

ON THE THEORY OF SPACES Λ

G. G. LORENTZ

1. Introduction. In this paper we discuss properties of the spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$, which were defined for the special case $\phi(x) = \alpha x^{\alpha-1}$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, in our previous paper [8]. A function $f(x)$, measurable on the interval $(0, l)$, $l < +\infty$ belongs to the class $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ provided the norm $\|f\|$, defined by

$$(1.1) \quad \|f\| \equiv \left\{ \int_0^l \phi(x) f^*(x)^p dx \right\}^{1/p},$$

is finite. Here $\phi(x)$ is a given nonnegative integrable function on $(0, l)$, not identically 0, and $f^*(x)$ is the decreasing rearrangement of $|f(x)|$, that is, the decreasing function on $(0, l)$, equimeasurable with $|f(x)|$. (For the properties of decreasing rearrangements see [5, 12, 7, and 8].) We write also $\Lambda(\alpha, p)$ instead of $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ with $\phi(x) = \alpha x^{\alpha-1}$, and $\Lambda(\phi)$ instead of $\Lambda(\phi, 1)$. We shall also consider spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ for the infinite interval $(0, +\infty)$. In §2 we give some simple properties of the spaces Λ , and show in particular that $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ has the triangle property if and only if $\phi(x)$ is decreasing. In §3 we discuss the conjugate spaces $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$, and show that the spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ are reflexive. In §4 we give a generalization of the spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$, and characterize the conjugate spaces in case $p = 1$. In §5 we give applications; we prove that the Hardy-Littlewood majorants $\theta(x, f)$ of a function $f \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$ or $f \in \Lambda^*(\phi, p)$ also belong to the same class. We give sufficient conditions for an integral transformation to be a linear operation from one of these spaces into itself, and apply them to solve the moment problem for the spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ and $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$.

2. Properties of spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$. We shall establish the following result.

THEOREM 1. *The norm $\|f\|$ defined by (1.1) has the triangle property if and only if $\phi(x)$ is equivalent to a decreasing function; in this case $f, g \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$*

Received April 11, 1951.

A large part of this investigation was carried out while the author held a fellowship at the Summer Institute of the Canadian Mathematical Congress in 1950.

Pacific J. Math. 1 (1951), 411-429.

implies $f + g \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$.

Proof. (a) Suppose that $\|f\|$ has the triangle property. Let $\delta > 0$, $h > 0$, $a > 0$, and $a + 2h \leq l$. Set

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 + \delta & \text{on } (0, a + h) \\ 1 & \text{on } (a + h, a + 2h) \\ 0 & \text{on } (a + 2h, l), \end{cases} \quad g(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } (0, h) \\ 1 + \delta & \text{on } (h, a + 2h) \\ 0 & \text{on } (a + 2h, l); \end{cases}$$

then

$$(f + g)^*(x) = \begin{cases} 2 + 2\delta & \text{on } (0, a) \\ 2 + \delta & \text{on } (a, a + 2h) \\ 0 & \text{on } (a + 2h, l). \end{cases}$$

We have $\|f\| = \|g\|$; hence the inequality $\|f + g\| \leq \|f\| + \|g\|$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ (2 + 2\delta)^p \int_0^a \phi(x) dx + (2 + \delta)^p \int_a^{a+2h} \phi(x) dx \right\}^{1/p} \\ & \leq 2 \left\{ (1 + \delta)^p \int_0^{a+h} \phi(x) dx + \int_{a+h}^{a+2h} \phi(x) dx \right\}^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

or to

$$(2 + \delta)^p \int_a^{a+2h} \phi(x) dx \leq (2 + 2\delta)^p \int_a^{a+h} \phi(x) dx + 2^p \int_{a+h}^{a+2h} \phi(x) dx,$$

and thus to

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{(1 + \delta)^p - (1 + \frac{1}{2}\delta)^p}{(1 + \frac{1}{2}\delta)^p - 1} \int_a^{a+h} \phi(x) dx \geq \int_{a+h}^{a+2h} \phi(x) dx.$$

If $\Phi(x)$ is the integral of ϕ over $(0, x)$, we obtain from (2.1), making $\delta \rightarrow 0$,

$$\Phi(a + h) \geq \frac{1}{2} [\Phi(a) + \Phi(a + 2h)];$$

that is, $\Phi(x)$ is concave, and thus $\phi(x)$ is equivalent to a decreasing function.

(b) Suppose that ϕ is decreasing. Instead of (2.1) we can now write

$$(2.2) \quad \|f\| = \sup_{\phi_r} \left\{ \int_0^l \phi_r |f|^p dx \right\}^{1/p},$$

the supremum being taken over all possible rearrangements ϕ_r of ϕ . It follows from (2.2) that $f, g \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$ implies $f + g \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$ and $\|f + g\| \leq \|f\| + \|g\|$.

It is now easy to see that, for $\phi(x)$ decreasing, $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ is a Banach space; the completeness may be proved by usual methods (compare [8]). In general, $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ is not uniformly convex. Suppose, for instance, that there is a sequence $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$(2.3) \quad \Phi(2\delta_n)/\Phi(\delta_n) \rightarrow 1.$$

This condition is satisfied, for example, if $\phi(x) = x^{-1} |\log x|^{-p}$, $p > 1$. We take $f_n(x) = h_n$ on $(0, 2\delta_n)$, $f_n(x) = 0$ on $(2\delta_n, l)$; we take $g_n(x) = h_n$ on $(0, \delta_n)$, $g_n(x) = -h_n$ on $(\delta_n, 2\delta_n)$, and $g_n(x) = 0$ on $(2\delta_n, l)$; and we choose h_n so that

$$\|f_n\|^p = \|g_n\|^p = h_n^p \Phi(2\delta_n) = 1.$$

Then we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \{f_n(x) + g_n(x)\} = \begin{cases} h_n & \text{on } (0, \delta_n), \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere,} \end{cases}$$

and $(1/2)(f_n - g_n)^*(x)$ is the same function. Therefore

$$\left\| \frac{f_n + g_n}{2} \right\|^p = \left\| \frac{f_n - g_n}{2} \right\|^p = h_n^p \Phi(\delta_n) \rightarrow 1,$$

and so $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ is not uniformly convex. In case of the spaces $\Lambda(\alpha, p)$, the problem remains open.

