

On the boundedness of certain generalized Hilbert operators in ℓ^p

Nikolaos Athanasiou*

May 2022

Abstract

The Hilbert matrix $\mathcal{H}_{n,m} = (n+m+1)^{-1}$ has been extensively studied in previous literature. In this paper we look at generalized Hilbert operators arising from measures on the interval $[0, 1]$, such that the Hilbert matrix is obtained by the Lebesgue measure. We provide a necessary and sufficient condition for these operators to be bounded in ℓ^p and calculate their norm.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation and history

The study of the classical Hilbert operator has its origins on the classical inequality of the same name.

Theorem 1.1. (*Hilbert's inequality*) *Suppose that $(a_m)_{m=1}^\infty$ and $(b_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ are sequences of non-negative terms and let $p, q > 1$ be Hölder conjugates, i.e. such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Assume that $(a_m) \in \ell^p$ and $(b_n) \in \ell^q$. Then there holds*

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_m b_n}{m+n} \leq \frac{\pi}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{p}\right)} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

It was Hilbert who first proved the above for the special case $p = q = 2$ in one of his lectures on integral equations. His proof was published by Weyl (1908). The first proof for general $p, q > 1$ was given by Hardy and Riesz [5]. Perhaps the best reference for the proof is [4]. A sharp version of Hilbert's inequality is the following: For $(a_m)_{m=0}^\infty$ and $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ both sequences of non-negative numbers such that $(a_m) \in \ell^p$ and $(b_n) \in \ell^q$, there holds

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_m b_n}{m+n+1} \leq \frac{\pi}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{p}\right)} \left(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}. \quad (1.1)$$

*American College of Thessaloniki, V. Sevenidi 17, Pylaia 55535, Thessaloniki, Greece.
E-mail address: nikathan@act.edu

The Hilbert operator and its associated Hilbert matrix are now introduced as follows: Consider the operator H on ℓ^p given by

$$H : (a_n)_{n=0}^\infty \mapsto \left(\sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{a_m}{m+n+1} \right)_{n=0}^\infty.$$

The fact that this is a bounded operator on ℓ^p for $p > 1$ follows from Hilbert's inequality as follows.

We recall that the norm of $(a_n) \in \ell^p$ is $\|(a_n)\|_{\ell^p} = (\sum_{n=0}^\infty a_n^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Moreover there must hold

$$\|(a_n)\|_{\ell^p} = \sup_{h \in (\ell^p)^*, \|h\| \leq 1} h((a_n)),$$

where h is any element of the dual space ℓ^q with norm 1. Therefore

$$\|(a_n)\|_{\ell^p} = \sup_{(b_n) \in \ell^q, \|(b_n)\|_{\ell^q} \leq 1} \left| \sum_{n=0}^\infty a_n b_n \right|.$$

By fixing an arbitrary number k and taking the supremum over all sequences $(b_n) \in \ell^q$ such that $\|(b_n)\|_{\ell^q} = k$, we arrive at the desired result. The associated

matrix

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdots \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{4} & \cdots \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$$

acting on column vectors whose entries are terms of a sequence in ℓ^p is another way to look at the operator (we shall not be making a notational distinction between H and its associated matrix). Further historical notes and properties of the Hilbert matrix can be found in [1].

Notice that each entry in H can be written as

$$H_{n,k} = \int_0^1 g_{n,k}(t) dt,$$

where $g_{n,k}(t) := \binom{n+k}{k} (1-t)^n t^k$. Motivated by this integral representation, in the current paper we shall be looking at a class of generalized Hilbert operators, arising from replacing dt with finite, positive Borel measures. The definition is as follows.

Definition 1.2. Let μ be a finite, positive Borel measure on $[0, 1]$. We define the generalized Hilbert matrix C^μ by

$$C_{n,k}^\mu := \binom{n+k}{k} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^k d\mu(t), \quad (1.2)$$

for n, k integers ranging from 0 to ∞ .

The generalized Hilbert matrix can be viewed as an operator on ℓ^p given by $\ell^p \ni (c_n)_{n=0}^\infty \mapsto (d_n)_{n=0}^\infty$, with

$$d_n := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{n,k}^\mu c_k. \quad (1.3)$$

Let us, finally, note that the corresponding question to the one addressed in this paper for the case of generalized Césaro operators was tackled in [3] and throughout this work, our general approach significantly borrows from the ideas presented in it.

