

FUNCTION SPACES RELATED TO THE DIRICHLET SPACE

N. ARCOZZI, R. ROCHBERG, E. SAWYER, AND B. D. WICK

1. INTRODUCTION

We present results about spaces holomorphic of functions associated to the classical Dirichlet space. The spaces we consider have roles similar to the roles of H^1 and BMO in the Hardy space theory and we will emphasize those analogies.

Definitions and background information are in the next section. The sections after that contain results about the spaces and the functions in them. Most of the results are new but some are not; however it seemed useful to present all of them together. In the brief final section we mention some questions.

2. BACKGROUND

We begin by defining the Dirichlet and Hardy spaces in ways that emphasize the analogy between them. General background references for the Hardy space theory include [G], [D], and [N]; further information about the Dirichlet space is in [Ro] and [W2].

The Dirichlet space \mathcal{D} is the Hilbert space of holomorphic functions $f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$ on the unit disk \mathbb{D} for which

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} |f'(z)|^2 dA < \infty, \text{ equivalently, } \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 = \sum_0^{\infty} (n+1) |a_n|^2 < \infty.$$

The \mathcal{D} inner product of f and $g = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n z^n$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, g \rangle &= \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{D}} \\ &= \sum_0^{\infty} (n+1) a_n \bar{b}_n \\ &\sim f(0) \overline{g(0)} + \int_{\mathbb{D}} f'(z) \overline{g'(z)} dA. \end{aligned}$$

The Hardy space H^2 is the Hilbert space of holomorphic functions on the unit disk for which

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} |f'(z)|^2 (1 - |z|^2) dA < \infty, \text{ equivalently, } \|f\|_{H^2}^2 = \sum_0^{\infty} |a_n|^2 < \infty.$$

N.A.'s work partially supported by the COFIN project Analisi Armonica, funded by the Italian Minister for Research.

R.R.'s work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0070642.

E.S.'s work supported by the National Science and Engineering Council of Canada.

B.W.'s work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0752703.

There are fundamental differences between the functional analytic and function theoretic results for these spaces but there are also intriguing analogies, some of which we will see below.

Associated to the Hankel bilinear forms which we will consider in Section 6 are "weakly factored" function spaces which we now define; see [A], [ARSW], [CFR], and [CV] for other instances of this construction. Define the weakly factored space $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ to be the completion of finite sums $h = \sum f_j g_j$ using the norm

$$\|h\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} = \inf \left\{ \sum \|f_j\|_{\mathcal{D}} \|g_j\|_{\mathcal{D}} : h = \sum f_j g_j \right\}.$$

In particular if $f \in \mathcal{D}$ then $f^2 \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ and

$$(2.1) \quad \|f^2\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2.$$

The spaces $H^2 \odot H^2$ is defined analogously using the norm of H^2 . It is an immediate consequence of the inner-outer factorization for Hardy space functions that $H^2 \odot H^2 = H^1$.

We also introduce a variant of $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$. Define the space $\partial^{-1}(\partial \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D})$ to be the completion of the space of functions h such that h' can be written as a finite sum, $h' = \sum f'_j g_j$ (and thus $h = \partial^{-1} \sum (\partial f_i) g_i$), with the norm

$$\|h\|_{\partial^{-1}(\partial \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D})} = \inf \left\{ \sum \|f_j\|_{\mathcal{D}} \|g_j\|_{\mathcal{D}} : h' = \sum f'_j g_j \right\}.$$

We say that a positive measure μ supported on the closed disk is a Carleson measure for \mathcal{D} , $\mu \in CM(\mathcal{D})$, if there is a $C > 0$ so that for all $f \in \mathcal{D}$

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} |f|^2 d\mu \leq C^2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2.$$

The smallest such C is the Carleson measure norm of μ , $\|\mu\|_{CM(\mathcal{D})}$. The set of measures $CM(H^2)$ is defined and normed analogously. The measures in $CM(\mathcal{D})$ were first characterized by Stegenga [S] using capacity theoretic conditions. Measure theoretic characterizations can also be given, for instance in [ARS2].

Recall that among the equivalent definitions of BMO is that f is in BMO exactly if

$$(2.2) \quad \|f\|_{BMO}^2 \sim |f(0)|^2 + \left\| |f'|^2 (1 - |z|^2) dA \right\|_{CM(H^2)} < \infty.$$

We next introduce the space \mathcal{X} which plays a role in the Dirichlet space theory analogous to the role of BMO in the Hardy space theory. We say $f \in \mathcal{X}$ if

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 = |f(0)|^2 + \left\| |f'|^2 dA \right\|_{CM(\mathcal{D})} < \infty.$$

We denote the closure in \mathcal{X} of the space of polynomials by \mathcal{X}_0 .

Finally we define the multiplier spaces. For a space of holomorphic functions X the multiplier space, $\mathcal{M}(X)$, is the space of functions f for which multiplication by f is a bounded map of X into itself. The space is normed by the norm of the multiplication operator. It is a result going back to Setgenga [S] that $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) = H^\infty \cap \mathcal{X}$; here H^∞ is the space of bounded holomorphic functions on the disk. The analogous result $\mathcal{M}(H^2) = H^\infty \cap BMO$ also holds but it is never presented that way because $H^\infty \subset BMO$.

Here is a summary of relations between the spaces. The duality pairings are with respect to the Dirichlet pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Theorem 1. *We have*

- (1) $\mathcal{X}_0^* = \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$,
- (2) $(\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D})^* = \mathcal{X}$,
- (3) $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) = H^\infty \cap \mathcal{X}$,
- (4) $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D} = \partial^{-1}(\partial \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D})$.

Proof discussion. As we mentioned (3) is proved in [S].

A result essentially equivalent to $(\partial^{-1}(\partial \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}))^* = \mathcal{X}$ was proved by Coifman-Muri [CM] using real variable techniques and in more function theoretic contexts by Tolokonnikov [To] and by Rochberg-Wu [RW]. An interesting alternative approach to the result is given by Treil and Volberg in [TV].

In [W1] it is shown that $\mathcal{X}_0^* = \partial^{-1}(\partial \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D})$. Item (2) is proved in [ARSW] and when that is combined with the other results we obtain (1) and (4). \square

Statement (2) of the theorem is the analog of Nehari's characterization of bounded Hankel forms on the Hardy space, recast using the identification $H^2 \odot H^2 = H^1$ and Fefferman's duality theorem. Item (1) is the analog of Hartman's characterization of compact Hankel forms. Statement (4) is similar in spirit to the weak factorization result for Hardy spaces given by Aleksandrov and Peller in [AP] where they study Foguel-Hankel operators on the Hardy space.

Given the previous theorem it is easy to check the inclusions

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) \subset \mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$$

which we will use later.

3. SIZE

In this section we obtain norm and pointwise estimates for the functions in $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ and \mathcal{X} . We begin by recalling the basic results for the Dirichlet space.

