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1. A theory of trigonometric, interpolating polynomials suitable for $L^p$ functions was introduced by Marcinkiewicz and Zygmund [4]. A main feature of this was the use of a translation parameter for the interpolation points, a technique which avoided difficulties arising from the fact that the interpolating points were only countable and which made the problem two-dimensional. Thus we write

$$I_{n,w}(x; f) = \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{|\xi| \leq n} \int (u + x) D_n(u - y), \quad x = \frac{2\eta}{2n+1},$$

where $D_n$ is the Dirichlet kernel. $I_{n,w}(x; f)$ is then a trigonometric polynomial of degree $n$ interpolating the function $f$ at the fundamental points of interpolation translated by the parameter $w$. Their paper included certain fundamental inequalities which were analogues of known results about Fourier series, and in general the analogy with Fourier series was stressed. Immediately, however, differences with respect to convergence were noted in the construction of counterexamples. A positive convergence theorem was later proved by Offord [5] under the assumption of the finiteness of a certain integral. However, no indications were given here concerning the precision of the assumption.

The principal theorem of this paper is a generalization of Offord’s result. We assume also the finiteness of an integral and prove the almost everywhere convergence of the sequence $I_{n,w}(x; f)$. Counterexamples are provided to show that very little improvement in the result is possible. The extension to Jackson polynomials is indicated, along with an interpretation of the theorem in terms of fractional integrals. Then a type of continuity called translation continuity, which seems appropriate in this context, is introduced, and certain elementary properties are proved. Under the assumptions of our main theorem, a function is proved to be translation continuous almost everywhere. Finally, a very precise result concerning translation continuity at a point is proved.
We shall be concerned then with the almost everywhere convergence of the sequence $I_{n,a}(z;f)$ for functions $f$ satisfying a condition

\[(C_{a,p}) \quad \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \left| \frac{f(x+w)-f(x)}{u^{1+\alpha}} \right|^p \, du \, dx < \infty.\]

In [5], a hypothesis similar to $(C_{a,p})$ was used; but the second difference of $f$ replaced the first, and $a$ was taken to be one. However, for the values of $a$ which concern us there is no substantial difference in using the first difference of $f$ rather than the second (cf. [3]). Actually, two different hypotheses were used in [3], each guaranteeing the convergence of $I_{n,a}(z;f)$. However, as we indicate below, the second result is a consequence of the first.

Theorem 1. (i) Let $f$ satisfy $(C_{a,p})$ for some $p > 1$ and some $\alpha > \alpha_a = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2$. For almost every $(x, u)$, $I_{n,a}(x; f)$ converges to $f(x)$.

(ii) For every $p > 1$ and every $\alpha < 1/2$, there exists a function $f$ satisfying $(C_{a,p})$ such that $I_{n,a}(x; f)$ diverges for almost every $(x, u)$.

It is a fact of some interest that $a_0$ is a number of great importance in Diophantine approximation, and that our proof of (ii) relies heavily on this same subject. In broad outline, our proof of (i) follows the pattern established in [5]. Thus $f$ is approximated by $f_n$, an integral mean of $f$, such that $I_{n,a}(x; f_n)$ is close to $I_{n,a}(x; f)$ in a certain sense. Then the convergence of $I_{n,a}(x; f_n)$ to $f(x)$ is proved. This is in the latter step that our proof differs substantially from that of [5]. Perhaps the most novel aspect of our proof is the use of a new inequality from the theory of subadditive functions. We begin by presenting this inequality which is known [3]. Since the proof is not long, and since it is a companion to the vital second lemma, we include a proof.

2. We say the positive measurable function $\varphi$ is subadditive on the open interval $(0, A)$ if $0 < A < \infty$, and $\varphi(u+v) \leq \varphi(u) + \varphi(v)$ whenever $u, v$ and $u+v$ all belong to $(0, A)$.

Lemma 1. Let $\varphi$ be positive, measurable, and subadditive on $(0, A)$. (i) Let $p \geq 1$, and let $\alpha$ be any real number. There exists $C_{\alpha,p}$ depending only on $\alpha$ and $p$ such that

\[
\left( \int_0^\infty \frac{\varphi(u)}{u^{1+\alpha}} \, du \right)^{1/p} \leq C_{\alpha,p} \int_0^\infty \frac{\varphi(u)}{u^{1+\alpha}} \, du.
\]

(ii) If either integral above is finite, then there exists a constant $C$ depending on $\varphi$, $p$, and $\alpha$ but not on $u$ such that $\varphi(u) \leq Cu^\alpha$ for $u$ in $(0, A)$.

