Y. Shi extended the classical GKN theory for symmetric operators to Hermitian subspaces [27]. Based on the above, a complete characterization of all the self-adjoint extensions for a class of discrete linear Hamiltonian systems are obtained in terms of boundary conditions via linear independent square summable solutions [24].

The spectral properties of discrete linear Hamiltonian systems have been widely discussed (cf. [1, 5, 9, 22, 25] and their references). It is worth mentioning that M. Bohner and his coauthors discussed the disconjugacy of discrete linear Hamiltonian systems and proved the Reid Roundabout Theorem [5, Theorem 2]. In [1], some properties of recessive solutions of (1.1) were discussed. The Friedrichs extension of semi-bounded second-order difference operators was discussed in [4]. To the best of our knowledge, the existence of the recessive solutions of (1.1) has not been given and the Friedrichs extension of the minimal subspace corresponding to (1.1) has not been established.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the basic concepts and useful results on the linear relations and the sesquilinear forms are recalled. In addition, several important difference equations related with (1.1) are listed at the end of this section. In Section 3, the existence of the recessive solutions of (1.1) and the existence of the Friedrichs extension of the minimal subspace generated by (1.1) are proved under some conditions, respectively. In addition, a characterization of the recessive solutions of (1.1) is obtained. In Section 4, a characterization of matrix Θ is obtained by using the recessive solutions and then a characterization of the Friedrichs extension is established in terms of boundary condition via the recessive solutions.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, some fundamental and useful results about linear relations and sesquilinear forms are recalled. At the end of this section, several important difference equations related to (1.1) are listed.

2.1. Linear relations. Let \mathcal{X} be a complex Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Let T and S be two linear relations (briefly, relations or named linear subspaces) in $\mathcal{X}^2 := \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$. The domain and the range of T are defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(T) &:= \{x \in \mathcal{X} : (x, x') \in T\}, \\ \mathcal{R}(T) &:= \{x' \in \mathcal{X} : (x, x') \in T\}.\end{aligned}$$

The adjoint of T and the sum of two relations are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}T^* &:= \{(y, y') \in \mathcal{X}^2 : \langle x, y' \rangle = \langle x', y \rangle \text{ for all } (x, x') \in T\}, \\ T^{-1} &:= \{(x', x) : (x, x') \in T\}, \\ T + S &:= \{(x, x' + x'') : (x, x') \in T, (x, x'') \in S\}.\end{aligned}$$

It has been shown that T is densely defined if and only if T^* is single-valued [23, Theorem 3.1]. T is said to be *Hermitian* if $T \subset T^*$. T is said to be *symmetric* if $T \subset T^*$ and $\mathcal{D}(T)$ is dense in \mathcal{X} . T is said to be *self-adjoint* if $T = T^*$.

Denote

$$T(x) = \{x' \in \mathcal{X} : (x, x') \in T\}.$$

It is clear that $T(0) = \{0\}$ if and only if there exists a unique linear operator A_T from $\mathcal{D}(T)$ into \mathcal{X} such that its graph is equal to T , i.e., $G(A_T) = T$.

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. The subspace $\mathcal{R}(T - \lambda I)^\perp$ and the number $d_\lambda(T) := \dim \mathcal{R}(T - \lambda I)^\perp$ are called the *deficiency space* and *deficiency index* of T with λ , respectively. By \overline{T} denote the closure of T in \mathcal{X}^2 . It can be easily verified that $d_\lambda(T) = d_\lambda(\overline{T})$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

Let T be a relation in \mathcal{X}^2 . The set

$$\Gamma(T) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \exists c(\lambda) > 0 \text{ s.t. } \|x' - \lambda x\| \geq c(\lambda)\|x\|, \forall (x, x') \in T\}$$

is called the regularity domain of T . It has been shown by [27, Theorem 2.3] that the deficiency index $d_\lambda(T)$ is constant in each connected subset of $\Gamma(T)$. If T is Hermitian, then $d_\lambda(T)$ is constant in the upper and lower half-planes. Denote

$$d_\pm(T) := d_{\pm i}(T)$$

for an Hermitian linear relation T , and call $d_\pm(T)$ the positive and negative deficiency indices of T , respectively.

Lemma 2.1. [7, Theorem 15] *Let T be a closed Hermitian subspace in \mathcal{X}^2 . Then T has self-adjoint extensions if and only if $d_+(T) = d_-(T)$.*

Next, we introduce a form on $\mathcal{X}^2 \times \mathcal{X}^2$ by

$$[(x, x') : (y, y')] := \langle x', y \rangle - \langle x, y' \rangle, \quad (x, x'), (y, y') \in \mathcal{X}^2.$$

It can be easily verified that $[\cdot]$ is a conjugate bilinear and skew-Hermitian map from $\mathcal{X}^2 \times \mathcal{X}^2$ into \mathbb{C} . Let T be a closed Hermitian subspace in \mathcal{X}^2 and satisfy $d_+(T) = d_-(T) = d$. A set $\{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^d$ is called a GKN-set for the pairs of subspaces $\{T, T^*\}$ if it satisfies

- (1) $\beta_j \in T^*$, $1 \leq j \leq d$;
- (2) $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_d$ are linearly independent in T^* (modulo T);
- (3) $[\beta_j : \beta_k] = 0$, $1 \leq j, k \leq d$.

Lemma 2.2. [27, Theorem 4.7] *Let T be a closed Hermitian subspace in \mathcal{X}^2 and satisfy $d_+(T) = d_-(T) = d$. A subspace T_1 in \mathcal{X}^2 is a self-adjoint extension of T if*

and only if there exists a GKN-set $\{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^d$ for $\{T, T^*\}$ such that T_1 is determined by

$$T_1 = \{\gamma \in T^* : [\gamma : \beta_j] = 0, 1 \leq j \leq d\}.$$

A subspace T is said to be bounded from below if there exists a number $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad \langle x', x \rangle \geq \gamma \|x\|^2, \quad \forall (x, x') \in T.$$

The lower bound of T is the largest number $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ for which (2.1) holds. It can be easily verified that T is Hermitian if it is bounded from below.

Lemma 2.3. [3, Proposition 1.4.6] *Let T be an Hermitian subspace and be bounded from below with lower bound γ . Then $\mathbb{C} \setminus [\gamma, \infty) \subset \Gamma(T)$, and the deficiency index $d_\lambda(T)$ is constant for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [\gamma, \infty)$.*

2.2. Sesquilinear forms. Let \mathcal{X} be a complex Hilbert space and let \mathcal{D} be a linear subspace (not necessarily closed or dense) of \mathcal{X} . A sesquilinear form $\mathbf{t}[\cdot, \cdot]$ is a complex-valued mapping from $\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}$ to \mathbb{C} , which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{t}[x, ay + bz] &= \bar{a} \mathbf{t}[x, y] + \bar{b} \mathbf{t}[x, z], \\ \mathbf{t}[ay + bz, x] &= a \mathbf{t}[y, x] + b \mathbf{t}[z, x], \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y, z \in \mathcal{D}$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. The set $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t}) = \mathcal{D}$ is called the domain of \mathbf{t} . Define the quadratic form $\mathbf{t}[\cdot]$ associated with $\mathbf{t}[\cdot, \cdot]$ as $\mathbf{t}[x] := \mathbf{t}[x, x]$ with the same domain \mathcal{D} . \mathbf{t} is said to be sectorial with vertex at the origin and semiangle α , $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$, if

$$\mathbf{t}_i[x] \leq \tan \alpha \mathbf{t}_r[x], \quad x \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t}_i) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t}_r),$$

where \mathbf{t}_r and \mathbf{t}_i stand for the real and imaginary parts of \mathbf{t} . \mathbf{t} is said to be Hermitian if $\mathbf{t}[x]$ is real for all $x \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t})$. It is clear that \mathbf{t} is sectorial if it is Hermitian.