For $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$ define functions δ and L by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\zeta) &= 1 - |\zeta|^2 \\ L(\zeta) &= 1 + \log \delta(\zeta)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall [G, Section 1.1] that the pseudohyperbolic metric, ρ , on the disk is given by

$$\rho(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = \left| \frac{\zeta_1 - \zeta_2}{1 - \overline{\zeta_1} \zeta_2} \right|$$

and satisfies $0 \leq \rho < 1$. The hyperbolic distance, β , is given by

$$(3.1) \quad \beta(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = \log \left(\frac{1 + \rho(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)}{1 - \rho(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)} \right).$$

On subsets of $\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$ on which $\rho \leq c < 1$ we have $\rho \sim \beta$. However for highly separated points we have estimates such as $\beta(0, \zeta) \sim L(\zeta)$ as $|\zeta| \rightarrow 1$.

For $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$ the reproducing kernel (for \mathcal{D}), which is characterized by the property that for $f \in \mathcal{D}$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$ we have $f(\zeta) = \langle f, k_\zeta \rangle$, is given by the formula

$$k_\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{\zeta z} \log \frac{1}{(1 - \overline{\zeta} z)}.$$

One has that for $\zeta, \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{D}$

$$(3.2) \quad \|k_\zeta\|_{\mathcal{D}} = L(\zeta)^{1/2},$$

$$(3.3) \quad \|\bar{\partial}_\zeta k_\zeta\|_{\mathcal{D}} \sim \delta(\zeta)^{-1},$$

$$(3.4) \quad \|k_{\zeta_1} - k_{\zeta_2}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \sim \frac{\beta(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)}{1 + \beta(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)^{1/2}} \lesssim \beta(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)^{1/2}.$$

The first two are straightforward. For the third we introduce the space $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ of functions in \mathcal{D} which vanish at the origin and which is normed by $\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n z^n\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}^2 = \sum n |a_n|^2$. The reproducing kernels for $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ are the functions $\tilde{k}_\zeta(z) = -\log(1 - \bar{\zeta}z)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|k_{\zeta_1} - k_{\zeta_2}\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 &= \sup \{ |\langle f, k_{\zeta_1} - k_{\zeta_2} \rangle| : f \in \mathcal{D}, \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}} = 1 \}^2 \\ &= \sup \{ |\langle f, k_{\zeta_1} - k_{\zeta_2} \rangle| : f \in \mathcal{D}, f(0) = 0, \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}} = 1 \}^2 \\ &\sim \sup \left\{ \left| \langle f, \tilde{k}_{\zeta_1} - \tilde{k}_{\zeta_2} \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \right| : f \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}, \|f\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} = 1 \right\}^2 \\ &= \left\| \tilde{k}_{\zeta_1} - \tilde{k}_{\zeta_2} \right\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}^2 = \left\langle \tilde{k}_{\zeta_1} - \tilde{k}_{\zeta_2}, \tilde{k}_{\zeta_1} - \tilde{k}_{\zeta_2} \right\rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} \\ &= -\log(1 - |\zeta_1|^2) - \log(1 - |\zeta_2|^2) + 2\log|1 - \bar{\zeta}_1\zeta_2| \\ (3.5) \quad &= -\log \frac{(1 - |\zeta_1|^2)(1 - |\zeta_2|^2)}{|1 - \bar{\zeta}_1\zeta_2|^2} = -\log \left(1 - \left| \frac{\zeta_1 - \zeta_2}{1 - \bar{\zeta}_1\zeta_2} \right|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.6) \quad = \log \left(\frac{1 + \rho(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)}{1 - \rho(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)} \right) - 2\log(1 + \rho(\zeta_1, \zeta_2))$$

$$(3.7) \quad = \beta(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) - 2\log(1 + \rho(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)).$$

The passage from the first line to the second uses the fact that replacing $f(z)$ by $f(z) - f(0)$ gives a better competitor for calculating the first supremum. The passage to the third line uses the fact that the identity map is a bounded invertible map of $\{f \in \mathcal{D}, f(0) = 0\}$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. The equality in (3.5) is a computational identity, see [G, Section 1.1], and the final line is obtained using (3.1).

If $\rho \leq c < 1$ then we have $\rho \sim \beta$ and the desired estimate can be seen from (3.6). For $\rho \sim 1$ we estimate using the last line.

From these estimates follow pointwise estimates for $f \in \mathcal{D}$;

$$(3.8) \quad \sup \{|f(\zeta)| : \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}} \leq 1\} \sim L(\zeta)^{1/2},$$

$$(3.9) \quad \sup \{|f'(\zeta)| : \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}} \leq 1\} \sim \delta(\zeta)^{-1},$$

$$(3.10) \quad \sup \{|f(\zeta_1) - f(\zeta_2)| : \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}} \leq 1\} \lesssim \beta(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)^{1/2}.$$

In such estimates will refer to the fact that the left side is dominated by the right as the *upper estimate*, the other as the *lower estimate*.

We now give estimates for k_ζ , $\bar{\partial}_\zeta k_\zeta$ and related functions in \mathcal{X} and $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$. We omit rewriting them in the forms such as (3.8), (3.9), and (3.10).

Theorem 2. *For $\zeta, \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{D}$ we have*

(1) (norm estimates in \mathcal{X})

$$(3.11) \quad \|k_\zeta\|_{\mathcal{X}} \sim L(\zeta),$$

$$(3.12) \quad \|\bar{\partial}_\zeta k_\zeta\|_{\mathcal{X}} \sim L(\zeta)^{1/2} \delta(\zeta)^{-1},$$

$$(3.13) \quad \|k_{\zeta_1} - k_{\zeta_2}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \lesssim \beta(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)^{1/2} \left(L(\zeta_1)^{1/2} + L(\zeta_2)^{1/2} \right),$$

(2) (norm estimates in $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$)

$$(3.14) \quad \|k_\zeta\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \sim \log(1 + L(\zeta)),$$

$$(3.15) \quad \|k_\zeta^2\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \sim L(\zeta),$$

$$(3.16) \quad \|\bar{\partial}_\zeta k_\zeta\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \sim L(\zeta)^{-1/2} \delta(\zeta)^{-1}.$$

For $\theta > 0$ we have

$$(3.17) \quad \left\| \left(\frac{1 - |\zeta|^2}{1 - \bar{\zeta}z} \right)^\theta \right\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \sim L(\zeta)^{-1/2}.$$

The implied constant here may depend on θ .(3) (a relatively large function in \mathcal{X})The function $H(z)$ defined by

$$H(z) = \int_{1/2}^1 \log \left(\frac{1}{1 - zx} \right) \frac{1}{(1 - x) [\log(1 - x)]^2} dx$$

satisfies both

$$(3.18) \quad \|H\|_{\mathcal{X}} < \infty, \text{ and}$$

$$H(\zeta) = \log(|\log(1 - \zeta)|) + O(1) \text{ for } \zeta \in (.9, 1).$$

(4) (norms of monomials)

For $n = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$(3.19) \quad \|z^n\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \sim \sqrt{n},$$

$$(3.20) \quad \|z^n\|_{\mathcal{X}} \sim \sqrt{n}.$$

Proof. We first note that the estimates (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) imply the upper estimates in (3.11), (3.12), and (3.13). More precisely if one starts with a representation $h = \sum f_j g_j$ of $h \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ which is almost optimal and then applies the estimate (3.8) to all of the f 's and g 's we find $|h(\zeta)| \lesssim L(\zeta) \|h\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}}$. Taking note of the fact that $(\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D})^* = \mathcal{X}$ this gives the upper estimate in (3.11). If we start with the same representation of h , compute h' and apply the estimates (3.8) and (3.9) we conclude

$$|h'(\zeta)| \lesssim L(\zeta)^{1/2} \delta(\zeta)^{-1} \|h\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}}.$$