The remarks made above apply also to the spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ in case of the infinite interval $(0, +\infty)$. We assume in this case that $\int_0^l \phi(x) dx < +\infty$ for any $l < +\infty$; the additional hypothesis on $f \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$ is that the rearrangement $f^*(x)$ exists, which is the case if and only if any set $[|f(x)| \geq \epsilon]$, $\epsilon > 0$, has finite measure. The completeness of $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ in this case follows from the fact that the set of such f is a closed linear subset of the Banach space of all f for which (2.2) is finite. If

$$(2.4) \quad \int_0^{+\infty} \phi(x) dx = +\infty,$$

this subspace coincides with the whole space. Condition (2.4) is in particular satisfied if $\phi(x) = \alpha x^{\alpha-1}$.

3. Reflexivity of the spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$. We shall first give some definitions and lemmas which will be useful in the sequel. If $g(x)$, $g_1(x)$ are two positive functions defined on $(0, l)$, $0 < l \leq +\infty$, we write $g < g_1$, if for all finite $0 \leq x \leq l$ we have

$$\int_0^x g(t) dt \leq \int_0^x g_1(t) dt.$$

Integration by parts readily yields:

LEMMA 1. *If $g < g_1$, and f is positive and decreasing on $(0, l)$, then*

$$(3.1) \quad \int_0^l g f dx \leq \int_0^l g_1 f dx.$$

LEMMA 2. *If $g < g_1$, and g, g_1 are positive and decreasing, then also $\psi(g) < \psi(g_1)$ for any convex increasing positive function, in particular for $\psi(u) = u^p$, $p \geq 1$.*

For the proof, let $f(x) = \{\psi(g_1(x)) - \psi(g(x))\} / \{g_1(x) - g(x)\}$ if $g(x) \neq g_1(x)$, and let $f(x)$ be equal to one of the derivatives of $\psi(u)$ at $u = g(x)$ if $g(x) = g_1(x)$. Then $f(x)$ is the slope of the chord of the curve $v = \psi(u)$ on the interval (u, u_1) , $u = g(x)$, $u_1 = g_1(x)$. The slope decreases as both u, u_1 decrease. Therefore $f(x)$ is decreasing and positive. Applying Lemma 1, we obtain

$$\int_0^l f(x)[g(x) - g_1(x)] dx \leq 0,$$

which proves our assertion.

THEOREM 2. *Suppose that $f(x)$, $g(x)$ are positive and decreasing on $(0, l)$, and $f \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$, $p > 1$. Then*

$$(3.2) \quad \int_0^l f g dx \leq \|f\|_{\Lambda} \inf_{\phi D \succ g} \left\{ \int_0^l \phi D^q dx \right\}^{1/q}, \quad \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1,$$

where infimum is taken for all decreasing positive $D(x)$ for which $\phi D \succ g$. Moreover, this infimum is equal to the supremum of $\int_0^l f g dx$ for all positive decreasing f with $\|f\| \leq 1$, if there is a function D with $\phi D \succ g$ and $\int \phi D^q dx < +\infty$, and is to $+\infty$ if there is no such D .

This theorem is due to I. Halperin. For the proofs, see a paper of Halperin appearing in the Canadian Journal of Mathematics and, for a simpler proof, [10].

Inequality (3.2) is a combination of (3.1) and the usual Hölder inequality. For if $g_1 = \phi D \succ_g$, then

$$(3.3) \quad \int_0^l f g \, dx \leq \int_0^l f g_1 \, dx = \int_0^l \phi^{1/p} f \phi^{1/q} D \, dx \\ \leq \|f\| \left\{ \int_0^l \phi D^q \, dx \right\}^{1/q}.$$

Here and in the next section, the following theorem will be useful:

THEOREM 3. Suppose that X is a normed linear space of measurable functions $f(x)$ on $(0, l)$, $0 < l < +\infty$, with the properties: (i) X contains all constants; (ii) if f_1 is measurable and $|f_1(x)| \leq |f(x)|$, $f \in X$, then $f_1 \in X$ and $\|f_1\| \leq \|f\|$; (iii) if $f \in X$ and f_e denotes the characteristic function of the set e , then $\|f f_e\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\text{meas } e \rightarrow 0$.

Let Y consist of all measurable functions g for which $\int_0^l f g \, dx$ exists for all $f \in X$. Then

$$(3.4) \quad F(f) = \int_0^l f g \, dx, \quad g \in Y,$$

is the general form of a linear functional on X , and its norm is equal to

$$\|g\| \equiv \sup_{\|f\| \leq 1} \int_0^l f g \, dx < +\infty.$$

Proof. (a) Let $g \in Y$; then $\int_0^l f |g| \, dx$ exists for all $f \in X$, and $\|g\| = \sup \int_0^l f |g| \, dx$, where f runs through all positive $f \in X$ with $\|f\| \leq 1$. If $\|g\| = +\infty$, there is a sequence $f_n \geq 0$, $\|f_n\| \leq 1$ such that $\int f_n |g| \, dx > n^3$. Then $f = \sum n^{-2} f_n \in X$, and therefore $\int_0^l f |g| \, dx$ must exist. However $\int f |g| \, dx \geq n^{-2} \int f_n |g| \, dx \geq n$, which is a contradiction. Hence $\|g\| < +\infty$ for $g \in Y$. We see now that for $g \in Y$, $\int f g \, dx$ is a linear functional with norm $\|g\|$.