1.2 Preliminaries

In this subsection we will be introducing a series of lemmata which will become relevant later on.

Lemma 1.3. *There holds*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} s^n = (1-s)^{-m-1},$$

for all $s \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. That the left-hand side converges (absolutely) is a direct consequence of the ratio test for series. One can use induction on m . For $m = 0$, the result holds. Assume the result holds for $m = k$. Then we have

$$(1-s)^{-m-2} = \frac{1}{1-s} (1-s)^{-m-1} = (1+s+s^2+\dots) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} s^n.$$

Since both series above converge absolutely, their product is given by the series

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{l=0}^n \binom{m+l}{m} \right) s^n,$$

which is convergent by Mertens' theorem on the Cauchy product of series. Therefore, all one has to show is that

$$\sum_{l=0}^n \binom{m+l}{m} = \binom{m+n+1}{m+1},$$

which itself can be shown by a straightforward induction, using the fact that

$$\binom{m+n+1}{m+1} + \binom{m+n+1}{m} = \binom{m+n+2}{m+1}.$$

□

Lemma 1.4. *There holds*

$$\frac{1-t}{1-te^{-x}} \geq e^{-\frac{t}{1-t}x},$$

for x non-negative and $t \in [0, 1)$.

Proof. One can consider, for a fixed t , the function

$$f_t(x) = (1-te^{-x})e^{-\frac{t}{1-t}x}.$$

Differentiating with respect to x we see that the only critical point is at $x = 0$, whence the result follows. \square

Lemma 1.5. *There holds*

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(\omega)} \int_0^\infty e^{-ax} x^{\omega-1} dx = a^{-\omega},$$

for any $a > 0$ and $\omega > 0$.

Proof. As long as a is positive, the integral is well-defined and convergent. Recall that

$$\Gamma(\omega) = \int_0^\infty e^{-x} x^{\omega-1} dx.$$

Setting $u = ax$, we have $dx = \frac{du}{a}$ and the integral becomes

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-u} u^{\omega-1} a^{-\omega} du = a^{-\omega} \Gamma(\omega).$$

The result follows. \square

2 Boundedness of \mathcal{C}^μ on ℓ^p

In the current section we shall prove two theorems regarding the boundedness of \mathcal{C}^μ as an operator on ℓ^p spaces. The first concerns the case where there are no Dirac masses at 0 or 1, while the latter allows for the existence of such masses at the endpoints of $[0, 1]$.

Theorem 2.1. *Fix $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. If μ has no Dirac masses at 0 or 1, then the matrix \mathcal{C}^μ is bounded as an operator from ℓ^p to itself if and only if*

$$\mathcal{N}_p^\mu := \int_0^1 \frac{1}{(1-t)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} t^{\frac{1}{p}}} d\mu(t) < \infty.$$

Moreover, if that is the case, the operator norm equals \mathcal{N}_p^μ (here we understand that when $p = \infty$, the integral becomes $\int_0^1 \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t)$).

Proof. Suppose that $\int_0^1 \frac{1}{(1-t)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} t^{\frac{1}{p}}} d\mu(t)$ is finite and there are no Dirac masses at 0 or 1. We will, in the first instance, show that \mathcal{C}^μ is bounded from ℓ^p to ℓ^p for $1 \leq p < \infty$ and we will calculate its norm. We will then treat the case $p = \infty$.

We begin by defining, for a given sequence $(a_n)_{n=0}^\infty \in \ell^p$, the function $e_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$e_n(t) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} t^m (1-t)^n a_m. \quad (2.1)$$

We claim that e_n is well-defined on $[0, 1]$ and that there holds, for $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e_n^p \leq \frac{1}{(1-t)^{p-1} t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n^p. \quad (2.2)$$

To check this, we first look at the case $p > 1$. Here, Hölder's inequality gives

$$e_n(t) \leq \left(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \underbrace{\binom{n+m}{m}^q t^{qm} (1-t)^{qn}}_{:= B_m} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $q = \frac{p}{p-1}$ is the Hölder conjugate of p , i.e. $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$. To check that the first term on the right-hand side in (2.3) is convergent, the ratio test for series gives

$$\frac{B_{m+1}}{B_m} = \left(\frac{\binom{n+m+1}{m+1} t^{m+1} (1-t)^n}{\binom{n+m}{m} t^m (1-t)^n} \right)^q = \left(\frac{m+n+1}{m+1} t \right)^q \rightarrow t^q, \quad (2.4)$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, for $t \in [0, 1)$, we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B_{m+1}}{B_m} = t^q < t < 1$$

and therefore the series is (absolutely) convergent. Finally, for $t = 1$, the partial sums $\sum_{m=0}^K B_m = 0$ and hence the series equals zero. This shows that for all $t \in [0, 1]$, $e_n(t)$ is well-defined.