This gives the upper estimate for a functional in the dual space, this time the upper estimate in (3.12). Similarly, we obtain (3.13) by showing that for a unit vector $h \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ we have a good estimate for $|h(\zeta_1) - h(\zeta_2)|$. Using the identity

$$(3.21) \quad fg = \frac{1}{4}((f + g)^2 - (f - g)^2)$$

we see that we can write $h = \sum h_j^2$ with $\sum \|h_j\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 = O(1)$. For each term we have

$$|h_j^2(\zeta_1) - h_j^2(\zeta_2)| \leq |h_j(\zeta_1) - h_j(\zeta_2)| \{ |h_j(\zeta_1)| + |h_j(\zeta_2)| \}.$$

We apply (3.4) to the first factor on the right and (3.2) to the terms inside the braces and obtain

$$|h_j^2(\zeta_1) - h_j^2(\zeta_2)| \lesssim \beta(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)^{1/2} (L(\zeta_1)^{1/2} + (L(\zeta_2)^{1/2}) \|h_j\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2.$$

Summing with respect to j gives the desired estimate for h .

We now consider the corresponding lower estimates. Note that $k_\zeta(\zeta) \sim L(\zeta)$. Using the upper estimate in (3.11) and duality we have

$$L(\zeta)^2 \sim |k_\zeta(\zeta)^2| = |\langle k_\zeta^2, k_\zeta \rangle| \leq \|k_\zeta^2\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \|k_\zeta\|_{\mathcal{X}} \lesssim \|k_\zeta^2\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} L(\zeta).$$

Comparing the right side and the left we obtain the lower estimate in (3.15). With that estimate in hand we compare the left side with the fourth term and obtain the lower estimate in (3.11).

We now prove the upper estimate for (3.17) as a separate lemma.

Lemma 1. *Pick and fix $\theta > 0$ and $\zeta \in \mathcal{D}$. Define*

$$G_{\zeta, \theta}(z) = G_\theta(z) = \left(\frac{1 - |\zeta|^2}{1 - \bar{\zeta}z} \right)^\theta.$$

We have

$$\|G_{\zeta, \theta}\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \lesssim L(\zeta)^{-1/2}.$$

Proof of Lemma. We will use the auxiliary function Λ ,

$$\Lambda(z) = 3i - \log(1 - \bar{\zeta}z).$$

The constant $3i$ insures $\text{Im}(\Lambda) > 1$ and in particular we can work freely with powers of Λ . Set $G_1 = G_\theta \Lambda^{-3/4}$ and $G_2 = \Lambda^{3/4}$; thus $G_\theta = G_1 G_2$. We will obtain the upper estimate in (3.17) using

$$(3.22) \quad \|G_\theta\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}}^2 \leq \|G_1\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \|G_2\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2.$$

Without loss of generality we assume ζ is real and positive. We only need to consider the case of ζ close to 1. Set $\zeta = 1 - \gamma$ and $z = 1 + w$, hence $\gamma \sim \delta = \delta(\zeta)$ and $1 - \bar{\zeta}z = \gamma - w + \gamma w$. We compute

$$G_1'(z) = \theta \bar{\zeta} \frac{\delta^\theta}{(1 - \bar{\zeta}z)^{\theta+1} \Lambda^{3/4}} + \frac{3\bar{\zeta}}{4} \frac{\delta^\theta}{(1 - \bar{\zeta}z)^{\theta+1} \Lambda^{7/4}}$$

and

$$G_2'(z) = \frac{3\bar{\zeta}}{4} \frac{1}{(1 - \bar{\zeta}z) \Lambda^{1/4}}.$$

We break \mathbb{D} into regions beginning with $R_0 = \mathbb{D} \cap \{w : |w| \leq \gamma\}$. In R_0 we have $\text{Re } w \leq 0$ and hence $|\gamma - w + \gamma w| \geq \text{Re}(\gamma - w + \gamma w) \geq \gamma + O(\gamma^2) \geq c\gamma$. Hence for $z \in R_0$

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma &\lesssim |1 - \bar{\zeta}z| \lesssim 1, \\ 1 + |\log \gamma| &\lesssim |\Lambda|. \end{aligned}$$

For $n = 1, 2, \dots$ we set $R_n = \mathbb{D} \cap \{w : 2^{n-1}\gamma \leq |w| \leq 2^n\gamma\}$ and denote by n_0 the largest n for which $R_n \neq \emptyset$; thus $n_0 \sim |\log \delta|$. For $z \in R_n$, $1 \leq n \leq n_0$, we have

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} |1 - \bar{\zeta}z| &\sim 2^n \gamma, \\ 1 + |\log 2^n \gamma| &\lesssim |\Lambda|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the second of those estimates into account we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_1\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left| \frac{\delta^\theta}{(1 - \bar{\zeta}z)^{\theta+1} \Lambda^{3/4}} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\delta^\theta}{(1 - \bar{\zeta}z)^{\theta+1} \Lambda^{7/4}} \right|^2 \\ &\lesssim \delta^{2\theta} \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left| \frac{1}{(1 - \bar{\zeta}z)^{\theta+1} \Lambda^{3/4}} \right|^2 \\ &\lesssim \delta^{2\theta} \sum_{n=0}^{n_0} \int_{R_n} \frac{1}{|1 - \bar{\zeta}z|^{2\theta+2} |\Lambda|^{3/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate each integral using (3.23) or (3.24) and the fact that $\text{Area}(R_n) \lesssim 2^{2n} \gamma^2 \sim 2^{2n} \delta^2$. We continue with

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_1\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 &\lesssim \delta^{2\theta+2} \sum_{n=0}^{n_0} 2^{2n} \frac{1}{(2^n \delta)^{2\theta+2} (1 + |\log 2^n \gamma|)^{3/2}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{n_0} \frac{1}{2^{2n\theta} (1 + |\log 2^n \gamma|)^{3/2}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^A + \sum_{n=A}^{n_0} \end{aligned}$$

where A is the largest integer for which $2^A \sqrt{\gamma} < 1$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_1\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 &\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^A + \sum_{n=A}^{n_0} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{|\log \gamma|^{3/2}} \sum_{n=0}^A \frac{1}{2^{2n\theta}} + \sum_{n=A}^{n_0} \frac{1}{2^{2n\theta}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{|\log \gamma|^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{(2^A)^{2\theta}} \lesssim \frac{1}{|\log \gamma|^{3/2}} + \delta^\theta \\ (3.25) \quad &\lesssim \frac{1}{|\log \gamma|^{3/2}} \sim \frac{1}{|\log \delta|^{3/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_2\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{D}} |G'_2|^2 \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{1}{|1 - \bar{\zeta}z|^2 |\Lambda|^{1/2}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{n_0} \int_{R_n} \frac{1}{|1 - \bar{\zeta}z|^2 |\Lambda|^{1/2}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{n_0} (2^n \delta)^2 \frac{1}{(2^n \delta)^2 (1 + |\log 2^n \gamma|)^{1/2}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n < c|\log \delta|} \frac{1}{(1 + |\log \gamma| - n \log 2)^{1/2}} \\ (3.26) \quad &\lesssim |\log \gamma|^{1/2} \sim |\log \delta|^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.25) and (3.26) in (3.22) and recalling that $L(\zeta) \sim |\log \delta(z)|$ completes the proof of the lemma. \square

