

**Zeitschrift:** L'Enseignement Mathématique  
**Herausgeber:** Commission Internationale de l'Enseignement Mathématique  
**Band:** 15 (1969)  
**Heft:** 1: L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE

**Artikel:** THE ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR OF THE  $n$ th ORDER DIFFERENCE  
**Autor:** Baishanski, Bogdan M.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-43202>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 20.03.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

# THE ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR OF THE $n^{\text{th}}$ ORDER DIFFERENCE

Bogdan M. BAISHANSKI

*To the memory of J. Karamata*

The fundamental result on the regularly varying functions, proved originally by Karamata [1], [2] for continuous functions, and later by Korevaar, van Aardenne-Ehrenfest and de Bruijn [3] for measurable functions, can be stated as follows: If  $f$  is a positive measurable function and if  $\frac{f(tx)}{f(x)}$  tends to a limit  $\varphi(t)$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $t$  positive, then (i)  $\varphi(t) = t^\alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is a real number; (ii) the convergence of  $\frac{f(tx)}{f(x)}$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , is uniform in  $t$  on every interval  $[a, b]$ ,  $0 < a < b < \infty$ ; (iii) there exists  $X$  such that  $\log f$  is bounded on every finite subinterval of  $[X, \infty)$ ; and (iv) for  $x > X$ ,  $f$  can be written in the form

$$f(x) = x^\alpha \exp \left[ C(x) + \int_x^x \frac{\delta(t)}{t} dt \right],$$

where  $C(x)$  and  $\delta(x)$  are bounded measurable functions on  $[X, \infty)$ , convergent to zero as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . With  $g(x) = \log f(e^x)$ , the fundamental result takes the following form: If  $g$  is a measurable real-valued function, and if

$$(1) \quad \Delta_t g(x) = g(x+t) - g(x) \rightarrow \psi(t)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  for every real  $t$ , then (i)  $\psi(t) = At$  with some real  $A$ ; (ii) the convergence in (1) is uniform in  $t$  on bounded sets; (iii) there exists  $X$  such that  $g(x)$  is bounded on every finite subinterval of  $[X, \infty)$ ; and (iv) for

$x > X$ ,  $g(x) = Ax + c(x) + \int_x^x \varepsilon(t) dt$ , where  $c(x)$  and  $\varepsilon(x)$  are bounded measurable functions on  $[X, \infty)$ , convergent to zero as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ .

In this article we shall generalize the preceding result by replacing in (1) the first-order difference  $\Delta_t g(x)$  by the  $n^{\text{th}}$  order difference

$$\Delta_t^n g(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^{n-k} \binom{n}{k} g(x+kt);$$

in other words we shall consider here measurable functions  $g$  which satisfy the condition

$$(2) \quad \Delta_t^n g(x) \rightarrow \psi(t), \quad x \rightarrow \infty,$$

for every real  $t$ . This condition is a natural one, and there are important functions which do not satisfy (1), but satisfy (2) for some value of  $n$ ; such a function, for example, is  $\log \Gamma(x)$ .

Instead of considering the  $n^{\text{th}}$  order equidistant difference  $\Delta_t^n g(x)$  we could consider the general  $n^{\text{th}}$  order difference

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_{t_1} \Delta_{t_2} \dots \Delta_{t_n} g(x) = \\ & = \sum_{\varepsilon_1=0}^1 \sum_{\varepsilon_2=0}^1 \dots \sum_{\varepsilon_n=0}^1 (-1)^{n+\varepsilon_1+\dots+\varepsilon_n} g(x + \varepsilon_1 t_1 + \dots + \varepsilon_n t_n), \end{aligned}$$

and so, instead of the condition (2) we could consider the apparently stronger condition

$$(3) \quad \Delta_{t_1} \Delta_{t_2} \dots \Delta_{t_n} g(x) \rightarrow \chi(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n), \quad x \rightarrow \infty,$$

for every point  $\tau = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n) \in R^n$ .

However, for an arbitrary, not necessarily measurable, complex-valued function  $g$ , the conditions (2) and (3) are equivalent. This fact is easy to verify in the case  $n = 2$  owing to the identity

$$(4) \quad \Delta_{t_1} \Delta_{t_2} = \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{t_1}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{t_2}^2 - \frac{1}{2} T_{2t_2} \Delta_{t_1-t_2}^2,$$

(where the translation operator  $T_t$  is defined by  $T_t g(x) = g(x+t)$ , a notation we are going to use throughout this paper) or to the identity

$$(5) \quad \Delta_{t_1} \Delta_{t_2} = \Delta_{(t_1+t_2)/2}^2 - T_{t_2} \Delta_{(t_1-t_2)/2}^2.$$

To prove this fact for general  $n$  we need the following.