For $p = 1$, it is enough to show that, for a fixed $t \in [0, 1]$ and for any fixed n , the sequence

$$c_m(n; t) := \binom{n+m}{m} t^m (1-t)^n$$

is in ℓ^∞ . Consider a biased coin with probability of heads t and probability of tails $1-t$. The probability of landing m heads in $(n+m)$ throws for this coin

is precisely $c_m(n; t)$. Hence each term is bounded by 1 and the result follows. This proves that $e_n(t)$ is well-defined when $(a_n) \in \ell^1$.

By Hölder's inequality again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_n^p(t) &\leq \left(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} (1-t)^n t^m a_m^p \right) \left(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} (1-t)^n t^m \right)^{p-1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1-t)^{p-1}} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} (1-t)^n t^m a_m^p. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Summing over n , we get (for $0 < t < 1$),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e_n^p &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1-t)^{p-1}} \binom{n+m}{m} (1-t)^n t^m a_m^p \\ &\leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1-t)^{p-1}} t^m a_m^p \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} (1-t)^n \\ &\leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1-t)^{p-1} t} a_m^p, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where we have used Lemma 1.3. We now have

$$\begin{aligned} b_n &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 \binom{n+m}{m} t^m (1-t)^n a_m d\mu(t) \\ &= \int_0^1 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} t^m (1-t)^n a_m d\mu(t) \quad (\text{by the } {}^1\text{D.C.T.}) \\ &= \int_0^1 e_n(t) d\mu(t). \end{aligned}$$

By Minkowski's inequality, we have

$$\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e_n^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} d\mu(t) \leq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{p}} (1-t)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} d\mu(t), \quad (2.7)$$

or equivalently

$$\|(b_n)\|_{\ell^p} \leq \left(\int_0^1 \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{p}} (1-t)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}} d\mu(t) \right) \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^p}. \quad (2.8)$$

To show that \mathcal{N}_p^μ is the optimal constant (and hence the norm of the corresponding operator, when it is finite) we work as follows. Fix any $\eta > 0$ small.

There exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\delta}^{1-\delta} \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{p}} (1-t)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}} d\mu(t) > (1-\eta) \mathcal{N}_p^{\mu}. \quad (2.9)$$

That such a δ exists follows from the monotone convergence theorem, when applied for example to the functions $f_n(t) = \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{p}} (1-t)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}} \mathbb{1}_{[\frac{1}{n}, \frac{n-1}{n}]}$. We choose c, N, ε (in this order) such that

- There holds $(1 + \frac{1}{c})^{-\frac{2}{p}} > 1 - \eta$.
- There holds $N \geq \lceil \frac{c}{\delta} \rceil$, so that

$$\int_{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}^{1-\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{p}} (1-t)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}} d\mu(t) > \int_{\delta}^{1-\delta} \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{p}} (1-t)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}} d\mu(t) > (1-\eta) \mathcal{N}_p^{\mu},$$

for $n \geq N$.

- There holds $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{p}$. Moreover, denoting $w = \frac{1}{p} + \varepsilon$, we must choose ε so that the following two conditions also hold:

$$\int_{\delta}^{1-\delta} t^{-w} (1-t)^{w-1} d\mu(t) > (1-\eta) \int_{\delta}^{1-\delta} \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{p}} (1-t)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}} d\mu(t) \quad (2.10)$$

and such that

$$\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} (n+1)^{-pw} > (1-\eta) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1)^{-pw}. \quad (2.11)$$

The latter condition can be met for ε sufficiently small, since the p -series diverges for $p = 1$ and converges for $p > 1$.