A sequence $\{x_n\} \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t})$ is said to be \mathbf{t} -convergent to $x \in \mathcal{X}$, in symbol

$$x_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{t}} x,$$

if $x_n \rightarrow x$ in \mathcal{X} and $\mathbf{t}[x_n - x_m] \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. An Hermitian sesquilinear form \mathbf{t} is said to be closed if $\{x_n\} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{t}} x$ implies that $x \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t})$ and $\mathbf{t}[x_n - x] \rightarrow 0$; and \mathbf{t} is said to be closable if it has a closed extension.

The following is a direct consequence of [15, Chapter VI, Theorem 1.17].

Lemma 2.4. *An Hermitian sesquilinear form \mathbf{t} is closable if and only if $x_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{t}} 0$ implies $\mathbf{t}[x_n] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. When this condition is satisfied, \mathbf{t} in \mathcal{X} has the closure (the smallest closed extension) $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ which defined in the following way.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\bar{\mathbf{t}}) &:= \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X} : \exists \{x_n\} \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t}) \text{ s.t. } x_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{t}} x \right\}, \\ \bar{\mathbf{t}}[x_1, x_2] &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{t}[x_{1n}, x_{2n}], \quad \forall x_{jn} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{t}} x_j, \quad j = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

The following result is a direct consequence of [10, Lemma 4.2].

Lemma 2.5. *Let T be a Hermitian relation in \mathcal{X}^2 . The form \mathbf{t}_T generated by T as the following*

$$\mathbf{t}_T[x_1, x_2] := \langle x'_1, x_2 \rangle, \quad \forall (x_j, x'_j) \in T, \quad j = 1, 2,$$

with $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t}) = \mathcal{D}(T)$ is well-defined, Hermitian and closable.

The following result is a direct consequence of [10, Proposition 2.8, Theorem 4.3].

Lemma 2.6. *Let \mathbf{t} be a closed and Hermitian form in \mathcal{X} with lower bound $\gamma > 0$. Then there exists a unique self-adjoint linear relation $T_{\mathbf{t}}$ with the same lower bound $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{D}(T_{\mathbf{t}}) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t})$$

and for every $(x, x') \in T_{\mathbf{t}}$ and $y \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t})$ one has

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbf{t}[x, y] = \langle x', y \rangle.$$

Conversely, for every self-adjoint relation $T_{\mathbf{t}}$ with the lower bound $\gamma > 0$, there exists a unique closed and Hermitian form \mathbf{t} in \mathcal{X} such that (2.2) and (2.3) are satisfied.

2.3. Several difference equations related to (1.1). System (1.1) contains the following two important models. One is the formally self-adjoint scalar difference equation with complex coefficients

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \Delta^j (p_j \nabla^j z(t)) + i \sum_{k=1}^n [(-1)^{k+1} \Delta^k (q_k z(t)) + q_k \nabla^k z(t)] = \lambda w(t) z(t),$$

where $p_j(t)$ and $q_k(t)$ are all real-valued, $p_n(t) \neq 0$ on \mathcal{I} , and $i = \sqrt{-1}$. In fact, by letting $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)^T$ and $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)^T$ with

$$\begin{aligned} u_j(t) &= \Delta^{j-1} z(t-j), \\ v_j(t) &= \sum_{k=j}^n (-1)^{k+j} \Delta^{k-j} (p_k(t) \nabla^k z(t)) + i \sum_{k=j}^n (-1)^{k+1} \Delta^{k-j} (q_k(t) z(t)), \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we can convert (2.4) into (1.1) with

$$A(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_{n-1} \\ iq_n(t)/p_n(t) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C(t) = \begin{pmatrix} p_0(t) + q_n(t)/p_n(t) & \alpha(t) \\ \alpha^*(t) & \beta(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B(t) &= \text{diag}\{0, \dots, 0, p_n^{-1}(t)\}, \\ \alpha(t) &= i(q_{n-1}(t), q_{n-2}(t), \dots, q_1(t))^T, \\ \beta(t) &= \text{diag}\{p_1(t), p_2(t), \dots, p_{n-1}(t)\}, \\ W(t) &= \text{diag}\{w(t), 0, \dots, 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The other is the second-order vector Sturm-Liouville difference equation

$$(2.5) \quad -\nabla(P(t)\Delta u(t)) + Q(t)u(t) = \lambda W(t)u(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{I},$$

where $P(t)$, $Q(t)$ and $W(t)$ are $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices, $W(t) \geq 0$ and $P(t) > 0$. In fact, by letting $v(t) = P(t)\Delta u(t)$, we can convert (2.5) into the following form

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(t) = P^{-1}(t)v(t), \\ \Delta v(t) = (Q(t+1) - \lambda W(t+1))u(t+1), \end{cases} \quad t \in \mathcal{I}.$$

The general singular discrete linear Hamiltonian system is in the form

$$(2.6) \quad J\Delta y(t) = (\tilde{P}(t) + \lambda \tilde{W}(t))R(y)(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{I},$$

where $\tilde{W}(t) \geq 0$ and $\tilde{P}(t)$ are $2n \times 2n$ Hermitian matrices; J is the $2n \times 2n$ canonical symplectic matrix, that is,

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_n \\ I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$y(t) = (u^T(t), v^T(t))^T$ with $u(t), v(t) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $R(y)(t)$ is the partial right shift operator

$$R(y)(t) = \begin{pmatrix} u(t+1) \\ v(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

System (1.1) is a special case of (2.6) with

$$\tilde{W}(t) = \text{diag}\{W(t), 0\}.$$

Since $I_n - A(t)$ is invertible, system (1.1) is equivalent to the following system

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{cases} u(t+1) = \tilde{A}(t)u(t) + \tilde{A}(t)B(t)v(t), \\ v(t+1) = \tilde{C}(t, \lambda)\tilde{A}(t)u(t) + D(t, \lambda)v(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{I}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{A}(t) &= (I_n - A(t))^{-1}, \quad \tilde{C}(t, \lambda) = C(t) - \lambda W(t), \\ D(t, \lambda) &= \tilde{C}(t, \lambda)\tilde{A}(t)B(t) + I_n - A^*(t). \end{aligned}$$

For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, it can be easily verified that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}(t) & \tilde{A}(t)B(t) \\ \tilde{C}(t, \lambda)\tilde{A}(t) & D(t, \lambda) \end{pmatrix}^* J \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}(t) & \tilde{A}(t)B(t) \\ \tilde{C}(t, \lambda)\tilde{A}(t) & D(t, \lambda) \end{pmatrix} \equiv J.$$

This implies that (2.7), as well as (1.1), is a symplectic system when $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

3. THE EXISTENCE OF THE RECESSIVE SOLUTIONS AND THE FRIEDRICHS EXTENSION

In the first subsection, some variational properties of the solutions of (1.1) are recalled, and then the existence of the recessive solutions of (1.1) is proved. In the second subsection, by introducing a quadratic form associated with (1.1) we show the existence of the Friedrichs extension of the minimal subspace generated by (1.1). A characterization of the recessive solutions is given in the last subsection.