**THEOREM 1.** *For every  $n \geq 1$  there exists a positive integer  $k$ , rational numbers  $C_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , and  $2k$  linear forms  $l_j$  and  $z_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , on  $R^n$  with integer coefficients such that*

$$(6) \quad \Delta_{t_1} \Delta_{t_2} \dots \Delta_{t_n} = \sum_{j=1}^k C_j T_{z_j(\tau)} \Delta_{l_j(\tau)}^n,$$

where  $\tau = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$ .

If in this theorem the words “integer coefficients” are replaced by “rational coefficients”, a slightly weaker statement is obtained which will later be referred to as the weak form of Theorem 1. The weak form is obviously sufficient to deduce the equivalence of (2) and (3), but its proof does not seem to be much simpler. We might also observe that for  $n = 2$  the smallest  $k$  for which an identity (6) exists is 3, but the smallest  $k$  for which a weak form of identity (6) exists is 2; see (4) and (5).

A statement weaker than the weak form of Theorem 1—but still strong enough to imply that (2) and (3) are equivalent—is the following:

*In the algebra of finite linear combinations of translation operators, any product of  $n$  difference operators belongs to the ideal generated by the  $n^{\text{th}}$  powers of all difference operators.*

Using the equivalence of (2) and (3) we shall prove the following generalization of the fundamental result on the regularly varying functions:

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $F$  be a measurable complex-valued function on  $\mathbb{R}$ . If*

(7)  $\Delta_t^n F(x)$  converges as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  to a limit  $\psi(t)$  for every real  $t$ , then

(i) *there exists a complex number  $A$  such that*

$$(8) \quad \Delta_{t_1} \Delta_{t_2} \dots \Delta_{t_n} F(x) \rightarrow A t_1 t_2 \dots t_n, \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

*for every  $\tau = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .*

*(In particular,  $\psi(t)$ , defined in (7), is equal to  $At^n$ ).*

(ii) *the convergence in (8) is uniform in  $\tau$  on bounded subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . (In particular, the convergence in (7) is uniform in  $t$  on bounded subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ ).*

(iii) *there exists  $X$  such that  $F$  is bounded on every finite subinterval of  $[X, \infty)$ .*

(iv) *on the interval  $[X, \infty)$ ,  $F$  can be represented in the form  $F(x) = \frac{A}{n!} x^n + f_0(x) + f_1(x) + \dots + f_n(x)$ , where  $f_0$  is bounded and measurable and tends to zero as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , and, for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , the  $j^{\text{th}}$  derivative of  $f_j$  is continuous and tends to zero as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We shall write  $z_j = \sum_i z_{ji} t_i$ ,  $l_j = \sum_i l_{ji} t_i$ ,  $e^{t_i x} = x_i$ . Since the mapping  $T_u \rightarrow e^{ux}$  introduces an isomorphism between the algebra of finite linear combinations of translation operators and the algebra of finite linear combinations of the functions  $e^{ux}$ , ( $u \in \mathbb{R}$ ), and since

$\Delta_u^n = (T_u - T_0)^n$ , it will be sufficient to show the existence of integers  $z_{ji}$ ,  $l_{ji}$  and rationals  $C_j$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$  such that

$$(9) \quad \prod_{i=1}^n (x_i - 1) = \sum_{j=1}^k C_j \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{z_{ji}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{l_{ji}} - 1 \right)^n.$$

This will follow immediately if we prove that in the ring of all polynomials in  $n$  indeterminates over the rational number field the polynomial  $(x_1 - 1)(x_2 - 1) \dots (x_n - 1)$ , multiplied by a suitable monomial  $x_1^{\gamma_1} \dots x_n^{\gamma_n}$ , belongs to the ideal  $J_n$  generated by all the polynomials of the form  $(x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} - x_1^{\beta_1} x_2^{\beta_2} \dots x_n^{\beta_n})^n$ . (Here  $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$  are non-negative integers and we assume  $\alpha_i \beta_i = 0$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ). This is true for  $n = 1$ ; in order to deduce the validity of the statement for  $n$  from its validity for  $n - 1$ , it is sufficient to show that the polynomial

$$(10) \quad x_1^{\beta_1} \dots x_{n-1}^{\beta_{n-1}} (x_n - 1) (x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_{n-1}^{\alpha_{n-1}} - x_1^{\beta_1} \dots x_{n-1}^{\beta_{n-1}})^{n-1} = \\ = (x_1^{\beta_1} \dots x_{n-1}^{\beta_{n-1}})^n (x_n - 1) (x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \dots x_{n-1}^{\varepsilon_{n-1}} - 1)^{n-1}$$

belongs to  $J_n$ . To show this and so to complete the proof it suffices to prove

