

MEASURE THEORETIC ASPECTS OF THE FINITE HILBERT TRANSFORM

GUILLERMO P. CURBERA, SUSUMU OKADA, AND WERNER J. RICKER

ABSTRACT. The finite Hilbert transform T , when acting in the classical Zygmund space $L\log L$ (over $(-1, 1)$), was intensively studied in [8]. In this note an integral representation of T is established via the $L^1(-1, 1)$ -valued measure $m_{L^1}: A \mapsto T(\chi_A)$ for each Borel set $A \subseteq (-1, 1)$. This integral representation, together with various non-trivial properties of m_{L^1} , allow the use of measure theoretic methods (not available in [8]) to establish new properties of T . For instance, as an operator between Banach function spaces T is not order bounded, it is not completely continuous and neither is it weakly compact. An appropriate Parseval formula for T plays a crucial role.

1. INTRODUCTION

The finite Hilbert transform $T(f)$ of $f \in L^1(-1, 1)$ is the principal value integral

$$T(f)(t) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\int_{-1}^{t-\varepsilon} + \int_{t+\varepsilon}^1 \right) \frac{f(x)}{x-t} dx,$$

which exists for a.e. $t \in (-1, 1)$ and is a measurable function. The resulting linear operator $T: L^1(-1, 1) \rightarrow L^0(-1, 1)$ is continuous, as a consequence of Kolmogorov's theorem, [1, Theorem III.4.9(b)]. It follows from M. Riesz's theorem, [1, Theorem III.4.9(a)], that the operator T maps $L^p(-1, 1)$ into itself boundedly whenever $1 < p < \infty$. This result remains valid for a certain class of rearrangement invariant (briefly, r.i.) spaces. Indeed, given a r.i. space X , let $\underline{\alpha}_X$ and $\bar{\alpha}_X$ denote its lower and upper Boyd indices, respectively (see [1, Definition III.5.12]). From [13, pp.170–171] it follows that T maps X boundedly into itself if and only if X admits non-trivial Boyd indices, that is, if $0 < \underline{\alpha}_X \leq \bar{\alpha}_X < 1$. For example, $\underline{\alpha}_{L^p(-1,1)} = \bar{\alpha}_{L^p(-1,1)} = 1/p$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, [1, Theorem IV.4.6]. For such r.i. spaces X , the resulting linear operator $T_X: X \rightarrow X$ has been studied in [4], [6] and [7].

In [8] the operator T is investigated when acting in the classical Zygmund space $L\log L := L\log L(-1, 1)$. This is a r.i. space on $(-1, 1)$ which is close to $L^1(-1, 1)$ in the sense that it contains all r.i. spaces having non-trivial Boyd indices: the Boyd

Date: Tuesday 25th June, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 44A15, 28B05; Secondary 46E30.

Key words and phrases. Finite Hilbert transform, Zygmund space $L\log L$, vector measure, integral representation.

The first author acknowledges the support of of PID2021-124332NB-C21 FEDER/Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación and FQM-262 (Spain).

indices of $L\log L$ itself are trivial (both equal 1), which implies that T *does not* map $L\log L$ into itself. However, T *does* map $L\log L$ continuously into the strictly larger space $L^1(-1, 1)$, [8, Theorem 2.1]. It is also established in Theorem 5.6 of [8] that T cannot be extended to any r.i. domain space beyond $L\log L$ whilst still taking its values in $L^1(-1, 1)$, that is, the finite Hilbert transform $T: L\log L \rightarrow L^1(-1, 1)$, denoted by T_{\log} , is optimally defined.

The point of departure of this paper is to continue the study of T_{\log} but, from a different perspective, which then allows the use of other techniques. A crucial fact is that the finitely additive set function $m_{L^1}: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow L^1(-1, 1)$ defined on the Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{B} of $(-1, 1)$ by $m_{L^1}(A) := T(\chi_A)$, for $A \in \mathcal{B}$, actually turns out to be σ -additive, that is, m_{L^1} is a *vector measure*. This allows us to invoke relevant results from the well developed theory of integration of scalar functions with respect to Banach-space-valued measures; see, for example, [10], [15], [17], [18] and the references therein. In particular, there is available the associated Banach function space $L^1(m_{L^1})$ of all (\mathbb{C} -valued) m_{L^1} -integrable functions together with the continuous linear *integration operator* $I_{m_{L^1}}: L^1(m_{L^1}) \rightarrow L^1(-1, 1)$ given by

$$(1.1) \quad I_{m_{L^1}}(f) := \int_{(-1,1)} f \, dm_{L^1}, \quad f \in L^1(m_{L^1}).$$

One of the main results is that $L^1(m_{L^1})$ turns out to coincide with $L\log L$ and that $I_{m_{L^1}}(f) = T_{\log}(f)$ for every $f \in L^1(m_{L^1})$, that is, (1.1) provides an *integral representation* of the singular integral operator T_{\log} (cf. Theorem 4.1). This representation is used to establish various properties of T_{\log} . The fact that m_{L^1} is a rather complicated vector measure plays an important role. For instance, m_{L^1} has infinite variation over every set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ with positive Lebesgue measure and the subset $m_{L^1}(\{A \cap B : B \in \mathcal{B}\})$ is not order bounded in $L^1(-1, 1)$; see Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.6, respectively. Moreover, the range $m_{L^1}(\mathcal{B})$ of m_{L^1} is not a relatively compact subset of $L^1(-1, 1)$; see Theorem 3.10. Some consequences of such properties of m_{L^1} , together with (1.1) and the identity $I_{m_{L^1}} = T_{\log}$, are as follows. The finite Hilbert transform $T_{\log}: L\log L \rightarrow L^1(-1, 1)$ fails to be an order bounded operator (cf. Theorem 4.4), it is not a completely continuous operator (cf. Theorem 4.6) and neither is it a weakly compact operator (cf. Theorem 4.7).

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Rearrangement invariant spaces. We denote by μ the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} . The relevant measure space considered in this paper is μ restricted to the Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{B} of the open interval $(-1, 1)$, which we again denote by μ . The vector space of all \mathbb{C} -valued, \mathcal{B} -simple functions is denoted by $\text{sim } \mathcal{B}$. We denote by $L^0 := L^0(\mu)$ the vector space of all \mathbb{C} -valued measurable functions on $(-1, 1)$. Measurable functions on $(-1, 1)$ which coincide a.e. are identified. With respect to the a.e. pointwise order for its positive cone, L^0 is a complex vector lattice. The space L^0 is also a metrizable topological vector space for the topology of convergence

in measure. An order ideal X of L^0 is called a *Banach function space* (briefly, B.f.s.) based on the measure space $((-1, 1), \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ if $\text{sim } \mathcal{B} \subseteq X$ and if X is equipped with a lattice norm $\|\cdot\|_X$ for which it is complete. For brevity, we speak of X as a B.f.s. over $(-1, 1)$. A typical example of a B.f.s. over $(-1, 1)$ is the Lebesgue space $L^p := L^p(\mu)$ for each $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

A B.f.s. X has σ -order continuous norm if $\|f_n\|_X \downarrow 0$ for every sequence $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq X$ satisfying $f_n \downarrow 0$. Equivalently, every function $f \in X$ has absolutely continuous norm, meaning that $\|f\chi_{A_n}\| \downarrow 0$ whenever $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$ in \mathcal{B} (see [1, Propositions I.3.2 and I.3.5]). We say that X has the *Fatou property* if, whenever $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a norm-bounded, increasing sequence of non-negative functions in X for which $f = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f_n$ exists in L^0 , then necessarily $f \in X$ and $\|f_n\|_X \uparrow \|f\|_X$. The *associate space* X' of X is the vector sublattice of L^0 defined by $X' := \{g \in L^0 : fg \in L^1 \text{ for every } f \in X\}$ equipped with the lattice norm $\|g\|_{X'} := \sup\{|\int_{-1}^1 fg d\mu| : f \in X \text{ with } \|f\|_X \leq 1\}$. It turns out that X' is a closed linear subspace of the dual Banach space X^* of X . Moreover, X' is also a B.f.s. over $(-1, 1)$. If X has σ -order continuous norm, then $X' = X^*$; see, for example, [16, p.29].