(b) Suppose that $F(f)$ is a given linear functional on X . By (i) and (ii), any characteristic function $f_e(x)$ belongs to X . Define $G(e) = F(f_e)$; since $|G(e)| \leq \|F\| \|f_e\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\text{meas } e \rightarrow 0$, there is an integrable $g(x)$ with $G(e) = \int_e g \, dx$. This means that (3.4) holds for $f = f_e$, and therefore also for all step-functions \bar{f} (which are linear combinations of the f_e). For a bounded f , there is a sequence $\bar{f}_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ uniformly. As $\|\bar{f}_n - f\| \rightarrow 0$, this establishes (3.4) for all bounded f . Now suppose $f \in X$ is such that $f g = |f| |g|$. Let $f_n(x) = f(x)$ if $|f(x)| \leq n$,

$f_n(x) = 0$ otherwise; then $\|f - f_n\| \rightarrow 0$ by (iii), and hence $\int_0^l f_n g dx = F(f_n)$ has a finite limit. This shows that $\int |f| |g| dx < +\infty$; therefore $g \in Y$. Repeating the last part of this argument for an arbitrary $f \in A$, we obtain (3.4).

REMARKS. (A) Let X have the additional property: (iv) $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ almost everywhere, $f_n \in X$, and $\|f_n\| \leq M$ imply $f \in X$. Then the existence of $\int fg dx$ for all $g \in Y$ implies $f \in X$.

For taking the subsequence $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ of (b), we see that $F_n(g) = \int f_n g dx$ is a sequence of linear functionals convergent toward $\int fg dx$ for any $g \in Y$. Then the norms $\|F_n\| = \|f_n\|$ are uniformly bounded, and using (iv) we obtain $f \in X$.

(B) Since Y is the conjugate space to X , Y is a Banach space, and Y clearly satisfies (ii). Suppose now that X satisfies (i)–(iv) and that Y satisfies (i) and (iii). Then Remark A and Theorem 3 together imply that X is the conjugate space of Y , in other words that any linear functional $F(g)$ in Y is of the form $F(g) = \int fg dx$, $f \in X$ and $\|F\| = \|f\|$.

(C) The above results hold for the interval $(0, +\infty)$ if the conditions (i)–(iii) [and eventually (iv)] are true for functions vanishing outside of a finite interval, and also (v) for any $f \in X$, $\|f - f^l\| \rightarrow 0$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$, where f^l is defined by $f^l(x) = f(x)$ on $(0, l)$ and $f^l(x) = 0$ on $(l, +\infty)$.

Applying these general results to the space $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ in case of a finite interval, we see that (i) and (ii) are satisfied. Condition (iii) follows from

$$\|h_e\|^p \leq \int_0^{\text{meas } e} \phi f^{*p} dx \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{meas } e \rightarrow 0,$$

$[h_e(x)$ is the function $f(x)f_e(x)]$, and (iv) from (2.2) and Fatou's theorem. We obtain the result that the space $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$ conjugate to $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ consists of all measurable functions g such that there is a decreasing positive D with $\phi D > g^*$ and $\int_0^l \phi D^q dx < +\infty$; further,

$$(3.5) \quad \|g\|_{\Lambda^*} = \inf_{\phi D > g^*} \left\{ \int_0^l \phi D^q dx \right\}^{1/q}.$$

For it follows from Theorem 2 that

$$\left| \int_0^l f g dx \right| \leq \int_0^l f^* g^* dx \leq \|f\|_{\Lambda} \|g\|_{\Lambda^*},$$

and that $\|g\|_{\Lambda^*}$ is the supremum of the integral $\int fg \, dx$ for all $\|f\| \leq 1$.

Now if $g(x) = C > 0$ is a constant, we take an $l_1 > 0$ with $\phi(l_1) > 0$ and $C_1 = Cl[l_1\phi(l_1)]^{-1}$. Then $\int_0^{l_1} C_1 \phi(x) \, dx \geq Cl$; and if $D(x) = C_1$ on $(0, l_1)$, $D(x) = 0$ on (l_1, l) , then $\phi D > g$. Therefore Λ^* satisfies (i). Also (iii) holds, for if $h_e(x) = g(x)f_e(x)$, $g \in \Lambda^*$, $g^* < \phi D$, then $h_e^* < \phi D_1$, where $D_1(x) = D(x)$ on $(0, \text{meas } e)$, $D_1(x) = 0$ on $(\text{meas } e, l)$, and

$$\|h_e\|_{\Lambda^*}^q \leq \int_0^l \phi D_1^q \, dx = \int_0^{\text{meas } e} \phi D^q \, dx \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{meas } e \rightarrow 0.$$

We have proved the theorem:

THEOREM 4. *The space $\Lambda(\phi, p)$, $p > 1$, is reflexive. Its conjugate is defined by (3.5).*

We now consider the case of an infinite interval and assume $\int_0^\infty \phi \, dx = +\infty$. Then $f \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$ implies $f^*(x) \rightarrow 0$ for $x \rightarrow \infty$. If $a > 0$ is fixed and l sufficiently large, then the function $|f^l(x)|$ of (v) will take values $\geq f^*(a)$ only on a set of arbitrarily small measure. In view of (iii), condition (v) will follow for $\Lambda(\phi, p)$, if we can show that the norm of the function $f^*(a+x)$, $0 \leq x < +\infty$, tends to 0 as $a \rightarrow \infty$, or even if this is true for some sequence $a \rightarrow \infty$. This norm does not exceed

$$\left\{ \int_0^\infty \phi(x) f^*(a+x)^p \, dx \right\}^{1/p} = \left\{ \int_0^\infty \phi(x) f^*(x)^p \left[\frac{f^*(x+a)}{f^*(x)} \right]^p dx \right\}^{1/p} \rightarrow 0,$$

as the integrand has the majorant ϕf^{*p} , and $f^*(x+a)/f^*(x) \rightarrow 0$ for $a \rightarrow \infty$.