If $a > 0$, and $\psi$ is subadditive, then $\psi(u)/\psi^a$ is also subadditive. Hence, in the proof it would be enough to restrict attention to the case $a < 0$. However, this does not account for any simplification in the proof.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the value of the integral on the right in (i). $\mathcal{M}$ may be assumed finite and strictly positive. Let $E$ denote the set of points $u$ such that $\varphi(u) > \mathcal{M}^{\alpha}(\log(4/3))$, and let $G$ be the complement of $E$. Then

\[
\int_0^\infty \frac{\varphi(u)}{u^{1+\alpha}} \, du = \log(4/3) / \mathcal{M} \int_0^\infty \frac{\varphi(u)}{u^{1+\alpha}} \, du = \log(4/3).
\]

We assert that for every $a$ in $(0, A)$ there exists $v$ in $(u/3, u/3)$ such that $v$ belongs to $G$ and $w = u - v$ belongs to $G$. If this were not so, say for $u_n$, then $(u_n/3, u_n/3) = E_0 \cup E_1$ where $E_0 = \mathcal{M}^{-\alpha}(\log(4/3))$ and $E_1$ is the set of points of the form $v = u_n - w$ where $w$ belongs to $E_0$. Since $E_0$ and $E_1$ are reflections of each other through the point $u_n/3$, they have the same measure, $|E_0|$. Thus $|E_0| > u_n/6$, and

\[
\log(4/3) = \int_{u_n/3}^{3u_n/3} \frac{1}{u} \, du = \int_{u_n/3}^{u_n/3} \frac{1}{u} \, du = \int_{u_n/3}^{u_n/3} \frac{1}{u} \, du < \log(4/3)
\]

by (1). This contradiction proves our assertion. Thus

\[
\varphi(u) - \varphi(v + w) < \varphi(v) + \varphi(w) = \frac{M}{\log(4/3)} (v^\alpha + w^\alpha)
\]

If $0 < a$, $v^\alpha + w^\alpha < 2w^\alpha$. If $0 < \alpha$, $v^\alpha + w^\alpha < 2w^\alpha/3$. Hence

\[
\varphi(u) \leq C_{\alpha,p} M^{\alpha} (\log(4/3))
\]

and so

\[
\frac{\varphi(u)}{u^{1+\alpha}} \leq C_{\alpha,p} M^{\alpha+1} (\log(4/3))^{1/p}.
\]

Integration over $(0, A)$ completes the proof of (i). (2) shows that $\varphi(u) \leq Cu^\alpha$ if the right side of (i) is finite. If only the left side is finite, then the same proof holds except that $M$ must be replaced by the value of the corresponding integral.

We shall be interested in the case when $\varphi(u) = \varphi(u; f)$ where

\[
\varphi(u; f) = \left( \int_0^u \frac{1}{|f(x) - f(x)|^p} \, dx \right)^{1/p}, \quad r > 1,
\]

$f$ is assumed to be periodic, and Minkowski's inequality verifies the subadditivity property. The statement of Lemma 1 in this case is

\[
\left( \int_0^u \int_0^u \frac{|f(x + w) - f(x)|^p}{u^{1+\alpha}} \, dx \, dw \right)^{1/p} \leq C_{\alpha,p} \int_0^u \frac{1}{u^{1+\alpha}} \left( \int_0^u \frac{|f(x + w) - f(x)|^p}{u^{1+\alpha}} \, dx \right)^{1/p}.
\]
The same inequality holds if each of the above integrals the second symmetric difference of \( f \) replaces the first (cf. [3]). It is a consequence of this last fact that the second convergence result of [5] follows from the first, as was mentioned previously.

For direct applications to the proof of our theorem, we need a kind of local version of our first lemma. Let \( E \) be an interval \((0, \alpha_0)\) in \((0, 2\pi)\). Let \( E + x \) be the translation of \( E \) by \( x \), and let \( 2E = (0, 2\alpha_0) \). We introduce the functions

\[
\varphi_k(u, x) = \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\alpha_0}^{\alpha_0} \left( \frac{f(u + x) - f(u)}{x} \right)^p \, du \right)^{1/p}
\]

\[
\varphi(u, x) = \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\alpha_0}^{\alpha_0} \left| f(u + x) - f(u) \right|^p \, du \right)^{1/p}.
\]

If \( f \) satisfies \((C_{ap})\), then \( \varphi \) is integrable. We cannot expect that for fixed \( x \), \( \varphi_k(u, x) \) will be subadditive in \( u \). However, we can prove for it an inequality similar to that of Lemma 1.

**Lemma 2.** Let \( f \) satisfy \((C_{ap})\) with \( p \geq 1 \) and \( a > 0 \). For each \( x \) in \((0, \alpha_0)\) and each \( u \) in \((0, \alpha_0)\)

\[
\varphi_k(u, x) \leq \frac{2}{\log^2 2} \left( \frac{\log \left( 1 + \frac{2\pi}{\alpha_0} \right)}{\log \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0} \right)} \right) \varphi(u, x).
\]

Fix \( x \), and let \( 0 < u < x \). By Minkowski’s inequality,

\[
\varphi_k(u + v, x) \leq \left( \int_{E + x} \left| f(u + v) - f(u) \right|^p \, dv \right)^{1/p} + \varphi_k(v, x).
\]

Since \( 0 < v \leq x \), then \( E + v \subset 2E \). Thus

\[
\varphi_k(u + v, x) \leq \varphi_k(u, x) + \varphi_k(v, x).
\]

This inequality is the analogue of the subadditivity property. Now

\[
\int_{E + x} \varphi_k(u, x) \, du = \sqrt{2\pi} \varphi(u, x).
\]

Let \( M \) denote the value of this integral, and let \( S \) be the set of \( u \) such that \( \varphi_k(u, x) > M^{1/p} \log^p 2 \). A slight variation of the argument used in the proof of Lemma 1 shows that for each \( u \) in \((0, 2\pi)\), there exists \( v \) in \((0, u)\) and \( w = u - v \) both in the complement of \( S \). Let \( 0 < u < \alpha_0 \leq 2\pi \). By (3), we may write

\[
\varphi_k(u, x) \leq \varphi_k(v, x) + \varphi_k(w, x) \leq \left( \frac{M}{\log 2} \right)^{1/p} \varphi(v) + \varphi(w).
\]

This completes the proof of the lemma.

As mentioned earlier, the first step in the proof of the theorem is the approximination of \( f \) by an integral mean. Thus let

\[
f_k(u) = \frac{1}{2\alpha_0} \int_{-\alpha_0}^{\alpha_0} f(t) \, dt, \quad A_n = \frac{\pi}{(2n + 1)^{1/2}}, \quad \varphi_n(u) = f_k(u) - f(u).
\]

**Lemma 3.** Let \( f \) satisfy \((C_{ap})\) with \( p \geq 1 \) and \( a > 0 \). Let \( \delta \) in the definition of \( A_n \) satisfy \( 1/a < \delta \), and let \( \beta = a\delta - 1 \). Then

\[
\int_{\delta}^{1/a} \int_{\delta}^{1/a} |f_k(u + v) - f_k(u)|^p \, du \, dv \leq C \int_{\delta}^{1/a} \int_{\delta}^{1/a} |f(u + v) - f(u)|^p \, du \, dv.
\]

\( C \) on the right side of this inequality denotes a constant depending in this case on the parameters \( a, \beta, \delta, \) and \( p \). Throughout the remainder of the paper, we shall let \( C \) denote a constant which may be different in different contexts and usually without specifying its dependence on particular parameters. Lemma 3 is only a slightly more general result than Lemma 2 of [5], and its proof is very close to the proof of the latter. We therefore omit it. The next lemma is a consequence of our Lemma 3 and the following inequality from [4]:

\[
\int_{\delta}^{1/a} \int_{\delta}^{1/a} |I_n(u; f_k) - I_n(u; f)|^p \, du \, dv \leq C_{\delta} \int_{\delta}^{1/a} |f(u)|^p \, du, \quad p > 1.
\]

**Lemma 4.** Let \( f \) satisfy \((C_{ap})\), \( p > 1 \), \( a > 0 \), and let \( \delta \), and \( \beta \) be as above. Then for almost every \((x, u)\)

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |I_n(x; f_k) - I_n(x; f)|^p \leq C < \infty.
\]

In view of the last result, \( I_{n}(x; f_k) - I_{n}(x; f) = o(1) \) for almost every \((x, u)\). Thus our theorem will be proved if we can show that \( I_{n}(x; f_k) - I_{n}(x; f) = o(1) \) for almost every \((x, u)\) with an appropriate choice of \( \delta \). We choose \( \delta \) so that \( 1/a < \delta < 1 + a \). This choice is possible if \( a > 1 \). It may be assumed that \( a < 1 \) since decreasing \( a \) does not invalidate the \((C_{ap})\) condition, and we do this now for technical reasons. The \((C_{ap})\) condition implies that the functions

\[
g(x) = \int_{0}^{2\pi} \left| f(x + u) - f(u) \right|^p \, du, \quad h(x) = \int_{0}^{2\pi} \left| f(x + u) - f(u) \right|^p \, du
\]

are integrable. Let \( x \) be a point such that \( g(x) \) and \( h(x) \) exist and such that their integrals have finite derivatives at \( x \). For notational simplicity only we let \( x = 0 \) be such a point and assume further that \( f(0) = 0 \). The expression for \( I_n(0; f_k) \) is periodic in \( u \) of period \( 2\pi(2n + 1) \) so that we
may let \( |w| \leq \pi/(2n+1) \). Let \( \omega_n \) be a step function having positive jumps of \( 2\pi/(2n+1) \) at the points \( 2m\pi/(2n+1), \, m = 0, \pm 1, \ldots \) Then we may write \( I_{n,2} \) as a Stieltjes integral over any interval of length \( 2\pi \). Thus (cf. [6])

\[
I_{n,2}(0; f_a) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_a(u + t) \, D_a(u + t) \, d\omega(t) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_a(u + t + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, D_a(u + t + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, d\omega(t).
\]

Taking the mean of these two expressions for \( I_{n,2}(0; f_a) \) gives

\[
I_{n,2}(0; f_a) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left[ f_a(u + t) - f_a(u + t + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \right] \, D_a(u + t + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, d\omega(t) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_a(u + t + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, D_a(u + t + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, d\omega(t).
\]

We denote the first integral on the right by \( I_{n,1}'(0; f_a) \), the second by \( I_{n,2}(0; f_a) \), and show that each is \( o(1) \). The interval of integration for \( I_{n,1}'(0; f_a) \) is divided into three parts: the first with \( |t| \leq 5\pi/(2n+1), \) the second with \( t \) in \( (5\pi/(2n+1), \pi) \), and the third with \( t \) in \( (-\pi, -5\pi/(2n+1)) \). Denote the corresponding integrals by \( D, E_1, \) and \( E_2 \), respectively. \( D \) consists of five terms of the form

\[
\frac{1}{2n+1} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_a(u + \frac{2\pi j}{2n+1}) \, D_a(u + \frac{2\pi j}{2n+1}) \, d\omega(u + \frac{2\pi j}{2n+1}), \quad \text{for } |j| \leq 2.
\]

Since \( |D_a(t)| \leq 1 \) for all \( t \), and since \( |w| \leq \pi/(2n+1) \), it is enough to show that \( f_a(t) \) is small if \( t < 5\pi/(2n+1) \). By Hölder's inequality

\[
|f_a(t)|^p \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |(t)|^p \, dt.
\]

The variable of integration satisfies \( |t| \leq 8\pi/(2n+1) \) so that \( 1/2\pi \leq 8\pi/(2n+1) \) \( \leq (2n+1)^p \leq O(1)^p \) since \( \alpha < 1 + \alpha \). Recalling that \( f(0) = 0 \), we see that \( |D|^p \) is majorized by \( g(0) + \lambda(0) \) times a term which is \( o(1) \) as \( n \to \infty \).

To estimate \( E_1 \), we use the easily verifiable fact that \( \frac{2\pi}{2n+1} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} D_a(u + t) \, d\omega(u + t) \leq C \log n \), for any \( u \). An application of Hölder's inequality shows that

\[
|E_1|^p \leq C(\log n)^{p-1} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left[ \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_a(u + t + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, D_a(u + t) + D_a(u + t + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, d\omega(t) \right]^p dt.
\]

For \( \delta \) in the given interval and for \( |w| \leq \pi/(2n+1) \),

\[
|D_a(u + t) + D_a(u + t + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1})| \leq \frac{C}{(2n+1)(1+\delta)} \leq \frac{4C}{(2n+1)|\delta|}.
\]

We substitute this into the above integral, introduce the function

\[
\gamma_n(t) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_a(u + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, d\omega(u),
\]

and integrate by parts to obtain

\[
|E_1|^p \leq C(\log n)^{p-1} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_a(u + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, d\omega(u) \right| \, dt.
\]

Let \( \Theta(v) \) denote the interval \( (v - \Delta_v, v + \Delta_v) \). By Hölder's inequality,

\[
|E_1|^p \leq C(2n+1)^p \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_a(u + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, d\omega(u) \right| \, dt.
\]

The justification for the second inequality is that the intervals \( \Theta(u + v + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \) corresponding to the jumps of \( \omega_n \) are disjoint and contained in \( (0, 2\pi) \). Thus

\[
|E_1|^p \leq C(\log n)^{p-1} (2n+1)^p \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_a(u + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, d\omega(u) \right| \, dt.
\]

The first term on the right is \( o(1) \) since \( \alpha < 1 \) and so \( \delta < 2 \). For the second we write \( t^\delta = t^\delta(1 + \delta) \leq C t^\delta(1 + \delta) \) if \( s \) belongs to the interval \((0, 2\pi) \). Thus the second term above does not exceed

\[
C(\log n)^{p-1} (2n+1)^p \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_a(u + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \, d\omega(u) \right| \, dt.
\]

Recalling that \( f(0) = 0 \), we see that the inner integral does not exceed \( g(0) \). An integration then shows that \( E_1 = o(1) \) since \( \delta < 1 + \alpha \). A similar argument holds for \( E_2 \) so that \( |E_{n,2}(0; f_a)| = o(1) \).