We now have the upper estimates for (3.12) and (3.17). Next pick and fix $\theta > 0$ and $\zeta \in \mathcal{D}$. Recalling the duality of $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ and \mathcal{X} we have

$$\delta(\zeta)^{-1} \sim \left| \frac{d}{dz} G_{\zeta, \theta}(z) \right|_{z=\zeta} = |\langle G_{\zeta, \theta}, \bar{\partial}_{\zeta} k_{\zeta} \rangle| \leq \|G_{\zeta, \theta}\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \|\bar{\partial}_{\zeta} k_{\zeta}\|_{\mathcal{X}}$$

which, given the upper estimates, forces the corresponding lower estimates.

We move to estimates for norms in $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$. First we consider (3.14). By (2.1) it is enough to show that $\|k_{\zeta}^{1/2}\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \lesssim \log(1 + L(\zeta))$. We argue as in the previous lemma. Continuing the notation from that lemma we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|k_{\zeta}^{1/2}\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{D}} |k_{\zeta}^{-1/2} k'_{\zeta}|^2 \sim \int_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{1}{|1 - \bar{\zeta}z|^2 |\log(1 - \zeta z)|} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{n_0} (2^n \delta)^2 \frac{1}{(2^n \delta)^2 \inf \{|\log(1 - \zeta z)| : z \in R_n\}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n < c|\log \delta|} \frac{1}{(1 + |\log \gamma| - n \log 2)} \\ &\lesssim |\log(c_1 + c_2 |\log \delta|)|^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant c_1, c . Recalling the relationship between δ and L completes the proof of the upper estimate for (3.14).

The upper estimate for (3.15) is an immediate consequence of (2.1) and (3.2). The lower estimate is a consequence of the upper estimate for (3.11), duality and the computation

$$L(\zeta)^2 = \langle k_{\zeta}^2, k_{\zeta} \rangle \leq \|k_{\zeta}^2\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \|k_{\zeta}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \sim \|k_{\zeta}^2\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} L(\zeta).$$

For (3.16) one checks that

$$\left| \frac{d}{dz} (\bar{\partial}_{\zeta} k_{\zeta}) \right| \sim \frac{1}{\delta} \left| \frac{1 - |\zeta|^2}{1 - \bar{\zeta}z} \right|.$$

The upper and lower estimates (3.16) now follow from those in (3.17).

We now establish (3.18) and hence also the lower estimate for (3.16). If μ is a positive measure supported on $[1/2, 1]$ which satisfies

$$(3.27) \quad \mu([x, 1]) \lesssim \frac{-1}{\log(1 - x)}.$$

then $\mu \in CM(\mathcal{D})$ see, for instance, [ARS]. In particular the measure on $[1/2, 1]$ given by

$$d\mu(x) = \frac{1}{(1 - x) [\log(1 - x)]^2} dx$$

is in $CM(\mathcal{D})$. Hence by Theorem 5 below we know that $\|H\|_{\mathcal{X}} < \infty$. Next we estimate $H(\zeta)$ for $\zeta \in (.9, 1)$. Pick and fix ζ .

$$\begin{aligned} H(\zeta) &= \int_{1/2}^1 \log\left(\frac{1}{1 - \zeta x}\right) \frac{1}{(1 - x) [\log(1 - x)]^2} dx \\ &= \int_{1/2}^{\zeta} \dots + \int_{\zeta}^1 \dots \end{aligned}$$

Now note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1-\zeta x}{1-x} &= O(1); \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq \zeta, \\ \frac{1-\zeta x}{1-\zeta} &= O(1); \quad \zeta \leq x \leq 1, \text{ and} \\ \int_{1/2}^1 d\mu &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we can continue our estimate of $H(\zeta)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} H(\zeta) &= \int_{1/2}^{\zeta} -\log(1-x) \frac{dx}{(1-x)[\log(1-x)]^2} \\ &\quad - \log(1-\zeta) \int_{\zeta}^1 \frac{dx}{(1-x)[\log(1-x)]^2} + O(1) \\ &= \int_{1/2}^{\zeta} \frac{-dx}{(1-x)\log(1-x)} - \log(1-\zeta) \int_{\zeta}^1 \frac{dx}{(1-x)[\log(1-x)]^2} + O(1) \\ &= \log(|\log(1-\zeta)|) + O(1) - \log(1-\zeta) \frac{-1}{\log(1-\zeta)} \\ &= \log(|\log(1-\zeta)|) + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

as required.

To obtain the upper estimate in (3.19) note that $\|z^n\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \leq \|z^n\|_{\mathcal{D}} \|1\|_{\mathcal{D}} \sim \sqrt{n}$. To obtain the upper estimate in (3.20) we compute the Carleson measure norm of the measure $d\mu = |f'|^2 dx dy$ for the function $f(z) = z^n$. The measure only depends on $|z|$ hence the norm is the maximum of the quantities

$$A_k = \frac{1}{\|z^k\|_{\mathcal{D}}} \left(\int |z^k|^2 d\mu \right)^{1/2}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Doing the integration yields $A_k \sim n/\sqrt{(k+1)(n+k+1)}$ which has a maximum $n/\sqrt{n+1} \sim \sqrt{n}$ at $k = 0$. These two upper estimates imply the two lower estimates because $n \sim \langle z^n, z^n \rangle \lesssim \|z^n\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \|z^n\|_{\mathcal{X}}$. \square

Remark 1. *There is an alternative approach to the upper estimate in (3.14), the growth estimates for $f \in \mathcal{X}$. If $f \in \mathcal{X}$ then for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^{k+1}\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 &= \int \int \left| \frac{d}{dz} f^{k+1} \right|^2 dA \\ &= \int \int (k+1)^2 |f'|^2 |f^k|^2 dA \\ &\leq (k+1)^2 \left\| |f'|^2 dA \right\|_{CM(\mathcal{D})} \|f^k\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \\ &\leq (k+1)^2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \|f^k\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This computation gives both the starting and inductive step in showing $\|f^k\|_{\mathcal{D}} = O(k!) \|f\|_{\mathcal{X}}$. Using those estimates we see that if ε is small we can sum the series for $g = \exp(\varepsilon f)$ and conclude that $g \in \mathcal{D}$. The upper estimate in (3.14) follows from applying (3.8) to the function $g \in \mathcal{D}$.

4. COEFFICIENTS

The norm of a function in \mathcal{D} is unchanged if each Taylor coefficient is replaced by its modulus. This has consequences for the Taylor coefficients of functions in $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ and those in \mathcal{X} .