To prove (v) for $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$, we need a result going beyond Lemma 1, namely that if g and D are decreasing and positive, and $\phi D > g$, then there is another such function D_0 for which $\phi D > \phi D_0 > g$, and that except for certain open intervals I where D_0 is constant, $\int_0^x \phi D_0 \, dt = \int_0^x g \, dt$. (This fact is proved in the paper of Halperin, mentioned at the beginning of this section and in [10]). As before, we have to prove that if $g \in \Lambda^*(\phi, p)$ is positive and decreasing, then the norm of the function $h(x) = g(x+a)$, $x \geq 0$, tends to 0 as $a \rightarrow \infty$ for certain values of a . There is a D with $\phi D > g$ and $\int_0^\infty \phi D^q \, dx < +\infty$; and, by Lemma 2, $\int_0^\infty \phi D_0^q \, dx < +\infty$. As $\int_0^\infty \phi \, dx = +\infty$, we deduce that $D_0(x) \rightarrow 0$ for $x \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore

$$\int_0^x \phi D_0 \, dx = o[\Phi(x)].$$

On intervals I , $\int_0^x \phi D_0 dt$ is of the form $C\Phi(x) + C_1$, where $\Phi(x) = \int_0^x \phi dt$. If an I extends to $+\infty$, we have $C = 0$, that is $\int_0^x \phi D_0 dt = C_1$ for all large x , and $D_0(x)$ is necessarily 0 for all such x . In this case also $g(x) = 0$ for all large x , and our assertion is trivial. If, on the other hand, there are arbitrarily large values a which do not belong to any I , then we have for these a ,

$$\int_0^a \phi D_0 dt = \int_0^a g dt .$$

It follows that $\int_0^x \phi D_0 dt \geq \int_0^x g dt$, $x \geq a$, or $\phi(x+a)D_0(x+a) > g(x+a)$, and this implies $\phi(x)D_0(x+a) > g(x+a)$. Therefore,

$$\|h\|^q \leq \int_0^\infty \phi(x) D_0(x+a)^q dx = \int_0^\infty \phi(x) D_0(x)^q \left[\frac{D_0(x+a)}{D_0(x)} \right]^q dx \rightarrow 0$$

for $a \rightarrow \infty$. We obtain in this way:

THEOREM 5. *The space $\Lambda(\phi, p)$, $p > 1$, $l = \infty$ is reflexive; its conjugate is given by (3.5).*

4. A generalization. There is an obvious generalization of the spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$. Consider a class C of functions $\phi(x) \geq 0$ integrable over $(0, l)$, and let $X(C, p)$ consist of all those functions $f(x)$ for which

$$(4.1) \quad \|f\| = \sup_{\phi \in C} \left\{ \int_0^l \phi |f|^p dx \right\}^{1/p} < +\infty .$$

A special type of these spaces is obtained if C is chosen to consist of all integrable positive functions $\phi(x)$ whose integrals $\phi_1(e)$ satisfy the condition

$$(4.2) \quad \phi_1(e) \leq \Phi(e) ,$$

where $\Phi(e)$ is a given positive finite set function of measurable sets $e \subset (0, l)$. We may then assume that

$$(4.3) \quad \Phi(e) = \sup_{\phi_1} \phi_1(e) .$$

(A full characterization of set functions $\Phi(e)$ which may be represented in form (4.3) by means of a class of positive additive ϕ_1 will be given by the author elsewhere [9].) In particular, let $\phi_0(x)$ be a fixed decreasing positive function, and let $\Phi(e) = \int_0^{\text{meas } e} \phi_0 dx$; then condition (4.2) is equivalent to the condition

$$\phi^*(x) \leq \phi_0(x).$$

Therefore, in this case the norm (4.1) is equal to (1.1), and so $X(\Phi, p) = \Lambda(\phi_0, p)$.

For the space $X(\Phi, p)$, the condition $\|f\| = 0$ is equivalent to $f(x) = 0$ almost everywhere if and only if $\Phi(e) > 0$ for any set e of positive measure. Suppose now that $\Phi(e)$, defined by (4.3), vanishes on certain sets e with $\text{meas } e > 0$. There is then [2, p. 80, Theorem 15] a least measurable set e_0 which contains any such set e up to a null set; and e_0 is a union of a properly chosen denumerable set of these sets e . Hence $\phi_1(e_0) = 0$, and $\Phi(e_0) = 0$. It is easy to see that in this case $\|f\| = 0$ is equivalent to $f(x) = 0$ almost everywhere on $(0, l) - e_0$, and that the values of $f(x)$ on e_0 have no significance whatsoever for $\|f\|$. Omitting e_0 from $(0, l)$, we do not change the space $X(\phi, p)$, and we obtain a $\Phi(e)$ satisfying the above condition. In the sequel, ϕ is assumed to have this property.

The spaces $X(\Phi, p)$ are normed linear spaces. Their completeness may be proved by usual methods, if for instance $F(e)$ has the property that $\text{meas } e \rightarrow 0$ implies $\Phi(e) \rightarrow 0$ and if $l < +\infty$.

