

DIRICHLET FINITE SOLUTIONS OF $\Delta u = Pu$

IVAN J. SINGER¹

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this paper is to give a necessary and also a sufficient condition for a Dirichlet finite harmonic function on a Riemann surface to be represented as a difference of a Dirichlet finite solution of $\Delta u = Pu$ ($P \geq 0$) and a Dirichlet finite potential of signed measure.

1. Let $P = P(z) dx dy$ ($z = x + iy$) be a nonnegative not identically zero α -Hölder continuous ($0 < \alpha \leq 1$) second order differential on a Riemann surface R and $PD(R)$ be the Hilbert space of all Dirichlet finite solutions of

$$(1) \quad \Delta u(z) = P(z)u(z), \quad \Delta \cdot = 4\partial^2 \cdot / \partial z \partial \bar{z},$$

on R with the scalar product given by mixed Dirichlet integral, i.e. $(u, v) = D_R(u, v) = \int_R du \wedge *dv$, not the energy integral.

The study of $PD(R)$ was begun by Royden [6]. We will use the fact shown by Nakai [2] that $PD(R)$ forms a vector lattice under the natural order in $PD(R)$. We also use the Glasner-Katz maximum principle [1] that the modulus of every function in $PD(R)$ takes its maximum on the Royden harmonic boundary. The recent result of Nakai [3] that $PBD(R)$ is dense in $PD(R)$ will not be made use of.

Let $\Delta(R)$ be the Royden harmonic boundary and $HD(R)$ be the class of Dirichlet finite harmonic functions on R . (For the basic materials from the Royden compactification and the class $HD(R)$ we refer to the monograph of Sario and Nakai [7].) One of the important problems in the theory of $PD(R)|\Delta(R)$ in $HD(R)|\Delta(R)$. We will prove a theorem which contributes to this question.

2. If R is parabolic, then $PD(R) = \{0\}$ (cf. Royden [6]), which case offers no interest. Therefore we assume throughout the paper that R is hyperbolic. Let $\tilde{M}(R)$ be the class of all Dirichlet finite Tonelli functions on R and $\tilde{M}_\Delta(R)$ the subclass of $\tilde{M}(R)$ consisting of functions f with $f|\Delta(R) = 0$ (cf. [7]). We then have the orthogonal decomposition

$$\tilde{M}(R) = HD(R) + \tilde{M}_\Delta(R),$$

Received by the editors May 26, 1971.

AMS 1970 subject classifications. Primary 31A05, 58G99.

¹ The work was sponsored by the U.S. Army Research Office—Durham, Grant DA-ARO-D-31-124-71-G20, UCLA.

© American Mathematical Society 1972

and since $PD(R) \subset \tilde{M}(R)$, we can define an operator $T: PD(R) \rightarrow HD(R)$ characterized by

$$(2) \quad u - Tu \in \tilde{M}_\Delta(R).$$

Using results cited in §1 we can show that T is a vector space isomorphism from $PD(R)$ onto

$$(3) \quad X_D(R) \equiv T(PD(R))$$

such that $u > 0$ is equivalent to $Tu > 0$ and $\sup_R |u| = \sup_R |Tu|$. Therefore the study of $PD(R)$ can be reduced to that of $X_D(R)$ and for this reason we call T the *reduction operator* for Dirichlet finite solutions. It can be seen that

$$u = Tu - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_R G(\cdot, \zeta) P(\zeta) u(\zeta) d\xi d\eta \quad (\zeta = \xi + i\eta)$$

(cf. [3]). We will discuss when $h \in HD(R)$ belongs to $X_D(R)$.