The decreasing rearrangement $f^* : [0, 2] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ of a function $f \in L^0(-1, 1)$ is the right continuous inverse of its distribution function: $\lambda \mapsto \mu(\{t \in (-1, 1) : |f(t)| > \lambda\})$ for $\lambda \geq 0$. A *rearrangement invariant* space X over $(-1, 1)$ is a B.f.s. with the Fatou property such that if $g^* \leq f^*$ with $f \in X$, then $g \in X$ and $\|g\|_X \leq \|f\|_X$. In this case, its associate space X' is also a r.i. space, [1, Proposition II.4.2].

The Zygmund space $L \log L$ is the vector sublattice of L^0 consisting of all measurable functions f on $(-1, 1)$ for which either one of the following two equivalent conditions holds:

$$\int_{-1}^1 |f(x)| \log^+ |f(x)| dx < \infty, \quad \int_0^2 f^*(t) \log \left(\frac{2e}{t} \right) dt < \infty,$$

see [1, Definition IV.6.1 and Lemma IV.6.2]. Then $L \log L$ is a r.i. space with σ -order continuous norm given by

$$\|f\|_{L \log L} := \int_0^2 f^*(t) \log \left(\frac{2e}{t} \right) dt, \quad f \in L \log L.$$

(cf. [1, Definition IV.6.3]). The Zygmund space $L_{\text{exp}} \subseteq L^0$ is defined as the vector sublattice of all measurable functions f on $(-1, 1)$ for which there is a constant $\lambda > 0$ (depending on f) such that

$$\int_{-1}^1 \exp(\lambda |f(x)|) dx < \infty;$$

see [1, Definition IV.6.1]. It is a r.i. space when equipped with the lattice norm

$$(2.1) \quad \|f\|_{L_{\text{exp}}} := \sup_{0 < t < 2} \frac{f^{**}(t)}{\log(2e/t)}, \quad f \in L_{\text{exp}}.$$

Here, $f^{**}(t) := (1/t) \int_0^t f^*(s) ds$, for $t > 0$, is the maximal function of f^* ; see [1, Definition II.3.1]. The space L_{exp} is the associate space of $L\log L$ (up to equivalence of norms), [1, Theorem IV.6.5]. Since $L\log L$ has σ -order continuous norm, it follows that

$$(2.2) \quad L_{\text{exp}} = (L\log L)' = (L\log L)^*.$$

Moreover, the inclusions $L^\infty \subseteq L_{\text{exp}} \subseteq L^p \subseteq L\log L \subseteq L^1$ are valid, for every $1 < p < \infty$, and the corresponding natural inclusion maps are bounded; see again [1, Theorem IV.6.5].

2.2. The finite Hilbert transform. Since $0 < \underline{\alpha}_{L\log L} = \overline{\alpha}_{L\log L} = 1$ (see [1, Theorem IV.6.5]), it is the case that $T(L\log L) \not\subseteq L\log L$. Otherwise, the inclusion $T(L\log L) \subseteq L\log L$ would imply that T maps $L\log L$ boundedly into itself, which is not the case; see Section 1. However, the finite Hilbert transform T does map $L\log L$ boundedly into L^1 as ascertained in [8, Theorem 2.1], which we record formally.

Lemma 2.1. *The finite Hilbert transform T maps $L\log L$ into L^1 and the resulting linear operator $T_{\log}: L\log L \rightarrow L^1$ is bounded.*

The following Parseval formula for a pair of functions $f \in L\log L$ and $g \in L^\infty$, established in [8, Corollary 3.3], will play an important role in the sequel. An analogous Parseval formula involving a r.i. space X with non-trivial Boyd indices and its associate space X' occurs in [4, Proposition 3.1].

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f \in L\log L$ and $g \in L^\infty$. Both of the functions $fT(g)$ and $gT(f)$ belong to L^1 and satisfy*

$$(2.3) \quad \int_{-1}^1 fT(g) d\mu = - \int_{-1}^1 gT(f) d\mu.$$

From Lemma 2.2, given $g \in L^\infty$, the function $fT(g) \in L^1$ for every $f \in L\log L$. That is, $T(g) \in (L\log L)' = L_{\text{exp}}$. Consequently, T maps L^∞ into L_{exp} . Let

$$(2.4) \quad T_\infty: L^\infty \rightarrow L_{\text{exp}}$$

denote the resulting linear operator, which is necessarily bounded via the closed graph theorem. It follows from (2.2) and (2.3) that the adjoint operator $(T_{\log})^*: (L^1)^* \rightarrow (L\log L)^* = L_{\text{exp}}$ of T_{\log} equals $-T_\infty$ on $L^\infty = (L^1)^*$, that is,

$$(2.5) \quad (T_{\log})^*(f) = -T_\infty(f) \in L_{\text{exp}}, \quad f \in L^\infty.$$

Recall that given $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ a function $\phi: (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is called λ -Hölder continuous if there exists a constant $K_\phi > 0$ such that

$$|\phi(x) - \phi(t)| \leq K_\phi |x - t|^\lambda, \quad x, t \in (-1, 1).$$

Let $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ denote the Beta function and define the bounded, continuous function $w(x) := \sqrt{1 - x^2}$ for $x \in (-1, 1)$. The arcsine distribution $1/w$ belongs to L^p for all

$1 \leq p < 2$ and satisfies

$$(2.6) \quad \left(T\left(\frac{1}{w}\right)\right)(t) = \text{p.v.} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{dx}{\sqrt{1-x^2}(x-t)} = 0, \quad t \in (-1, 1).$$

[20, §4.3(14)]. The following result, together with its proof, was kindly communicated to us (privately) by Prof. D. Elliott.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ and $\phi: (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a λ -Hölder continuous function. Then*

$$(2.7) \quad w(t) \left| \left(T\left(\frac{\phi}{w}\right)\right)(t) \right| \leq \frac{2}{\pi} K_\phi B(1/2, \lambda), \quad t \in (-1, 1).$$

In particular, $wT(\phi/w) \in L^\infty$.

Proof. Fix $t \in (-1, 1)$. The proof is via a series of steps.

Step 1. Define $I_1(t) := \int_{-1}^t (t-x)^{\lambda-1} / \sqrt{1-x^2} dx$ and note that the integrand is non-negative on $(-1, t)$. For the change of variables $x = -1 + (1+t)\xi$, that is, $\xi = (1+x)/(1+t)$, we have that $(t-x) = (1+t)(1-\xi)$ and $(1-x^2) = 2(1+t)\xi(1-(1+t)(\xi/2))$. It follows that

$$(2.8) \quad I_1(t) = \frac{(1+t)^{\lambda-\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \int_0^1 \frac{(1-\xi)^{\lambda-1}}{\sqrt{\xi} \sqrt{1-(1+t)(\xi/2)}} d\xi.$$

For each $\xi \in [0, 1]$ the inequalities $0 \leq (1+t)(\xi/2) \leq (1+t)/2$ imply that

$$1 - (1+t)(\xi/2) - (1-t)/2 \geq 1 - (1+t)/2 - (1-t)/2 = 0.$$

Accordingly,

$$(2.9) \quad 0 < \left(1 - (1+t)(\xi/2)\right)^{-1/2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{1-t}}, \quad \xi \in [0, 1].$$

It follows from (2.8) and (2.9) that

$$I_1(t) \leq \frac{(1+t)^{\lambda-\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \int_0^1 \frac{\sqrt{2}(1-\xi)^{\lambda-1}}{\sqrt{\xi} \sqrt{1-t}} d\xi = \frac{(1+t)^\lambda}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} \int_0^1 \xi^{\frac{1}{2}-1} (1-\xi)^{\lambda-1} d\xi$$

and hence, via the definition of the Beta function, that

$$(2.10) \quad I_1(t) \leq B(1/2, \lambda) \frac{(1+t)^\lambda}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} = B(1/2, \lambda) \frac{(1+t)^\lambda}{w(t)}.$$

Step 2. Define $I_2(t) := \int_t^1 (x-t)^{\lambda-1} / \sqrt{1-x^2} dx$ and note that the integrand is non-negative on $(t, 1)$. Making the substitution $s = -x$ in the integral

$$I_1(-t) = \int_{-1}^{-t} \frac{(-t-x)^{\lambda-1}}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = \int_t^1 \frac{(-t+s)^{\lambda-1}}{\sqrt{1-s^2}} ds$$

shows that $I_1(-t) = I_2(t)$. Since $w(t) = w(-t)$, it follows from the previous identity and (2.10) that

$$(2.11) \quad I_2(t) = I_1(-t) \leq B(1/2, \lambda) \frac{(1-t)^\lambda}{w(t)}.$$