3.1. Existence of the recessive solutions. Denote

$$l(\mathcal{I}) := \{y : y = \{y(t)\}_{t \in \mathcal{I}}, y(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}\}.$$

For any two $y_1, y_2 \in l(\mathcal{I})$, denote

$$(y_1, y_2)(t) := y_2^*(t)Jy_1(t),$$

where J is the canonical symplectic matrix. If the limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (y_1, y_2)(t)$$

exists and is finite, then its limit is denoted by $(y_1, y_2)(\infty)$. The natural difference operator corresponding to system (1.1) is denoted by

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{L}(y)(t) := \begin{pmatrix} (I_n - A^*(t))v(t) - v(t+1) + C(t)u(t+1) \\ (I_n - A(t))u(t+1) - u(t) - B(t)v(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad y \in l(\mathcal{I}).$$

Lemma 3.1. [25, Lemma 2.1] *For any two $y_1, y_2 \in l(\mathcal{I})$ and any $s, k \in \mathcal{I}$ with $s < k$,*

$$\sum_{t=s}^k [R(y_2)^*(t)\mathcal{L}(y_1)(t) - \mathcal{L}(y_2)^*(t)R(y_1)(t)] = (y_1, y_2)(k+1) - (y_1, y_2)(s).$$

By small letters $y = (u; v)$ we denote a vector-valued solution of (1.1) and by capital letter $Y = (U; V)$ denote a $2n \times n$ matrix-valued solution of (1.1). Let y_1 and y_2 be two solutions of (1.1). It follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$(y_1, y_2)(t) \equiv (y_1, y_2)(0) = c, \quad t \in \mathcal{I}.$$

where c is a constant. Further, we call y a *prepared (or conjoined) solution* if

$$(y, y)(t) \equiv 0.$$

Similarly, $Y(t) = (U(t); V(t))$ is called a *prepared (or conjoined) solution* if

$$Y^*(t)JY(t) \equiv 0.$$

It follows from Lemma 3.1 that $Y(t)$ is a prepared solution of (1.1) if and only if $U^*(t)V(t)$ is Hermitian for some $t \in \mathcal{I}$.

As it has been shown in Section 2.3, system (1.1) can be converted into (2.7), which is a symplectic system when $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. So, the results in [1, Section 3] can be applied to system (1.1) when $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\tilde{A}(t) = (I_n - A(t))^{-1}$ in (2.8).

Lemma 3.2. [1, Theorems 3.32, 3.33] *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and $Y_0 = (U_0; V_0)$ be a prepared solution of (1.1) such that $U_0(t)$ is invertible for $t \geq t_1 \geq 0$. Then*

$$D(t) = U_0^{-1}(t+1)\tilde{A}(t)B(t)(U_0^{-1})^*(t), \quad t \geq t_1$$

is Hermitian, and consequently

$$S_0(t_1) := 0, \quad S_0(t) := \sum_{s=t_1}^{t-1} U_0^{-1}(s+1)\tilde{A}(s)B(s)(U_0^{-1})^*(s), \quad t \geq t_1 + 1$$

is Hermitian for $t \geq t_1$. Let $Y = (U; V)$ be another solution of (1.1). Then it can be expressed as

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} U(t) = U_0(t)(P + S_0(t)Q), \\ V(t) = V_0(t)(P + S_0(t)Q) + (U_0^{-1})^*(t)Q, \end{cases} \quad t \geq t_1,$$

where

$$(3.3) \quad P = U_0^{-1}(t_1)U(t_1), \quad Q = U_0^*(t)V(t) - V_0^*(t)U(t)$$

*are constant matrices. Conversely, let P and Q be constant $n \times n$ matrices and $U(t)$ and $V(t)$ be defined by (3.2). Then $Y(t) = (U; V)$ is a solution of (1.1) and therefore (3.3) holds. Further, $Y = (U; V)$ is a prepared solution of (1.1) if and only if P^*Q is Hermitian.*

Let $Y = (U; V)$ be a prepared solution of (1.1). It is said to be a *dominant solution* provided that there exists an integer $t_1 \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $U(t)$ is invertible for $t \geq t_1$ and

$$\sum_{s=t_1}^{\infty} U^{-1}(s+1)\tilde{A}(s)B(s)(U^{-1})^*(s)$$

converges to a Hermitian matrix with finite entries. We call $Y(t)$ a *recessive (or principal) solution* provided that whenever $Y_1 = (U_1; V_1)$ is a solution of (1.1) satisfying

$$Y^*(t)JY_1(t) \equiv C, \quad t \in \mathcal{I},$$

where C is a non-singular matrix, there exists $t_1 \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $U_1(t)$ is non-singular for $t \geq t_1$ and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U_1^{-1}(t)U(t) = 0.$$

In this case, $y_1(t), y_2(t), \dots, y_n(t)$, which are the column of $Y(t)$, are called the recessive solutions of (1.1).

Lemma 3.3. [1, Theorems 3.50] *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and $Y = (U; V)$ be a dominant solution of (1.1) with $U(t)$ invertible for $t \geq t_1 \geq 0$. Define $Y_0 = (U_0; V_0)$ by*

$$\begin{cases} U_0(t) = U(t)S(t), \\ V_0(t) = V(t)S(t) - (U^{-1})^*(t), \quad t \geq t_1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$S(t) = \sum_{s=t}^{\infty} U^{-1}(s+1)\tilde{A}(s)B(s)(U^{-1})^*(s), \quad t \geq t_1,$$

Then $Y_0 = (U_0; V_0)$ is a recessive solution of (1.1).

System (1.1) is said to have *the unique two point property* on \mathcal{I} with respect to some $\lambda = \lambda_0$ provided that whenever $y_1 = (u_1; v_1)$ and $y_2 = (u_2; v_2)$ are solutions of (1.1) with $u_1(t_1) = u_2(t_1)$ and $u_1(t_2) = u_2(t_2)$, where $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \infty$, it follows that $y_1(t) \equiv y_2(t)$ on \mathcal{I} . It follows from [1, Theorem 3.55] that there exists a unique matrix-valued solution of (1.1) satisfying the boundary conditions

$$U(t_1) = I_n, \quad U(t_2) = 0, \quad 0 \leq t_1 < t_2,$$

provided that (1.1) has the unique two point property on \mathcal{I} .

Lemma 3.4. [1, Theorems 3.56] *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that system (1.1) has a recessive solution $Y_0 = (U_0; V_0)$, which satisfying $U_0(t_1)$ non-singular and (1.1) has the unique two point property on $[t_1, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Z}$. Let $Y(t, s) = (U(t, s); V(t, s))$ be the solution of (1.1), which satisfying the boundary conditions*

$$U(t_1, s) = I_n, \quad U(s, s) = 0$$

Then $Y(t, s) \rightarrow Y_0(t)U_0^{-1}(t_1)$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$; that is, $Y(t, s)$ converges to the recessive solution which satisfies the initial condition of $U(t_1) = I_n$.

By $B^\dagger(t)$ denote the Moore-Penrose Inverse of the matrix B , i.e., the unique matrix satisfying $BB^\dagger B = B$ and $B^\dagger BB^\dagger = B^\dagger$ such that both BB^\dagger and $B^\dagger B$ are Hermitian. It can be easily verified that $B^\dagger \geq 0$ if $B \geq 0$. A solution $y = (u; v)$ of (1.1) is said to have a *generalized zero* at t provided that $u(t) = 0$ if $t = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} u(t-1) &\neq 0, \quad u^*(t) \in \text{Ran}(\tilde{A}(t-1)B(t-1)), \\ u^*(t-1)B^\dagger(t-1)(I_n - A(t-1))u(t) &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

if $t \geq 1$. System (1.1) is said to be *disconjugate* on \mathcal{I} with respect to $\lambda = \lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ provided that every solution y of (1.1) with $\lambda = \lambda_0$ has at most one generalized zero on \mathcal{I} .

For a subinterval \mathcal{I}_1 of \mathcal{I} , let $\Lambda(\mathcal{I}_1)$ denote the vector space of n -dimension vector functions $v(t)$ which are solutions of $\Delta v(t) = -A^*(t)v(t)$ and $B(t)v(t) = 0$ on \mathcal{I}_1 .

It can be easily verified that $v(t) \in \Lambda(\mathcal{I}_1)$ if and only if $y(t) = (0; v(t))$ is a solution of (1.1) on \mathcal{I}_1 for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. System (1.1) is said to be *normal* on some subinterval \mathcal{I}_1 of \mathcal{I} if $\Lambda(\mathcal{I}_1)$ is zero-dimensional. If (1.1) is normal on every subinterval of \mathcal{I} , then system (1.1) is said to be *identically normal* on \mathcal{I} .