Theorem 3. *We have*

- (1) *If $a(z) = \sum a_n z^n \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ then there is a $b(z) = \sum b_n z^n \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ with $|a_n| \leq b_n$ and $\|b\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \leq C \|a\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}}$.*
- (2) *Suppose $c(z) = \sum c_n z^n \in \mathcal{X}$ with $c_n \geq 0$. Given $\{d_n\}$ with $|d_n| \leq c_n$ then $d(z) = \sum d_n z^n \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\|d\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq C \|c\|_{\mathcal{X}}$.*

Proof. The first statement is a direct consequence of the definitions and the comment before the theorem. The second follows from the first and the duality statement; item (2) in Theorem 1. \square

We will call a sequence of positive integers $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ lacunary if there is a $q > 1$ so that $\forall k, n_{k+1}/n_k > q$ and we say that a function $d(z) = \sum d_n z^n$ has a lacunary power series if $\{n : d_n \neq 0\}$ is a lacunary sequence.

As we note in the proof, parts of the following theorem were first obtained by Brown and Shields [BS] building on earlier work by Taylor [T].

Theorem 4. *We have*

- (1) *If $a(z) = \sum a_n z^n \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ then $\sum \frac{|a_n|}{1+\log(n+1)} < \infty$.*
- (2) *Suppose $b(z) = \sum b_n z^n$;*
 - (a) *If $|b_n| \leq \frac{C}{(n+1)(1+\log(n+1))}$ then $b(z) \in \mathcal{X}$.*
 - (b) *If $\sum n \log(n+1) |b_n|^2 < \infty$ then $b(z) \in \mathcal{X}$.*
- (3) *Suppose $d(z)$ has a lacunary power series; then the following are equivalent:*
 - (a) $d \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D})$,
 - (b) $d \in \mathcal{X}$,
 - (c) $d \in \mathcal{D}$,
 - (d) $d \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$.
- (4) *Suppose $f(z) = \sum f_n z^n \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$; then for any lacunary set N ,*

$$\sum_{n \in N} n |f_n|^2 < \infty.$$

Proof. By the first part of the previous theorem it suffices to prove the first statement for a power series with positive coefficients, $a(z) = \sum a_n z^n$, $a_n \geq 0$. In that case we know $a(x) \geq 0$ for $0 \leq x < 1$. Select a positive measure μ supported on the interval $(0, 1)$ with the property that $\mu((x, 1)) \sim (\log(1-x))^{-1}$. Such a measure will be a Carleson measure for \mathcal{D} . Hence $a \rightarrow \int a d\mu$ is a bounded linear functional on $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ (Proposition 1 below). We also have

$$\int r^n d\mu \geq \int_{1-1/n}^1 r^n d\mu \geq c \int_{1-1/n}^1 d\mu \geq \frac{c}{|\log(1/n)|}.$$

Thus

$$\|a\| \geq C \int a d\mu \geq C' \sum \frac{a_n}{1 + \log(n+1)}.$$

Part (2a) follows from part (1) together with part (2) of the previous theorem. The statement (2b) is a result of Brown and Shields. Although they use different language they prove (2b) on page 299 of [BS].

We turn to (3). By the inclusions (2.3) we have $(3a) \implies (3b) \implies (3c) \implies (3d)$. Proposition 20 of [BS] is the statement that for lacunary series $(3c) \implies (3a)$. To finish we show that $(3d) \implies (3c)$. Suppose $d(z)$ is given by a lacunary series and is in $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$. We want to show $d \in \mathcal{D}$. Because \mathcal{D} is a Hilbert space it suffices to have good estimates of $|\langle d, h \rangle|$ for $h \in \mathcal{D}$, $\|h\| = 1$. If we replace h by j which has the same Taylor coefficients as h for the indices for which $d_n \neq 0$ and has its other coefficients 0 then we have both $\langle d, h \rangle = \langle d, j \rangle$ and $\|j\| \leq \|h\|$. Hence it suffices to estimate $|\langle d, j \rangle|$. Using the fact that $(3c) \implies (3a)$, the inclusions (2.3), and item (2) of Theorem 1 we have

$$j \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) \subset \mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D})^*.$$

Hence d , which we assumed was in $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ pairs with j with the appropriate estimates.

To prove (4) note that by (3) given any sequence $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n |g_n|^2 = 1$ the function $g = \sum g_n z^n$ is in \mathcal{X} with uniformly bounded norm. Pairing g with f and taking the supremum over g gives the conclusion. \square

Part (2a) of the theorem rests on the fact that Carleson measures supported on the interval $(0,1)$ are easy to characterize. Part (2b) of the theorem rests on the fact that it is easy to characterize the measures μ for which the natural densely defined inclusion of \mathcal{D} into $L^2(\mu)$ extends to a map in the Hilbert Schmidt class; see the second part of Theorem 8 below.

With one exception these results are analogous to Hardy space results. Part (1) is the analog of Hardy's inequality which states that if $a \in H^1$ then $\sum |a_n| / (n+1) < \infty$. The duality of H^1 and BMO then gives an analog of (2a). Statement (2b) is the analog of the fact that the Hilbert space \mathcal{D} is contained in BMO , a standard result which can be given a simple proof by adapting the proof of (2b) in [BS]. Statement (3) is the analog of the basic Littlewood-Paley result for the Hardy spaces: if $f(z)$ has a lacunary power series and is in one of the spaces H^p , $p > 0$, or BMO then it is in all of them. This is where there is a small exception to the general analogy. It is straightforward that having f in H^2 with a lacunary power series does not force $f \in H^\infty$ and it is equally straightforward that if such an f is in \mathcal{D} then it is bounded. The final statement is the analog of Paley's theorem that if $f \in H^1$ and N is a lacunary set then $\sum_{n \in N} |f_n|^2 < \infty$.

5. CARLESON MEASURES AND INTERPOLATION

5.1. Carleson Measures. We will say μ is a Carleson measure for $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$, $\mu \in CM(\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D})$, if there is a $C > 0$ so that for all f in $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} |f| d\mu \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}}.$$

Proposition 1. $CM(\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}) = CM(\mathcal{D})$.

Proof. This follows immediately from the definitions, (2.1), and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. \square

One can also ask for which *complex* measures $\int_{\mathbb{D}} f d\mu$ will be bounded; that is, when are there estimates

$$(5.1) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{D}} f d\mu \right| \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D},$$

$$(5.2) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{D}} f^2 d\mu \right| \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{D}?$$

The answer is the same in both cases. Given a finite complex measure μ define its Dirichlet projection $P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\mu}(w)$ by

$$P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\mu}(w) = \int_{\mathbb{D}} \log \left(\frac{1}{1 - w\bar{z}} \right) d\bar{\mu}(z).$$

(Here $\bar{\mu}$ is the complex conjugate of the measure μ .)

Theorem 5. *Given a finite complex measure μ on the disk, estimate (5.1), or equivalently (5.2), holds if and only if $P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. To obtain the first statement compute with monomials to check that $\int_{\mathbb{D}} f d\mu = \langle f, P_B\mu \rangle$ and then invoke part (2) of Theorem 1. If $P_{\mathcal{D}}\mu \in \mathcal{X}$ then, evaluating (5.1) on the function f^2 and taking note of (2.1) we see that (5.2) holds. Finally we note that if μ is given and (5.2) holds then so does (5.1). The reason is that, again, noting (3.21), if $g \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ then g can be written as $g = \sum h_j^2$ with $h_j \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\sum \|h_j\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \leq C \|g\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}}$. \square

Corollary 1. *If $\mu \in CM(\mathcal{D})$ then*

$$B_{\mu}(w) = \int_{\mathbb{D}} (\pi + \arg(1 - w\bar{z})) d\mu(z).$$

is the real part of a function in \mathcal{X} . (We are using the branch of \arg for which $|\arg(\zeta)| \leq \pi$.)