Step 3. In view of (2.6) we can write

$$(2.12) \quad \left(T\left(\frac{\phi}{w}\right)\right)(t) = \text{p.v.} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(t)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}(x-t)} dx.$$

Moreover, since $|x-t|$ equals $(t-x)$ for $-1 < x \leq t$ and equals $(x-t)$ for $t \leq x < 1$, the λ -Hölder continuity of ϕ together with (2.10) and (2.11) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \left| \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(t)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}(x-t)} \right| dx &\leq \frac{K_\phi}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{|x-t|^\lambda}{\sqrt{1-x^2}|x-t|} dx \\ &= \frac{K_\phi}{\pi} (I_1(t) + I_2(t)) \\ &\leq \frac{K_\phi}{\pi} B(1/2, \lambda) \frac{h(t)}{w(t)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $h(s) := (1+s)^\lambda + (1-s)^\lambda$ for $s \in (-1, 1)$. Defining $h(-1) = h(1) = 2^\lambda$ it is clear that $h \geq 0$ is continuous on $[-1, 1]$, differentiable on $(-1, 1)$ and satisfies $h(s) = h(-s)$. Since $h'(s) < 0$ for $s \in (0, 1)$, we can conclude that h is decreasing on $[0, 1]$ and so $\sup_{|s|<1} h(s) = \max_{x \in [0, 1]} h(x) = h(0) = 2$. It follows that

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \left| \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(t)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}(x-t)} \right| dx \leq \frac{2K_\phi B(1/2, \lambda)}{\pi w(t)}.$$

Accordingly, the principal value integral in (2.12) is a Lebesgue integral and so the previous inequality yields the desired inequality (2.7). \square

3. THE VECTOR MEASURE ASSOCIATED TO T

By a *vector measure* we mean a Banach-space-valued, σ -additive set function defined on a σ -algebra of subsets of some non-empty set. Given any r.i. space X over $(-1, 1)$ with non-trivial Boyd indices, the finite Hilbert transform $T_X: X \rightarrow X$ is bounded. The associated set function $A \mapsto m_X(A) := T_X(\chi_A) \in X$, for $A \in \mathcal{B}$, is clearly finitely additive. It turns out that m_X is actually σ -additive, that is, m_X is a vector measure; see [5, Section 3].

Since $T(L^\infty) \subseteq T(L^2) \subseteq L^1$ we can consider the L^1 -valued set function defined by

$$(3.1) \quad m_{L^1}(A) := T(\chi_A) \in L^1, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}.$$

Clearly, m_{L^1} is finitely additive. Actually m_{L^1} is σ -additive. Indeed, if $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$ in \mathcal{B} , then $\chi_{A_n} \rightarrow 0$ pointwise in $(-1, 1)$. The σ -order continuity of the norm in L^2 implies that $\chi_{A_n} \rightarrow 0$ in L^2 . Since T_{L^2} is continuous, it follows that $m_{L^1}(A_n) = T(\chi_{A_n}) \rightarrow 0$ in L^2 and hence, also in L^1 . So, $m_{L^1}: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow L^1$ is a vector measure. A subset

$A \in \mathcal{B}$ is called m_{L^1} -null if $m_{L^1}(B) = 0$ for all sets $B \in \mathcal{B}$ with $B \subseteq A$. Given $g \in L^\infty = (L^1)^*$, define a \mathbb{C} -valued measure $\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle$ on \mathcal{B} by

$$\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle(A) := \langle m_{L^1}(A), g \rangle, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}.$$

Proposition 3.1. *The following statements hold for the vector measure $m_{L^1}: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow L^1$.*

(i) *For each $g \in L^\infty$ it is the case that*

$$(3.2) \quad \langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle(A) = - \int_A T(g) d\mu, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}.$$

In particular, the variation measure $|\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle|$ of $\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle$ is given by

$$(3.3) \quad |\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle|(A) = \int_A |T(g)| d\mu, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}.$$

(ii) *The vector measure m_{L^1} and Lebesgue measure μ have the same null sets.*

Proof. (i) Fix $g \in L^\infty$. Apply Lemma 2.2 with $f := \chi_A$ to obtain (3.2) as

$$\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle(A) = \langle m_{L^1}(A), g \rangle = \int_{-1}^1 T(\chi_A)g d\mu = - \int_{-1}^1 \chi_A T(g) d\mu = - \int_A T(g) d\mu,$$

for every $A \in \mathcal{B}$. It is well known that (3.2) implies (3.3).

(ii) It is obvious from (3.1) that every μ -null set is m_{L^1} -null. Conversely fix an m_{L^1} -null set $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $|\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle|(A) = 0$ for every $g \in L^\infty$. For $g := \chi_{(-1,1)} \in L^\infty$, it follows from (3.3) that

$$0 = |\langle m_{L^1}, \chi_{(-1,1)} \rangle|(A) = \int_A |T(\chi_{(-1,1)})| d\mu = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_A \left| \log \left(\frac{1-t}{1+t} \right) \right| dt.$$

This implies that $\mu(A) = 0$ because $\log \left(\frac{1-t}{1+t} \right) = 0$ if and only if $t = 0$. \square

For the vector measure m_X , with X a r.i. space over $(-1, 1)$ having non-trivial Boyd indices, Proposition 3.2(iii) in [5] reveals that there exists $g_0 \in X' \subseteq X^*$ such that $\mu = |\langle m_X, g_0 \rangle|$. Such a function g_0 is called a *Rybakov functional* for m_X , [10, Theorem IX.2.2], because m_X and $|\langle m_X, g_0 \rangle|$ have the same null sets. The following result shows that an analogue is available for $X = L^1$.

Proposition 3.2. *There exists a Rybakov functional $g_0 \in L^\infty$ for m_{L^1} satisfying $\mu = |\langle m_{L^1}, g_0 \rangle|$.*

Proof. The proof is via a series of steps.

Step 1. Define the function $\Psi: (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Psi(t) := \int_0^t \frac{1 - (x/t)}{\sqrt{1 - x^2}} dx + \int_t^1 \frac{(t - x)/(1 - t)}{\sqrt{1 - x^2}} dx, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

The claim is that there exists a unique number $a \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ such that $\Psi(a) = 0$. Since $x \mapsto 1/\sqrt{1 - x^2} = 1/w(x)$ belongs to $L^1(0, 1)$ it follows by dominated convergence that Ψ is continuous on $(0, 1)$.

Given $t \in (0, 1)$, the inequalities

$$0 \leq \int_0^t \frac{1 - (x/t)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx \leq \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx$$

imply that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^t \frac{1 - (x/t)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = 0$. Moreover, for $t \rightarrow 0^+$ we also have

$$\int_t^1 \frac{(t-x)/(1-t)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = \frac{1}{1-t} \int_0^1 \frac{(t-x)\chi_{[t,1]}(x)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx \rightarrow \int_0^1 \frac{-x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx < 0,$$

again by dominated convergence. Accordingly,

$$\Psi(0^+) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \Psi(t) = - \int_0^1 \frac{x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = -1 < 0.$$

Concerning $\Psi(1^-)$ observe, again by dominated convergence, that

$$\int_0^t \frac{1 - (x/t)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = \int_0^1 \frac{1 - (x/t)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} \chi_{[0,t]}(x) dx \rightarrow \int_0^1 \frac{1-x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx$$

for $t \rightarrow 1^-$. On the other hand, the inequality

$$\left| \frac{t-x}{1-t} \right| \chi_{[t,1]}(x) = \frac{x-t}{1-t} \leq \frac{1-t}{1-t} = 1, \quad x \in [t, 1],$$

for each $t \in (0, 1)$, implies that

$$\left| \frac{t-x}{(1-t)\sqrt{1-x^2}} \right| \chi_{[t,1]}(x) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}, \quad x \in (0, 1).$$

Since $1/w \in L^1(0, 1)$, we can again apply dominated convergence to conclude that $\int_t^1 \frac{t-x}{(1-t)\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx \rightarrow 0$ for $t \rightarrow 1^-$. Accordingly,

$$\Psi(1^-) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 1^-} \Psi(t) = \int_0^1 \frac{1-x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx > 0.$$

By the intermediate value theorem there exists $a \in (0, 1)$ satisfying $\Psi(a) = 0$.