3. Let Ω be a regular subregion of R . By the P -unit e_Ω on Ω we mean the solution e_Ω of (1) on Ω with the continuous boundary values 1. The net $\{e_\Omega\}$ for every regular subregion Ω is decreasing and hence convergent to a solution on R :

$$e_R = \lim_{\Omega \rightarrow R} e_\Omega \geq 0$$

which we call the P -unit on R . The only bounded solution of (1) on R is zero if and only if $e_R \equiv 0$ (Ozawa [5], Royden [6]). We describe $X_D(R)$ in terms of $\{e_\Omega\}$ and e_R as follows:

THEOREM. *Suppose that $h \in HD(R)$. If $h \in X_D(R)$, then*

$$(4) \quad D_R(e_R h) < \infty.$$

Conversely if

$$(5) \quad \limsup_{\Omega \rightarrow R} D_\Omega(e_\Omega h) < \infty,$$

then $h \in X_D(R)$.

The proof will be given in §§4 and 7. The condition (4) is necessary for $h \in X_D(R)$ but not sufficient. In fact, let $R = \{|z| < 1\}$ and $P(z) = 4(1 + |z|^2)(1 - |z|^2)^{-2}$. Then $e_R \equiv 0$ and $X_D(R) = \{0\}$ (Royden [6]), while (4) is trivially valid for every $h \in HD(R)$. The condition (5) is sufficient for $h \in X_D(R)$ but not necessary. We exhibit an instructive example due to Nakai [4]. Let $R = \{|z| > 1\}$ and $P(z) = 1 + |z|^{-1}$. Consider $\Omega_n = \{1 + n^{-1} < |z| < n\}$ ($n = 2, 3, \dots$) which exhausts R as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Denote by e_n the P -unit on Ω_n . The P -unit e_R on R is given by

$$e_R(z) = \left(e \int_1^\infty e^{-2t} t^{-1} dt \right)^{-1} \cdot e^{|z|} \cdot \int_{|z|}^\infty e^{-2t} \cdot t^{-1} dt$$

and a straightforward calculation shows that $e_R \in PD(R)$ and hence $1 \in X_D(R)$. We also see that

$$e_n(z) = \alpha_n e^{|z|} + \beta_n e^{|z|} \int_1^{|z|} e^{-2t} t^{-1} dt$$

where

$$\alpha_n = e^{-n} - (e^{-n} - e^{-(1+1/n)}) \left(\int_{1+1/n}^n e^{-2t} t^{-1} dt \right)^{-1} \int_1^n e^{-2t} t^{-1} dt,$$

and

$$\beta_n = (e^{-n} - e^{-(1+1/n)}) \left(\int_{1+1/n}^n e^{-2t} t^{-1} dt \right)^{-1}.$$

However an easy but cumbersome computation shows that

$$D_R(1 \cdot e_n) = \mathcal{O}(n) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty)$$

and (5) is not valid for $h=1 \in X_D(R)$. By Fatou's lemma, (5) implies (4). That the converse is not necessarily true is also seen from the above example.

4. Necessity of (4). Suppose $h \in X_D(R)$. Since $X_D(R)$ forms a vector lattice along with $PD(R)$, we may assume $h > 0$ to prove (4). Let $u \in PD(R)$ such that $h = Tu$ and let $\varphi = u - h$. We will prove (4) both for u and φ .

We write $\|\cdot\|_\Omega = (D_\Omega(\cdot))^{1/2}$. By Green's formula

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(1 - e_\Omega)\|_\Omega^2 &= - \int_\Omega u(1 - e_\Omega) d * d(u(1 - e_\Omega)) \\ &= - \int_\Omega u^2(1 - e_\Omega)^2 P + \int_\Omega u^2(1 - e_\Omega) e_\Omega P \\ &\quad + 2 \int_\Omega u(1 - e_\Omega) du \wedge * de_\Omega \\ &\leq \int_\Omega u(1 - e_\Omega) Pu + 2 \int_\Omega (1 - e_\Omega) du \wedge *(u de_\Omega) \\ &= \int_\Omega u(1 - e_\Omega) d * du + 2 \int_\Omega (1 - e_\Omega) du \wedge *(d(u e_\Omega) - e_\Omega du). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\int_\Omega u(1 - e_\Omega) d * du = - \int_\Omega d(u(1 - e_\Omega)) \wedge * du$. By Schwarz's inequality

$$\|u(1 - e_\Omega)\|_\Omega^2 \leq \|u(1 - e_\Omega)\|_\Omega \|u\|_\Omega + 2 \|u\|_\Omega \|u e_\Omega\|_\Omega + 2 \|u\|_\Omega^2.$$