Finally, we pick the sequence $a_n = (n+1)^{-w}$. Using Lemma 1.5, we have

$$a_n = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\omega)} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-(n+1)x} x^{w-1} dx \quad (2.12)$$

Using this and (2.1), we can get the following estimate for $e_n(t)$.

$$\begin{aligned} e_n(t) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\omega)} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-x} x^{w-1} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} t^m (1-t)^n e^{-mx} dx \\ &= \frac{(1-t)^n}{\Gamma(\omega)} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-x} x^{w-1} (1-te^{-x})^{-n-1} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{1-t} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\omega)} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-x} x^{w-1} \left(\frac{1-t}{1-te^{-x}} \right)^{n+1} dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1-t} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\omega)} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-x} x^{w-1} e^{-(n+1)\frac{t}{1-t}x} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{1-t} \left(\frac{1+nt}{1-t} \right)^{-w}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

where the penultimate step was obtained by Lemma 1.4 and the last step from Lemma 1.5. When $\frac{c}{n} \leq t \leq 1 - \frac{c}{n}$, we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} e_n(t) &\geq (1-t)^{w-1} t^{-w} \left(1 + \frac{1}{c}\right)^{-w} (n+1)^{-w} \\ &\geq (1-t)^{w-1} t^{-w} (1-\eta) a_n. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Using (2.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_n &= \int_0^1 e_n(t) d\mu(t) \geq \int_{\frac{c}{n}}^{1-\frac{c}{n}} e_n(t) d\mu(t) \\ &\geq (1-\eta) a_n \int_{\frac{c}{n}}^{1-\frac{c}{n}} t^{-w} (1-t)^{w-1} d\mu(t) \\ &\geq (1-\eta) a_n \int_{\delta}^{1-\delta} t^{-w} (1-t)^{w-1} d\mu(t) \\ &\geq (1-\eta)^2 a_n \int_{\delta}^{1-\delta} t^{-\frac{1}{p}} (1-t)^{\frac{1}{p}-1} d\mu(t) \\ &\geq (1-\eta)^3 a_n \mathcal{N}_p^\mu, \quad \text{for } n \geq N, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

hence

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n^p \geq \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} b_n^p \geq \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} (1-\eta)^{3p} (\mathcal{N}_p^\mu)^p a_n^p \geq (1-\eta)^{3p+1} (\mathcal{N}_p^\mu)^p \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n^p. \quad (2.16)$$

This establishes the "if" direction. For the "only if" direction, assume that \mathcal{C}^μ is bounded as an operator on ℓ^p for $1 \leq p < \infty$. We claim that the integral \mathcal{N}_p^μ is finite. We shall make use of the same sequences as the ones just used. With the preceding notation, for an arbitrarily small but fixed $\eta > 0$, we have for the sequences described above:

$$b_n = \int_0^1 e_n(t) d\mu(t) \geq (1-\eta) a_n \int_0^1 (1-t)^{w-1} t^{-w} d\mu(t) \quad (2.17)$$

and hence

$$\left(\sum b_n^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq \left[(1-\eta) \int_0^1 (1-t)^{w-1} t^{-w} d\mu(t)\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum a_n^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (2.18)$$

From here we observe, given the boundedness of \mathcal{C}^μ , that $\int_0^1 (1-t)^{w-1} t^{-w} d\mu(t)$ is finite and uniformly bounded above by the operator norm as $\eta \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, it is not hard to establish that, as $\eta \rightarrow 0$, the way ε is chosen means that $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ as well and hence the functions

$$(1-\eta)(1-t)^{w-1}t^{-w} \rightarrow \frac{1}{(1-t)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}t^{\frac{1}{p}}}$$

pointwise as $\eta \rightarrow 0$. Fix any $z > 0$ small. An application of the dominated convergence theorem on the interval $[z, 1-z]$ (on this fixed interval, the functions $(1-\eta)(1-t)^{w-1}t^{-w}$ are uniformly bounded above) now implies that the integral

$$\int_z^{1-z} \frac{1}{(1-t)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}t^{\frac{1}{p}}} d\mu(t)$$

is finite and bounded above by the operator norm. As $z \rightarrow 0$, an application of the monotone convergence theorem gives the desired result.

We finally examine the case $p = \infty$. Assume that $\int_0^1 \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t)$ is finite and consider a sequence $(a_n) \in \ell^\infty$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} b_n &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^m a_m d\mu(t) \\ &\leq \left[\int_0^1 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} (1-t)^n t^m d\mu(t) \right] \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^\infty} \\ &= \left[\int_0^1 \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t) \right] \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^\infty}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

Taking the supremum over n , we have

$$\|(b_n)\|_{\ell^\infty} \leq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t) \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^\infty}. \tag{2.20}$$

By taking (a_n) to be a constant sequence different than the zero sequence, we see that the constant is optimal. Conversely, if the operator is bounded on ℓ^∞ , picking any constant non-zero sequence (a_n) , we see that the integral $\int_0^1 \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t)$ is finite and the result follows. \square

2.1 The case where μ is allowed to have Dirac masses at 0 and/or 1

To allow for the possibility of Dirac masses at 0 or 1, we need to be a bit more careful with semantics and notation.