Further, we denote

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_1(y)(t) &:= -\Delta v(t) + C(t)u(t+1) - A^*(t)v(t), \\ \mathcal{L}_2(y)(t) &:= \Delta u(t) - A(t)u(t+1) - B(t)v(t), \\ \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{I}) &:= \{y \in l_W^2(\mathcal{I}) : \mathcal{L}_1(y)(t) = \lambda W(t)u(t+1), t \in \mathcal{I}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_2(\mathcal{I}) &:= \{y \in l_W^2(\mathcal{I}) : \mathcal{L}_2(y)(t) = 0, t \in \mathcal{I}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_0(\mathcal{I}) &:= \{y \in \mathcal{D}_2(\mathcal{I}) : u(0) = u(t) = 0 \text{ for sufficiently large } t\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathcal{D}_2(\mathcal{I})$ is independent of λ and it is called the admissible space of (1.1) on \mathcal{I} . A quadratic form associated with (1.1) is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_\lambda(y) := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} u^*(t+1)\tilde{C}(t, \lambda)u(t+1) + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} v^*(t)B(t)v(t), \quad y \in \mathcal{D}_0(\mathcal{I}),$$

where $\tilde{C}(t, \lambda) = C(t) - \lambda W(t)$ by (2.8). It is clear that $\mathcal{F}_\lambda(y) = 0$ for any $y \in \mathcal{D}_2(\mathcal{I})$ with $u(t) \equiv 0$ on \mathcal{I} . $\mathcal{F}_\lambda(\cdot)$ is said to be *positive definite* on \mathcal{I} if $\mathcal{F}_\lambda(y) > 0$ for any $y \in \mathcal{D}_0(\mathcal{I})$ with $u(t) \not\equiv 0$ on \mathcal{I} .

For convenience, we denote the following assumptions and make some statements on them.

- (A₁) System (1.1) is disconjugate on \mathcal{I} with respect to $\lambda = \lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (A₂) System (1.1) is identically normal on \mathcal{I} .
- (C₁) $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_0}(\cdot)$ is positive definite on \mathcal{I} .
- (C₂) System (1.1) has the unique two point property on \mathcal{I} with respect to $\lambda = \lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 3.5. (1) *It can be easily verified that (A₂) holds if $B(t) > 0$ on \mathcal{I} . But the system (1.1) specified by (2.4) is identically normal on \mathcal{I} , although $B(t)$ is singular for any $t \in \mathcal{I}$.*

- (2) *It is clear that (C₂) implies (A₂).*
- (3) *(A₁) and (A₂) imply (C₂). In fact, Let $y = (u; v)$ be a solution of (1.1) with $\lambda = \lambda_0$ satisfying $u(t_1) = u(t_2) = 0$ with $t_1 < t_2$. It is clear that $y = (u; v)$ has a generalized zero in $[0, t_1] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. In addition, one can get that $u(t) \equiv 0$ for $t \in [t_1, t_2] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. Otherwise, $y = (u; v)$ would have another generalized zero in $[t_1 + 1, t_2] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. which contradicts the disconjugacy of (1.1). Further, one get that $v(t) \equiv 0$ for $t \in [t_1, t_2 - 1] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. So, it follows that $y(t_1) = 0$, which together with the invertibility of $I_n - A(t)$, implies that $y(t) \equiv 0$ on \mathcal{I} .*
- (4) *(A₁) is equivalent to (C₁). In fact, (A₁) holds if and only if (1.1) is disconjugate with respect to λ_0 on any bounded subinterval of \mathcal{I} . It has been shown by [5, Theorem 2] that system (1.1) is disconjugate with respect to λ_0 on a bounded subinterval \mathcal{I}_1 of \mathcal{I} if and only if $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_0}(y)$ is positive definite on the corresponding space $\mathcal{D}_0(\mathcal{I}_1)$.*

Now we show the existence of the recessive solutions of (1.1).

Theorem 3.6. *Assume that (A₁) – (A₂) hold. Then for any $t_1 \geq 1$, system (1.1) with $\lambda = \lambda_0$ has a recessive solution $\tilde{Y} = (\tilde{U}; \tilde{V})$ which satisfying $\tilde{U}(t_1) = I_n$ and $\tilde{U}(t)$ non-singular for $t \geq t_1$.*

Proof. Since (A_1) holds, every solution y of (1.1) with $\lambda = \lambda_0$ has at most one generalized zero on \mathcal{I} . Let $Y = (U; V)$ be the solution of (1.1) with $\lambda = \lambda_0$ satisfying the initial value condition $Y(0) = (0; I_n)$. We claim that $U(t)$ is non-singular for all $t \geq 1$. Assume not. Then there exists $s \geq 1$ and a non-trivial vector $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $U(s)\eta = 0$. Set $y(t) = (U(t)\eta; V(t)\eta)$. Then $y(t)$ is a non-trivial solution with boundary value

$$u(0) = u(s) = 0.$$

which yields $y(t) \equiv 0$ on \mathcal{I} by (3) of Remark 3.5. This contradicts with the initial value condition $Y(0) = (0; I_n)$. Hence $U(t)$ is non-singular for all $t \geq 1$.

It is clear that $Y(t)$ is a prepared basis of (1.1). We can get by Lemma 3.2 that $U^{-1}(t+1)\tilde{A}(t)B(t)(U^{-1})^*(t)$ is Hermitian for $t \geq 1$. In addition, the assumption (A_1) implies that

$$U^*(t)B^\dagger(t)(I_n - A(t))U(t+1) \geq 0, \quad t \geq 1,$$

and consequently

$$(3.4) \quad U^{-1}(t+1)\tilde{A}(t)B(t)(U^{-1})^*(t) \geq 0, \quad t \geq 1.$$

Define

$$S(1) = 0, \quad S(t) = \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} U^{-1}(s+1)\tilde{A}(s)B(s)(U^{-1})^*(s), \quad t \geq 2,$$

and set

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{cases} U_1(t) = U(t)(I_n + S(t)), \\ V_1(t) = V(t)(I_n + S(t)) + (U^{-1})^*(t), \end{cases} \quad t \geq 1.$$

Again by Lemma 3.2, $Y_1 = (U_1; V_1)$ is a prepared basis solution of (1.1) with $\lambda = \lambda_0$. It follows from (3.4) that

$$0 = S(1) \leq S(t) \leq S(t+1), \quad t \geq 2.$$

This implies that $U_1(t)$ is non-singular for $t \geq 1$. Again by Lemma 3.2, $Y = (U; V)$ can be written as

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{cases} U(t) = U_1(t)(I_n - S_1(t)), \\ V(t) = V_1(t)(I_n - S_1(t)) - (U_1^{-1})^*(t), \end{cases} \quad t \geq 1,$$

where

$$S_1(1) = 0, \quad S_1(t) = \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} U_1^{-1}(s+1)\tilde{A}(s)B(s)(U_1^{-1})^*(s), \quad t \geq 2.$$

It follows from the first formulae of (3.5) and (3.6) that

$$I_n = (I_n + S(t))(I_n - S_1(t)), \quad t \geq 1.$$

Since $S(t) \geq 0$ and it is non-decreasing, one has that $I_n - S_1(t) > 0$ and it is non-increasing. Therefore, the limit

$$S_1(\infty) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} S_1(t)$$

exists and it satisfies

$$0 < S_1(\infty) < I_n.$$

Thus, $Y_1 = (U_1; V_1)$ is a dominant solution with $U_1(t)$ non-singular for $t \geq 1$.