The spaces $X(C, p)$ satisfy the conditions (i), (ii), and (iv) of 3 [(iv) follows easily by Fatou's theorem]. Condition (iii) is not fulfilled in general. We can however enforce (iii) by defining the spaces $\Lambda(C, p)$ and $\Lambda(\Phi, p)$ to consist of all those functions $f \in X(C, p)$ or $f \in X(\Phi, p)$, respectively, for which $\|ff_e\| \rightarrow 0$ with $\text{meas } e \rightarrow 0$ in X . Then the conjugate space $\Lambda^*(C, p)$ and all linear functionals in $\Lambda(C, p)$ are given by Theorem 3. We conclude this section by describing the spaces $\Lambda^*(\Phi, 1)$ more precisely:

THEOREM 6. *If $f \in \Lambda(\Phi, 1)$, then*

$$(4.4) \quad \left| \int_0^l f g \, dx \right| \leq \|f\| \sup_{\Phi(e) > 0} \frac{1}{\Phi(e)} \int_e |g| \, dx,$$

and the left integral exists provided the right side is finite; moreover, the supremum $M(g)$ in the right side is equal to the supremum of $\int_0^l f g \, dx$ for all $f \in \Lambda(\Phi, 1)$ with $\|f\| \leq 1$.

Proof. Consider the function $\phi_0(x) = M(g)^{-1} |g(x)|$; then

$$\int_0^l |f| |g| \, dx = M(g) \int_0^l \phi_0 |f| \, dx \leq M(g) \|f\|_{\Lambda},$$

since

$$\int_e \phi_0(x) dx = M(g)^{-1} \int_e g(x) dx \leq \Phi(e), \quad e \subset (0, l).$$

This proves (4.4). On the other hand, if e is an arbitrary subset of $(0, l)$ with $\Phi(e) > 0$, then the function $f(x) = \Phi(e)^{-1} f_e(x) \operatorname{sign} g(x)$ has norm 1 in $\Lambda(\phi, 1)$, and

$$\int_0^l f g dx = \Phi(e)^{-1} \int_e |g| dx.$$

Therefore the integral $\int_0^l f g dx$ takes values arbitrarily close to $M(g)$.

From Theorems 3 and 6 we deduce that the space $M(\Phi, 1) = \Lambda^*(\Phi, 1)$ consists of all $g(x)$ for which

$$(4.5) \quad \|g\| = \sup_e \left\{ \Phi(e)^{-1} \int_e |g(x)| dx \right\} < +\infty.$$

In particular, the space $M(\phi)$, conjugate to $\Lambda(\phi)$, is given by

$$(4.6) \quad \|g\|_{M(\phi)} = \sup_e \left\{ \phi_1(e)^{-1} \int_e |g| dx \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that the expression (4.6) is the limit, for $p \rightarrow 1$, of the norm of g in the space $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$, $p > 1$.

5. Applications. We shall make three applications.

5.1. Hardy-Littlewood majorants. We take in this section $l = 1$. We write

$$(5.1) \quad \theta(x, f) = \sup_{0 \leq y \leq 1} \frac{1}{y - x} \int_x^y |f(t)| dt,$$

and denote by $\theta_1(x, f)$ and $\theta_2(x, f)$ the supremum of the same expression for $0 \leq y < x$ or $x < y \leq 1$, respectively. Then

$$(5.2) \quad \theta(x, f) \leq \max \{ \theta_1(x, f), \theta_2(x, f) \}.$$

On the other hand, it is well known [5, p. 291] that

$$(5.3) \quad \theta_1^*(x, f) \leq \theta(x, f^*) = \frac{1}{x} \int_0^x f^*(t) dt,$$

and this is also true with θ_2 in place of θ_1 . From (5.2) we derive, for any $p \geq 1$,

$$\theta^p(x, f) \leq \theta_1^p(x, f) + \theta_2^p(x, f) .$$

It follows that

$$\theta^*(x, f)^p \leq (\theta_1^p + \theta_2^p)^* < (\theta_1^p)^* + (\theta_2^p)^* = \theta_1^{*p} + \theta_2^{*p} \leq 2\theta(x, f^*)^p ;$$

that is,

$$(5.4) \quad \theta^*(x, f)^p < 2\theta(x, f^*)^p .$$

We shall make repeated use of the inequality of Hardy [12, p.72]:

$$(5.5) \quad \int_0^l x^{s-p} F(x)^p dx \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-s-1} \right)^p \int_0^l x^s f(x)^p dx ,$$

where $p > 1$, $s < p - 1$, $0 < l \leq +\infty$, and $F(x)$ is the integral of the positive function $f(x)$.

In our present situation it follows from (5.3) and (5.5), if $p > 1$, that

$$\int_0^x \theta(t, f^*)^p dt \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-1} \right)^p \int_0^x f^*(t)^p dt ;$$

and, by Lemma 1,

$$(5.6) \quad \int_0^1 \phi(x) \theta^*(x, f)^p dx \leq 2 \left(\frac{p}{p-1} \right)^p \int_0^1 \phi(x) f^*(x)^p dx .$$

This is case (i) of the following theorem:

THEOREM 7. (i) If $f \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$ and $p > 1$, then also $\theta(x, f) \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$; (ii) if $f^*(x) \log(1/x) \in \Lambda(\phi)$, then $\theta(x, f) \in \Lambda(\phi)$; (iii) if $f \in \Lambda(\phi)$, and $\phi(x)$ is decreasing with respect to $x^{-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$, then $\theta(x, f) \in \Lambda(\phi)$.