Fix $0 < t < s < 1$. From the definition of Ψ it follows that

$$\Psi(s) - \Psi(t) = \int_0^t \frac{\frac{x}{t} - \frac{x}{s}}{w(x)} dx + \int_t^s \frac{(1 - \frac{x}{s}) + \frac{x-t}{1-t}}{w(x)} dx + \int_s^1 \frac{(1-x)(s-t)}{(1-s)(1-t)w(x)} dx,$$

from which it is clear that $\Psi(s) > \Psi(t)$. Hence, Ψ is strictly increasing. Since

$$\Psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \int_0^1 \frac{1-2x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx - \int_0^1 \frac{2x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = \frac{\pi}{2} - 2 < 0,$$

the unique number $a \in (0, 1)$ such that $\Psi(a) = 0$ satisfies $\frac{1}{2} < a < 1$.

Step 2. For a as in Step 1 define $c_1 := -a$, $c_2 := 0$ and $c_3 := a$ and then the disjoint intervals $I_1 := (-1, c_1]$, $I_2 := (c_1, c_2]$, $I_3 := (c_2, c_3]$ and $I_4 := (c_3, 1)$. Now define the piecewise affine function $u: (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$u(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{a+x}{1-a}, & \text{for } x \in I_1, \\ \frac{a+x}{a}, & \text{for } x \in I_2, \\ \frac{a-x}{a}, & \text{for } x \in I_3, \\ \frac{a-x}{1-a}, & \text{for } x \in I_4. \end{cases}$$

Setting $u(-1) := u(1) := -1$, it is clear that u is an even function which is continuous on $[-1, 1]$ and satisfies $|u(x)| \leq 1$ for $x \in [-1, 1]$. Via Step 1 we note that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.4) \quad \int_{-1}^1 \frac{u(x)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx &= 2 \int_0^1 \frac{u(x)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx \\ &= 2 \left(\int_0^a \frac{1-(x/a)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx + \int_a^1 \frac{(a-x)/(1-a)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx \right) \\ &= 2\Psi(a) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The claim is that u is 1-Hölder continuous on $(-1, 1)$. Since u is piecewise affine, it is differentiable in $(-1, 1)$ except at the points c_1, c_2, c_3 , with constant derivative (at most $1/(1-a)$ in modulus) in the interior of each interval I_j , for $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Hence, given two points $x < t$ in $(-1, 1)$, an application of the mean value theorem yields

$$(3.5) \quad |u(x) - u(t)| \leq \frac{1}{1-a} |x - t|, \quad x, t \in (-1, 1),$$

by considering the possible cases that arise. Namely, both points $x, t \in I_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq 4$, or x, t lie in adjacent intervals (that is, $x \in I_j$ and $t \in I_{j+1}$, for $j = 1, 2, 3$), or $x \in I_j$ and $t \in I_{j+2}$ for $j = 1, 2$, or $x \in I_1$ and $t \in I_4$. The 1-Hölder continuity of u is clear from (3.5).

Step 3. The claim is that u satisfies the inequality

$$(3.6) \quad \left| \sqrt{1-u(x)^2} - \sqrt{1-u(t)^2} \right| \leq \left(\frac{2}{1-a} \right)^{1/2} |x-t|^{1/2}, \quad x, t \in (-1, 1).$$

To establish (3.6) will require the fact that

$$(3.7) \quad |\sqrt{y} - \sqrt{z}| \leq \sqrt{|y-z|}, \quad y, z \in (0, \infty),$$

which follows, for $y > z$, by squaring both sides. The inequality (3.7) implies that the left-side of (3.6) is at most

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sqrt{1-u(x)^2} - \sqrt{1-u(t)^2} \right| &\leq \sqrt{|u(x)^2 - u(t)^2|} = \sqrt{|u(x) - u(t)| \cdot |u(x) + u(t)|} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \sqrt{|u(x) - u(t)|}, \end{aligned}$$

because $|u(s)| \leq 1$ for $s \in (-1, 1)$; see Step 2. But, $|u(x) - u(t)| \leq \frac{1}{1-a} |x - t|$ (see (3.5)), which then implies the validity of (3.6).

Step 4. Define the function $F: (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$(3.8) \quad F(x) := \begin{cases} u(x) - i\sqrt{1 - u(x)^2}, & \text{for } x \in (-1, 0], \\ u(x) + i\sqrt{1 - u(x)^2}, & \text{for } x \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

Recall that $u \in C([-1, 1])$. Moreover, $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} F(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^-} F(x) = u(0) = 1$ and so there exists an extension $F \in C([-1, 1]) \subseteq L^\infty$. The claim is that F is $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuous on $(-1, 1)$ and satisfies

$$(3.9) \quad \int_{-1}^1 \frac{F(x)}{w(x)} dx = 0.$$

It follows from (3.5) that

$$|u(x) - u(t)| \leq \frac{|x - t|}{1 - a} = \frac{|x - t|^{1/2}|x - t|^{1/2}}{1 - a} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1 - a}|x - t|^{1/2}, \quad x, t \in (-1, 1),$$

that is, $\operatorname{Re}(F) = u$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuous. So, it suffices to show that $G := \operatorname{Im}(F)$ is also $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuous. To this end, consider the following cases.

If $t, x \in (-1, 0]$ or $t, x \in [0, 1)$, then the inequality (3.6) shows that $|G(x) - G(t)| \leq (2/(1 - a))^{1/2}|x - t|^{1/2}$.

Let $t \in (-1, 0)$ and $x \in [0, 1)$. From $u(0) = 1$ and $|u| \leq 1$ on $(-1, 1)$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |G(x) - G(t)| &= \sqrt{1 - u(x)^2} + \sqrt{1 - u(t)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{u(0) - u(x)}\sqrt{u(0) + u(x)} + \sqrt{u(0) - u(t)}\sqrt{u(0) + u(t)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}(\sqrt{u(0) - u(x)} + \sqrt{u(0) - u(t)}). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (3.5) and the inequalities $|x| \leq |x - t|$ and $|t| \leq |x - t|$ we have that

$$(3.10) \quad |G(x) - G(t)| \leq \left(\frac{2}{1 - a}\right)^{1/2} (|x|^{1/2} + |t|^{1/2}) \leq 2\left(\frac{2}{1 - a}\right)^{1/2} |x - t|^{1/2}.$$

In the case when $t \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in (-1, 0)$ a similar argument as in the previous case again yields the inequality (3.10).

We can conclude that (3.10) holds for all $x, t \in (-1, 1)$. Accordingly, G is $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuous on $(-1, 1)$ and hence, so is $F = u + iG$.

To establish (3.9), observe first that $G \in C([-1, 1])$ is an odd function and $1/w \in L^1$ is an even function, so that $\int_{-1}^1 \frac{G(x)}{w(x)} dx = 0$. This together with (3.4) establish (3.9) because $F = u + iG$.

Step 5. Setting $\phi := F$ and $\lambda := 1/2$ in Theorem 2.3 yields that $g_0 = -wT(F/w) \in L^\infty$. Fix $p \in (2, \infty)$. Since $F \in L^\infty$, we have $F \in X := L^p$ and, by (3.9), that $\int_{-1}^1 \frac{F(x)}{w(x)} dx = 0$. Also $g_0 \in X$. Since $0 < \underline{\alpha}_X = \bar{\alpha}_X < 1/2$, it follows from [4, Corollary 3.5(b)] with $f := g_0$ and $g := F$ there, that g_0 is the unique solution (in X) satisfying $T(g_0) = F$.