Define

$$S_2(t) = \sum_{s=t}^{\infty} U_1^{-1}(s+1)\tilde{A}(s)B(s)(U_1^{-1})^*(s), \quad t \geq 1.$$

It can be shown similarly as above that $0 < S_2(t) < I_n$ for all $t \geq 1$. Set

$$\begin{cases} U_2(t) = U_1(t)S_2(t), \\ V_2(t) = V_1(t)S_2(t) - (U_1^{-1})^*(t), \quad t \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then $Y_2 = (U_2; V_2)$ is determined uniquely on \mathcal{I} and it follows from Lemma 3.3 that $Y_2(t)$ is a recessive solution of (1.1). It is clear that $U_2(t)$ is invertible for $t \geq 1$. Set $\tilde{Y}(t) = Y_2(t)U_2^{-1}(t_1)$. Then $\tilde{Y}(t)$ is still a recessive solution satisfying $\tilde{U}(t_1) = I_n$ and $\tilde{U}(t)$ is invertible for $t \geq t_1$. The proof is complete. \square

3.2. The existence of the Friedrichs extension. Denote

$$l_W^2(\mathcal{I}) := \left\{ y \in l(\mathcal{I}) : \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} u^*(t+1)W(t)u(t+1) < \infty \right\}$$

with the semi-scalar product

$$\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle_W := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} u_2^*(t+1)W(t)u_1(t+1).$$

Further, we define $\|y\|_W := \langle y, y \rangle_W^{1/2}$ for $y \in l_W^2(\mathcal{I})$, and introduce the following quotient space

$$L_W^2(\mathcal{I}) := l_W^2(\mathcal{I}) / \{y \in l_W^2(\mathcal{I}) : \|y\|_W = 0\}.$$

Then by [25, Lemma 2.5], $L_W^2(\mathcal{I})$ is a Hilbert space with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_W$. For any $y \in l_W^2(\mathcal{I})$, we denote by $[y]$ the corresponding equivalent class in $L_W^2(\mathcal{I})$. Denote

$$l_{W,0}^2(\mathcal{I}) := \{y \in l_W^2(\mathcal{I}) : \exists s \in \mathcal{I} \text{ s.t. } y(0) = y(t) = 0, t \geq s\}.$$

Consider the following non-homogeneous system corresponding to (1.1)

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u(t) = A(t)u(t+1) + B(t)v(t), \\ \Delta v(t) = C(t)u(t+1) - A^*(t)v(t) - W(t)u'(t+1), \quad t \in \mathcal{I}, \end{cases}$$

and denote

$$\begin{aligned} H &:= \{([y], [y']) \in (L_W^2(\mathcal{I}))^2 : \exists y \in [y] \text{ s.t. (3.7) holds}\}, \\ H_{00} &:= \{([y], [y']) \in H : \exists y \in [y] \text{ s.t. } y \in l_{W,0}^2(\mathcal{I}) \text{ and (3.7) holds}\}, \\ H_0 &:= \overline{H_{00}}, \end{aligned}$$

where H , H_{00} , and H_0 are called the maximal, pre-minimal, and minimal subspaces corresponding to system (1.1), separately.

It is clear that H_{00} and H_0 are Hermitian. It follows from [22, Theorem 3.1] that $H_{00}^* = H_0^* = H$ and from [24, Theorem 3.2] that

$$(3.8) \quad H_0 = \{(y, [y']) \in H : y(0) = 0, (x, y)(\infty) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{D}(H)\}.$$

We say that the *definiteness condition* for system (1.1) holds on \mathcal{I} , if there exists a finite subinterval $\mathcal{I}_0 = [t_0, s_0] \cap \mathbb{Z} \subset \mathcal{I}$ such that for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, every non-trivial solution $y(t)$ of (1.1) satisfies

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_0} u^*(t+1)W(t)u(t+1) > 0.$$

For convenience, we denote

(**A₃**) The definiteness condition for system (1.1) holds on \mathcal{I} .

Remark 3.7. Assumption (A_3) is important and necessary to the characterization of Fridrichs extension of the minimal subspace generated by (1.1).

- (1) It has been shown by [22, Corollary 5.1] that the positive and negative deficiency indices are equal to the the number of linearly independent square summable solutions of (1.1) with λ in the upper or lower half-planes, if and only if the definiteness condition for system (1.1) holds. With the assumption (A_3), a complete characterization of all the self-adjoint extensions for (2.6) has been obtained in terms of boundary conditions via linearly independent square summable solutions [24].
- (2) It has been shown in [22, Theorem 4.2] that (A_3) holds if and only if for any $([y], [y']) \in H$, there exists a unique $y \in [y]$ such that (3.7) holds. Therefore, we can write briefly $(y, [y']) \in H$ instead of $([y], [y']) \in H$.
- (3) If (A_3) holds, then any two elements of H can be patched up to construct another new element of H . For example, for any $(x, [x']), (y, [y']) \in H$, there exists $(z, [z']) \in H$ satisfying

$$z(t) = x(t) \text{ for } t \leq t_0, \quad z(t) = y(t) \text{ for } t \geq s_0 + 1.$$

In addition, there exist $(z_j, [z'_j]) \in H$ satisfying

$$z_j(t_0) = e_j, \quad z_j(t) = 0, \quad t \geq s_0 + 1, \quad 1 \leq j \leq 2n,$$

where

$$e_i := \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{i-1}, 1, 0, \dots, 0)^T \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}.$$

For details, see [24, Lemma 3.3, Remark 3.3].

- (4) The definiteness condition for (1.1) is independent of λ , and some sufficient conditions have been given [22, Section 4].

Lemma 3.8. Assume that (A_3) holds. For any $(y_i, [y'_i]) \in H$ with $y_i = (u_i; v_i)$ and $y'_i = (u'_i; v'_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y'_1, y_2 \rangle_W &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} u_2^*(t+1) \mathcal{L}_1(y_1)(t) \\ (3.9) \quad &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \{u_2^*(t+1)C(t)u_1(t+1) + v_2^*(t)B(t)v_1(t)\} - u_2^*(t)v_1(t)|_0^\infty. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for any $(y, [y']) \in H$,

$$(3.10) \quad \langle y', y \rangle_W = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \{u^*(t+1)C(t)u(t+1) + v^*(t)B(t)v(t)\} - u^*(t)v(t)|_0^\infty,$$

and for any $(y, [y']) \in H_{00}$,

$$(3.11) \quad \langle y', y \rangle_W = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} u^*(t+1)C(t)u(t+1) + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} v^*(t)B(t)v(t).$$

Proof. It suffices to show (3.9) holds. Let $(y_i, [y'_i]) \in H$ with $y_i = (u_i; v_i)$ and $y'_i = (u'_i; v'_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Then it follows from (3.7) that

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u_i(t) = A(t)u_i(t+1) + B(t)v_i(t), \\ \Delta v_i(t) = C(t)u_i(t+1) - A^*(t)v_i(t) - W(t)u'_i(t+1), \quad t \in \mathcal{I}. \end{cases}$$

By the second formula of (3.12), one can get

$$W(t)u_1'(t+1) = C(t)u_1(t+1) - [\Delta v_1(t) + A^*(t)v_1(t)] = \mathcal{L}_1(y_1)(t),$$

and further one can get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y_1', y_2 \rangle_W &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} u_2^*(t+1)W(t)u_1'(t+1) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} u_2^*(t+1)\mathcal{L}_1(y_1)(t) \\ (3.13) \quad &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \{u_2^*(t+1)C(t)u_1(t+1) - u_2^*(t+1)[\Delta v_1(t) + A^*(t)v_1(t)]\}. \end{aligned}$$

By using the formula

$$\Delta(u^*(t)v(t)) = \Delta u^*(t)v(t) + u^*(t+1)\Delta v(t)$$

and the first formula of (3.12) one can get that

$$(3.14) \quad -u_2^*(t+1)[\Delta v_1(t) + A^*(t)v_1(t)] = v_2^*(t)B(t)v_1(t) - \Delta(u_2^*(t)v_1(t)).$$

Inserting (3.14) into (3.13), one can obtain the second equation of (3.9). The proof is complete. \square