To prove (ii) we observe that (5.4) with $p = 1$ and Lemma 1 imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta\|_{\Lambda(\phi)} &= \int_0^1 \phi(x) \theta^*(x, f) dx \leq 2 \int_0^1 \phi(x) \frac{1}{x} dx \int_0^x f^*(t) dt \\ &= 2 \int_0^1 f^*(t) dt \int_t^1 \frac{\phi(x)}{x} dx \leq 2 \int_0^1 \phi(t) f^*(t) \log \frac{1}{t} dt < +\infty . \end{aligned}$$

Finally, if the hypothesis of (iii) holds, that is if $\phi(x) = x^{-\delta} D(x)$ with a decreasing positive D , then the preceding inequality gives

$$\|\theta\| \leq 2 \int_0^1 f^*(t) D(t) \int_t^1 x^{-\delta-1} dx \leq 2 \delta^{-1} \int_0^1 \phi(t) f^*(t) dt .$$

THEOREM 8. (i) If $f^*(x) \log(1/x) \in \Lambda^*(\phi, p)$, $p \geq 1$, then $\theta(x, f) \in \Lambda^*(\phi, p)$;
(ii) if $f \in \Lambda^*(\alpha, p)$, $p > 1$, then $\theta(f) \in \Lambda^*(\alpha, p)$.

Proof. (i) Let $p > 1$ [the case $p = 1$, $\Lambda^*(\phi, p) = M(\phi)$ is simpler]. By (5.4), and since $\theta(x, f^*)$ decreases, we have

$$\|\theta(f)\|^q \leq 2^q \|\theta(f^*)\|^q = 2^q \inf_{\phi D \succ \theta(f^*)} \int_0^1 \phi(x) D(x)^q dx .$$

But by (5.3), we have

$$\int_0^x \theta(u, f^*) du = \int_0^x f^*(t) dt \int_t^x \frac{du}{u} \leq \int_0^x f^*(t) \log \frac{1}{t} dt ,$$

which means that $\theta(x, f^*) < f^*(x) \log(1/x) = h(x)$; hence

$$\|\theta(f)\|^q \leq 2^q \inf_{\phi D \succ h} \int_0^1 \phi D^q dx = 2^q \|h\|^q < +\infty .$$

(ii) Let $f \in \Lambda^*(\alpha, p)$; because of (5.4) we may assume that $f = f^*$, that is, that f is positive and decreasing. Suppose $f < \phi D$ and $\int_0^1 \phi D^q dx < +\infty$ with $\phi(x) = \alpha x^{\alpha-1}$. Then by (5.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(x, f) &= \frac{1}{x} \int_0^x f(t) dt \leq \frac{\alpha}{x} \int_0^x t^{\alpha-1} D(t) dt \\ &= \alpha x^{\alpha-1} \frac{1}{x^\alpha} \int_0^x t^{\alpha-1} D(t) dt = \phi(x) D_1(x) , \end{aligned}$$

say. The function $D_1(x)$ is positive and decreasing, as

$$\begin{aligned} D_1'(x) &= -\alpha x^{-\alpha-1} \int_0^x t^{\alpha-1} D dt + x^{-1} D(x) \\ &\leq -\alpha x^{-\alpha-1} D(x) \int_0^x t^{\alpha-1} dt + x^{-1} D(x) = 0 . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Hardy's inequality, we have

$$\|\theta(f)\|^q \leq \alpha \int_0^1 x^{\alpha-1} D_1^q dx = \alpha \int_0^1 x^{(1-\alpha)(q-1)} \left\{ \frac{1}{x} \int_0^x t^{\alpha-1} D dt \right\}^q dx$$

$$\leq C \int_0^1 x^{(1-\alpha)(q-1)+(\alpha-1)q} D(x)^q dx = C \int_0^1 x^{\alpha-1} D^q dx$$

with some constant C . Thus $\theta(f) \in \Lambda^*$, which proves (ii).

It should be remarked that $f^* \log(1/x)$ behaves very much like $f^* \log^+ f^*$:

(a) If $f^* \log(1/x)$ belongs to $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$, $p \geq 1$, then $f \log^+ |f|$ belongs to $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$. For if $p > 1$ [the case $p = 1$ is similar but simpler], there is a $D(x)$ with $f^* \log(1/x) < \phi D$ and $\int_0^1 \phi D dx < +\infty$. Then also $f^*(\delta) \log(1/x) < \phi D$ on $(0, \delta)$; in particular,

$$f^*(\delta) \int_0^\delta \log \frac{1}{x} dx \leq \int_0^\delta \phi D dx \leq 1$$

if δ is small. Therefore $f^*(\delta) \leq \delta^{-1}$ for all small δ , which shows that

$$f \log^+ |f| \in \Lambda^*(\phi, p).$$

(b) Now suppose $\phi(x)$ is such that, for some $\delta > 0$, we have $\int_0^1 \phi(x) x^{-\delta} dx < +\infty$. If $f \log^+ |f|$ belongs to $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$, $p \geq 1$, then $f^* \log(1/x)$ also does. In fact, by Young's inequality [5, p. 111; or 11, p. 64], for the pair of inverse functions $\phi(u) = \log^+ u$, $\psi(v) = e^v$, we obtain $ab \leq a \log^+ a + e^b$ ($a, b \geq 0$) and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} f^* \log \frac{1}{x} &\leq \delta^{-1} f^* \log^+ (\delta^{-1} f^*) + x^{-\delta} \leq \delta^{-1} f^* \log^+ \frac{1}{\delta} + \delta^{-1} f^* \log^+ f^* + x^{-\delta} \\ &\leq A f^* \log^+ f^* + B + x^{-\delta} \end{aligned}$$

for some constants A, B .

It follows from these remarks, that Theorem 7 (ii) may be regarded as a generalization of the theorem of Hardy-Littlewood [12, p. 245] that $f \log^+ |f| \in L$ implies $\theta(f) \in L$.