A direct calculation using (3.8) shows that $|F(x)| = 1$ for all $x \in [-1, 1]$. Accordingly,

$$\mu(A) = \int_A |F| d\mu = \int_A |T(g_0)| d\mu, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}.$$

On the other hand, (3.3) implies that $|\langle m_{L^1}, g_0 \rangle|(A) = \int_A |T(g_0)| d\mu$, for each $A \in \mathcal{B}$. So, $\mu = |\langle m_{L^1}, g_0 \rangle|$ with $g_0 \in L^\infty = (L^1)^*$. Hence, g_0 is a Rybakov functional for m_{L^1} satisfying $\mu = |\langle m_{L^1}, g_0 \rangle|$. \square

Remark 3.3. In Proposition 3.2 the proof of the existence of $g_0 \in L^\infty$ which satisfies $\mu = |\langle m_{L^1}, g_0 \rangle|$ is significantly more involved than proving the existence of $g_0 \in X' \subseteq X^*$, which satisfies $\mu = |\langle m_X, g_0 \rangle|$, whenever X is a r.i. space over $(-1, 1)$ with non-trivial Boyd indices (cf. [5, Proposition 3.2(iii)]). On the other hand, since $L^\infty \subseteq X' \subseteq X^*$ for all such r.i. spaces X and $m_X(A) = m_{L^1}(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}$, Proposition 3.2 is a considerable strengthening of Proposition 3.2(iii) in [5]. First, g_0 exists in the *proper subspace* L^∞ of X' and second, the *same function* $g_0 \in L^\infty$ can be chosen as a Rybakov functional satisfying $\mu = |\langle m_X, g_0 \rangle|$ for *every* X .

The variation measure $|m_{L^1}|: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ of m_{L^1} is defined as for scalar measures by replacing the absolute value with the norm in L^1 ; see [10, Definition I.1.4].

Theorem 3.4. *The vector measure $m_{L^1}: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow L^1$ has infinite variation over every set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfying $\mu(A) > 0$.*

Proof. Fix a set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\mu(A) > 0$. Then either $\mu(A \cap [0, 1]) > 0$ or $\mu(A \cap (-1, 0)) > 0$ or both. Assume that $\mu(A \cap [0, 1]) > 0$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$. Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq k < n$ we shall prove, with $A_k(n) := A \cap [(k-1)/n, k/n)$, that

$$(3.11) \quad \|m_{L^1}(A_k(n))\|_{L^1} \geq \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{A_k(n)} \log(1-y) dy + \frac{1}{\pi} (\log n) \cdot \mu(A_k(n)).$$

Since n and k are fixed, let $a := (k-1)/n$ and $b := k/n$ for ease of notation. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\chi_{A_k(n)})\|_{L^1} &= \|\chi_{(-1,b)} \cdot T(\chi_{A_k(n)})\|_{L^1} + \|\chi_{[b,1)} \cdot T(\chi_{A_k(n)})\|_{L^1} \\ &\geq \|\chi_{[b,1)} \cdot T(\chi_{A_k(n)})\|_{L^1} = \int_b^1 |T(\chi_{A_k(n)})(x)| dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_b^1 \left| \text{p.v.} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\chi_{A_k(n)}(y)}{y-x} dy \right| dx = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_b^1 \left(\int_{-1}^1 \frac{\chi_{A_k(n)}(y)}{x-y} dy \right) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \chi_{A_k(n)}(y) \left(\int_b^1 \frac{1}{x-y} dx \right) dy = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{A_k(n)} \left[\log(x-y) \right]_{x=b}^{x=1} dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{A_k(n)} \left(\log(1-y) - \log(b-y) \right) dy \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{A_k(n)} \left(\log(1-y) - \log(b-a) \right) dy \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{A_k(n)} \log(1-y) dy - \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{A_k(n)} \log(1/n) dy \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{A_k(n)} \log(1-y) dy + \frac{1}{\pi} (\log n) \cdot \mu(A_k(n)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Fubini's theorem and the fact that $(x-y) \geq 0$ whenever $b \leq x < 1$ and $y \in A_k(n)$. This establishes (3.11) because $m_{L^1}(A_k(n)) = T(\chi_{A_k(n)})$ by definition. Since, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$ the collection $\{A_k(n) : 1 \leq k < n\}$ is a partition of $A \cap [0, (n-1)/n)$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|m_{L^1}|(A \cap [0, 1)) &\geq |m_{L^1}|(A \cap [0, (n-1)/n)) \\
&\geq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \|m_{L^1}(A_k(n))\|_{L^1} \\
&\geq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{A_k(n)} \log(1-y) dy + \frac{1}{\pi} (\log n) \cdot \mu(A_k(n)) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{A \cap [0, (n-1)/n)} \log(1-y) dy + \frac{1}{\pi} (\log n) \cdot \mu(A \cap [0, (n-1)/n)).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the function $y \mapsto \log(1-y)$ is integrable over $A \cap [0, 1)$ and, for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_0 \geq 2$ and $\alpha > 0$, we have $\mu(A \cap [0, (n-1)/n)) > \alpha$ for all $n \geq n_0$, it follows that $|m_{L^1}|(A \cap [0, 1)) = \infty$.

If $\mu(A \cap [0, 1)) = 0$, then necessarily $\mu(A \cap (-1, 0)) > 0$. By a similar argument, it follows that $|m_{L^1}|(A \cap (-1, 0)) = \infty$. So, we can conclude that $|m_{L^1}|(A) = \infty$. \square

Remark 3.5. (i) Proposition 3.1(ii) shows that the vector measure m_{L^1} is absolutely continuous with respect to μ . Since L^1 does not have the Radon-Nikodym property [10, p.219], the question arises of whether or not there exists a Bochner μ -integrable (or, more general, a Pettis μ -integrable) function $F: (-1, 1) \rightarrow L^1$ such that $m_{L^1}(A) = \int_A F d\mu$, for $A \in \mathcal{B}$. But, the existence of such a function F would imply that m_{L^1} has σ -finite variation, [21, Proposition 5.6(iv)], which is not the case by Theorem 3.4.

(ii) Given any r.i. space X over $(-1, 1)$ with non-trivial Boyd indices the operator T_X is bounded on X . Since $X \subseteq L^1$ continuously, [1, Corollary II.6.7], there exists $K > 0$ such that $\|g\|_{L^1} \leq K\|g\|_X$ for all $g \in X$. It follows, for each $A \in \mathcal{B}$, that $\|T(\chi_A)\|_{L^1} \leq K\|T(\chi_A)\|_X$, that is, $\|m_{L^1}(A)\|_{L^1} \leq K\|m_X(A)\|_X$. So, Theorem 3.4 implies that m_X has infinite variation over every set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\mu(A) > 0$. For an alternative proof of this fact see [5, Proposition 3.2(v)].

Another consequence of Theorem 3.4 is as follows. We will use the notation $A \cap \mathcal{B} := \{A \cap B : B \in \mathcal{B}\} = \{B : B \in \mathcal{B}, B \subseteq A\}$ for each $A \in \mathcal{B}$. A subset $F \subseteq L^1$ is called *order bounded* if there exists $0 \leq h \in L^1$ such that $|f| \leq h$ for all $f \in F$.

Corollary 3.6. *Given a set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfying $\mu(A) > 0$, the subset $m_{L^1}(A \cap \mathcal{B})$ is not order bounded in L^1 . In particular, the range of m_{L^1} is not order bounded in L^1 .*

Proof. Fix $A \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\mu(A) > 0$. Assume, by way of contradiction, that $m_{L^1}(A \cap \mathcal{B})$ is order bounded in L^1 . Then the restriction of m_{L^1} to $A \cap \mathcal{B}$ is an L^1 -valued order bounded measure defined on the measurable space $(A, A \cap \mathcal{B})$. Since L^1 is separable, Dedekind complete and has σ -order continuous norm, it follows from [19, Proposition 1 (1) and Theorem 5 (2)] that there exists a smallest vector measure $\nu: A \cap \mathcal{B} \rightarrow L^1$, taking values in the positive cone $(L^1)^+$ of L^1 , which dominates the restriction of m_{L^1} to $A \cap \mathcal{B}$ in the sense that $|m_{L^1}(B)| \leq \nu(B)$ in $(L^1)^+$ for each $B \in A \cap \mathcal{B}$. So, given $B \in A \cap \mathcal{B}$, we have $\|m_{L^1}(B)\|_{L^1} \leq \|\nu(B)\|_{L^1}$ because the L^1 -norm is a lattice norm. Hence, given finitely many pairwise disjoint sets $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n \in A \cap \mathcal{B}$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n \|m_{L^1}(B_k)\|_{L^1} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \|\nu(B_k)\|_{L^1} = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \nu(B_k) \right\|_{L^1} \\ &= \|\nu(\cup_{k=1}^n B_k)\|_{L^1} \leq \|\nu(A)\|_{L^1} < \infty \end{aligned}$$

because L^1 is an abstract L^1 -space, [18, p.105], and because $\nu(B_k) \in (L^1)^+$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$. Thus the total variation measure $|m_{L^1}|: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ satisfies $|m_{L^1}|(A) < \infty$. This contradicts Theorem 3.4. The proof is thereby complete.

