

By (15) there is a positive integer k such that

$$p(n-k) < \beta_n < p(n+k)$$

and we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'_n(\xi) &= -\sum_{\nu=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\xi_n - \beta_\nu} + \sum_{\nu=1}^{2k} \frac{1}{\beta_{n+1+\nu} - \xi_n} + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{n+2k+1+\nu} - \xi_n} - \frac{1}{\beta_\nu} \right) - \frac{1}{\xi_n} \\ &< -\sum_{\nu=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\beta_{n+1} - \beta_\nu} + \sum_{\nu=1}^{2k} \frac{1}{\beta_{n+1+\nu} - \beta_{n+1}} + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{n+2k+1+\nu} - \beta_{n+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_\nu} \right) \\ &< -\frac{1}{p} \sum_{\nu=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{(n+1+k) - (\nu-k)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{\nu=1}^{2k} \frac{1}{\nu} + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{(n+k+1+\nu) - (n+1+k)} - \frac{1}{\nu+k} \right) \\ &< -\frac{1}{p} \sum_{\nu=2k+2}^{2k+n} \frac{1}{\nu} + \frac{2k+2}{\varepsilon} + \frac{k}{p} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\nu(\nu+k)}. \end{aligned}$$

From the last inequality we see that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi'_n(\xi_n) = -\infty$, which proves the theorem.

7. Theorem 2 is obviously more general than Theorem 3, but the last is better adapted to applications: the first of the inequalities (15) means that the points β_n can not be too near each other and the second one means that these points can not be too far from the points pn . It would be interesting to look for weaker conditions on β_n which would imply the convergence of the series (7).

PAŃSTWOWY INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY
STATE INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS

(Reçu par la Rédaction 15. 1. 1951).

A theorem on moments

by

J. G.-MIKUSIŃSKI (Wrocław).

We shall prove the following

Theorem. *Let*

$$\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots$$

be two sequences of positive numbers such that

$$(1) \quad \beta_{n+1} - \beta_n > \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |\beta_n - pn| < q \quad (n=1, 2, \dots),$$

where ε , p and q are positive constants and

$$(2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n = \infty.$$

Let $f(x)$ be an integrable function over a given finite interval $0 < a < x < b$. If

$$\delta_{mn} = \gamma_m \beta_n$$

and if given any $c > a$, there is a number M such that

$$\left| \int_a^b x^{\delta_{mn}} f(x) dx \right| < M c^{\delta_{mn}} \quad (m, n=1, 2, \dots),$$

then $f(x) = 0$ almost everywhere in (a, b) .

Before the proof we shall give some corollaries.

Corollary 1. If β_n and γ_n satisfy (1) and (2) and all the moments $\int_a^b x^{\delta_{mn}} f(x) dx$ are commonly bounded, then $f(x) = 0$ almost everywhere in $(1, b)$.

This is obvious.

Corollary 2. If $\delta_n = pn^\kappa + q$ ($0 < \kappa \leq 1$), and if given any $c > a$, there is a number M such that

$$\left| \int_a^b x^{\delta_n} f(x) dx \right| < M e^{c\delta_n} \quad (n=1, 2, \dots),$$

then $f(x) = 0$ almost everywhere in (a, b) .

Indeed, let β_n be the least number of the form pk^κ greater than n and let $\gamma_m = m^\kappa$. Then the sequences β_1, β_2, \dots and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots$ satisfy the conditions of the theorem and we have

$$\delta_{m\beta_n} = \gamma_m \beta_n = p(km)^\kappa.$$

Thus

$$\left| \int_a^b x^{\delta_{m\beta_n}} f(x) dx \right| < M e^{\delta_{m\beta_n}},$$

and, by the theorem formulated at the beginning, we get $x^{\delta_{m\beta_n}} f(x) = 0$ almost everywhere and consequently $f(x) = 0$ almost everywhere.

The particular case $\kappa = 1$ of Corollary 2 is a well known theorem on moments¹⁾.

Now, we establish two lemmas.

Lemma 1. If β_n satisfy (1), then the products

$$(3) \quad a_n = \frac{1}{e} \prod_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_v}{|\beta_v - \beta_n|} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_n}{\beta_v}\right) \quad (n=1, 2, \dots)$$

are convergent and

$$(4) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} a_n e^{\delta_n x} \int_0^T e^{-\beta_n x \tau} f(\tau) d\tau = \int_0^T f(\tau) d\tau$$

for every function $f(t)$ integrable over the interval $(0, T)$ (finite or infinite).

This lemma is a generalization of a well known theorem of Phragmén¹⁾.

Proof of Lemma 1. The convergence of (3) is easy to prove. To show (4) write

$$\psi(x) = 1 - a_1 x^{\delta_1} + a_2 x^{\delta_2} - a_3 x^{\delta_3} + \dots;$$

this series converges absolutely for each non-negative x and its sum $\psi(x)$ is a continuous function decreasing monotonically in the

¹⁾ See J. G.-Mikusiński, *Remarks on the Moment Problem and a Theorem of Picone*, Colloquium Mathematicum II. 2 (1951), p. 138-141.

interval $0 \leq x < \infty$ from 1 to 0²⁾. We have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} a_n e^{\delta_n x} \int_0^T e^{-\beta_n x \tau} f(\tau) d\tau = \int_0^T \varphi(x, t - \tau) f(\tau) d\tau,$$

where

$$\varphi(x, u) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} a_n e^{\delta_n x u} = 1 - \psi(e^{xu}).$$

To obtain (4), it is sufficient to remark that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x, u) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } u > 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } u < 0. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2. Put $\delta_{mn} = \gamma_m \beta_n$, where β_n, γ_n satisfy (1) and (2). If

$$(5) \quad \left| \int_0^T e^{\delta_{mn} t} g(t) dt \right| < M r^{\delta_{mn}} \quad (m, n=1, 2, \dots),$$

for every $r > 1$ then $g(t) = 0$ almost everywhere in $(0, T)$.

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $g(t) = f(T - t)$. If $r = e^{(T-t)/2}$, and $t < T$ then by (5) we have

$$(6) \quad \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} a_n e^{\delta_{mn} x} \int_0^T e^{-\delta_{mn} x \tau} f(\tau) d\tau \right| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e^{-\delta_{mn}(T-t)} M r^{\delta_{mn}} = M \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n (r^{\gamma_m})^{\beta_n}.$$

But the series $\sum a_n x^{\delta_n}$ converges uniformly in any interval $[0, x_0]^2$; thus by (4) we get from (6), as $m \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\int_0^T f(\tau) d\tau = 0,$$

and consequently $f(t) = 0$ almost everywhere and $g(t) = 0$ almost everywhere.

Proof of Theorem. Lemma 2 is equivalent to Theorem by the substitution $e^t = x/a$ and $r = c/a$.

²⁾ J. G.-Mikusiński, *On generalized power series*, this volume, p. 181-190.