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $(y, [y']) \in H - \lambda I$. Since $I_n - A(t)$ is invertible, one can get from (3.7) that $y(t)$ is determined uniquely by $[y']$ and the initial value $y(0)$. In particular, y is determined uniquely by $[y']$ for any $(y, [y']) \in H_{00} - \lambda I$. This means that $(H_{00} - \lambda I)^{-1}$ is an Hermitian operator. Now, we introduce a sesquilinear form \mathbf{t}_λ associated with $(H_{00} - \lambda I)^{-1}$:

$$\mathbf{t}_\lambda[y'] := \langle y', y \rangle_W - \lambda \langle y, y \rangle_W, \quad \forall (y, [y']) \in H_{00} - \lambda I.$$

It is clear $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t}_\lambda) = \mathcal{R}(H_{00} - \lambda I) = \mathcal{D}((H_{00} - \lambda I)^{-1})$. One get \mathbf{t}_λ is closable by Lemma 2.5. In addition, it follows from Lemma 3.8 that for any $(y, [y']) \in H_{00} - \lambda I$,

$$\mathbf{t}_\lambda[y'] = \mathcal{F}_\lambda(y) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} u^*(t+1)\tilde{C}(t, \lambda)u(t+1) + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} v^*(t)B(t)v(t).$$

Theorem 3.9. *Assume that $(A_1) - (A_3)$ hold and let $\lambda < \lambda_0$. Then $H_0 - \lambda I$ is bounded from below with the lower bound $\gamma > 0$. And consequently, $d_+(H_0) = d_-(H_0) := d$ and therefore H_0 has a unique self-adjoint extension (Friedrichs extension) with the lower bound $\gamma + \lambda$.*

Proof. It suffices to show $H_{00} - \lambda I$ is bounded from below with the lower bound $\gamma > 0$. Suppose that $H_{00} - \lambda I$ is not bounded from below with the lower bound $\gamma > 0$. Then for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $(y, [y']) \in H_{00}$ such that

$$\langle y' - \lambda y, y \rangle_W \leq \varepsilon \langle y, y \rangle_W.$$

In particular, by taking $\varepsilon = (\lambda_0 - \lambda)/2$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_0}(y) = \langle y' - \lambda_0 y, y \rangle_W < 0.$$

This contradicts with the assumption (A_1) by (4) of Remark 3.5. Hence, $H_{00} - \lambda I$ and consequently $H_0 - \lambda I$ is bounded from below with the lower bound $\gamma > 0$. This yields that H_0 is bounded from below with lower bound $\gamma + \lambda$ and it follows from Lemma 2.3 that $d_+(H_0) = d_-(H_0)$ and consequently H_0 has self-adjoint extensions.

The boundedness of $H_0 - \lambda I$ implies the boundedness of $\mathbf{t}_\lambda[\cdot]$, as well as its closure $\bar{\mathbf{t}}_\lambda[\cdot]$. Further, it follows from Lemma 2.6 that there exists a unique self-adjoint extension of $H_0 - \lambda I$ with the same lower bound. This means that H_0 has a unique Friedrichs extension with lower bound $\gamma + \lambda$. The proof is complete. \square

In the following, we denote the Friedrichs extension of H_0 by H_F . Then $H_F - \lambda I$ is the Friedrichs extension of $H_0 - \lambda I$.

Lemma 3.10. *Assume that (A_1) – (A_3) hold. Then $y(0) = 0$ for any $(y, [y']) \in H_F$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{D}(H_F) = \mathcal{D}(H_F - \lambda I)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, it suffices to show $y(0) = 0$ for any $(y, [y']) \in H_F - \lambda I$ with some $\lambda < \lambda_0$.

Let $\lambda < \lambda_0$ and $(y, [y']) \in H_F - \lambda I$. Note that $H_F - \lambda I$ is a Friedrichs extension of $H_{00} - \lambda I$, and $(H_F - \lambda I)^{-1}$ is a Friedrichs extension of $(H_{00} - \lambda I)^{-1}$. It follows from 2.6 that $\mathcal{D}((H_F - \lambda I)^{-1}) \subset \mathcal{D}(\bar{\mathbf{t}})$. So, there exists $(y_m, [y'_m]) \in H_{00} - \lambda I$ such that $[y'_m] \xrightarrow{t_\lambda} [y']$. That is,

$$(3.15) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} (u' - u'_m)^*(t+1)W(t)(u' - u'_m)(t+1) = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{t}}_\lambda[y'] &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{t}_\lambda[y'_m] \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} u_m^*(t+1)\tilde{C}(t, \lambda)u_m(t+1) + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} v_m^*(t)B(t)v_m(t). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that (3.15) yields

$$(3.16) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} W(t)u'_m(t+1) = W(t)u'(t+1), \quad t \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Since $(y_m, [y'_m]) \in H_{00} - \lambda I$, it follows that

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u_m(t) = A(t)u_m(t+1) + B(t)v_m(t), & t \in \mathcal{I}, \\ \Delta v_m(t) = \tilde{C}(t, \lambda)u_m(t+1) - A^*(t)v_m(t) - W(t)u'_m(t+1). \end{cases}$$

Since $u_m(0) = v_m(0) = 0$ for all m , it follows from the first formula of (3.17) that $u_m(1) = 0$ for all m and then it follows from the second formula that (3.17) that $v_m(1) = -W(0)u'_m(1)$. This yields

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} v_m(1) = -W(0)u'(1)$$

by using (3.16). Inserting $u_m(1) = 0$ and $v_m(1) = -W(0)u'_m(1)$ into the first formula of (3.17) and letting $m \rightarrow \infty$, one get that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} u_m(2) = (I_n - A(1))^{-1}B(1)W(0)u'(1).$$

Repeating the above procession, one can get that for each $t \in \mathcal{I}$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} y_m(t)$ exists, which is denoted by $y_0(t)$. It is clear $(y_0, [y']) \in H_F - \lambda I$ and $y_0(0) = 0$. Since $H_F - \lambda I$ is bounded with lower bound $\gamma > 0$, $(H_F - \lambda I)^{-1}$ is a bounded operator. Therefore, $y_0(t) = y(t)$ for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$. In particular, $y(0) = y_0(0) = 0$. The proof is complete. \square

3.3. The characterization of the recessive solutions. Let $\tilde{Y}_s = (\tilde{U}_s; \tilde{V}_s)$ be the solution of (1.1) on \mathcal{I} , which satisfies the boundary conditions

$$\tilde{U}_s(1) = I_n, \quad \tilde{U}_s(s) = 0, \quad (s \geq s_0 + 1)$$

and let $\tilde{Y} = (\tilde{U}; \tilde{V})$ be the recessive solution of (1.1), satisfying $\tilde{U}(1) = I_n$. Denote

$$\tilde{Y}(t) = [\tilde{y}_1(t), \tilde{y}_2(t), \dots, \tilde{y}_n(t)], \quad \tilde{Y}_s(t) = [\tilde{y}_{1s}(t), \tilde{y}_{2s}(t), \dots, \tilde{y}_{ns}(t)].$$

It follows from Lemma 3.4 that

$$\tilde{y}_j(t) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{y}_{js}(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{I}.$$

It follows from (3) of Remark 3.7 that there exist $(z_j, [z'_j]) \in H$ satisfying

$$(3.18) \quad z_j(0) = \tilde{y}_j(0), \quad z_j(t) = 0, \quad t \geq s_0 + 1, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

Define

$$y_j := \tilde{y}_j - z_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

It is clear that $y_j(0) = 0$, and

$$(y_j, [\lambda z_j - z'_j]) \in H - \lambda I,$$

On the other hand, let $\lambda < \lambda_0$. Then $(H_F - \lambda I)^{-1}$ is a bounded operator defined on $L_W^2(\mathcal{I})$. Hence, there exists a unique $\check{y}_j \in l_W^2(\mathcal{I})$ such that

$$(3.19) \quad (\check{y}_j, [\lambda z_j - z'_j]) \in H_F - \lambda I.$$

By noting $y_j(0) = 0$ and by using Lemma 3.10, one get that $y_j(t) = \check{y}_j(t)$ on \mathcal{I} .