Applying the result just proven with $A = (-1, 1)$, establishes the claim for the range of m_{L^1} . \square

Remark 3.7. The results in the proof of Corollary 3.6 that are quoted from [19] apply to the B.f.s. $L^1_{\mathbb{R}}$ of all μ -integrable functions taking their values in \mathbb{R} . Since $L^1 = L^1_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus iL^1_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the complexification of $L^1_{\mathbb{R}}$, these results remain valid in L^1 .

To be able to establish the non-compactness of the range $m_{L^1}(\mathcal{B})$ of m_{L^1} we need some preparation.

Lemma 3.8. *The subset $U := \{\chi_A : A \in \mathcal{B}\}$ of L^0 is not relatively compact.*

Proof. Assume, by way of contradiction, that U is relatively compact in L^0 . This will be shown to imply that U is also relatively compact in L^1 . Take any sequence $(A_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in \mathcal{B} . The relative compactness of U in the metric space L^0 ensures that the corresponding sequence $(\chi_{A_n})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ admits a subsequence $(\chi_{A_{n(k)}})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ converging in measure. We may suppose that $(\chi_{A_{n(k)}})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ itself converges pointwise a.e. on $(-1, 1)$ by taking a subsequence, if necessary. So, there exists $A \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\chi_{A_{n(k)}} \rightarrow \chi_A$ pointwise a.e. as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By dominated convergence, $\chi_{A_{n(k)}} \rightarrow \chi_A$ in L^1 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, an arbitrary sequence in the subset U of L^1 admits a convergent subsequence in the norm of L^1 . This contradicts the fact that U is not a relatively compact subset of L^1 (see, for example, [10, Example III.1.2]). So, U is not relatively compact in L^0 . \square

For the following fact we refer to [2, Corollary 2.2.6].

Lemma 3.9. *For every function $h \in L^0$, the multiplication operator $M_h: f \mapsto fh$ is continuous from L^0 into itself.*

Recall that $w(x) := \sqrt{1-x^2}$ for $x \in (-1, 1)$; see Section 2. An important auxiliary operator \widehat{T} , given by

$$\widehat{T}(g)(x) := -\frac{1}{w}T(wg)(x), \quad \text{a.e. } x \in (-1, 1),$$

for each $g \in L^1$, will be required. It is a bounded linear operator from L^p into itself whenever $1 < p < 2$, which is also the case for every r.i. space X over $(-1, 1)$ with Boyd indices satisfying $1/2 < \underline{\alpha}_X \leq \bar{\alpha}_X < 1$, [4, Theorem 3.2]. Recall that $T: L^1 \rightarrow L^0$ is continuous via Kolmogorov's theorem. Since \widehat{T} is the composition of T with the operator of multiplication by w in L^1 and the operator of multiplication by $(-1/w)$ in L^0 (both continuous operators), it follows that \widehat{T} maps L^1 continuously into L^0 ; we have used Lemma 3.9.

The Bartle-Dunford-Schwartz theorem implies that $m_{L^1}(\mathcal{B})$ is necessarily a relatively weakly compact subset of L^1 , [10, Corollary I.2.7]. Corollary 3.6 and the following result show that not more than this can be said about $m_{L^1}(\mathcal{B})$ as a subset of L^1 .

Theorem 3.10. *The range $m_{L^1}(\mathcal{B})$ of m_{L^1} is not relatively compact in L^1 .*

Proof. Assume, on the contrary, that $m_{L^1}(\mathcal{B})$ is relatively compact in L^1 . Observe that $m_{L^1}(\mathcal{B}) = T(U) \subseteq L^1$, where U is as in Lemma 3.8. As ascertained above, \widehat{T} maps L^1 continuously into L^0 . So, $\widehat{T}(T(U))$ is relatively compact in L^0 . On the other hand, we know from [8, Theorem 4.10 (iv)] that

$$\chi_A - \frac{\mu(A)}{\pi w} = \widehat{T}(T(\chi_A)), \quad A \in \mathcal{B},$$

is valid as an equality in $L \log L$ and hence, also in L^0 . It follows from the previous identity, for $V := \{\chi_A - \frac{\mu(A)}{\pi w} : A \in \mathcal{B}\}$, that $V = \widehat{T}(T(U)) \subseteq L^0$. Accordingly, V is relatively compact in L^0 . Moreover, the compact subset $W := \{\frac{a}{\pi w} : 0 \leq a \leq 2\} \subseteq L^0$ satisfies $U \subseteq V + W$. This implies that U is relatively compact in L^0 , which contradicts Lemma 3.8. So, we can conclude that $m_{L^1}(\mathcal{B})$ is not relatively compact in L^1 . \square

Consider now the L_{exp} -valued set function associated with the operator $T_\infty: L^\infty \rightarrow L_{\text{exp}}$, defined by

$$m_{\text{exp}}(A) := T_\infty(\chi_A) \in L_{\text{exp}}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}.$$

Clearly, m_{exp} is finitely additive and has bounded range. We will show that m_{exp} is *not* σ -additive.

Theorem 3.11. *The bounded linear operator $T_\infty : L^\infty \rightarrow L_{\text{exp}}$ satisfies*

$$\|T_\infty(\chi_A)\|_{L_{\text{exp}}} > \frac{1}{e^{2\pi}}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}, \mu(A) > 0.$$

Proof. Let $f \in L^\infty$. From (2.1) and $f^{**}(t) = (1/t) \int_0^t f^*(s) ds \geq f^*(t)$, for $t > 0$, it follows that

$$(3.12) \quad \|f\|_{L_{\text{exp}}} \geq \sup_{0 < t < 2} \frac{f^*(t)}{\log(2e/t)}.$$

According to [12, Theorem 2.1] it is the case that

$$\sup_{0 < t < 2} \frac{f^*(t)}{\log(2e/t)} < \infty \iff \sup_{1 \leq p < \infty} \frac{\|f\|_{L^p}}{p} < \infty$$

and, from that proof, it follows for some constant $c > 1/e$, that

$$(3.13) \quad c \sup_{1 \leq p < \infty} \frac{\|f\|_{L^p}}{p} \leq \sup_{0 < t < 2} \frac{f^*(t)}{\log(2e/t)} \leq e \sup_{1 \leq p < \infty} \frac{\|f\|_{L^p}}{p}.$$

From (3.12) and (3.13) we can conclude that

$$(3.14) \quad \|f\|_{L_{\text{exp}}} \geq c \sup_{1 \leq p < \infty} \frac{\|f\|_{L^p}}{p}.$$

Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary measurable set with $\mu(E) < \infty$, H be the Hilbert transform on \mathbb{R} and $1 < p < \infty$. It follows from [14, Theorem 1.1] that

$$(3.15) \quad \int_E |H(\chi_E)(x)|^p dx = \left(2 - \frac{1}{2^{p-1}}\right) \frac{\mu(E)}{\pi^p} \zeta(p) \Gamma(p+1),$$

where $\zeta(p)$ is the value of the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ at $s = p$. Given any Borel set $A \subseteq (-1, 1)$ note, according to the definition of H in [14, (1.1)], that