(11) Let  $I_n$  denote the ideal generated by the polynomials  $(x-1)^n, (y-1)^n, (y-x)^n, (y-x^2)^n, \dots, (y-x^{2^n-1})^n$  in the ring of all polynomials in  $x, y$  with rational coefficients. Then  $(x-1)^r (y-1)^{n-r} \in I_n$  for  $0 \leq r \leq n$ ,

then to apply (11) with  $r = 1, x = x_n, y = x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \dots x_{n-1}^{\varepsilon_{n-1}}$ , and to remark that  $\alpha_i \beta_i = 0$  for every  $i$  implies that if in (10)  $\varepsilon_i$  is negative, then  $\varepsilon_i = -\beta_i$ .

To prove (11) we denote by  $Z_n$  the set of all positive integers  $m$  such that  $(x-1)^r (y-1)^{m-r} \in I_n$  for every integer  $r, 0 \leq r \leq m$ , so that we have only to show  $n \in Z_n$ . Since obviously  $2n - 1 \in Z_n$ , it is sufficient to prove that

$$(12) \quad m \in Z_n, \quad 2n - 1 \geq m > n, \quad \text{implies} \quad m - 1 \in Z_n.$$

Let  $s$  be an arbitrary integer such that  $m - n \leq s \leq n - 1$  and let  $D_k = D_k(m, n, s)$  satisfy

$$(13) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{2n-m} D_k k^p = \delta_{ps}, \quad m - n \leq p \leq n - 1,$$

where  $\delta_{ps}$  is equal to 1 if  $p = s$ , to zero otherwise. (Such  $D_k$  exist, the determinant of the system (13) being different from zero).

With  $P_k(x) = 1 + x + x^2 + \dots + x^{k-1}$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2n - m$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (y - x^k)^{m-1} &= [(y - 1) - (x^k - 1)]^{m-1} = \\ &= \sum_{p=0}^{m-1} (-1)^p \binom{m-1}{p} (x - 1)^p (y - 1)^{m-1-p} P_k^p(x), \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$\sum_{p=m-n}^{n-1} (-1)^p \binom{m-1}{p} (x - 1)^p (y - 1)^{m-1-p} P_k^p(x) \in I_n$$

for every  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2n - m$ . Multiplying these expressions respectively by  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_{2n-m}$  and adding we find that

$$(14) \quad \sum_{p=m-n}^{n-1} (x - 1)^p (y - 1)^{m-1-p} Q_p(x) \in I_n,$$

where  $Q_p(x) = (-1)^p \binom{m-1}{p} \sum_{k=1}^{2n-m} D_k P_k^p(x)$ .

Since  $P_k^p(1) = k^p$ , we obtain from (13) that for  $p \neq s$   $Q_p(x)$  contains  $x - 1$  as a factor, so that by the induction hypothesis (12) all the terms on the left-hand side of (14) with  $p \neq s$  belong to  $I_n$ , so that (14) implies

$$(x - 1)^s (y - 1)^{m-1-s} Q_s(x) \in I_n.$$

Writing in the last formula  $Q_s(x) = [Q_s(x) - Q_s(1)] + Q_s(1)$ , noticing that  $Q_s(x) - Q_s(1)$  contains  $x - 1$  as a factor, using once more (12) and then observing that (13) implies  $Q_s(1) \neq 0$ , we obtain finally that

$$(x - 1)^s (y - 1)^{m-1-s} \in I_n$$

for  $m - n \leq s \leq n - 1$  (and trivially so for  $0 \leq s < m - n$  and  $n - 1 < s \leq m - 1$ ), so that  $m - 1 \in Z_n$ , which was to be proved.