Based on the above discussion, we get the following characterization of the recessive solutions.

Theorem 3.11. *Assume that (A_1) – (A_3) hold and $\lambda < \lambda_0$. Let $\tilde{Y}(t) = [\tilde{y}_1, \tilde{y}_2, \dots, \tilde{y}_n](t)$ be the recessive solution of (1.1) which satisfying $\tilde{U}(1) = I_n$. Then*

$$(3.20) \quad \tilde{y}_j(t) = z_j(t) + \check{y}_j(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{I}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

where z_j is defined by (3.18) and \check{y}_j is defined by (3.19).

4. CHARACTERIZATIONS OF FRIDRICHS EXTENSIONS

In this section, the most simple characterization of the matrix Θ is established by using of the recessive solutions. Based on this, we establish a characterization of the Fridriches extension H_F in terms of boundary conditions via linear independent recessive solutions.

We assume that (A_1) – (A_3) hold and fix $\lambda < \lambda_0$. It follows from Theorem 3.9 and Lemma 2.3 that the minimal subspace H_0 is bounded from below and $d_+(H_0) = d_-(H_0)$. Denote

$$d_+(H_0) = d_-(H_0) := d$$

Then $n \leq d \leq 2n$, and it follows from (1) of Remark 3.7 that (1.1) has d linearly independent solutions $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_d$ in $l_W^2(\mathcal{I})$. As it has discussed in [24, Section 4], $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_d$ can be arranged such that

$$(4.1) \quad \Theta := ((\theta_i, \theta_j)(t))_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2d-2n}$$

is a constant matrix and it is invertible.

Lemma 4.1. [24, Theorem 5.8] *Assume that (A_1) – (A_3) hold. A subspace $T \subset (L_W^2(\mathcal{I}))^2$ is a self-adjoint extension of H_0 if and only if there exist two matrices $M_{d \times 2n}$ and $N_{d \times (2d-2n)}$ such that*

$$(4.2) \quad \text{rank}(M, N) = d, \quad M J M^* - N \Theta^T N^* = 0,$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad T = \{(y, [y']) \in H : M y(0) - N \begin{pmatrix} [y, \theta_1](\infty) \\ \vdots \\ [y, \theta_{2d-2n}](\infty) \end{pmatrix} = 0\}.$$

where Θ is defined by (4.1).

Remark 4.2. If matrices M and N satisfy the conditions in Lemma 4.1, we call (M, N) a self-adjoint boundary condition. Let (M, N) and (M', N') be two self-adjoint boundary conditions. If there exists a $d \times d$ invertible matrix G such that

$$M' = GM, \quad N' = GN,$$

then (M, N) and (M', N') are regarded as one self-adjoint boundary condition.

Lemma 4.3. Assume that $(A_1) - (A_3)$ hold and let $\lambda < \lambda_0$. Then (1.1) has d linearly independent solutions $\tilde{y}_1(t), \tilde{y}_2(t), \dots, \tilde{y}_n(t), \hat{y}_1(t), \hat{y}_2(t), \dots, \hat{y}_{d-n}(t)$ in $l_W^2(\mathcal{I})$ such that

- (1) $\tilde{Y}(t) = [\tilde{y}_1(t), \tilde{y}_2(t), \dots, \tilde{y}_n(t)]$ is a recessive solution of (1.1) satisfying $\tilde{U}(1) = I_n$;
- (2) $\hat{Y}(t) = [\hat{y}_1(t), \hat{y}_2(t), \dots, \hat{y}_{d-n}(t)]$ satisfies $\hat{U}(1) = 0$ and the i_1, \dots, i_{d-n} -th rows of $\hat{V}(1)$ form I_{d-n} .
- (3) Let

$$(4.4) \quad \theta_j = \tilde{y}_{i_j}, \quad \theta_{d-n+j} = \hat{y}_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d-n.$$

Then Θ defined by (4.1) has the form

$$(4.5) \quad \Theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_{d-n} \\ -I_{d-n} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. It follows from Theorem 3.6 that the recessive solution of (1.1) exists, which is denoted by $\tilde{Y}(t)$ and satisfies $\tilde{U}(1) = I_n$. By the definition of the recessive solution, one get that the n columns of $\tilde{Y}(t)$, denote by $\tilde{y}_1(t), \tilde{y}_2(t), \dots, \tilde{y}_n(t)$, are n linear independent solutions belonging to l_W^2 .

By $y_{n+1}(t), y_{n+2}(t), \dots, y_d(t)$ denote the other $d-n$ linear independent solutions of (1.1) in $l_W^2(\mathcal{I})$, and denote $Y_1(t) = [y_{n+1}(t), y_{n+2}(t), \dots, y_d(t)]$. Then $Y_1(t)$ is a $2n \times (d-n)$ matrix-valued solution of (1.1). It is clear $\hat{Y}(t) := Y_1(t) - \tilde{Y}(t)U_1(1)$ is still a $2n \times (d-n)$ matrix-valued solution of (1.1), satisfying $\hat{U}(1) = 0$. Denote

$$\hat{Y}(t) = [\hat{y}_1(t), \hat{y}_2(t), \dots, \hat{y}_{d-n}(t)].$$

Then $\tilde{y}_1(t), \tilde{y}_2(t), \dots, \tilde{y}_n(t), \hat{y}_1(t), \hat{y}_2(t), \dots, \hat{y}_{d-n}(t)$ are d linear independent solutions of (1.1) in l_W^2 .

It follows from $\hat{U}(1) = 0$ that $\hat{V}(1)$ has rank $d-n$. We first consider the case that the first $d-n$ rows of $\hat{V}(1)$ form a $(d-n) \times (d-n)$ non-singular sub-matrix. By multiplying a $(d-n) \times (d-n)$ non-singular constant matrix from right side if necessary, we can get a new $2n \times (d-n)$ matrix-valued solution of (1.1), still denoted by $\hat{Y}(t)$, whose the first $d-n$ rows of $\hat{V}(1)$ form I_{d-n} . In this case,

$$(\tilde{Y}(1), \hat{Y}(1)) = \begin{pmatrix} I_n & O_{n \times (d-n)} \\ \hat{V}(1) & \hat{V}_1(1) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\hat{V}_1(1)$ is a $(2n-d) \times (d-n)$ matrix.

For the general case that the i_1, \dots, i_{d-n} -th rows of $\hat{V}(1)$ form a $(d-n) \times (d-n)$ non-singular sub-matrix. By multiplying a $(d-n) \times (d-n)$ non-singular constant matrix from right side if necessary, we can get a new $2n \times (d-n)$ matrix solution of (1.1), still denoted by $\hat{Y}(t)$, whose the i_1, \dots, i_{d-n} -th rows of $\hat{V}(1)$ form I_{d-n} .