Theorems 7 and 8 have many applications which may be derived in the same way as the corresponding results for the spaces L^p (see [12, p. 246]). As an example, we give the following result. Let $k > 0$, and let $\sigma_n^{(k)}(x, f)$ denote the Cesàro sum of order k of the Fourier series of a function $f(x)$. If $\theta(x, f)$ is taken for the interval $(0, 4\pi)$, we have: if $f(x)$ satisfies one of the hypotheses of Theorems 7 or 8, then $|\sigma_n^{(k)}(x, f)| \leq C_k \theta(x, f)$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$. We may give another formulation of this result. In the spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ and $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$ we introduce a

partial ordering, writing $f_1 \leq f_2$ if $f_1(x) \leq f_2(x)$ almost everywhere. With this ordering, Λ and Λ^* become Banach lattices for which the order convergence $f_n \rightarrow f$ is identical with the convergence $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ almost everywhere and the existence of a function $h(x)$ of the lattice such that $|f_n(x)| \leq h(x)$ almost everywhere. This is an immediate consequence of the fact that the lattices Λ , Λ^* satisfy the condition (ii) of Theorem 3 (see [6, pp.154-156]). Then the above result implies that $\sigma_n^{(k)} \rightarrow f$ in order in the corresponding space. Theorems of this section may also be used to obtain analogues of theorems of Hardy [3] and Bellman [1] for spaces Λ and Λ^* ; see Petersen [11].

5.2. *Integral transformations.* Let $K(x, t)$ be measurable on the square $0 \leq x \leq 1$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$, and let

$$(5.7) \quad F(x) = \int_0^1 K(x, t) f(t) dt.$$

THEOREM 9. Suppose that there is a constant M such that

$$(i) \quad \int_0^1 |K(x, t)| dt \leq M \quad \text{almost everywhere};$$

(ii) for any rearrangement $\phi_r(x)$ of $\phi(x)$, the function $h_r(t) = \int_0^1 \phi_r(x) K(x, t) dx$ belongs to $M(\phi)$ and has a norm not exceeding M . Then (5.7) is a linear operator of norm $\leq M$ mapping $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ into itself. Condition (ii) may also be replaced by

$$(iii) \quad \int_0^1 |K(x, t)| dx \leq M \quad \text{almost everywhere}.$$

Proof. Condition (ii) is equivalent to

$$(5.8) \quad h_r^*(t) < M\phi(t).$$

Assuming $f \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$, $p > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \phi_r(x) |F(x)|^p dx &\leq \int_0^1 \phi_r dx \left\{ \int_0^1 |K| |f(t)| dt \right\}^p \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \phi_r dx \int_0^1 |K| |f|^p dt \left\{ \int_0^1 |K| dt \right\}^{p/q} \\ &\leq M^{p/q} \int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt \int_0^1 \phi_r(x) |K(x, t)| dx \\ &\leq M^{p/q} \int_0^1 h_r^*(t) f^*(t)^p dt; \end{aligned}$$

by (5.8) and Lemma 1, this is

$$\leq M^{1+p/q} \int_0^1 \phi(t) f^*(t)^p dt = M^p \|f\|^p,$$

which proves the first part of the theorem. Suppose now that (i) and (iii) hold. Let $\delta > 0$, e an arbitrary set of measure δ , and e_1 a set of measure δ such that $\phi_r(x) \geq \phi(\delta)$ on e_1 and $\phi_r(x) \leq \phi(\delta)$ on the complement $C e_1$ of e_1 . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_e |h_r(t)| dt &\leq \int_e dt \int_{e_1} |\phi_r(x)| |K| dx + \int_e \int_{C e_1} \\ &\leq M \int_{e_1} |\phi_r(x)| dx + \phi(\delta) \int_e dt \int_0^1 |K(x, t)| dx \\ &\leq M \Phi(\delta) + M \delta \phi(\delta) \leq 2M \Phi(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the norm of $h_r(t)$ in $M(\phi)$ does not exceed $2M$, and proves (ii).

REMARK. If the conditions of Theorem 9 are satisfied, then

$$(5.9) \quad G(t) = \int_0^1 K(x, t) g(x) dx$$

is a linear operator of norm $\leq 2M$ mapping $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$ into itself.

We have in fact, for $g \in \Lambda^*(\phi, p)$ and $f \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 G(t) f(t) dt &= \int_0^1 g(x) dx \int_0^1 K(x, t) f(t) dt = \int_0^1 g(x) F(x) dx \\ &\leq \|g\|_{\Lambda^*} \|F\|_{\Lambda} \leq M \|f\|_{\Lambda} \|g\|_{\Lambda^*}, \end{aligned}$$

(the integrals evidently exist), and this shows that $G \in \Lambda^*$ and that $\|G\| \leq M \|g\|$.

Theorem 9 is akin to the "convexity theorem" of M. Riesz [12, p.198]. We mention for completeness that there is a generalization of this theorem, in which the different spaces L^p involved are replaced by the spaces $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ with the same ϕ . The proof, which follows closely the proof of M. Riesz's theorem in [12], is omitted.

5.3. *Moment problems.* We give an application of Theorem 9 to moment problems of the form

$$(5.10) \quad \mu_n = \int_0^1 x^n f(x) dx, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots.$$

We shall write

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{n\nu} &= \Phi\left(\frac{\nu+1}{n+1}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\nu}{n+1}\right), & \Phi(x) &= \int_0^x \phi \, dt, \\ \mu_{n\nu} &= \left(\frac{n}{\nu}\right) \Delta^{n-\nu} \mu_\nu = \int_0^1 f(x) p_{n\nu}(x) \, dx, \\ p_{n\nu} &= \left(\frac{n}{\nu}\right) x^\nu (1-x)^{n-\nu}, & \nu &= 0, 1, \dots, n,\end{aligned}$$

and $\mu_{n\nu}^*$ for the decreasing rearrangement of the $|\mu_{n\nu}|$, $\nu = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Moreover, we set

$$(5.11) \quad f_n(x) = (n+1) \mu_{n\nu} \quad \text{for} \quad \frac{\nu}{n+1} \leq x < \frac{\nu+1}{n+1},$$

and obtain

$$(5.12) \quad f_n(x) = \int_0^1 K_n(x, t) f(t) \, dt,$$

$$K_n(x, t) = (n+1) p_{n\nu}(t), \quad \frac{\nu}{n+1} \leq x < \frac{\nu+1}{n+1},$$

For the special case $\phi(x) = \alpha x^{\alpha-1}$ and $p = 1$, the following theorem (with another proof) has been given in [8].