To show that \( I_{n,2}(0; f_a) = o(1) \), we again divide the interval of integration into three parts: the first with \( |t| < 3\pi/(2n+1) \), the second
with \( t \in (3n/(2n+1), \pi), \) and the third with \( t \in (-\pi, -3\pi/(2n+1)). \) Designate the three integrals by \( A, B_1 \) and \( B_2, \) respectively. For the same reasons that \( D \) above is small, \( A = o(1). \) \( B_1 \) may be treated as \( B_2 \) above. Thus since \( |B_2(u+1)| \leq C(u+1)^{\theta}, \)

\[
(4) \quad |B_1| \leq C\log n \int \phi_u(t) \frac{\phi_u(v)}{\pi} + C\log n \int \phi_u(t) \frac{\phi_u(v)}{\pi} \, dt,
\]

where

\[
\phi_u(t) = \int_{\pi/(2n+1)}^t \left| f(u + v) - f(u + v + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \right|^p \, dv .
\]

To estimate \( \phi_u, \) we write

\[
\int \left| f(u + v) - f(u + v + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \right|^p \leq C\int \left| f(s) - f(s + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \right|^p \, ds
\]

and so

\[
(5) \quad \phi_u(t) \leq C\int_{\pi/(2n+1)}^{t+\pi/(2n+1)} \left| f(s) - f(s + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \right|^p \, ds .
\]

Since \( t+u+u_s \leq 1+2\pi/(2n+1), \) consider

\[
\phi_u(t) = C \int_{\pi/(2n+1)}^{t+\pi/(2n+1)} \left| f(s) - f(s + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \right|^p \, ds ,
\]

where \( \mathcal{E} \) is the set \( \{0, 1+2\pi/(2n+1)\}. \) An application of Lemma 2 gives

\[
\phi_u(t) \leq C \int_{\pi/(2n+1)}^{t+\pi/(2n+1)} \left| f(s) - f(s + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}) \right|^p \, ds .
\]

We note that \( 2t+4\pi/(2n+1) \leq \Theta \) for the range of \( t \) values we consider, and that the integral of \( g \) has, by assumption, a finite derivative at 0. Thus

\[
\int g(s) \, ds = O(t). \quad \text{Substitution of these inequalities into (5) shows that}
\]

\[
\phi_u(t) = (2n+1)^{t-\log n}O(t) .
\]

It follows from (4) that \( |B_2|^p \) does not exceed a constant multiple of

\[
(\log 2n+1)^{\theta-1} (2n+1)^{t-\log n} \left[ 1 + \int_{\pi/(2n+1)}^{t} \frac{1}{(s+1)^\alpha} \, ds \right] .
\]

The integral on the right is \( O(\log n). \) Since \( \delta-1 < \alpha, \) \( B_1 = o(1). \) By an analogous argument involving the differentiability of \( h \) at 0, we may show that \( B_2 = o(1) \), and the proof of (i) is complete.

4. The function to be constructed for the proof of (ii) is of the form

\[
\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f_{m}(\xi), \quad \text{where} \quad f_{m}(x) = \text{a step function equal to the positive real} \quad A_{m} \quad \text{if} \quad |x-2\pi|/m < 4\pi A_{m}^2 / m^2 \quad \text{for some integer} \quad j \quad \text{and equal to 0 otherwise.}
\]

The numbers \( A_m \) increase slowly to \( \infty \) with \( m \) and can be chosen in many ways. To be definite, we shall say \( A_m = (\log m)^{10}. \) It is known [1] that for \( \{\pi, \theta\} \) in a set \( E_m, \sup \{ |f_{m}(x) - f_{m}(\pi)| > C A_{m}^{10} \}. \) The set \( E_m \) is a subset of the square in the \( \mathbb{R}^2 \)-plane of side \( 2\pi, \) and \( E_m \) has measure \( 4\pi^2 - \epsilon_m \) where \( \epsilon_m = o(1). \) Thus, if the sequence \( m(t) \) increases rapidly enough, the sequence \( f_{m}(x; t) \) diverges for almost every \( (x, \theta). \)

It now remains only to describe the sequence \( m(t) \) so that \( f(t) \) satisfies the condition \( (C_{m}) \). Let \( J_m \) be the set for which \( f_{m}(x) = 0. \) Since \( |J_{m}| \), the measure of \( J_{m}, \) equals \( 5\pi A_{m}^{10} / m, \) we may demand that \( \sum |J_{m}| < \infty. \)

This implies that \( f(t) \) is at least defined for almost all \( t. \) If \( K_{t} \) is the subset of \( J_{m_0} \) such that \( f_{m_0}(t) = 0 \) if \( j > t. \) The \( K_{t} \)'s are mutually disjoint, and their union is, except for a set of measure 0, the set where \( f(t) \neq 0. \)