2.1.1 Preliminary measure-theoretic notes

Given a measure μ on $[0, 1]$ and a function f defined on $[0, 1]$ which is measurable with respect to μ , we shall denote the integral $\int_0^1 f(t) d\mu(t)$ by $\mu_{[0,1]}f$. In general, for any measurable subset \mathcal{A} of $[0, 1]$, we will use $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}(f)$ to denote the integral $\mu_{[0,1]}(f \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}})$, which is well-defined as $f \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is μ -measurable.

For a function g defined only on a subset \mathcal{P} of $[0, 1]$, by a slight abuse of notation, we shall also use $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(g)$ to denote the integral

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}} g d\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(t),$$

where $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$ is the restriction of the measure on \mathcal{P} in the obvious way.

For a given measure μ and for any function f on $[0, 1]$, the following decomposition holds:

$$\mu_{[0,1]}(f) = \mu_{(0,1)}(f) + c_0 f(0) + c_1 f(1),$$

where $c_1 := \mu(\{0\})$ and $c_2 := \mu(\{1\})$ are the Dirac masses of the measure at 0 and 1 respectively. This, in turn, provides the following decomposition for the matrix \mathcal{C}^μ :

$$\mathcal{C}_{n,k}^\mu = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{n,k}^\mu + \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,k}^\mu, \quad (2.21)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{n,k}^\mu := \mu_{(0,1)}(g_{n,k}(t))$ and

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}^\mu := \begin{pmatrix} c_0 + c_1 & c_1 & c_1 & c_1 & \dots \\ c_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ c_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots \\ c_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

2.1.2 Main Result

In this section we will show the following:

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that μ contains Dirac masses c_0 at 0 and c_1 at 1, with $|c_0| + |c_1| > 0$. For $1 \leq p < \infty$, the only case when \mathcal{C}^μ can be a bounded operator on ℓ^p is when $c_1 \neq 0 = c_0$ and $p = 1$. In that case, the operator is bounded if and only if*

$$\int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{t} d\mu(t) = \int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{t} d\mu(t) + c_1$$

is finite. Moreover, this expression, when finite, equals the norm of the operator. Finally, when $p = \infty$, the operator is bounded if and only if $c_0 \neq 0 = c_1$ and the integral

$$\int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t)$$

is finite. Moreover, the above, when finite, equals the norm of the operator on ℓ^∞ .

Proof. We begin by establishing the following two lemmata:

Lemma 2.3. *If the measure μ contains a Dirac mass at 0, then the matrix is unbounded on ℓ^p for $1 \leq p < \infty$.*

This holds for the following reason. The matrix \hat{C}^μ for $c_0 \neq 0$ does not even map ℓ^p to itself, since

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_0 + c_1 & c_1 & c_1 & c_1 & \cdots \\ c_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ c_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots \\ c_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_0 \\ a_1 \\ a_2 \\ a_3 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (c_0 + c_1)a_0 + c_1(a_1 + a_2 + \cdots) \\ c_0 a_0 \\ c_0 a_0 \\ c_0 a_0 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.22)$$

and clearly, as the sequence on the right-hand side eventually consists of the same non-zero (as long as $a_0 \neq 0$) constant, it cannot be in ℓ^p . Finally, since the matrix \tilde{C}^μ comprises only positive entries, the sum $\tilde{C}^\mu + \hat{C}^\mu$ also fails to map ℓ^p to ℓ^p .

