Errata for

"An Introduction to Operators on the Hardy-Hilbert Space",

by Rubén A. Martínez-Avendaño and Peter Rosenthal. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 237, Springer 2006.

Last update: May 17, 2007.

Thanks to Dvir Kleper.

• Page 46, line 5. Statement of Corollary 2.2.6.

It reads: $\mathcal{M}_E = \{ f \in \mathbf{H}^2 : f(e^{i\theta}) = 0 \text{ a.e. on } E \}.$

It should read: $\mathcal{M}_E = \{ f \in \mathbf{L}^2 : f(e^{i\theta}) = 0 \text{ a.e. on } E \}.$

• Page 46, line 8. In the proof of Corollary 2.2.6.

It reads: $\mathcal{M}_E = \{ f \in \mathbf{H}^2 : f(e^{i\theta}) = 0 \text{ a.e. on } E \}.$

It should read: $\mathcal{M}_E = \{ f \in \mathbf{L}^2 : f(e^{i\theta}) = 0 \text{ a.e. on } E \}.$

• Page 54, line -8. In the proof of Example 2.4.5.

It reads: $|\phi(0)| < \prod_{j=k}^{n} |z_k|$.

It should read: $|\phi(0)| < \prod_{k=1}^{n} |z_k|$.

• Page 72, line -9. In the proof of Theorem 2.6.7.

It reads: $\mu_1(E) \leq \mu_2(E)$.

It should read: $\mu_1(E) \ge \mu_2(E)$

• Page 75, line -3. In the proof of Theorem 2.6.8.

It reads: $B_n \mathbf{H}^2$.

It should read: $B_m \mathbf{H}^2$.

• Page 77, line -1. In the proof of Corollary 2.6.11.

It reads: all the inner parts of all the functions in H^2 .

It should read: all the inner parts of all the functions in ϕH^2 .

• Page 81, line 6. In the proof of Lemma 2.7.1.

It reads: such that $\{g(r_ne^{i\theta})\} \to g(e^{i\theta})$ a.e.

It should read: such that $\{g(r_ne^{i\theta})\} \to \widetilde{g}(e^{i\theta})$ a.e.

• Page 84, lines 8 through 15. The statement and proof of Corollary 2.7.5 have many θ 's where there should be t's. Also, the last F should be \widetilde{F} . The correct statement and proof should be:

Corollary 2.7.5. If f is in H^2 , f is not identically 0, and F is defined by

$$F(z) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} \log|\widetilde{f}(e^{i\theta})| d\theta\right),\,$$

then $|\widetilde{F}(e^{it})| = |\widetilde{f}(e^{it})|$ a.e.

Proof. Since F is in \mathbf{H}^2 ,

$$|\widetilde{F}(e^{it})| = \lim_{r \to 1^-} |F(re^{it})| = \exp\left(\lim_{r \to 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} P_r(\theta - t) \log |\widetilde{f}(e^{i\theta})| d\theta\right).$$

By the corollary to Fatou's theorem (Corollary 1.1.27),

$$\exp\left(\lim_{r\to 1^-}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}P_r(\theta-t)\log|\widetilde{f}(e^{i\theta})|\,d\theta\right)=\exp\left(\log|\widetilde{f}(e^{it})|\right)\quad\text{a.e.}$$

Since $\exp\left(\log |\widetilde{f}(e^{it})|\right) = |\widetilde{f}(e^{it})|$, it follows that $|\widetilde{F}(e^{it})| = |\widetilde{f}(e^{it})|$ a.e. \square

• Page 88, line 3. In the statement of Theorem 2.7.7.

It reads:
$$F(z) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} \log|f(e^{i\theta})| d\theta\right)$$

It should read: $F(z) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} \log |\widetilde{f}(e^{i\theta})| d\theta\right)$,

 $\bullet\,$ Page 109, line 14. In the proof of Theorem 3.3.1.

It reads: Then each h_n is in \mathbf{H}^2 .

It should read: Then each h_n is in $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{H}}^2$.

• Page 114, line 11. In the proof of Theorem 3.3.15.

It reads: it contains $\sigma(T_{\phi})$ by Theorem 1.2.11.

It should read: it contains $\sigma(T_{\phi})$ by Corollary 3.3.7.

• Page 114, line -2. In the proof of Theorem 3.3.15.

It reads: implies that $\overline{f}e_n$ is in $L^2 \ominus H^2$

It should read: implies that $\overline{f}e_n$ is in $L^2 \ominus \widetilde{H}^2$

• Page 156, line 10. In the proof of Theorem 4.5.7.

It reads: $= a \left(\chi_{E \cup E^*}(e^{i\theta}) - \chi_{E \cap E^*}(e^{i\theta}) \right) + 2b$

It should read: $= a \left(\chi_{E \cup E^*}(e^{i\theta}) + \chi_{E \cap E^*}(e^{i\theta}) \right) + 2b$

- Page 156, line -3. In the proof of Theorem 4.5.7. It reads: $=\chi_{E\cup E^*}(e^{i\theta}) - \chi_{E\cap E^*}(e^{i\theta}) = \chi_{E\cup E^*}(e^{i\theta}),$ It should read: $=\chi_{E\cup E^*}(e^{i\theta}) + \chi_{E\cap E^*}(e^{i\theta}) = \chi_{E\cup E^*}(e^{i\theta}),$
- $\bullet\,$ Page 167, line -4. In the proof of Lemma 5.1.9.
 - It reads: $(f, C^*k_{\lambda}) = (f, k_{\phi(\lambda)})$
 - It should read: $(f, C_{\phi}^* k_{\lambda}) = (f, k_{\phi(\lambda)})$