Since \( A_{m} \) increases and \( A_{m}^2 / |J_{m}| \) decreases, we may further specify that

\[
(6) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} A_{m(i)}^2 |J_{m(i)}| \leq 2.4 A_{m(i)}^2 \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} A_{m(i)}^2 |J_{m(i)}| \leq 2A_{m(i)}^2 |J_{m(i)}| .
\]

If \( f(t) = 0, \) then \( x \) belongs to \( J_{m_0}, \) and \( x \) does not, or the opposite is true. Thus, if \( 0 < \theta < \pi(m(j)), \) then \( f_{m_0}(x+\pi) = f_{m_0}(x) = 0 \) except for a set of \( x \) measure not exceeding \( 2\pi m(j). \) Hence

\[
(7) \quad \int_{E} f_{m_0}(x+\pi) \, dx - f_{m_0}(x) \, dx \leq 2\pi m(j) A_{m_0}^2 .
\]

Let \( b_j = \pi(m(j)) \) where \( 1/(1-a) < b < 1/a. \) This choice is possible if \( a < 1/2. \) We write \( F_{j} = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} f_{m_0}(x) G_{i}(x), \) \( G_{i}(x) = f(x) - F_{i}(x). \) By Hölder's inequality,

\[
|F_{j}(x+\pi) - F_{i}(x)|^{p} \leq \pi^{p-1} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |f_{m_0}(x+\pi) - f_{m_0}(x)|^{p}
\]

and thus from (7) if \( 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi(m(j)), \)

\[
(8) \quad \int_{E} |F_{j}(x+\pi) - F_{i}(x)|^{p} \, dx \leq 2^{p-1} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} A_{m_0}^2 |J_{m(i)}| \leq 2^{p} m(j) A_{m_0}^2 .
\]
Lemma 5. (i) Let \( p > 1 \) and \( 0 < a < p \). If \( f \) is the fractional integral of order \( a/p \) of a function \( g \) of class \( L^p \), then \( \int_0^1 [f(x+w) - f(x)]^p \, dw = O(w^a) \).

(ii) Let \( 0 < \beta < p \). If \( f \) satisfies \( (C_{a\beta}) \), then for every \( a, \beta, 0 < a < \beta \), \( f \) is the fractional integral of order \( a/p \) of a function \( g \) of class \( L^p \).

Both parts of the lemma can be made more precise in special cases, but it contains all the informations we need. Let \( \eta \) be the Fourier series of \( f \). It has been implicitly assumed that \( c_0 = 0 \). For notational convenience, assume further that \( c_0 = 0 \) if \( w < 0 \). The Fourier series of \( f(x+w) - f(x-w) \) is then \( 2i \sum_{\nu>0} c_\nu (\sin \nu w) e^{i\nu x} \), \( w \) is temporarily fixed, and we consider separately the sums corresponding to \( \nu \leq 1/w \) and to \( \nu > 1/w \). The first sum can be thought of as the transform of the sum \( \sum_{\nu>1/w} (\sin \nu w) e^{i\nu x} \) after application of the multipliers \( (\sin \nu w) \). Since these multipliers are bounded by one and essentially monotone, we have

\[
\int_0^1 \left| \sum_{\nu=1}^w c_\nu (\sin \nu w) e^{i\nu x} \right|^p \, dw \leq C \int_0^w \left| \sum_{\nu=1}^{1/w} c_\nu e^{i\nu x} \right|^p \, dw.
\]

For the second sum

\[
\int_0^1 \left| \sum_{\nu>1/w} c_\nu (\sin \nu w) e^{i\nu x} \right|^p \, dw \leq C \int_0^1 \left| \sum_{\nu>1} c_\nu e^{i\nu x} \right|^p \, dw.
\]

The series \( \sum_{\nu=1/w} c_\nu e^{i\nu x} \) is the transform of \( \sum_{\nu>1/w} (\sin \nu w) e^{i\nu x} \) after application of the multipliers \( (\sin \nu w) \) which are bounded by one and decrease to zero. Thus

\[
\int_0^1 \left| \sum_{\nu=1/w} c_\nu e^{i\nu x} \right|^p \, dw \leq C w \int_0^w \left| \sum_{\nu=1/w} c_\nu e^{i\nu x} \right|^p \, dw.
\]

Since the sequence \( w^a c_\nu \), except for a constant factor, the sequence of Fourier coefficients of \( g \), part (i) of the lemma follows by combining two of the above inequalities and noting that

\[
\int_0^1 \left| f(x+w) - f(x-w) \right|^p \, dw = \int_0^w \left| f(x+w) - f(x-w) \right|^p \, dw.
\]

The hypothesis of Lemma 5 (ii) insures by Lemma 1 that

\[
\int_0^w \left| f(x+w) - f(x-w) \right|^p \, dw = O(w^a).
\]
Thus if \( a < \beta \),
\[
\int_0^a \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{ds}{u+2\pi s} \left| f(s) - f(s') \right|^p |du|^{1/p} < \infty.
\]
This implies that \( f \) is the desired fractional integral \([3]\).