THEOREM 10. *The sequence of real numbers μ_n is a moment sequence of a function of the space $\Lambda(\phi, p)$ or of $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$ [for the case $\Lambda(\phi, 1)$, we assume $\phi(x) \rightarrow \infty$ for $x \rightarrow 0$] if and only if the norms of the functions (5.11) are uniformly bounded in this space.*

For the space $\Lambda(\phi, p)$, the condition is

$$(5.13) \quad \sum_{\nu=0}^n \Phi_{n\nu} \mu_{n\nu}^{*p} \leq M(n+1)^{-p},$$

and for $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$, $p > 1$,

$$(5.14) \quad \mu_{n\nu}^* < \Phi_{n\nu} D_{n\nu}, \quad \sum_{\nu=0}^n \Phi_{n\nu} D_{n\nu}^q \leq M^q,$$

with some positive decreasing $D_{n\nu}$, $\nu = 0, 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. If $f \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$, then condition (5.13) is satisfied by Theorem 9, because the kernel (5.12) satisfies (i) and (iii) with $M = 1$.

Conversely, let $\|f_n\|_{\Lambda} \leq M$. Since

$$\int_e |f_n(x)| dx \leq \phi(\delta)^{-1} \int_0^{\delta} \phi(x) |f_n(x)| dx \leq M \phi(\delta)^{-1}, \quad \text{meas } e = \delta,$$

it follows in case $p = 1$ that the integrals $\int_e |f_n| dx$ are uniformly absolutely continuous and uniformly bounded. In case $p > 1$, this follows by Hölder's inequality. We deduce that for a certain subsequence $f_{n_k}(x)$, the integrals $\int_e f_{n_k}(x) dx$ converge for any $e = (0, x)$ with x rational; hence they converge for any measurable set $e \subset (0, 1)$. We then have

$$(5.15) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_e f_{n_k}(x) dx = \int_e f(x) dx,$$

with some $f \in L$. Then also

$$(5.16) \quad \int_0^1 f_{n_k} \psi dx \longrightarrow \int_0^1 f \psi dx$$

for any bounded ψ . For any such ψ we have, by (3.2),

$$\left| \int_0^1 f \psi dx \right| \leq \lim \left| \int_0^1 f_{n_k} \psi dx \right| \leq M \|\psi\|_{\Lambda^*};$$

hence this must be true for any ψ in Λ^* . Thus by §3, it follows that $f \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$.

We remark also that it follows easily from (5.16) that we have

$$(5.17) \quad \int_0^1 f_{n_k} \psi_k dx \longrightarrow \int_0^1 f \psi dx,$$

if the sequence $\psi_k(x)$ is uniformly convergent towards a bounded function $\psi(x)$.

Now let P be the vector space of all polynomials

$$\psi(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \dots + a_m x^m$$

with usual addition and scalar multiplication. On P we define an additive and homogeneous functional F by

$$F(\psi) = a_0 \mu_0 + a_1 \mu_1 + \cdots + a_m \mu_m.$$

Let

$$B_n^\psi(x) = \sum_{\nu=0}^n \psi\left(\frac{\nu}{n}\right) p_{n\nu}(x)$$

be the Bernstein polynomial of order n of $\psi(x)$; then it is known [10] that

$$B_n^\psi(x) = a_0^{(n)} + a_1^{(n)}x + \cdots + a_m^{(n)}x^m,$$

and that $a_i^{(n)} \rightarrow a_i$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence $F(B_n^\psi) \rightarrow F(\psi)$. In particular, let $\psi(x) = x^m$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (5.18) \quad F(B_n^\psi) &= \sum_{\nu=0}^n \left(\frac{\nu}{n}\right)^m F(p_{n\nu}) = \sum_{\nu=0}^n \left(\frac{\nu}{n}\right)^m \mu_{n\nu} \\ &= \int_0^1 f_n(x) g_n(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi_n(x)$ is equal to $(\nu/n)^m$ in the interval $[\nu/(n+1), (\nu+1)/(n+1)]$. As $\psi_n(x) \rightarrow \psi(x)$ uniformly, we deduce from (5.18) and (5.17) that

$$\int_0^1 f(x) x^m dx = \lim F(B_n) = F(\psi) = \mu_m, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots$$

Since $f \in \Lambda(\phi, p)$, this proves that the condition is sufficient in case of the space Λ . The proof for the space $\Lambda^*(\phi, p)$, which is similar, is omitted.

REFERENCES

1. R. Bellman, *A note on a theorem of Hardy on Fourier constants*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 50 (1944), 741-744.
2. G. Birkhoff, *Lattice theory*, 2nd ed., New York, 1948.
3. G. H. Hardy, *The arithmetic mean of a Fourier constant*, Messenger of Math. 68 (1929), 50-52.
4. ———, *Divergent series*, Oxford, 1949.
5. G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge, England, 1934.
6. L. Kantorovitch, *Lineare halbgeordnete Räume*, Mat. Sbornik (N.S.) 2 (44) (1937), 121-168.

7. G. G. Lorentz, *A problem of plane measure*, Amer. J. Math. **71** (1949), 417-426.
8. ———, *Some new functional spaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **51** (1950), 37-55.
9. ———, *Multiply subadditive functions*, to appear in the Canadian J. Math.
10. ———, *Bernstein polynomials*, to appear as a book at the University of Toronto Press.
11. G. M. Petersen, paper not yet published.
12. A. Zygmund, *Trigonometric series*, Warszawa, 1935.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO