



Title	Multipliers of invariant subspaces in the bidisc
Author(s)	Nakazi, T.
Citation	Hokkaido University Preprint Series in Mathematics, 189, 1-12
Issue Date	1993-03
DOI	10.14943/83333
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/68935
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	pre189.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

**Multipliers Of Invariant Subspaces
In The Bidisc**

Takahiko Nakazi

Series #189. March 1993

HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY
PREPRINT SERIES IN MATHEMATICS

- # 162: S. Albeverio, K. Iwata, T. Kolsrud, Random parallel transport on surfaces of finite type, and relations to homotopy, 8 pages. 1992.
- # 163: S. Albeverio, K. Iwata, T. Kolsrud, Moments of random fields over a family of elliptic curves, and modular forms, 9 pages. 1992.
- # 164: Y. Giga, M. Sato, Neumann problem for singular degenerate parabolic equations, 12 pages. 1992.
- # 165: J. Wierzbicki, Y. Watatani, Commuting squares and relative entropy for two subfactors, 18 pages. 1992.
- # 166: Y. Okabe, A new algorithm driven from the view-point of the fluctuation-dissipation theorem in the theory of KM_2O -Langevin equations, 13 pages. 1992.
- # 167: Y. Okabe, H. Mano and Y. Itoh, Random collision model for interacting populations of two species and its strong law of large numbers, 14 pages. 1992.
- # 168: A. Inoue, On the equations of stationary processes with divergent diffusion coefficients, 25 pages. 1992.
- # 169: T. Ozawa, Remarks on quadratic nonlinear Schrödinger equations, 19 pages. 1992.
- # 170: T. Fukui, Y. Giga, Motion of a graph by nonsmooth weighted curvature, 11 pages. 1992.
- # 171: J. Inoue, T. Nakazi, Finite dimensional solution sets of extremal problems in H^1 , 10 pages. 1992.
- # 172: S. Izumiya, A characterization of complete integrability for partial differential equations of first order, 6 pages. 1992.
- # 173: T. Suwa, Unfoldings of codimension one complex analytic foliation singularities, 49 pages. 1992.
- # 174: T. Ozawa, Wave propagation in even dimensional spaces, 15 pages. 1992.
- # 175: S. Izumiya, Systems of Clairaut type, 7 pages. 1992.
- # 176: A. Hoshiga, The initial value problems for quasi-linear wave equations in two space dimensions with small data, 25 pages. 1992.
- # 177: K. Sugano, On bicommutators of modules over H-separable extension rings III, 9 pages. 1993.
- # 178: T. Nakazi, Toeplitz operators and weighted norm inequalities, 17 pages. 1993.
- # 179: O. Ogürisu, Existence and structure of infinitely degenerate zero-energy ground states of a Wess-Zumino type model in supersymmetric quantum mechanics, 26 pages. 1993.
- # 180: O. Ogürisu, Ground state of a spin 1/2 charged particle in an even dimensional magnetic field, 9 pages. 1993.
- # 181: K. Sugano, Note on H-separable Galois extension, 6 pages. 1993.
- # 182: M. Yamada, Distance formulas of asymptotic Toeplitz and Hankel operators, 13 pages. 1993
- # 183: G. Ishikawa, T. Ozawa, The genus of a connected compact real algebraic surface in the affine three space, 11 pages. 1993.
- # 184: T. Hibi, Canonical modules and Cohen-Macaulay types of partially ordered sets, 6 pages. 1993.
- # 185: Y. Giga, K. Yama-uchi, On a lower bound for the extinction time of surfaces moved by mean curvature, 16 pages. 1993.
- # 186: Y. Kurokawa, On functional moduli for first order ordinary differential equations, 9 pages. 1993.
- # 187: O. Ogürisu, Unitary equivalence between a spin 1/2 charged particle in a two-dimensional magnetic field and a spin 1/2 neutral particle with an anomalous magnetic moment in a two-dimensional electric field, 4 pages. 1993.
- # 188: A. Jensen, T. Ozawa, Existence and non-existence results for wave operators for perturbations of the laplacian, 30 pages. 1993.

Multipliers Of Invariant Subspaces In The Bidisc

By

Takahiko Nakazi

Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Science
Hokkaido University
Sapporo 060, Japan

*This research was partially supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, Ministry of Education

1980 Mathematics Subject Classification (1985 Revision): Primary 46 J 15, 47 A 15, 47 B 20 ; Secondary 32 A 35.

Keywords and phrases : bidisc, invariant subspace, multipliers

Abstract. For any nonzero invariant subspace M in $H^2(T^2)$, set $M^\times = [\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{z}^n M] \cap [\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{w}^n M]$ then M^\times is also an invariant subspace of $H^2(T^2)$ that contains M . If M is of finite codimension in $H^2(T^2)$ then $M^\times = H^2(T^2)$ and if $M = qH^2(T^2)$ for some inner function q then $M^\times = M$. In this paper invariant subspaces with $M^\times = M$ are studied. If $M = q_1 H^2(T^2) \cap q_2 H^2(T^2)$ and q_1, q_2 are inner functions then $M^\times = M$. However in general this invariant subspace may not be of the form $qH^2(T^2)$ for some inner function q . Put $\mathcal{M}(M) = \{\phi \in L^\infty : \phi M \subseteq H^2(T^2)\}$ then $\mathcal{M}(M)$ is described and $\mathcal{M}(M) = \mathcal{M}(M^\times)$ is shown. This is the set of all multipliers of M in the title. A necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{M}(M) = H^\infty(T^2)$ is given. It is noted that the kernel of a Hankel operator is an invariant subspace M with $M^\times = M$. The argument applies to the polydisc case.

§1. Introduction

Let T^2 be the torus that is the Cartesian product of 2 unit circles in \mathbb{C} . The usual Lebesgue spaces, with respect to the Haar measure m of T^2 , are denoted by $L^p = L^p(T^2)$, and the Hardy spaces $H^p = H^p(T^2)$ are spaces of all $f \in L^p(T^2)$ whose Fourier coefficients

$$\hat{f}(j, \ell) = \int_{T^2} f(z, w) \bar{z}^j \bar{w}^\ell dm(z, w)$$

are 0 as soon as at least one component of (j, ℓ) is negative where $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Let U^2 be the unit bidisc that is the Cartesian product of 2 open unit discs in \mathbb{C} . Any function f in H^p has an analytic extension to U^2 which is also denoted by f .

A closed subspace M of H^2 is said to be invariant if

$$zM \subset M \text{ and } wM \subset M.$$

Put $M_1 = [\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{z}^n M]$ and $M_2 = [\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{w}^n M]$ where $[\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{z}^n M]$ is the closed linear span of $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{z}^n M$ in L^2 . Set

$$M^\times = M_1 \cap M_2$$

then M is also an invariant subspace of H^2 . Put

$$H_1 = [\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{z}^n H^2] \text{ and } H_2 = [\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{w}^n H^2]$$

then $H^2 = H_1 \cap H_2$ and hence $(H^2)^\times = H^2$. Therefore it is desirable to

know invariant subspaces M which have the following property : $M^\times = H^2$ or

$M^\times = M$. An invariant subspace M of H^2 has full range if $M_1 = H_1$ and

$M_2 = H_2$. Such an invariant subspace has been studied by Agrawal, Clark and Douglas [2]. It is clear that M has full range if and only if $M^\times = H^2$. An invariant subspace M with $M^\times = M$ has not been studied. In this paper we study invariant subspaces with $M^\times = M$. For an invariant subspace M of H^2 set

$$\mathcal{M}(M) = \{\phi \in L^\infty : \phi M \subseteq H^2\}.$$

It is essentially known [2] that if $M^\times = M$ then $\mathcal{M}(M) = H^\infty$. In this paper we give a necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{M}(M) = H^\infty$.

Let K_0^2 denote the orthogonal complement of $\bar{H}^2 = \{\bar{f} : f \in H^2\}$ in L^2 . The invariant subspace qH^2 for an inner function q is called a Beurling subspace.

The author would like to thank Professor K. Takahashi for his helpful discussions.

§ 2. Intersection of Beurling subspaces

A Beurling subspace M satisfies $M^\times = M$ trivially. In this section we show that the intersections of Beurling subspaces have this property.

Proposition 1. If M is a nonzero invariant subspace of H^2 then there

exist two unimodular functions Q_1 in H_1 and Q_2 in H_2 such that $M_1 = Q_1 H_1$ and $M_2 = Q_2 H_2$, and hence

$$M^\times = Q_1 H_1 \cap Q_2 H_2.$$

Proof. By [7, p164 ~ p165], $[\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{z}^n M] = \chi_E Q_1 H_1 +$

$(1 - \chi_E) L^2$ where χ_E is a characteristic function of some measurable set E in T^2 , $\chi_E \in H_1$ and $|\chi_E| = 1$ a.e.. Since $M \subset H^2$ and H_1 has no reducing invariant subspaces under the multiplication of w , this implies that $M_1 = Q_1 H_1$ and $Q_1 \in H_1$ because $M_1 \subset H_1$. The same argument shows that $M_2 = Q_2 H_2$ and $Q_2 \in H_2$.

Theorem 2. Let ℓ be a finite positive integer. If $M = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\ell} q_j H^2$ and $\{q_j\}_{j=1}^{\ell}$ are inner functions then $M^\times = M$. Moreover

$$M^\times = Q_1 H_1 \cap Q_2 H_2$$

where $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^2$ are unimodular functions in $\{H_i\}_{i=1}^2$ and

$$M_i = Q_i H_i = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\ell} q_j H_i \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

Proof. Let $N = \bar{M}^\perp$, that is, N is the orthogonal complement of $\bar{M} = \{\bar{f} : f \in M\}$. Then $N = [\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} q_j K_0^2]$ because $(\bar{H}^2)^\perp = K_0^2$. Put $N_1 = [\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} q_j w H_1]$ and $N_2 = [\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} q_j z H_2]$ then $\{N_i\}_{i=1}^2$ are invariant subspaces and $N = [N_1 + N_2]$ because $K_0^2 = w H_1 + z H_2$. It is clear that $z N_1 = N_1$ and $w N_2 = N_2$. If $w N_1 = N_1$ then $N_1 \supset \bar{q}_j \bar{w}^n H_1$ for any positive n and so $N_1 = L^2$. This contradicts that $M \supset (\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} q_j) H^2$. Thus $w N_1 \neq N_1$ and

similarly $zN_2 \neq N_2$. By [7] there exist unimodular functions Q_1 and Q_2 such that $N_1 = Q_1 w H_1$ and $N_2 = Q_2 z H_2$. Since $N = [N_1 + N_2]$,

$$M = Q_1 H_1 \cap Q_2 H_2.$$

Since $Q_i H_i$ is the orthogonal complement of N_i and $N_i = (\bar{M}_i)^\perp$ for $i = 1, 2$,

$$M_i = Q_i H_i = \bigcap_{j=1}^n q_j H_i \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

In the case of one variable an intersection of two Beurling subspaces is also a Beurling subspace. This is not true in the case of two variables by [11, Theorem 2 and its proof]. In fact X_1 and X_2 in [11, Theorem 2] are intersections of two Beurling subspaces and $X_j \subseteq H^2$ for $j = 1, 2$.

If $X_1 = q_1 H^2$ and $X_2 = q_2 H^2$ for some inner functions q_1, q_2 then $\bar{q}_1 X_1 = \bar{q}_2 X_2 = H^2$. This contradicts [11, Theorem 2]. Hence our Theorem 2 is not

trivial. If an invariant subspace M is determined by vanishing conditions

at finitely many points of U then $M^{\times} = M$ because M is a finite co-

dimensional subspace of H^2 . We are interested in an invariant subspace

determined by vanishing conditions at infinitely many points of U . Let s

be an analytic function on U such that $s(U) \subset U$. Put

$$M_s = \{f \in H^2 : f(z, s(z)) = 0 \text{ for all } z \in U\}$$

then M_s is an invariant subspace of H^2 .

Proposition 3. Let s be an analytic function on U and $s(U) \subset U$. Then

$$M_s^* = QH_1 \cap H_2$$

where $Q = \frac{w-s}{1-\bar{s}w}$. (1) If $|s| = 1$ a.e. on T then $M_s^* = H^2$. (2) If

$|s| = r < 1$ a.e. on T for some constant r then

$$M_s^* = M_s = Q' H_1 \cap H_2 = Q' H^2 \cap H^2$$

where $Q' = \frac{w-s}{sr^{-1}-rw}$.