*Remark 1.* The ideal  $J_n$ , defined in the preceding proof, is given for every  $n$  by an infinite set of its generators, not by a basis; from this set of generators we can choose different bases for  $J_n$ , and to each basis there will correspond a formula of type (6). The real difficulty of the proof is to guess for each  $n$  a basis of  $J_n$  so that these bases for different  $n$  are connected in such a way that the induction step can be actually performed. Accordingly, the essential and the only non-trivial part of our proof is the statement and the proof of (11), especially our definition of the ideal  $I_n$ . (It can be

deduced from (11) that the ideal  $I_n$  is symmetric in the sense that  $P(x, y) \in I_n$  implies  $P(y, x) \in I_n$ . Rather peculiarly, the system of generators of  $I_n$  which we have used to define  $I_n$  and to prove the theorem is not symmetric in that sense).

We would like to stress the fact that, although Theorem 1 is stated as an existence theorem, its proof given above is constructive and can be used to find  $k, C_j, l_{ji}, z_{ji}, j = 1, \dots, k, i = 1, \dots, n$ , such that (6) holds.

*Remark 2.* We can express Theorem 1 in more intuitive terms in the following way. Let us call a rod any line-segment  $[a, b]$  in  $R^n$  which carries at the point  $z_j = \frac{(n-j)a + jb}{n}$  the electric charge  $(-1)^j \binom{n}{j} c$ , for every  $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$ . Here  $c$  is a rational number which can vary from one rod to another. Let  $G$  be the lattice of all the points in  $R^n$  with integer coordinates, and  $C$  the system of  $2^n$  electric charges, all of absolute value 1, situated at the vertices of the unit cube in  $R^n$ , in such a way that the charges at the endpoints of the same edge of the cube are of opposite sign and that the charge at the origin is positive. Theorem 1 is then equivalent to the following statement: it is possible to find finitely many rods such that each charge on each rod lies at some point of  $G$  and that when charges at the same point are added, the resulting non-zero sums form the system  $C$ . To verify this equivalence we assign to every expression of the form  $Ax_1^{s_1} x_2^{s_2} \dots x_n^{s_n}$ , where  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n$  are integers, the electric charge  $A$  at the point  $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$ . We then observe that in this way to the expression  $(-1)^n (x_1 - 1) \dots (x_n - 1)$  there corresponds the system  $C$ , and to the expression  $C_j \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{z_{ji}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{l_{ji}} - 1 \right)^n$ , i.e. to any summand on the righthand side of (9), there corresponds a rod with charges situated at the points of  $G$ .

If in the given geometric interpretation we replace  $G$  by  $G^*$ , where  $G^*$  denotes the set of all the points in  $R^n$  with rational coordinates, we obtain a geometric interpretation of the weak form of Theorem 1.

We shall use the given geometric interpretation to describe in an intuitive way first an identity (6) of the weak form and then an identity (6), in the case  $n = 3$ . In both identities  $k$  will be 16 (we did not try to find out whether this is the smallest possible value for  $k$ ); in other words in each case we shall use 16 rods to form the system  $C$  in  $R^3$ .

We take four rods of unit length having the same  $c$  and place them along the edges of the unit cube parallel to the  $x$ -axis in such a way that the charges at the vertices have appropriate signs. In this manner we obtain

eight superfluous charges (superfluous means not lying at one of the vertices of the unit cube) which can be cancelled by four additional rods of length 1 parallel to the  $y$ -axis. The newly created eight superfluous electric charges can be cancelled out by using four rods of length 1 parallel to the  $z$ -axis. The superfluous charges created at the last stage lie at the vertices of the cube concentric with the unit cube and having edges equal to  $1/3$ . To eliminate these charges we need four more rods, of length  $\sqrt{3}$ , situated along the four body diagonals of the cube. With the proper choice of the constant  $c$ , the system so obtained is identical to the system  $C$ . This construction is a geometric equivalent of an identity (6) of the weak form in the case  $n = 3$ .

If the preceding construction is slightly changed, namely if all the rods are chosen of length three times bigger, and if the first four rods are placed so that their middle thirds coincide with the edges of the unit cube parallel to the  $x$ -axis, we shall again obtain the system  $C$ . This new construction would be a geometric equivalent of an identity (6) in the case  $n = 3$ .

*Remark 3.* Let  $J_n$  have the same meaning as in the proof of Theorem 1. Then Theorem 1 is equivalent to the statement: there exists a monomial  $x_1^{\gamma_1} \dots x_n^{\gamma_n}$  such that

$$x_1^{\gamma_1} \dots x_n^{\gamma_n} (x_1 - 1) \dots (x_n - 1) \in J_n .$$

The weak form of Theorem 1 is equivalent to the statement: there exists a positive integer  $m$  and a monomial  $x_1^{\delta_1} \dots x_n^{\delta_n}$  such that

$$x_1^{\delta_1} \dots x_n^{\delta_n} (x_1^m - 1) \dots (x_n^m - 1) \in J_n .$$

*Proof of Theorem 2.*

(i) For  $\tau = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$  we write  $\Delta_\tau^{(n)} = \Delta_{t_1} \Delta_{t_2} \dots \Delta_{t_n}$ .