Proof. By bringing absolute values inside the integral we see that μ satisfies (5.1). Hence $P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{X}$. Using the fact that μ is real we find $B_{\mu} = \operatorname{Re}(-iP_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{\mu} + C)$ for some constant C , as required. \square

This corollary is the analog of the fact that the bayalage of a Carleson measure for the Hardy space, a function obtained from the measure by integrating against a certain positive kernel, is the real part of a function in BMO , [G, Ch 4 Th 1.6].

5.2. Interpolating Sequences. Let $Z = \{z_i\}$ be a sequence of points in the open disk. The associated measure μ_Z is defined by

$$\mu_Z = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{L(z_j)} \delta_{z_j}.$$

Let R be the restriction map which takes a holomorphic function f to its sequence of values on Z , $\{f(z_i)\}$. The sequence Z is said to be an interpolating sequence for \mathcal{D} if R is a bounded map of \mathcal{D} into and onto $l^2(\mu_Z)$ and an interpolating sequence for $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ if R maps $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ boundedly into and onto $l^1(\mu_Z)$. It is automatic that R maps $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D})$ into $l^{\infty}(\mu_Z)$; if the map is surjective we say Z is an interpolating

sequence for $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D})$. Walking through the definitions shows that if R is bounded on either \mathcal{D} or $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ then we must have that

$$(5.3) \quad \mu_Z \text{ is a Carleson measure.}$$

(We noted earlier that $CM(\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}) = CM(\mathcal{D})$ so it is not necessary to specify further.) Also, in order for interpolation to be possible the points of Z must maintain an appropriate distance from each other. We will say Z is separated if there is a $C > 0$ so that for all $i, j, i \neq j$

$$(5.4) \quad \beta(0, z_i) \leq C\beta(z_i, z_j).$$

Theorem 6. *The following are equivalent for a sequence Z :*

- (1) Z satisfies (5.3) and (5.4),
- (2) Z is an interpolating sequence for \mathcal{D} ,
- (3) Z is an interpolating sequence for $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D})$, and
- (4) Z is an interpolating sequence for $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$.

Proof. The equivalence of the first three statements was shown in manuscripts circulated by Marshall-Sundberg [MS] and by Bishop [Bi]. The first published proof is due to B  e [Bo]. Our contribution is the equivalence of the last statement.

To show this we first note that if (5.3) holds then R maps $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ boundedly into $l^1(\mu_Z)$. To see that the map is onto, suppose $\alpha = \{\alpha_i\} \in l^1(\mu_Z)$ and we wish to find $f \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ with $f(z_i) = \alpha_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Consider sequences β and γ defined, for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ by

$$\beta_i = |\alpha_i|^{1/2}, \quad \gamma_i = |\alpha_i|^{1/2} \frac{\alpha_i}{|\alpha_i|}$$

and note that β and γ are in $l^2(\mu_Z)$. If (5.3) and (5.4) are satisfied then by the second statement Z is an interpolating sequence for \mathcal{D} . Hence we can find b and g in \mathcal{D} so that for all i , $b(z_i) = \beta_i$, $g(z_i) = \gamma_i$. The function $f = bg$ is the function in $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ that we require.

In the other direction, suppose Z is an interpolating sequence for $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$. We have noted that if R is into then (5.3) holds. To finish we show that having R be onto with the natural norm estimates forces Z to satisfy (5.4). Pick $x, y \in Z, x \neq y$. Suppose $\beta(0, x) \leq \beta(0, y)$. Because Z is an interpolating sequence we can find $f \in \mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ with $f(x) = 0, f(y) = L(y)$ and $\|f\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} = O(1)$. We now use (3.13).

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(0, y) &\sim L(y) = |f(x) - f(y)| \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \|k_x - k_y\|_{\mathcal{X}} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}} \beta(x, y)^{1/2} \left(L(x)^{1/2} + L(y)^{1/2} \right) \\ &\lesssim \beta(x, y)^{1/2} L(y)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \beta(x, y)^{1/2} \beta(0, y)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\beta(0, y) \leq C\beta(x, y)$, as required. \square

6. HANKEL TYPE MATRICES AND SCHATTEN CLASSES

6.1. The Hardy Space. A Hankel form on the Hardy space is a bilinear form generated by a holomorphic symbol function b through the formula

$$H_b^{\text{Hardy}}(f, g) = \langle fg, b \rangle_{\text{Hardy}}.$$

If $b(z) = \sum_0^\infty b(n)z^n$ then the matrix representation of the form with respect to the standard orthonormal basis of monomials is $\left(\overline{b(i+j)}\right)_{i,j=0}^\infty$. Matrices of this form, the (i, j) entry is a function of $i+j$, are called Hankel matrices. Straightforward functional analytic considerations show that the space of b for which the form is bounded is exactly the space $(H^2 \odot H^2)^*$. (Such an argument is given in detail in, for instance, [ARSW]). When this is combined with Fefferman's identification of $(H^1)^*$ with BMO we obtain the first statement of the next theorem. That statement is an endpoint of a scale of statements relating the size of the H_b^{Hardy} to the smoothness of the function b ; for $0 < p < \infty$ the form H_b^{Hardy} is in the Schatten class \mathcal{S}_p if and only if b is in the diagonal Besov space B_p . These ideas are presented systematically in [P] and [N], here we just recall a few specifics. The class \mathcal{S}_2 is the Hilbert-Schmidt class; it consists of bilinear forms with the property that their matrix entries with respect to some, and hence every, orthonormal basis are square summable. The class \mathcal{S}_1 is the trace class; it consists of bilinear forms K which can be written as $K = \sum \alpha_i R_i$ where the R_i are bilinear forms of norm one and rank one and the sequence of scalars $\{\alpha_i\}$ is absolutely summable. The Besov space B_2 coincides with the Dirichlet space \mathcal{D} . The Besov space B_1 is defined by condition (6.1) below. We have:

Theorem 7. (1) H_b^{Hardy} is bounded if and only if $b \in BMO$.
 (2) H_b^{Hardy} is in the Hilbert-Schmidt class if and only if $b \in B_2$, i.e. if and only if

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} |b'(z)|^2 dx dy < \infty.$$

(3) H_b^{Hardy} is in the trace class if and only if $b \in B_1$, i.e. if and only if

$$(6.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{D}} |b''(z)| dx dy < \infty.$$

More generally matrices of the form

$$(6.2) \quad A = (a_{ij}) = \left((i+1)^\alpha (j+1)^\beta (i+j+1)^\gamma \overline{b(i+j)} \right);$$

with

$$(6.3) \quad \min \{ \alpha, \beta \} > \max \left\{ \frac{-1}{2}, \frac{-1}{p} \right\}$$

correspond to forms in \mathcal{S}_p if and only if $b(z)$ has a certain fractional order derivative in B_p ; however that fails if (6.3) fails [P, Ch 6 Thm 8.9].