To apply the lemma to the proof of part (i) of the theorem, we choose \( \beta \) such that \( a < \beta < 1 \) and note that the conclusion of the lemmas insures that \( f \) satisfies \((C_2)\). Hence Theorem 1 is applicable. For part (ii) of the theorem, we choose \( \beta \) such that \( a < \beta < 1/2 \), and construct \( f \) as before to satisfy \((C_2)\) and so that \( I_{\alpha}(x; f) \) diverges for almost every \((x, u)\).

6. The underlying idea in our construction of examples \( f \) for which \( I_{\alpha}(x; f) \) diverges almost everywhere is that for some \( \eta \), depending on \( x \) and \( u \), the functional value at the interpolating point \( u + 2\pi i/(2u + 1) \) which is closest to \( x \) is large (cf. [1]). This suggests the concept of translation continuity which we now introduce. Given two real numbers, \( x \) and \( u \), which do not differ by a rational multiple of \( \pi \), let \( r = r(x, u, \eta) \) be the integer uniquely defined by the relation \(|x - u - 2\pi r/\eta| < \pi/\eta\). We shall say that a measurable, periodic function \( f \) is translation continuous at \( x \) if for almost every \( u \)
\[
\lim_{\eta \to 0} \left| f(u + 2\pi r/\eta) - f(x) \right| = 0.
\]

The exceptional set is specifically meant to include those \( u \) which differ from \( x \) by a rational multiple of \( \pi \) so that there is no ambiguity in the definition of \( r \). There are several reasons for using this type of continuity in connection with interpolating polynomials. Here we consider only certain aspects of it related to our previous work.

The conclusions of Theorem 1 are applicable to the notion of translation continuity, even in a slightly more precise form: i.e. if \( f \) satisfies \((C_2)\), then \( f \) is translation continuous almost everywhere, and there are functions \( f \) satisfying \((C_2)\) for \( a < 1/2 \) such that \( f \) is translation continuous almost nowhere. The proof follows the lines of that for Theorem 1, but it is somewhat simpler. Thus, in the proof of the positive part, we show by the previous technique that \( f(u + 2\pi i/\eta) - f(u + 2\pi i/\eta) = o(1) \) and then that \( f(u + 2\pi i/\eta) - f(u) = o(1) \). An examination of the proof of the latter step at the pertinent spot reveals that what is involved is a kind of unsymmetric differentiation of the integral of \( f \).

There is, as before, a small gap in the bounds of a used for the positive and the negative parts of the theorem. However, as regards translation continuity at a point, we can be very precise. Let us say that \( f \) satisfies the condition \((D_{\alpha})\) at the point \( x \) if

\[
(D_{\alpha}) \quad \int_{x-1}^{x+1} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{ds}{|u+2\pi i|^{\alpha}} \left| f(u) - f(x) \right|^p |du|^{1/p} < \infty.
\]

Theorem 3. (i) Let \( p \geq 1 \), and let \( f \) satisfy \((D_{\alpha})\) at the point \( x \). Then \( f \) is translation continuous at \( x \). (ii) For every \( p \geq 1 \) and \( a < 1 \), there is a function \( f \) satisfying the condition \((D_{\alpha})\) at the point \( 0 \) and such that \( f \) is not translation continuous at \( 0 \).

Let \( g(u) = |f(u - f(x)|^p + 2\pi|^p \). The hypothesis implies that \( g \) is in class \( D^p \) over \((x - \pi, x + \pi)\). It is to be extended periodically outside this interval. As is known \([3]\), for almost every \( u \),
\[
\lim_{\eta \to 0} \sup_{u \neq x} \left| \frac{g(u + 2\pi i/\eta)^p}{\eta^p} \right| = 0.
\]

Now choose \( r \) as before so that \(|x - u - 2\pi r/\eta| < \pi/\eta\). Then
\[
|f(u + 2\pi r/\eta) - f(x)|^p = |x - u - 2\pi r/\eta|^p |g(u + 2\pi r/\eta)|^p \leq \eta^p |g(u + 2\pi r/\eta)|^p.
\]

By virtue of the previous formula, the term on the right is \( o(1) \).

For the construction of \( f \) in the proof of (ii), we first let \( \gamma \) be a sequence of reals decreasing to 0 and such that \( \sum_{\gamma} \gamma < \infty \). Let \( m(t) \) be a sequence of integers increasing rapidly to \( \infty \). Several conditions will be imposed on the sequence \( m(t) \), the first being that \( 1/\gamma < \log m(t) \). Let the periodic function \( f(t) \) be defined as \( 1 \) if \( 0 \leq t < 1/2 \) or \( 1/2 < t < 1/2 \) and as 0 otherwise. The intervals \( 1/2m(t) - 1/2m(t) \) may be taken as disjoint and lying in \((0, \pi)\). We note that for \( u \) in the interval \( u > 1/2m(t) \) Now let \( f(u) = \sum_{\gamma} f(x) \), an everywhere convergent series such that \( f(0) = 1 \), and such that
\[
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(u)|^p |du|^{1/p} < 2^{p+1} \sum_{\gamma=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\gamma^{2-2\gamma}}.
\]

The sum on the right is convergent for proper choice of the \( m(t) \) since \( 1 - \gamma > 0 \) so that \( f \) satisfies the condition \((D_{\alpha})\) for any \( p \geq 0 \) at the point \( 0 \).

Let \( E_1 \) be the subset of \((0, 2\pi)\) such that for \( u \) in \( E_1 \),
\[
|u + 2\pi j| < 1/2m(t) \quad \text{for some integers } j \text{ and } m(t) \text{ such that } \gamma m(t) < 1/\gamma m(t).
\]

Now let \( f(u) = 1 \) for \( u \in E_1 \) and \( f(u + 2\pi i/\eta) = 1 \). But
\[
|u + 2\pi i/\eta| < |u + 2\pi i/\eta - 1/2m(t)| + 1/2m(t) < \pi|\gamma m(t)|.
\]
so that $j$ is the integer $r$ associated with $u_0$, $0$, and $u$ as in our definition of translation continuity. Thus for $u$ in $E_i$

$$f(u + 2\pi u) = f(u + 2\pi u) = 1.$$ (10)

It is known [1] that $|E_i|$, the measure of $E_i$, exceeds $2\pi - C\gamma$, so that $\liminf |E_i| = 2\pi$. Thus for almost every $u$, the equation (10) occurs infinitely often.
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On Vietoris mapping theorem and its inverse

by

A. Białynicki-Birula (Warszawa)

0. We shall use Čech cohomology groups with coefficients in an arbitrary abelian group $A$. Let $X$, $Y$, $T$ be compact Hausdorff spaces and let $f: X \to Y$, $g_1: X \to T$, $g_2: Y \to T$ be continuous onto maps such that $g_1 f = g_2$. In this paper we prove (Theorem 1) that if $f$ induces isomorphisms of $i$th cohomology groups for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ and a monomorphism of the $(n+1)$st cohomology groups of fibres $g_1^{-1}(a)$, $g_2^{-1}(a)$, for all $a \in T$, then $f$ induces isomorphisms of $i$th cohomology groups for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ and a monomorphism of the $(n+1)$st cohomology groups of spaces $Y$ and $X$. The result generalizes the well-known Vietoris-Begle theorem [1].

On the other hand, we show (Theorem 2) that if there exists a totally disconnected subset $T' \subset T$ such that the fibres $g_1^{-1}(x)$, $g_2^{-1}(x)$ are $(n+1)$-acyclic for $x \in T - T'$ and $f$ induces isomorphisms of $i$th cohomology groups of $X$ and $Y$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$, then $f$ induces isomorphisms of $i$th cohomology groups of fibres $g_1^{-1}(a)$, $g_2^{-1}(a)$ for all $a \in T$ and $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. In the last part we give some applications of the theorems concerning with an Eilenberg-Kuratowski theorem [2].

1. All topological spaces considered here are Hausdorff. Let $T$ denote a topological compact space. $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}$ will denote sheaves of abelian groups. If $\mathcal{G}$ is a sheaf over $T$ and $x \in T$, then $\mathcal{G}_x$ denotes the stalk of $\mathcal{G}$ over $x$.

For any abelian group $A$, $A^T$ denotes the constant sheaf over $T$ with stalks $A$. If $U \subset T$, then $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{G})$ denotes the group of all cross-sections over $U$ into $\mathcal{G}$. If $\mathcal{G}$ is a sheaf, then $\mathcal{G}$ denotes the carrier of $\mathcal{G}$, i.e., the subset of $U$ composed of all $x \in U$ such that $\mathcal{G}(x) \neq 0$. $\mathcal{G}$ is a closed subset of $U$. We shall write $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{G})$ instead of $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{G})$. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ has its support in $U$ if $\mathcal{F}(x) = 0$ for any $x \in T - U$. $\mathcal{F}$ will denote the restriction of $\mathcal{F}$ to $U$. It is known that, if $\mathcal{F}$ is an injective sheaf and $U$ is a closed subset of $T$, then $\mathcal{F}$ is a soft sheaf. The $i$th cohomology group of $X$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{F}$ is denoted by $H^i(X, \mathcal{F})$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$

$E$, $I$, $J$ will denote positive cochain complexes of sheaves. The $m$th sheaf of $E$ will be denoted by $E_m$, $m = 0, 1, \ldots$. If we write $E_n \to F_{n+1}$,