$$-(H(\chi_A))(t) = T(\chi_A)(t), \quad t \in A.$$

Hence, from (3.15) we have, for each $1 < p < \infty$, that

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \|T(\chi_A)\|_p &= \left(\int_{-1}^1 |T(\chi_A)(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\geq \left(\int_A |T(\chi_A)(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \left(\int_A |H(\chi_A)(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \left(\left(2 - \frac{1}{2^{p-1}}\right) \frac{\mu(A)}{\pi^p} \zeta(p) \Gamma(p+1) \right)^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose furthermore that $\mu(A) > 0$. Set $f = T(\chi_A) \in L_{\text{exp}}$. Combining (3.14) and (3.16) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T(\chi_A)\|_{L_{\text{exp}}} &\geq c \sup_{1 \leq p < \infty} \frac{\|T(\chi_A)\|_{L^p}}{p} \\
&\geq c \sup_{1 \leq p < \infty} \frac{1}{p} \left(\left(2 - \frac{1}{2^{p-1}}\right) \frac{\mu(A)}{\pi^p} \zeta(p) \Gamma(p+1) \right)^{1/p} \\
&\geq \frac{c}{\pi} \sup_{1 \leq p < \infty} \frac{1}{p} \left(\mu(A) \Gamma(p+1) \right)^{1/p} \\
&\geq \frac{c}{\pi} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A)^{1/n} \frac{(\Gamma(n+1))^{1/n}}{n} \\
&= \frac{c}{\pi} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{\frac{n!}{n^n}} = \frac{c}{\pi} \frac{1}{e} > \frac{1}{e^2 \pi}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.12. Theorem 3.11 implies that m_{exp} is *not* σ -additive. Actually, m_{exp} is not even *strongly additive*. Recall that a Banach-space-valued, finitely additive set function ν defined on an algebra \mathcal{F} of subsets of a non-empty set is strongly additive if, for every sequence $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of pairwise disjoint sets in \mathcal{F} , the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \nu(E_n)$ is norm-convergent; see [10, Definition I.1.14], and, for equivalent conditions, [10, Proposition I.1.17]. Clearly every σ -additive vector measure is necessarily strongly additive.

4. INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION OF T

In this section we study operator theoretic characteristics of $T_{\log}: L \log L \rightarrow L^1$ and establish the integral representation given in (1.1). The tool for such a representation is the space $L^1(m_{L^1})$ of (equivalence classes of) \mathcal{B} -measurable functions $f: (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which are integrable with respect to the vector measure m_{L^1} .

A \mathcal{B} -measurable function $f: (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is said to be m_{L^1} -integrable if it is $\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle$ -integrable for every $g \in L^\infty$ and if, given any $A \in \mathcal{B}$, there is a function $\int_A f dm_{L^1}$ belonging to L^1 (necessarily unique) satisfying

$$\left\langle \int_A f dm_{L^1}, g \right\rangle = \int_A f d\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle, \quad \text{for every } g \in (L^1)^* = L^\infty.$$

In this case, $\int_A f dm_{L^1} \in L^1$ is called the integral of f over A with respect to m_{L^1} . The resulting L^1 -valued set function

$$A \longmapsto \int_A f dm_{L^1} \in L^1, \quad A \in \mathcal{B},$$

is called the indefinite integral of f with respect to m_{L^1} ; it is again σ -additive via the Orlicz-Pettis theorem, [10, Corollary 1.4.4]. Every \mathcal{B} -simple function $\varphi = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j \chi_{A_j}$ with $a_j \in \mathbb{C}$ and $A_j \in \mathcal{B}$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is m_{L^1} -integrable

and $\int_A \varphi dm_{L^1} = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j m_{L^1}(A_j \cap A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}$. For the above definitions and facts see [18, Section 3.1], for example.

By $L^1(m_{L^1})$ we denote the vector space of all m_{L^1} -integrable functions. Proposition 3.1(ii) implies that the indefinite integral of a function $f \in L^1(m_{L^1})$ is zero if and only if $f = 0$ off an m_{L^1} -null set if and only if $f = 0$ pointwise μ -a.e. Accordingly those functions in $L^1(m_{L^1})$ which equal 0 μ -a.e. are identified with the zero function. So, $L^1(m_{L^1})$ is a linear subspace of L^0 . Moreover, the space $L^1(m_{L^1})$ is a B.f.s. over $(-1, 1)$ with respect to the lattice norm

$$\|f\|_{L^1(m_{L^1})} := \sup \left\{ \int_{-1}^1 |f| d|\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle| : g \in L^\infty \text{ with } \|g\|_\infty \leq 1 \right\}, \quad f \in L^1(m_{L^1}).$$

For this and the fact that $L^1(m_{L^1})$ has σ -order continuous norm, we refer to [3, Theorem 1]. The denseness of $\text{sim } \mathcal{B}$ in $L^1(m_{L^1})$ is a consequence of the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence theorem for vector measures (due to D. R. Lewis); see, for example, [18, Theorem 3.7(ii)].

The integration operator $I_{m_{L^1}} : L^1(m_{L^1}) \rightarrow L^1$ is the linear map defined by

$$(4.1) \quad I_{m_{L^1}}(f) := \int_{(-1,1)} f dm_{L^1}, \quad f \in L^1(m_{L^1}).$$

It is a bounded operator as can be seen from the inequality

$$\|I_{m_{L^1}}(f)\|_{L^1} \leq \|f\|_{L^1(m_{L^1})}, \quad f \in L^1(m_{L^1}).$$

Given any r.i. space X over $(-1, 1)$ with non-trivial Boyd indices, the associated vector measure m_X satisfies $L^1(m_X) = X_a$ (as vector sublattices of L^0 and with equivalent lattice norms), where X_a denotes the absolutely continuous part of X , [1, Definition I.3.1]. Moreover, T_X equals the integration operator I_{m_X} . For this, see [5, Theorem 3.10 and Corollary 3.11(vi)] and [6, Theorem]. The crucial point for this note is the fact that both $L\log L$ and L^1 have absolutely continuous norm and that $T_{\log} : L\log L \rightarrow L^1$ is a bounded operator (cf. Lemma 2.1) which satisfies $m_{L^1}(A) = T_{\log}(\chi_A)$, for $A \in \mathcal{B}$. That is, m_{L^1} is the vector measure associated to the operator T_{\log} .

Theorem 4.1. *The identity $L^1(m_{L^1}) = L\log L$ holds as vector sublattices of L^0 and with equivalent lattice norms. In particular, $L^1(m_{L^1})$ and $L\log L$ are isomorphic B.f.s.' over $(-1, 1)$. Moreover, the integration operator $I_{m_{L^1}} = T_{\log}$.*

Proof. To verify that $L\log L \subseteq L^1(m_{L^1})$, let $f \in L\log L$. Given $g \in L^\infty = (L^1)^*$, we have from Lemma 2.2 that $fT(g) \in L^1$, which implies that $f \in L^1(\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle)$ via (3.3). Now, given $A \in \mathcal{B}$, since $f\chi_A \in L\log L$, Parseval's formula (2.3) with $f\chi_A$ in place of f gives

$$\int_A f d\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle = - \int_{-1}^1 f\chi_A T(g) d\mu = \int_{-1}^1 gT(f\chi_A) d\mu = \langle T_{\log}(f\chi_A), g \rangle.$$

This implies that $f \in L^1(m_{L^1})$ and $\int_A f dm_{L^1} = T_{\log}(f\chi_A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}$. In particular, $I_{m_{L^1}}(f) = T_{\log}(f)$; see (4.1). So, $L\log L \subseteq L^1(m_{L^1})$. Moreover, it has also been shown that $I_{m_{L^1}}$ is a bounded linear extension of T_{\log} to $L^1(m_{L^1})$.

On the other hand, T_{\log} does not admit a bounded linear extension to any strictly larger B.f.s. over $(-1, 1)$, [8, Theorem 5.6], which implies that both $L^1(m_{L^1}) = L\log L$ and $I_{m_{L^1}} = T_{\log}$. That the B.f.s.' $L^1(m_{L^1})$ and $L\log L$ have equivalent lattice norms is a consequence of the closed graph theorem, for example. \square

Corollary 4.2. *Let $f \in L^0$. Then f belongs to $L\log L$ if and only if $fT(g) \in L^1$ for every $g \in L^\infty$.*

Proof. \Rightarrow) This is part of Lemma 2.2.

\Leftarrow) According to (3.3) the condition $fT(g) \in L^1$ means that $f \in L^1(\langle m_{L^1}, g \rangle)$ for every $g \in L^\infty = (L^1)^*$. In other words, f is scalarly m_{L^1} -integrable. Since the codomain space L^1 of m_{L^1} does not contain an isomorphic copy of c_0 (as it is weakly sequentially complete), every scalarly m_{L^1} -integrable function is necessarily m_{L^1} -integrable, [15, Theorem 5.1]. Hence, $f \in L^1(m_{L^1}) = L\log L$ by Theorem 4.1. \square

Remark 4.3. (i) The optimal domain $[T, L^1]$, for T taking values in L^1 , has been specified in [8, (5.1) and (5.2)]. Due to [8, Lemma 5.4] we can conclude that $[T, L^1] = L^1(m_{L^1})$ as identical B.f.s.' over $(-1, 1)$.