6.2. The Dirichlet Space. By a Hankel form on the Dirichlet space we mean a form generated by a holomorphic symbol function b through the formula

$$H_b^{\text{Dirichlet}}(f, g) = \langle fg, b \rangle_{\text{Dirichlet}},$$

or, more compactly, $H_b(f, g) = \langle fg, b \rangle$.

It is convenient to restrict H_b to the subspace of \mathcal{D} of functions which vanish at the origin and we do that for the rest of the section. With that restriction there is no loss in assuming $b(0) = 0$; thus $b(z) = \sum_1^\infty b_n z^n$. The matrix representation of

H_b with respect to the orthonormal basis of monomials $\{n^{-1/2}z^n\}_1^\infty$ is

$$(6.4) \quad B = (\beta_{ij}) = \left(\frac{i+j+1}{\sqrt{i+1}\sqrt{j+1}} \overline{\hat{b}(i+j)} \right)_{i,j=1}^\infty.$$

This corresponds to $\alpha = \beta = -1/2$ in (6.2), outside the range (6.3). The form considered in [CM], [To] and [RW] corresponds to $\alpha = -1/2$, $\beta = 1/2$, also outside that range.

The boundedness criteria for the forms (6.4) is known and, as expected, the Hilbert-Schmidt criterion is straightforward to obtain. One approach to the proof of the third statement in Theorem 7 is through the use of decomposition theorems. When that approach is used to study trace class membership for H_b^{Hardy} one can obtain a necessary condition for membership and a sufficient condition, and the two conditions obtained are the same. However using a similar approach to study $H_b^{\text{Dirichlet}}$ produces two different conditions. We record those results in the following theorem. They, together with their straightforward consequences by interpolation, are the state of our knowledge.

Theorem 8. (1) H_b is bounded if and only if $b \in \mathcal{X}$.
 (2) H_b is in the Hilbert-Schmidt class if and only if

$$\sum_1^\infty n \log n |b_n|^2 < \infty,$$

equivalently if and only if

$$(6.5) \quad \int_{\mathbb{D}} |b'(z)|^2 \log \left(\frac{1}{1-|z|^2} \right) dx dy < \infty.$$

(3)

(a) If H_b is in the trace class then $b \in B_1$, i.e.

$$(6.6) \quad \int_{\mathbb{D}} |b''(z)| dx dy < \infty.$$

(b) If

$$(6.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{D}} |b''(z)| \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{1-|z|^2} \right)} dx dy < \infty.$$

then H_b is in the trace class.

- (c) Neither of the two previous implications can be reversed.
 (d) In fact there is no function $\rho(r)$ increasing continuously to ∞ on $(0, 1)$ with the property that knowing H_b is in the trace class insures

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} |b''(z)| \rho(|z|) dx dy < \infty.$$

Proof. The first statement is in [ARSW].

For the second recall that H_b is in \mathcal{S}_2 if and only if it has square summable matrix entries. We start with the matrix (6.4) and compute

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j} \left| \frac{i+j+1}{\sqrt{i+1}\sqrt{j+1}} b_{i+j} \right|^2 &= \sum_k \left(\sum_{m=0}^k \frac{(k+1)^2}{(m+1)(k-m-1)} \right) |b_k|^2 \\ &= \sum_k \frac{(k+1)^2}{k} \left(\sum_{m=0}^k \frac{1}{m+1} + \frac{1}{k-m-1} \right) |b_k|^2 \\ &= \sum_k (2k \log k) (1 + O(1)) |b_k|^2 \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to the desired condition. The integral condition follows from this together with the facts that the integral in (6.5) equals

$$\sum n^2 |b_n|^2 \int_0^1 r^{2n-1} \log \left(\frac{1}{1-r^2} \right) dr$$

and

$$\int_0^1 r^{2n-1} \log \left(\frac{1}{1-r^2} \right) dr \sim \frac{\log n}{n}.$$

The arguments for the first two parts of (3) are adaptations of arguments used to obtain analogous statements for Hankel forms on the Hardy and Bergman spaces; we only present the broad strokes here. One can find such arguments presented in full in [R] or [Z].

Pick a small parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. Pick a set of points $\Omega = \{\omega_i\} \subset \mathbb{D}$ that are hyperbolically separated; $\beta(\omega_i, \omega_j) > \varepsilon$ if $i \neq j$; and also so that Ω is relatively thick,

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{D} \inf \{\beta(z, \omega_i) : \omega_i \in \Omega\} < 100\varepsilon.$$

If ε is sufficiently small then the set of functions

$$\{h_i\} = \left\{ \frac{\delta(\omega_i)}{1 - \bar{\omega}_i z} : \omega_i \in \Omega \right\} \subset \mathcal{D}$$

is the image of an orthonormal basis of a Hilbert space under a bounded linear map. This insures that if K is a trace class bilinear form then $\sum_i |K(h_i, h_i)| < \infty$. Hence if H_b is trace class then

$$\sum \left| \left\langle \frac{\delta(\omega_i)^2}{(1 - \bar{\omega}_i z)^2}, b \right\rangle \right| < \infty.$$

It is essentially true that $\left\langle (1 - \bar{\omega}_i z)^{-2}, b \right\rangle = b''(\omega_i)$. Hence

$$\sum |b''(\omega_i)| \delta(\omega_i)^2 < \infty.$$

This sum is approximately a Riemann sum for the integral (6.6). Using basic modulus of continuity estimates and the flexibility available in the construction of Ω we can construct a similar sum which is a majorant for the integral. That establishes (a).

To see that this implication cannot be reversed we consider the functions $\bar{\partial}_\zeta k_\zeta(\cdot)$ and the associated Hankel forms H_ζ given by $H_\zeta(f, g) = \langle fg, \bar{\partial}_\zeta k_\zeta \rangle$. We have

$$H_\zeta(f, g) = (fg)'(\zeta) = f'(\zeta)g(\zeta) + g'(\zeta)f(\zeta).$$

Thus the H_ζ are all rank two forms and hence their trace class norms are uniformly comparable to their operator norms. By the first part of this theorem and the estimate (3.12) we conclude that

$$(6.8) \quad \|H_\zeta\|_{\text{trace class}} \sim L(\zeta)^{1/2} \delta(\zeta)^{-1}.$$

On the other hand standard estimates show $\|\bar{\partial}_\zeta k_\zeta\|_{B_1} \sim \delta(\zeta)^{-1}$. Thus

$$\|H_\zeta\|_{\text{trace class}} \approx \|\bar{\partial}_\zeta k_\zeta\|_{B_1}.$$

We now go to the third part. Set $\tilde{H}_\zeta = L(\zeta)^{-1/2} \delta(\zeta) H_\zeta$. By the discussion in the preceding paragraph these are forms with uniformly bounded trace class norms. Hence any linear combination of them with absolutely summable coefficients is also in \mathcal{S}_1 . In particular, if we select a set Ω meeting the conditions stated earlier and let $\{\alpha(\omega_i)\}$ be a function defined on Ω with the property that

$$\sum |\alpha(\omega_i)| L(\omega_i)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

then the form K ,

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \sum \alpha(\omega_i) \delta(\omega_i) H_{\omega_i} \\ &= \sum \alpha(\omega_i) L(\omega_i)^{1/2} \tilde{H}_{\omega_i}, \end{aligned}$$

is in \mathcal{S}_1 with norm dominated by $\sum |\alpha(\omega_i)| L(\omega_i)^{1/2}$.