In view of $\|u e_\Omega\|_\Omega \leq \|u(1 - e_\Omega)\|_\Omega + \|u\|_\Omega$, we deduce

$$\|u(1 - e_\Omega)\|_\Omega^2 \leq 3 \|u(1 - e_\Omega)\|_\Omega \cdot \|u\|_\Omega + 4 \|u\|_\Omega^2.$$

This implies $\|u(1 - e_\Omega)\|_\Omega \leq 4 \|u\|_\Omega$ or $\|u e_\Omega\|_\Omega \leq 5 \|u\|_\Omega$. Therefore, by Fatou's lemma,

$$D_R(e_R u) \leq \liminf_{\Omega \rightarrow R} D_\Omega(e_\Omega u) \leq 25 D_R(u) < \infty.$$

5. Let $h_\Omega \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ such that h_Ω is harmonic in Ω and $h_\Omega|_{\partial\Omega} = u$. Set $\varphi_\Omega = u - h_\Omega$. Observe $\Delta\varphi_\Omega = Pu$ and $\varphi_\Omega \leq 0$. Since $D_\Omega(u) = D_\Omega(h_\Omega) + D_\Omega(\varphi_\Omega)$ and $\lim_{\Omega \rightarrow R} h_\Omega = h$, we infer that $\varphi = \lim_{\Omega \rightarrow R} \varphi_\Omega$, $d\varphi = \lim_{\Omega \rightarrow R} d\varphi_\Omega$, and $D_\Omega(\varphi_\Omega) \leq D_\Omega(u)$. By Green's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_\Omega \varphi_\Omega\|_\Omega^2 &= - \int_\Omega e_\Omega \varphi_\Omega d * d(e_\Omega \varphi_\Omega) \\ &= - \int_\Omega e_\Omega^2 \varphi_\Omega^2 P - \int_\Omega e_\Omega^2 \varphi_\Omega u P - 2 \int_\Omega e_\Omega \varphi_\Omega d e_\Omega \wedge * d\varphi_\Omega \\ &\leq - \int_\Omega \varphi_\Omega d * du - 2 \int_\Omega e_\Omega d\varphi_\Omega \wedge *(\varphi_\Omega d e_\Omega) \\ &= \int_\Omega d\varphi_\Omega \wedge * du - 2 \int_\Omega e_\Omega d\varphi_\Omega \wedge *(d(e_\Omega \varphi_\Omega) - e_\Omega d\varphi_\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

By Schwarz's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_\Omega \varphi_\Omega\|_\Omega^2 &\leq \|\varphi_\Omega\|_\Omega \|u\|_\Omega + 2 \|\varphi_\Omega\|_\Omega \|e_\Omega \varphi_\Omega\|_\Omega + 2 \|\varphi_\Omega\|_\Omega^2 \\ &\leq 2 \|u\|_\Omega \|e_\Omega \varphi_\Omega\|_\Omega + 3 \|u\|_\Omega^2 \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $\|e_\Omega \varphi_\Omega\|_\Omega \leq 3 \|u\|_\Omega$. By Fatou's lemma we deduce

$$D_R(e_R \varphi) \leq \liminf_{\Omega \rightarrow R} D_\Omega(e_\Omega \varphi_\Omega) \leq 9 D_R(u) < \infty.$$

6. Sufficiency of (5). Let $u_\Omega \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\Delta u_\Omega(z) = P(z)u_\Omega(z)$ on Ω and $u_\Omega|_{\partial\Omega} = h$. By Green's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\Omega - h e_\Omega\|_\Omega^2 &= - \int_\Omega (u_\Omega - h e_\Omega) d * d(u_\Omega - h e_\Omega) \\ &= - \int_\Omega (u_\Omega - h e_\Omega) u_\Omega P + \int_\Omega (u_\Omega - h e_\Omega) h e_\Omega P \\ &\quad + 2 \int_\Omega (u_\Omega - h e_\Omega) dh \wedge * d e_\Omega \\ &= - \int_\Omega (u_\Omega - h e_\Omega)^2 P + 2 \int_\Omega (u_\Omega - h e_\Omega) dh \wedge * d e_\Omega \\ &\leq 2 \int_\Omega dh \wedge *(d(e_\Omega u_\Omega) - e_\Omega du_\Omega) \\ &\quad - 2 \int_\Omega e_\Omega dh \wedge *(d(h e_\Omega) - e_\Omega dh). \end{aligned}$$