(ii) From [8, Proposition 5.1(i) and Theorem 5.6] it follows that a function $f \in L^1$ belongs to $L\log L$ if and only if $fT(g) \in L^1$ for every $g \in L^\infty$. Corollary 4.2 above also presents this fact (even more general, for $f \in L^0$), possible by using the vector measure m_{L^1} .

(iii) It follows from Theorem 4.1 that $L^1(m_{L^1})$ is a *r.i. space*. This is not true in general for the L^1 -space of the vector measure associated with a kernel operator, [9, Example 5.15(b)].

The identification of $T_{\log}: L\log L \rightarrow L^1$ with the integration operator $I_{m_{L^1}}: L^1(m_{L^1}) \rightarrow L^1$, established in Theorem 4.1, allows us to prove the following operator theoretic results concerning T_{\log} .

Theorem 4.4. *The finite Hilbert transform $T_{\log}: L\log L \rightarrow L^1$ is not order bounded.*

Proof. Since $\{\chi_B : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is an order bounded subset of $L\log L$ but $m_{L^1}(\mathcal{B}) = \{T_{\log}(\chi_B) : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is *not* an order bounded subset of L^1 (cf. Corollary 3.6 with $A = (-1, 1)$), it follows that $T_{\log}: L\log L \rightarrow L^1$ is not an order bounded operator. \square

We now provide two alternative arguments for the non-compactness of T_{\log} to that given in [8, Proposition 4.15].

Corollary 4.5. *The finite Hilbert transform $T_{\log}: L\log L \rightarrow L^1$ is not compact.*

Proof. It suffices to establish that the integration operator $I_{m_{L^1}}: L^1(m_{L^1}) \rightarrow L^1$ is not compact. But, according to Theorems 1 and 4 of [17], a Banach-space-valued measure must have finite variation whenever its associated integration operator is compact. This fact and Theorem 3.4 prove the result.

An alternative proof follows from Theorem 3.10 and the fact that $m_{L^1}(\mathcal{B}) = T_{\log}(\{\chi_A : A \in \mathcal{B}\})$ with $\{\chi_A : A \in \mathcal{B}\}$ a bounded subset of $L\log L$. \square

A linear operator between Banach spaces is called *completely continuous* if it maps every weakly compact set into a norm-compact set. It is a concept that lies between that of a bounded operator and that of a compact operator.

Theorem 4.6. *The finite Hilbert transform $T_{\log} : L\log L \rightarrow L^1$ is not completely continuous.*

Proof. It suffices to establish that the integration operator $I_{m_{L^1}} : L^1(m_{L^1}) \rightarrow L^1$ is not completely continuous. But, this holds via Theorem 3.10 by applying the general fact that if the range of a Banach-space-valued vector measure is not relatively compact, then its associated integration operator is not completely continuous; see, for example, [18, p.153]. \square

Due to Corollary 4.5, the integration operator $I_{m_{L^1}}$ is not compact. This raises the question as to whether or not $I_{m_{L^1}}$ is at least weakly compact. The following result provides the answer.

Theorem 4.7. *The finite Hilbert transform $T_{\log} : L\log L \rightarrow L^1$ is not weakly compact. Consequently, neither is the integration operator $I_{m_{L^1}} : L^1(m_{L^1}) \rightarrow L^1$.*

Proof. We shall show that the adjoint operator $(T_{\log})^* : L^\infty \rightarrow L_{\exp}$ of T_{\log} is not weakly compact. By (2.5), we have $(T_{\log})^* = -T_\infty$. According to Remark 3.12 the bounded finitely additive set function $m_{\exp} : A \mapsto T_\infty(\chi_A) \in L_{\exp}$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}$ is not strongly additive. Hence, its range $m_{\exp}(\mathcal{B})$ is not relatively weakly compact in L_{\exp} ; see [10, Corollary I.5.3]. Consequently, the image of the unit ball B_{L^∞} under T_∞ is not relatively weakly compact in L_{\exp} because $m_{\exp}(\mathcal{B}) \subseteq T_\infty(B_{L^\infty})$. Thus, $(T_{\log})^* = -T_\infty$ is not a weakly compact operator. We can conclude from Gantmacher’s theorem, [11, Theorem VI.4.8], that also T_{\log} is not weakly compact.

Consequently, the integration operator $I_{m_{L^1}} : L^1(m_{L^1}) \rightarrow L^1$ is not weakly compact either. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bennett, R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of Operators*, Academic Press, Boston, 1988.
- [2] V. I. Bogachev, *Measure Theory, Vol. I*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 2007.
- [3] G. P. Curbera, Operators into L^1 of a vector measure and applications to Banach lattices, *Math. Ann.*, **293** (1972), 317 - 330.
- [4] G. P. Curbera, S. Okada, W. J. Ricker, *Inversion and extension of the finite Hilbert transform on $(-1, 1)$* , *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, **198** (2019), 1835–1860.
- [5] G. P. Curbera, S. Okada, W. J. Ricker, *Extension and integral representation of the finite Hilbert transform in rearrangement invariant spaces*, *Quaest. Math.*, **43** (2020), 783–812.
- [6] G. P. Curbera, S. Okada, W. J. Ricker, *Non-extendability of the finite Hilbert transform*, *Monatsh. für Math. (4)*, **195** (2021), 649–657.
- [7] G. P. Curbera, S. Okada, W. J. Ricker, *Fine spectra of the finite Hilbert transform in function spaces*, *Advances in Math.*, **380** (2021), 107597.

- [8] G. P. Curbera, S. Okada, W. J. Ricker, *The finite Hilbert transform acting in the Zygmund space $L\log L$* , to appear in *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* https://doi.org/10.2422/2036-2145.202203_003
- [9] G. P. Curbera, W. J. Ricker, *Optimal domains for kernel operators via interpolation*, *Math. Nachr.*, **244** (2002), 47–63.
- [10] J. Diestel, J.J. Uhl, Jr., *Vector Measures*, Math. Surveys 15, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1977.
- [11] N. Dunford, J. T. Schwartz, *Linear Operators I: General Theory*, Wiley, New York, 1964.
- [12] D. E. Edmunds, M. Krbeč, *On decomposition in exponential Orlicz spaces*, *Math. Nach.* **213** (2000), 77–88.
- [13] S. G. Krein, Ju. I. Petunin, E. M. Semenov, *Interpolation of Linear Operators*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., 1982.
- [14] E. Laeng, *On the L^p norms of the Hilbert transform of a characteristic function*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **262** (2012), 4534–4539.
- [15] D. R. Lewis, *On integrability and summability in vector spaces*, *Illinois J. Math.* **16** (1972), 294–307.
- [16] J. Lindenstrauss, L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach Spaces Vol. II*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979.
- [17] S. Okada, W.J. Ricker, L. Rodríguez-Piazza, *Compactness of the integration operator associated with a vector measure*, *Studia Math.* **150** (2002), 133–149.
- [18] S. Okada, W. J. Ricker, E. A. Sánchez-Pérez, *Optimal Domain and Integral Extension of Operators: Acting in Function Spaces*, Operator Theory Advances and Applications **180**, Birkhäuser, Berlin, 2008.
- [19] H. H. Schaefer, X-D. Zhang, *A note on order bounded vector measures*, *Arch. Math.*, **63** (1994), 52–157.
- [20] F. G. Tricomi, *Integral Equations*, Interscience, New York, 1957.
- [21] D. van Dulst, *Characterizations of Banach spaces not containing ℓ^1* , CWI Tract Vol. 59, Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica, Amsterdam, 1989.

FACULTAD DE MATEMÁTICAS & IMUS, UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA, CALLE TARFIA S/N, SEVILLA 41012, SPAIN

Email address: `curbera@us.es`

112 MARCORN CRESCENT, KAMBAH, ACT 2902, AUSTRALIA

Email address: `sus.okada@outlook.com`

MATH.-GEOGR. FAKULTÄT, KATHOLISCHE UNIVERSITÄT EICHSTÄTT-INGOLSTADT, D-85072 EICHSTÄTT, GERMANY

Email address: `werner.ricker@ku.de`