As mentioned earlier, using Theorem 1 we deduce from (7) that

$$\Delta_\tau^{(n)} F(x) \rightarrow \chi(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n), \quad x \rightarrow \infty ,$$

for every  $\tau \in R^n$ . Since  $F$  is measurable, the function  $\chi$  is measurable in each of the variables  $t_i$  separately,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . On the other hand,  $\Delta_{a+b} = T_b \Delta_a + \Delta_b$  implies that

$$\chi(t_1, \dots, t_i' + t_i'', \dots, t_n) = \chi(t_1, \dots, t_i', \dots, t_n) + \chi(t_1, \dots, t_i'', \dots, t_n) .$$

Consequently, as a function of  $t_i$ ,  $\chi$  is a measurable solution of the Cauchy equation  $h(x+y) = h(x) + h(y)$ , which implies that

$$\chi(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n) = C_i(t_1, \dots, t_{i-1}, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_n) t_i.$$

This being true for every  $i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , we obtain  $\chi(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n) = At_1 t_2 \dots t_n$  for some constant  $A = A_F$ . This proves conclusion (i) of the theorem.

Writing

$$(15) \quad f(x) = F(x) - \frac{A}{n!} x^n,$$

and observing that  $\Delta_\tau^{(n)} x^n = n! t_1 t_2 \dots t_n$  for every  $x$ , we obtain

$$(16) \quad \Delta_\tau^{(n)} f(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad x \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{for every } \tau \in R^n.$$

In the remaining part of this proof we shall consider complex-valued measurable functions  $f$  satisfying (16), since from the results obtained in that case and from (15) the conclusions (ii)-(iv) of the theorem will follow immediately.

(ii) We shall use the following notation:  $\varrho = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$ ,  $\sigma = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$   $\tau = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$  are points in  $R^n$ ; if  $a$  is a positive number,  $Q_a$  is the cube  $\{\tau \mid |t_i| \leq a \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ;  $d$  and  $\varepsilon$  are two arbitrary positive numbers;  $\varepsilon' = 2^{-n} \varepsilon$ ;  $c$  is a positive number satisfying

$$(17) \quad 2^n (c+d)^n - 2^n c^n + d^n < (c+d)^n;$$

$b=c+d$ ; the letter  $S$  is used for arbitrary subsets of the set  $K = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ;  $|S|$  is the number of the elements in  $S$ ;  $\tau(S)$  is that point of  $R^n$  which has its  $i^{\text{th}}$  coordinate equal to  $t_i$  if  $i \in S$  and to zero if  $i \notin S$ ;  $\lambda(\tau, S)$  denotes the expression  $\sum_{i \in S} t_i$ ;  $f$  is a measurable complex-valued function satisfying (16); and

$$N(x, \varepsilon, d) = \{\tau \mid \tau \in Q_d, \quad |\Delta_\tau^{(n)} f(x)| < \varepsilon\}$$

$$N_{\tau, S}(x, \varepsilon, c) = \tau(S) + N(x + \lambda(\tau, S), \varepsilon, c).$$

In order to prove that the convergence in (16) is uniform in  $\tau$  on bounded subsets of  $R^n$ , it is sufficient to show

$$(18) \quad \text{For any positive } \varepsilon \text{ and } d, \text{ there exists } X_{\varepsilon, d} \text{ such that } Q_d \subset N(x, \varepsilon, d) \text{ for } x > X_{\varepsilon, d}.$$

For this purpose we need the following simple identity for difference operators

$$(19) \quad \Delta_{\tau}^{(n)} = \sum_S (-1)^{|S|} T_{\lambda(\tau, S)} \Delta_{\rho - \tau(S)}^{(n)}$$

and also the following result:

$$(20) \quad \text{For any positive } \varepsilon \text{ and } d \text{ there exists } X_{\varepsilon, d} \text{ such that } \bigcap_S N_{\tau, S}(x, \varepsilon', c) \\ \text{is non-empty for all } \tau \in Q_d \text{ and all } x > X_{\varepsilon, d}.$$

To prove (19) we observe that

$$\Delta_{\rho + \sigma}^{(n)} = \prod_{i=1}^n \Delta_{r_i + s_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n (T_{r_i} \Delta_{s_i} + \Delta_{r_i})$$

implies

$$\Delta_{\rho + \sigma}^{(n)} = \sum_S T_{\lambda(\rho, S)} \prod_{i \in S} \Delta_{s_i} \prod_{i \in K-S} \Delta_{r_i}.$$

Substituting in the last equality  $\sigma = \tau - \rho$  and noticing that  $\Delta_{s_i} = T_{s_i} - T_0 = -T_{s_i} \Delta_{-s_i}$ , we obtain (19).