Proof. If $f \in M_s$ then for a.e. $z \in T$ $\frac{1-sw}{w-s} f(z, w)$ is

w -analytic and hence f belongs to QH_1 . Therefore $M_{s,1} \subset QH_1$. Since

$(1-rsw)^{-1} \in H_1$ for any constant r with $0 < r < 1$ and $w-s \in M_s$,

$(w-s)(1-rsw)^{-1}$ belongs to $M_{s,1}$. Since

$$\left| \frac{w-s}{1-r\bar{s}w} - \frac{w-s}{1-\bar{s}w} \right| \leq \left| \frac{1-r}{1-r\bar{s}w} \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{as } r \rightarrow 1)$$

because $m\{(z, w) \in T^2 : \bar{s}(z)w = 1\} = 0$, Q belongs to $M_{s,1}$ and hence $M_{s,1}$

$= QH_1$. Since $(w-rs)^{-1} \in H_2$ for any r with $0 < r < 1$ and $w-s \in$

M_s , $(w-s)(w-rs)^{-1} \in M_{s,2}$. As $r \rightarrow 1$ the constant 1 belongs to $M_{s,2}$

and hence $M_{s,2} = H_2$. This implies $M_s^* = QH_1 \cap H_2$. (1) is clear because

$sH_1 = H_1$. (2) Since $\frac{w-s}{1-sw} = \frac{sr^{-1}(w-s)}{sr^{-1}-rw}$, $M_s = Q' H_1 \cap H_2$. Put

$N = Q' H^2 \cap H^2$. If $Q' f = g$ for some f and g in H^2 then

$$(w-s)f(z, w) = (sr^{-1} - rw)g(z, w) \quad (z, w) \in U^2.$$

Thus g belongs to M_s and hence $M_s \supset N$. It is clear that $N_1 \subset Q' H_1$ and $N_2 \subset H_2$. The Q' belongs to N_1 because $(sr^{-1} - rw)^{-1} \in H_1$ and $w - s \in N$. The constant 1 belongs to N_2 because $(w - s)^{-1} \in H_2$ and $w - s \in N$. Thus $N = Q' H_1 \cap H_2$. Since $N^\times = N$ by the proof of Theorem 2, $M_s^\times = M_s = Q' H_1 \cap H_2 = Q' H^2 \cap H^2$.

§ 3. Multipliers of an invariant subspace

An invariant subspace M of H^2 is said to be podal if every invariant subspace N of H^2 is unitarily equivalent to M which is a subspace of M (cf. [3]). Agrawal, Clark and Douglas [2] showed that if an invariant subspace of H^2 has full range then it is podal. The following is a generalization of that. For if N is full range then $N^\times = H^2$.

Proposition 4. Let M and N be invariant subspaces of H^2 with $M \subset N^\times$.

If M is unitarily equivalent to N , then $M \subset N$.

Proof. By [2, Lemma 1] $M = qN$ for some unimodular function q . Then $M^\times = qN^\times$ and $M^\times \subset N^\times$. By [2, Proposition 3] the q is an inner function.

Proposition 5. Let M and N be invariant subspaces of H^2 with $M^\times = N^\times$.

Then M is unitarily equivalent to N if and only if $M = N$.

Proof. If M is unitarily equivalent to N then $M = qN$ for some unimodular function q . Then $M^\times = qN^\times$ and hence $M^\times = qM^\times$. Thus q is an inner function. By the same argument $N^\times = \bar{q}N^\times$ and hence q is also an inner function. Thus q is constant and $M = N$.

If M and N are invariant subspaces of finite codimension in H^2 , then we can show $M^\times = N^\times$ and hence by Proposition 5 $M = N$. This is Corollary 3 in [2] (see [5, Corollary 6]). Douglas and Yan [3] gave the following question: Can one characterize podal invariant subspaces?

Proposition 6. Let M be a nonzero invariant subspace of H^2 . M is podal if and only if any unimodular functions in $\mathcal{M}(M)$ belong to H^∞ .

Proof. If ϕ is a unimodular function in $\mathcal{M}(M)$ then $\phi M \subset H^2$ and ϕM is unitarily equivalent to M . If M is podal then $\phi M \subset M$ and hence $\phi \in H^\infty$ by [2, Proposition 3]. Suppose any unimodular functions in $\mathcal{M}(M)$ belong to H^∞ . If M is unitarily equivalent to N which is an invariant subspace in H^2 then $N = \phi M$ for some unimodular function ϕ . Since $\phi \in \mathcal{M}(M)$, by the hypothesis ϕ belongs to H^∞ and so M is podal.

By the proposition above, if $\mathcal{M}(M) = H^\infty$ then M is podal. We will characterize an invariant subspace M with $\mathcal{M}(M) = H^\infty$. In general $\mathcal{M}(M)$ is an invariant subspace of L^∞ which contains H^∞ . The structure of $\mathcal{M}(M)$ is

simpler than that of M .