By Schwarz's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\Omega - h e_\Omega\|_\Omega^2 &\leq 2 \|h\|_\Omega \|e_\Omega u_\Omega\|_\Omega + 2 \|h\|_\Omega \|u_\Omega\|_\Omega \\ &\quad + 2 \|h\|_\Omega \|h e_\Omega\|_\Omega + 2 \|h\|_\Omega^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the same estimate as in §4, we deduce $\|e_\Omega u_\Omega\|_\Omega \leq 5\|u_\Omega\|_\Omega$ and $\|u_\Omega\|_\Omega \leq \|u_\Omega - he_\Omega\|_\Omega + \|he_\Omega\|_\Omega$, and hence

$$\|u_\Omega - he_\Omega\|_\Omega^2 \leq 12 \|h\|_\Omega \|u - he_\Omega\|_\Omega + 14 \|h\|_\Omega \|he_\Omega\|_\Omega + 2 \|h\|_\Omega^2.$$

By (5) we conclude that

$$(6) \quad D_\Omega(u_\Omega) \leq K < \infty$$

for every Ω with a constant K .

7. Fix an Ω_0 such that $P \neq 0$ on Ω_0 . Since $\text{PD}(\Omega_0)$ is a Hilbert space with reproducing kernel (cf. [2]), (6) implies that there exists an exhaustion $\{\Omega_n\}$ of R with $\Omega_n \supset \Omega_0$ such that $\{u_{\Omega_n}\}$ converges uniformly on each compact set of Ω_0 . By a diagonal process, we may assume that $\{u_{\Omega_n}\}$ converges uniformly on each compact set of R . Let $u = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_{\Omega_n}$. Because of (6) and Fatou's lemma we see that $u \in \text{PD}(R)$. We can regard $h - u_{\Omega_n}$ as an element of $\tilde{M}_0(R) \subset \tilde{M}_\Delta(R)$. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (h - u_{\Omega_n}) = h - u$ uniformly on each compact set of R and $\sup_n D_R(h - u_{\Omega_n}) < \infty$, Kawamura's lemma (cf. [7]) implies that $h - u \in \tilde{M}_\Delta(R)$, i.e. $h = Tu$ and a fortiori $h \in X_D(R)$.

REFERENCES

1. M. Glasner and R. Katz, *On the behavior of solutions of $\Delta u = Pu$ at the Royden boundary*, J. Analyse Math. **22** (1969), 343–354. MR **41** #1995.
2. M. Nakai, *The space of Dirichlet-finite solutions of the equation $\Delta u = Pu$ on a Riemann surface*, Nagoya Math. J. **18** (1961), 111–131. MR **23** #A1027.
3. ———, *Dirichlet finite solutions of $\Delta u = Pu$, and classification of Riemann surfaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **77** (1971), 381–385.
4. ———, *On the old theorem of BreLOT. Note 2: On classification with respect to $\Delta u = Pu$* , Lecture Note at the University of California, Los Angeles, 1970.
5. M. Ozawa, *Classification of Riemann surfaces*, Kōdai Math. Sem. Rep. **1952**, 63–76. MR **14**, 462.
6. H. L. Royden, *The equation $\Delta u = Pu$, and the classification of open Riemann surfaces*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I No. 271 (1959). MR **22** #12215.
7. L. Sario and M. Nakai, *Classification theory of Riemann surfaces*, Die Grundlehren der math. Wissenschaften, Band 164, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1970. MR **41** #8660.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

Current address: Department of Mathematics, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida 33124