Lemma 2.4. *If the measure μ contains a Dirac mass at 1 and no Dirac mass at 0, then the matrix C^μ is unbounded as an operator on ℓ^p for $1 < p < \infty$.*

To establish this, notice that the first term of the sequence on the right-hand side of (2.22) is $c_1(a_0 + a_1 + \cdots)$. In general, the ℓ^p spaces are nested, in the sense that $\ell^p \subset \ell^q$ for $p < q$ and hence for each $p > 1$ there exists a sequence in ℓ^p which is not in ℓ^1 . Since \tilde{C}^μ consists of only positive entries, it again follows that C^μ does not map ℓ^p to itself when $c_1 \neq 0 = c_0$ and $p > 1$. The only case left to examine, when the measure contains a Dirac mass, is when $c_1 \neq 0 = c_0$ and \tilde{C}^μ is viewed as an operator on ℓ^1 . In this case we claim that the operator is bounded if and only if

$$\mu_{(0,1]} \left(\frac{1}{t} \right) = \int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{t} d\mu(t) + c_1$$

is finite and that, when finite, the expression above equals the operator norm.

Indeed, assume first that the expression above is finite. Proceeding as in (2.6), we get, for $0 < t < 1$:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e_n(t) \leq \frac{1}{t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(t) \quad (2.23)$$

for all n . We now notice that

$$b_0 = \int_{(0,1)} e_0(t) d\mu(t) + c_1 \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^1} \quad (2.24)$$

and

$$b_n = \int_{(0,1)} e_n(t) d\mu(t) \quad (2.25)$$

for $n \geq 1$. Adding (2.24) and (2.25) together, we arrive at

$$\|(b_n)\|_{\ell^1} \leq \left(\int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{t} d\mu(t) + c_1 \right) \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^1} \quad (2.26)$$

To show that this is the optimal constant, we again use the sequences described in the previous section. With the same notation as before, with $a_n = (n+1)^{-w}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n &= b_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n = \int_{(0,1)} e_0(t) d\mu(t) + c_1 \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^1} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{(0,1)} e_n(t) d\mu(t) \\ &\geq \left((1-\eta)^4 \int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{t} d\mu(t) + c_1 \right) \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

Letting $\eta \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the desired result.

Finally, let us suppose that the operator \mathcal{C}^μ is bounded on ℓ^1 . The same argument as in the previous case shows the finiteness of $\int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{t} d\mu(t)$.

We finally examine the case $p = \infty$. The proof is similar in spirit to the previous results, although a bit simpler. Indeed, if $c_1 \neq 0$ then it is clear from (2.21) that \mathcal{C}^μ does not map ℓ^∞ to itself.

Assume that $\int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t)$ is finite and consider a sequence $(a_n) \in \ell^\infty$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} b_n &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} \int_{(0,1)} (1-t)^n t^m a_m d\mu(t) + c_0 a_n \\ &\leq \left[\int_{(0,1)} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} (1-t)^n t^m d\mu(t) \right] \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^\infty} + c_0 a_n \\ &= \left[\int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t) \right] \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^\infty} + c_0 a_n. \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Taking the supremum of (2.28) over n , we have

$$\|(b_n)\|_{\ell^\infty} \leq \int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t) \|(a_n)\|_{\ell^\infty}. \quad (2.29)$$

By taking (a_n) to be a constant sequence different than the zero sequence, we see that the constant is optimal.

Conversely, assuming that the operator is bounded from ℓ^∞ to itself, again picking a non-zero constant sequence, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} b_n &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+m}{m} \int_{(0,1)} (1-t)^n t^m a_m d\mu(t) + c_0 a_n \\ &= \left[\int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t) \right] a_n. \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

From this, the finiteness of the operator norm implies the finiteness of

$$\int_{(0,1)} \frac{1}{1-t} d\mu(t)$$

and the result follows. □

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Aristomenis Siskakis for introducing me to this problem and for various beneficial suggestions regarding the format of the paper. I would also like to thank him, as well as Vasilis Daskalogiannis, Petros Galanopoulos and Giorgos Stylogiannis for several fruitful discussions on the topic. Finally, I thank Vasilis for useful comments and suggestions on the introduction.

References

- [1] V. Daskalogiannis, *Operators on Spaces of Analytic Functions*, PhD Thesis, <https://ikee.lib.auth.gr/record/336046/files/GRI-2021-33277.pdf>
- [2] P. Galanopoulos, D. Girela, J.A. Pelaez and A. G. Siskakis, *Generalized Hilbert operators*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 39 (2014), 231–258.
- [3] G. H. Hardy, *An inequality for Hausdorff means*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., Vol. s1-18 (1943), p. 46-50.
- [4] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Camb. Univ. Press (1988).
- [5] G. H. Hardy, *Note on a theorem of Hilbert concerning series of positive terms*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 23 (1925), 45-46