Theorem 7. If M is a nonzero invariant subspace of H^2 then

$$\mathcal{M}(M) = \bar{Q}_1 H_1 \cap \bar{Q}_2 H_2 \cap L^\infty$$

where $M^\times = Q_1 H_1 \cap Q_2 H_2$ and Q_i is a unimodular function in H_i for

$i = 1, 2$. Hence $\mathcal{M}(M) = H^\infty$ if and only if

$$\bar{Q}_1 H_1 \cap \bar{Q}_2 H_2 \cap L^\infty = H^\infty.$$

Proof. If $\phi \in \mathcal{M}(M)$ then $\phi M \subset H^2$. Hence for $i = 1, 2$

$$\phi M_i \subset H_i \quad \text{and} \quad M_i = Q_i H_i$$

where Q_i is a unimodular function in H_i . Thus $\phi \in \bar{Q}_1 H_1 \cap \bar{Q}_2 H_2 \cap$

L^∞ and hence $\mathcal{M}(M) \subset \bar{Q}_1 H_1 \cap \bar{Q}_2 H_2 \cap L^\infty$. Conversely let ϕ be in

$\bar{Q}_1 H_1 \cap \bar{Q}_2 H_2 \cap L^\infty$ then

$$\phi = \bar{Q}_1 \phi_1 = \bar{Q}_2 \phi_2$$

where ϕ_i is in H_i for $i = 1, 2$. If $f \in M$ then $f \in M^\times$ and hence

$$f = Q_1 f_1 = Q_2 f_2$$

where f_i is in H_i for $i = 1, 2$. Therefore $\phi f = \phi_1 f_1 = \phi_2 f_2$. This im-

plies that $\phi f \in H_1 \cap H_2 = H^2$ and hence $\phi \in \mathcal{M}(M)$. Thus $\bar{Q}_1 H_1 \cap$

$\bar{Q}_2 H_2 \cap L^\infty \subset \mathcal{M}(M)$. This implies the theorem.

For $\phi \in L^\infty$, the Hankel operator determined by ϕ is

$$H_\phi = (I - P)M_\phi | H^2$$

where P is the orthogonal projection from L^2 to H^2 .

Proposition 8. The kernel of a Hankel operator is an invariant subspace M with $M^\times = M$.

Proof. Suppose H_ϕ is the Hankel operator defined by $\phi \in L^\infty$ and let M be its kernel. It is clear that M is an invariant subspace. Since M is the kernel of H_ϕ , $\phi M \subset H^2$. By Theorem 7, $\mathcal{M}(M) = \mathcal{M}(M^\times)$ and $\phi M^\times \subset H^2$. This implies $M = M^\times$ because $M = \{\phi f \in H^2 : f \in H^2\}$.

References

1. P.R.Ahern and D.N.Clark, Invariant subspaces and analytic continuation in several variables, J. Math. Mech. 19(1970), 963-969.
2. O.P.Agrawal, D.N.Clark, and R.G.Douglas, Invariant subspaces in the polydisk, Pacific J. Math. 121(1986) 1-11.
3. R.G.Douglas and K.Yan, On the rigidity of Hardy submodules, Integral Eg. Oper. Th. 13(1990).
4. K.Hoffman, Banach Spaces of Analytic Functions, Prentice-Hall, 1962.
5. K.Izuchi, Unitary equivalence of invariant subspaces in the polydisk, Pacific J. Math. 130(1987), 351-358.

6. T.Nakazi, Nonmaximal weak-*Dirichlet algebra, Hokkaido Math. J.
5(1976), 88-96.
7. T.Nakazi, Invariant subspaces of weak-*Dirichlet algebras, Pacific J.
Math. 69(1977), 151-167.
8. T.Nakazi, Certain invariant subspaces of H^2 and L^2 on a bidisc, Can.
J. Math. XL (1988), 1272-1280.
9. T.Nakazi, Invariant subspaces in the bidisc and commutators, to appear
in J. Aust. Math. Soc.
10. T.Nakazi, Homogeneous polynomials and invariant subspaces in the
polydiscs. Archiv der Math. 58(1992), 56-63.
11. W.Rudin, Invariant subspaces of H^2 on a torus, J. Funct. Anal.
61(1985), 378-384.