Let θ_j be defined as (4.4). Then it can be verified directly that

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\theta_i, \theta_j)(1))_{1 \leq i \leq d-n, d-n+1 \leq j \leq 2d-2n} \\ &= -((\theta_i, \theta_j)(1))_{d-n+1 \leq i \leq 2d-2n, 1 \leq j \leq d-n} = I_{d-n} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$((\theta_i, \theta_j)(1))_{d-n+1 \leq i \leq 2d-2n, d-n+1 \leq j \leq 2d-2n} = 0.$$

Further, it follows from (3.20) and (3.18) that

$$\tilde{y}_j^* J \tilde{y}_k(\infty) = \tilde{y}_j^* J \tilde{y}_k(\infty) = \tilde{y}_j^*(0) J \tilde{y}_k(0) = 0, \quad 1 \leq j, k \leq d-n,$$

where the self-adjointness of H_F and $\tilde{y}_j(0) = 0$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, n$) are used. This implies that

$$((\theta_i, \theta_j)(1))_{1 \leq i, j \leq d-n} = 0.$$

So, (4.5) holds. The whole proof is complete. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Assume that $(A_1) - (A_3)$ hold. Let θ_j , $j = 1, \dots, d-n$, be defined by Lemma 4.3. Then*

$$(4.6) \quad H_F = \{(y, [y']) \in H : u(0) = 0, \quad (y, \theta_j)(\infty) = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d-n\},$$

Proof. Denote

$$(4.7) \quad T = \{(y, [y']) \in H : u(0) = 0, \quad (y, \theta_j)(\infty) = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d-n\}.$$

We first show $H_F \subset T$. For any $(y, [y']) \in H_F$, it follows from Lemma 3.10 that $u(0) = 0$. In addition, by the self-adjointness of H_F , one has

$$(y, \theta_j)(\infty) = (y, \tilde{y}_{i_j})(\infty) = (y, \tilde{y}_{i_j})(0) = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d-n,$$

where (3.20), (3.18) and $u(0) = \tilde{y}_{i_j}(0) = 0$ are used. So, $H_F \subset T$ holds.

Next, we show T is a self-adjoint extension of H_0 . It follows from Lemma 4.3 that (4.5) holds. Set

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{d \times 2n}, \quad N = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ I_{d-n} & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{d \times (2d-2n)},$$

It can be easily verified that (M, N) is a self-adjoint boundary condition and for each $y \in \mathcal{D}(H)$, it follows that

$$My(0) = \begin{pmatrix} u(0) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$N \begin{pmatrix} (y, \theta_1)(\infty) \\ \vdots \\ (y, \theta_{2d-2n})(\infty) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ (y, \theta_1)(\infty) \\ \vdots \\ (y, \theta_{d-n})(\infty) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, T is a self-adjoint extension of H_0 . This, together with $H_F \subset T$, yields that $T = H_F$. The proof is complete. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is supported by the NSF of Shandong Province, P.R. China [grant numbers ZR2020MA012 and ZR2021MA070].

REFERENCES

- [1] Calvin D. Ahlbrandt, Allan C. Peterson, *Discrete Linear Hamiltonian Systems*, Kluwer Texts in the Mathematical Sciences VOLUME 16, Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1996.
- [2] F. V. Atkinson, *Discrete and Continuous Boundary Problems*, Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1964.
- [3] J. Behrndt, S. Hassi, and H. Snoo, *Boundary Value Problems, Weyl Functions, and Differential Operators*, Monographs in Mathematics, 108, Birkhäuser, Cham 2020.
- [4] M. Benammar, W. D. Evans, *On the Friedrichs extension of semi-bounded difference operators*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 116(1994), 167–177.
- [5] M. Bohner, *Linear Hamiltonian difference systems: disconjugacy and Jacobi-type conditions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 199 (1996), 804–826.
- [6] M. Bohner, O. Došlý, W. Kraz, *Sturmian and spectral theory for discrete symplectic systems*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 361 (2009), 3109–3123.
- [7] E. A. Coddington, *Extension theory of formally normal and symmetric linear relations*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 134(1973).
- [8] R. Cross, *Multivalued Linear Operators*, New York, Marcel Dekker, 1998.
- [9] an. H. Erbe, P. Yan, *Disconjugacy for linear Hamiltonian difference systems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 167(1992), 355–367.
- [10] S. Hassia, A. Sandovicib, H.S.V. de Snooc, H. Winkler, *Extremal maximal sectorial extensions of sectorial relations*, Indagationes Mathematicae 28 (2017), 1019–1055.
- [11] D. B. Hinton, J. K. Shaw, *On the Titchmarsh-Weyl $M(\lambda)$ -Functions for linear Hamiltonian systems*, J. Differ. Equations, 40(1981), 316-342.
- [12] M. Lesch, M. Malamud, *On the deficiency indices and self-adjointness of symmetric Hamiltonian systems*, J. Differ. Equations 18(2003), 556–615.
- [13] H. Kalf, *On the characterization of the Friedrichs extension of ordinary or elliptic differential operators with astrongly singular potential*, J. Funct. Anal. 10 (1972), 230-250.
- [14] H. Kalf, *A characterization of the Friedrichs extension of Sturm-Liouville operators*, J. London Math. Soc. 17 (1978) 511-521.
- [15] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin/ Heidelberg/ New York/ Tokyo, 1984.
- [16] M. Marletta, A. Zettl, *The Friedrichs extension of singular differential operators*, J. Differ. Equ. 160 (2000), 404-421.
- [17] M. Moller, A. Zettl, *Symmetric differential operators and their Friedrichs extension*, J. Differential Equations 115 (1995) 56-69.
- [18] M. Naimark, *Linear Differential Operators, Part II, Linear Differential Operators in Hilbert Space*, Ungar Publ. Co., New York, 1968.
- [19] H.D. Niessen, A. Zettl, *The Friedrichs extension of regular ordinary differential operators*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect.A 114 (1990) 229-236.
- [20] H.D. Niessen, A. Zettl, *Singular Sturm-Liouville problems: the Friedrichs extension and comparison of eigenvalues*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 64 (1992) 545-578.
- [21] W.T. Reid, *Sturmian Theory for Ordinary Differential Equations*, Springer, New York, 1980.
- [22] G. Ren and Y. Shi, *Defect indices and definiteness conditions for a class of discrete linear Hamiltonian systems*, Appl. Math. Comp. 218(2011), 3414–3429.
- [23] G. Ren, *On the density of the minimal subspaces generated by discrete linear Hamiltonian systems*, Appl. Math. Lett. 27 (2014), 1–5.
- [24] G. Ren, Y. Shi, *Self-adjoint extensions for discrete linear Hamiltonian systems*, Linear Algebra and its Applications, 454 (2014), 1–48.
- [25] Y. Shi, *Weyl-Titchmarsh theory for a class of singular discrete linear Hamiltonian systems*, Linear Algebra Appl. 416(2006), 452–519.
- [26] Y. Shi, H. Sun, *Self-adjoint extensions for second-order symmetric linear difference equations*, Linear Algebra Appl. 434(2011), 903–930.

- [27] Y. Shi, *The Glazman-Krein-Naimark theory for Hermitian subspaces*, J. Operat. Theor. 68(2012), 241-256.
- [28] Y. Shi, G. Xu, and G. Ren, *Boundedness and closedness of subspaces of product spaces*, Linear and Multilinear Algebra, 66:2 (2018) 309-333.
- [29] H. Sun, Y. Shi, *Self-adjoint extensions for singular linear Hamiltonian systems with two singular endpoints*, J. Func. Anal., 259(2010), 2003-2027.
- [30] H. Sun, Y. Shi, *Self-adjoint extensions for singular linear Hamiltonian systems*, Math. Nachr., 284(2011), 797-814.
- [31] J. Sun, *On the self-adjoint extensions of symmetric ordinary differential operators with middle deficiency indices*, Acta Math. Sin., 2(1986), 152-167.
- [32] A. Wang, J. Sun, A. Zettl, *Characterization of domains of self-adjoint ordinary differential operators*, J. Differ. Equations, 246(2009), 1600-1622.
- [33] J. Weidmann, *Linear Operators in Hilbert Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.
- [34] C. Yang, H. Sun, *Friedrichs extensions of a class of singular Hamiltonian systems*, J. Differ. Equ. 293(2021), 359-391.
- [35] Z. Zheng, Q. Kong *Friedrichs extensions for singular Hamiltonian operators with intermediate deficiency indices*, J. Math. Ana. Appl. 461(2)(2018), 1672-1685

SCHOOL OF STATISTICS AND MATHEMATICS, SHANDONG UNIVERSITY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMICS, JINAN, SHANDONG 250014, P. R. CHINA
Email address: gjren@sdufe.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, P. R. CHINA
Email address: guixinxu_ds@163.com