To prove (20), we observe that (16) implies

$$(21) \quad m(N(x, \varepsilon', c)) \rightarrow m(Q_c), \quad x \rightarrow \infty.$$

For, if (21) is not true, there exists  $\delta > 0$  and a sequence  $\{x_i\}$ ,  $x_i \rightarrow \infty$ , such that  $m(N_i) < m(Q_c) - \delta$  for every  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ ; here  $N_i = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} N_j = N(x_i, \varepsilon', c)$ . This implies that the set  $N = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{i=j}^{\infty} N_i$  has measure  $< m(Q_c)$ , so that there exists a point  $\tau_0$  in  $Q_c$  which does not belong to  $N$ . Thus  $\tau_0 \notin N_i$  for infinitely many  $i$ , which is impossible, since, by (16),  $\Delta_{\tau_0}^{(n)} f(x_i) \rightarrow 0$  as  $x_i \rightarrow \infty$ .

By (21), there exists  $Y_{\varepsilon, d}$  such that  $m(N(x, \varepsilon', c)) > m(Q_c) - d^n$  for  $x > Y_{\varepsilon, d}$ . Since also  $\lambda(\tau, S) \geq -nd$  for  $\tau \in Q_d$ , we obtain that for every  $\tau \in Q_d$  each of the  $2^n$  sets  $N_S = N_{\tau, S}(x, \varepsilon', c)$  will have measure  $> m(Q_c) - d^n$  if  $x > X_{\varepsilon, d} = Y_{\varepsilon, d} + nd$ . Observing that each of the sets  $N_S$  is contained in  $Q_b$ , that  $m(Q_c) = 2^n c^n$ ,  $m(Q_b) = 2^n (c+d)^n$ , and so, for every  $S$ ,  $m(Q_b - N_S) = m(Q_b) - m(N_S) < 2^n (c+d)^n - 2^n c^n + d^n$ , and that the last expression is by (17) smaller than  $(c+d)^n$ , we have

$$m\left(\bigcup_S (Q_b - N_S)\right) \leq \sum_S m(Q_b - N_S) < 2^n (c+d)^n = m(Q_b),$$

which implies that  $\bigcup_S (Q_b - N_S) \neq Q_b$ . Taking complements with respect to  $Q_b$  of both sides in this inequality, we obtain (20).

Let  $\tau$  be an arbitrary point of  $Q_d$  and let  $x > X_{\varepsilon, d}$ . We deduce from (20) that there exists  $\rho = \rho(x, \tau)$  such that  $\rho \in N_{\tau, S}(x, \varepsilon', c)$  for every  $S$ . This

means that

$$|\Delta_{\rho-\tau(S)}^{(n)} f(x + \lambda(\tau, S))| < \varepsilon'$$

for every  $S$ , and implies that every summand on the right-hand side of (19) is in absolute value smaller than  $\varepsilon'$ , so that, by (19),  $|\Delta_{\tau}^{(n)} f(x)| < 2^n \varepsilon' = \varepsilon$ , which gives (18).

(iii) By the observation made at the end of part (i), and by the result of part (ii) of this proof, in order to prove the conclusion (iii) of the theorem it is sufficient to establish

(22) If  $f$  is a complex-valued measurable function on  $R$ , such that  $\Delta_t^n f(x) \rightarrow 0, x \rightarrow \infty$ , uniformly in  $t$  on the interval  $[0, 1]$ , then there exists  $X$  such that  $f$  is bounded on every finite subinterval of  $[X, \infty)$ .