The symbol function b of K is

$$b(z) = \sum \alpha(\omega_i) \delta(\omega_i) \bar{\partial}_\zeta k_\zeta|_{\zeta=\omega_i}.$$

To finish this part we invoke the following decomposition result which is a straightforward variation of the results of [Z, Sect 4.5].

Lemma 2. *Suppose ε is sufficiently small. Given a function b which satisfies (6.7) one can find scalars $\{\alpha(\omega_i)\}$ so that*

$$\begin{aligned} b(z) &= \sum \alpha(\omega_i) \delta(\omega_i) \bar{\partial}_\zeta k_\zeta|_{\zeta=\omega_i}(z) \text{ and} \\ \sum |\alpha(\omega_i)| L(\omega_i)^{1/2} &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{D}} |b''(z)| \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{1-|z|^2} \right)} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that the implication in part (c) cannot be reversed is a special case of statement (d). That statement is based on an observation of Bonami and Bruna [BB, Thm 8]. Suppose $b(z)$ is given by the lacunary series $b(z) = \sum c_k z^{3^k}$. If $\sum 3^k |c_k| < \infty$ then the matrix entries of H_b are absolutely summable and hence H_b is in the trace class. On the other hand given ρ as described it is straightforward to select the $\{c_k\}$ so that the summability condition is met but $\int |b''| \rho dx dy = \infty$. \square

7. QUESTIONS

Very little is known about the spaces \mathcal{X} and $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ or the functions in them. Here we mention some questions that seem natural.

We lack a satisfactory intrinsic characterization of the functions in these spaces. We noted that (2.2) is equivalent to the traditional definition of BMO . That definition is based on characterization of BMO functions using certain measures of

oscillation. It would be interesting to have a characterization of \mathcal{X} based on local oscillation. It would also be interesting to have a representation of functions in $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ in terms of simple building blocks, analogous to the atomic decomposition of H^1 .

There are real and complex interpolation scales with the spaces \mathcal{X} and $\mathcal{D} \odot \mathcal{D}$ as endpoints. The duality statements in Theorem 1 and basic facts from interpolation theory insure that the midpoint of those scales will be \mathcal{D} . However beyond that very special case the authors do not even have attractive conjectures for the description of the interpolation spaces.

For which b is $H_b \in \mathcal{S}_p$? Answers to similar questions have often involved Besov spaces. However the results in the previous theorem, particularly for $p < 2$, suggest that may not be the case here.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was begun while the second, third, and fourth author were visiting the Fields Institute. They thank the institute for its hospitality and its excellent working conditions.

REFERENCES

- [AP] A. Aleksandrov and V. Peller, Hankel operators and similarity to a contraction, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 1996, no. 6, 263–275.
- [A] A. Aleman, A class of integral operators on spaces of analytic functions, *Topics in Complex Analysis and Operator Theory*, Girela, Alvarez, eds, Universidad de Malaga, 2007.
- [ARS] N. Arcozzi, R. Rochberg and E. Sawyer, Carleson measures for analytic Besov spaces, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **18** (2002), 443–510.
- [ARS2] N. Arcozzi, R. Rochberg and E. Sawyer, Capacity, Carleson Measures, Boundary Convergence, and Boundary Behavior, *Perspectives in Partial Differential Equations, Harmonic Analysis and Applications*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 79, Amer. Math. Soc. 2008, 1–21.
- [ARSW] N. Arcozzi, R. Rochberg, E. Sawyer and B. Wick, Bilinear forms on the Dirichlet space, Manuscript 2008.
- [Bi] C. J. Bishop, Interpolating sequences for the Dirichlet space and its multipliers, preprint (1994).
- [Bo] B. Bøe, Interpolating sequences for Besov spaces, *J. Functional Analysis*, **192** (2002), 319–341.
- [BB] A. Bonami and J. Bruna, On truncations of Hankel and Toeplitz operators. *Publ. Mat.* 43 (1999), no. 1, 235–250.
- [BS] L. Brown and A. Shields, Cyclic vectors in the Dirichlet space, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 285 (1984), no. 1, 269–303.
- [CFR] W. Cohn, S. Ferguson, and R. Rochberg, Boundedness of higher order Hankel forms, factorization in potential spaces and derivations, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) 82 (2001), no. 1, 110–130.
- [CV] W. Cohn and I. Verbitsky, Factorization of tent spaces and Hankel operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* 175 (2000), no. 2, 308–329.
- [CM] R. Coifman and T. Murai, Commutators on the potential-theoretic energy spaces, *Tohoku Math. J.* (2) 40 (1988), no. 3, 397–407.
- [D] P. Duren, *Theory of H^p spaces*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 38 Academic Press, New York-London 1970.
- [G] J. Garnett, *Bounded analytic functions*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 236. Springer, New York, 2007.
- [MS] D. Marshall and C. Sundberg, Interpolating sequences for the multipliers of the Dirichlet space, preprint (1994), available at <http://www.math.washington.edu/~marshall/preprints/interp.pdf>.

- [N] N. Nikolski, Operators, functions, and systems: an easy reading. Vol. 1. Hardy, Hankel, and Toeplitz, Translated from the French by Andreas Hartmann. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 92. Amer. Math. Soc, 2002.
- [P] V. Peller, Hankel operators and their applications, Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [R] R. Rochberg, Trace ideal criteria for Hankel operators and commutators, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 31 (1982), no. 6, 913–925.
- [RW] R. Rochberg and Z. Wu, A new characterization of Dirichlet type spaces and applications, Illinois J. Math. 37 (1993), no. 1, 101–122.
- [Ro] W. Ross, The classical Dirichlet space, Recent advances in operator-related function theory, 171–197, Contemp. Math., 393, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.
- [S] D. Stegenga, Multipliers of the Dirichlet space, Illinois J. Math. 24 (1980), no. 1, 113–139.
- [T] G. Taylor, Multipliers on D_α , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 123 (1966) 229–240.
- [To] V. Tolokonnikov, Carleson’s Blaschke products and Douglas algebras, (Russian) Algebra i Analiz 3 (1991), no. 4, 186–197; translation in St. Petersburg Math. J. 3 (1992), no. 4, 881–892.
- [TV] S. Treil, and A. Volberg, A fixed point approach to Nehari’s problem and its applications, Toeplitz operators and related topics (Santa Cruz, CA, 1992), 165–186, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., 71, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1994.
- [W1] Z. Wu, The predual and second predual of W_α , J. Funct. Anal. 116 (1993), no. 2, 314–334.
- [W2] Z. Wu, Function theory and operator theory on the Dirichlet space, Holomorphic spaces (Berkeley, CA, 1995), 179–199, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 33, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [Z] K. Zhu, Operator theory in function spaces, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 139. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1990.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA, 40127 BOLOGNA, ITALY

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MO 63130, U.S.A

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, ONTARIO, L8S 4K1, CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LeCONTE COLLEGE, 1523 GREENE STREET, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COLUMBIA, SC 29208