Let us assume that the conclusion of (22) does not hold. Then there exists a sequence  $\{x_m\}, x_m \rightarrow \infty$ , such that  $f$  is unbounded on each of the intervals  $I_m = (x_m, x_m + 1)$ . This implies that for every  $m$  there exists a sequence of points  $y_{m1}, y_{m2}, \dots, y_{mn}, \dots$  in  $I_m$  such that  $y_{mn} \rightarrow y_{m0}, |f(y_{mn})| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

For  $r = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , write

$$S_{m,k,r} = \{x \mid -1 < x - y_{m0} < r + 1, |f(x)| < k\}.$$

Then  $m(S_{m,k,r}) \rightarrow r + 2$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , so that for every  $m$  there exists  $k = k(m)$  such that

$$(23) \quad m(S_{m,k,r}) > r + 2 - \frac{r}{2n} \quad \text{for } r = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Let  $j = j(m)$  be such that  $|f(y_{mj})| > m + 2^m k$ , and let  $I_{m,r}$  denote the interval  $(y_{mj}, y_{mj} + r)$ . It follows easily from (23) that

$$m(I_{m,r} \cap S_{m,k,r}) > r - \frac{r}{2n} \quad \text{for } r = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Let

$$U_{m,r} = \{t \mid 0 < t < 1, |f(y_{mj} + rt)| < k\}.$$

Then

$$y_{mj} + rU_{m,r} = I_{m,r} \cap S_{m,k,r},$$

so that  $m(U_{m,r}) > 1 - \frac{1}{2n}$  for  $r = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Thus the  $n$  sets  $U_{m,r}, r=1, 2, \dots, n$ , which are all contained in  $(0,1)$ , have a point  $t_m$  in common.

We have then  $0 < t_m < 1$ ,  $|f(y_{mj})| > m + 2^m k$  and  $|f(y_{mj} + rt_m)| < k$  for  $r = 1, 2, \dots, n$  which gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_{t_m}^n f(y_{mj})| &\geq |f(y_{mj})| - \sum_{r=1}^n \binom{n}{r} |f(y_{mj} + rt_m)| > \\ &> m + 2^m k - 2^m k = m \end{aligned}$$

for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ ; and this contradicts the assumption of (22).

(iv) Let  $f$  be a measurable complex valued function satisfying (16). Then, by the conclusion (iii) of the theorem, there exists  $X$  such that  $f$  is locally integrable on  $[X, \infty)$ , and so  $Mf(x) = \int_x^{x+1} f(t) dt = \int_0^1 f(x+t) dt$  is defined for  $x > X$ . The operators  $M$  and  $M - I$ , where  $I$  is the identity operator, commute, so that.

$$I = [M - (M - I)]^{n+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} (-1)^k \binom{n+1}{k} M^{n+1-k} (M - I)^k$$

From this it follows that for  $x > X$

$$(23) \quad f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} (-1)^k \binom{n+1}{k} h_k(x),$$

where  $h_k(x) = M^{n+1-k} (M - I)^k f(x)$  for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n + 1$ . We shall show that

$$(24) \quad D^{n-k} h_k(x) \text{ is continuous for } x > X, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n,$$

$$(25) \quad D^{n-k} h_k(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad x \rightarrow \infty \text{ for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n$$

$$(26) \quad h_{n+1}(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad x \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $D^j h$  denotes the  $j^{\text{th}}$  derivative of  $h$ .

From these three facts, writing  $f_0 = (-1)^{n+1} h_{n+1} + (-1)^n \binom{n+1}{n} h_n$  and  $f_j = (-1)^{n-j} \binom{n+1}{n-j} h_{n-j}$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , and using (15) and (16), we can easily deduce the conclusion (iv) of the theorem. (The boundedness of the function  $f_0$  on  $[X, \infty)$  will follow from the fact that  $h_n(x) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $h_{n+1}(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , from the conclusion (iii) of the theorem, the fact that the functions  $h_j(x)$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, n$  are continuous on  $[X, \infty)$  and the equality (23)).

We observe that for  $x > X$ ,  $Mf(x)$  is continuous, and so  $DM(Mf)(x) = Mf(x+1) - Mf(x) = \Delta_1 Mf(x)$ . From this we deduce that for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$

$$(27) \quad D^{n-k} h_k = D^{n-k} M^{n+1-k} (M - I)^k f = \Delta_1^{n-k} (M - I)^k Mf.$$

Since  $Mf(x)$  is continuous for  $x > X$ , the right-hand side of (27) is continuous on  $[X, \infty)$ , and so (24) follows from (27).

For any function  $g$  locally integrable on  $[X, \infty)$ ,  $(M-I)g(x) = \int_0^1 (g(u+x) - g(x)) du = \int_0^1 \Delta_u g(x) du$ , and it follows by induction that, for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ,

$$(28) \quad (M-I)^k g(x) = \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 \Delta_{u_1} \dots \Delta_{u_k} g(x) du_1 \dots du_k.$$

By (27) and (28) we obtain

$$(29) \quad D^{n-k} h_k = \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 \Delta_{u_1} \dots \Delta_{u_k} \underbrace{\Delta_1 \dots \Delta_1}_{n-k} Mf(x) du_1 \dots du_k$$

Since (16) implies that  $\Delta_\tau^{(n)} Mf(x) \rightarrow 0, x \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $\tau \in R^n$ , we see, by applying the conclusion (ii) of the theorem to the function  $Mf$ , that the integrands in the last integral converge uniformly to zero as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , so that from (29) follows (25).

Since  $\Delta_\tau^{(n)} f(x) \rightarrow 0, x \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $\tau \in R^n$  implies  $\Delta_\tau^{(n+1)} f(x) \rightarrow 0, x \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $\tau \in R^{n+1}$ , using (28) with  $k = n + 1, g = f$ , and applying the conclusion (ii) of the theorem with  $n$  replaced by  $n + 1$ , we obtain from (28) that (26) holds.

Related to Theorem 2 is the following

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $f$  be a complex valued measurable function on  $R$  satisfying*

$$(30) \quad \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} | \Delta_t^n f(x) | < \infty \text{ for every } t \in R.$$

*Then for every bounded subset  $B$  of  $R^n$  there exist  $K_B$  and  $X_B$  such that*

$$| \Delta_{t_1} \dots \Delta_{t_n} f(x) | < K_B$$

*for  $x > X_B$  and  $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n) \in B$ .*

In the case  $n = 1$  Theorem 3 was proved by I. Csiszár and P. Erdős [4].

*Proof of Theorem 3.* By Theorem 1, (30) implies

$$(31) \quad \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} | \Delta_\tau^{(n)} f(x) | < \infty, \text{ for every } \tau \in R^n.$$

Using the notation introduced in part (ii) of the proof of Theorem 2, we see that it is sufficient to show

$$(18') \quad \text{For any } d \text{ positive, there exist } X_d \text{ and } \varepsilon_d \text{ such that } Q_d \subset N(x, \varepsilon_d, d) \text{ for } x > X_d.$$

For that purpose we have only to show

(20') For any  $d$  positive there exist  $\varepsilon'_d$  and  $X_d$  such that  $\bigcap_s N_{\tau,S}(x, \varepsilon'_d, c)$  is non-empty for  $\tau \in Q_d$  and  $x > X_d$ ,

since in the same way in which we have deduced (18) from (19) and (20) we can deduce (18') from (19) and (20'), taking  $\varepsilon_d = 2^n \varepsilon'_d$ .

Investigating the proof of (20), we see that in order to prove (20') we need only

(32) For every  $d$  positive there exist  $\varepsilon'_d$  and  $Y_d$  such that

$$m(N(x, \varepsilon'_d, c)) > m(Q_c) - d^n \text{ for } x > Y_d.$$

Let us assume that (32) does not hold. Then there exists a sequence  $\{x_k\}$ ,  $x_k \rightarrow \infty$  such that

$$m(N(x_k, k, c)) \leq m(Q_c) - d^n$$

for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . It follows that the set  $N = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{k=i}^{\infty} N_k$ , where  $N_k = N(x_k, k, c)$ , is a proper subset of  $Q_c$ . So there exists  $\tau_0 \in Q_c$  such that  $\tau_0 \notin N_k$  for infinitely many  $k$ . This means that  $|\Delta_{\tau_0}^{(n)} f(x_k)| \geq k$  for infinitely many  $k$ , which is in contradiction with (31).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] KARAMATA, J., Sur un mode de croissance régulière des fonctions, *Matematica* (Cluj) 4 (1930), 38-53.
- [2] ——— Sur un mode de croissance régulière. Théorèmes fondamentaux, *Bull. de la Soc. math. de France* 61 (1933), 55-62.
- [3] KOREVAAR, J., T. VAN AARDENNE-EHRENFEST and N. G. DE BRUIJN, A Note on Slowly Oscillating Functions, *Nieuw Archief voor Wiskunde* (2) 23 (1949), 77-86.
- [4] CSISZÁR, I. and P. ERDÖS, On the function  $g(t) = \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} (f(x+t) - f(x))$ , *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat — Kutató Int. Közl.* Vol. IX, Ser. A, Fasc. 3 (1964), 603-606.

(Reçu le 15 janvier 1969)

Bogdan M. Baishanski  
 Department of Mathematics  
 Ohio State University  
 Columbus, Ohio 43210  
 U.S.A.

**vide-leer-empty**