Zeitschrift: L'Enseignement Mathématique
Herausgeber: Commission Internationale de l'Enseignement Mathématique
Band: 50 (2004)
Heft: 1-2: L'enseignement mathématique

Artikel: Linear functional equations and Shapiro's conjecture
Autor: Laczkovich, M.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-2642

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: 17.10.2025

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

L'Enseignement Mathématique, t. 50 (2004), p. 103–122

LINEAR FUNCTIONAL EQUATIONS AND SHAPIRO'S CONJECTURE

by M. LACZKOVICH *)

ABSTRACT. We investigate the functional equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i(y) f_i(x + b_i(y)) = h(y) \qquad (x, y \in \mathbf{R}),$$

where a_i, f_i, and h are complex valued functions defined on $\mathbf{R}$, and $b_1, \dots, b_n$ are real valued functions such that $b_i - b_j$ is not constant on any interval. We prove that under mild regularity conditions (e.g., if $a_1, \dots, a_n$ are nonvanishing functions of bounded variation, $b_1, \dots, b_n$ are d-convex and $f_1, \dots, f_n$ are measurable) the functions $f_1, \dots, f_n$ must be exponential polynomials. We also show that the continuity of the functions b_i and f_i implies the same conclusion, subject to Shapiro's conjecture on exponential polynomials with constant coefficients.

1. INTRODUCTION

The functional equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i(y) f_i(x + b_i(y)) = h(y) \tag{1}$$

has been studied extensively, and several papers have been devoted to the regularity properties of the solutions $f_1, \dots, f_n$. In [12] and [1] it is shown that if the functions a_i and b_i are smooth enough and if $f_1, \dots, f_n$ are locally integrable then $f_1, \dots, f_n$ are necessarily C^∞ functions. In this paper we show that under mild regularity conditions on the functions a_i and b_i, the functions f_i must be exponential polynomials, even if we only assume measurability instead of local integrability.

*) Research partially supported by the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research, Grant No. T032042.

We shall say that the function $\phi\colon [a,b] \to \mathbf{R}$ is *d-convex* if it can be written as the difference of two continuous convex functions. It is easy to see that $\phi\colon [a,b] \to \mathbf{R}$ is d-convex and Lipschitz if and only if ϕ is absolutely continuous and if the function ϕ' (defined on the set of points where ϕ is differentiable) is of bounded variation. Clearly, every C^2 function is d-convex.

A function $f\colon \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{C}$ is said to be an exponential polynomial if $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(x)\, e^{\alpha_i x}$, where $p_1, \dots, p_n$ are polynomials with complex coefficients and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are complex numbers.

THEOREM 1. *Let J be a nondegenerate interval, and suppose that the functions $a_i\colon J \to \mathbf{C}$ and $b_i\colon J \to \mathbf{R}$ $(i = 1, \dots, n)$ have the following properties.*

(i) *Each of the functions $a_1, \dots, a_n$ is nonvanishing on J and is of bounded variation;*

(ii) *each of the functions $b_1, \dots, b_n$ is d-convex on J; and*

(iii) *the function $b_i - b_j$ is not constant on any subinterval of J for every $1 \le i < j \le n$.*

Let $h\colon J \to \mathbf{C}$ be an arbitrary function, and let $f_1, \dots, f_n$ be complex valued measurable functions on $\mathbf{R}$ such that (1) *holds for almost every $(x,y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J$. Then each of the functions $f_1, \dots, f_n$ equals an exponential polynomial almost everywhere.*

The necessity of condition (iii) is shown by the fact that any function $f\colon \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{C}$ satisfies

$$f(x) + f(x+y) - f(x + \max(y,0)) - f(x + \min(y,0)) = 0$$

for every $(x,y) \in \mathbf{R}^2$.

We can formulate many similar statements by imposing different conditions on the functions involved. Two of the most interesting variants are the following.

STATEMENT M. *Suppose that the functions $a_i\colon J \to \mathbf{C}$ and $b_i\colon J \to \mathbf{R}$ $(i = 1, \dots, n)$ are measurable, a_i is nonvanishing on J for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $b_i - b_j$ is not constant on any set of positive measure for every $1 \le i < j \le n$. Let $h\colon J \to \mathbf{C}$ be an arbitrary function, and let $f_1, \dots, f_n$ be complex valued measurable functions on $\mathbf{R}$ such that* (1) *holds for almost every $(x,y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J$. Then each of the functions $f_1, \dots, f_n$ equals an exponential polynomial almost everywhere.*

STATEMENT C. *Suppose that the functions* $a_i\colon J \to \mathbf{C}$ *and* $b_i\colon J \to \mathbf{R}$ $(i = 1, \dots, n)$ *are continuous,* a_i *is nonvanishing on* J *for every* $i = 1, \dots, n$, *and* $b_i - b_j$ *is not constant on any subinterval of* J *for every* $1 \le i < j \le n$. *Let* $h\colon J \to \mathbf{C}$ *be an arbitrary function, and let* $f_1, \dots, f_n$ *be complex valued continuous functions on* $\mathbf{R}$ *such that* (1) *holds for every* $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J$. *Then each of the functions* $f_1, \dots, f_n$ *is an exponential polynomial.*

We do not know if Statements M and C are true or not. We shall prove, however, that Statement C is a consequence of Shapiro's conjecture.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ denote the set of difference operators of the form

$$\Delta f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \cdot f(x + b_i),$$

where a_i and b_i are complex. If we define addition in the obvious way and multiplication by $(\Delta_1 \Delta_2) f = \Delta_1(\Delta_2 f)$ then we obtain a commutative ring with identity. (In fact, what we obtain is the complex group ring over the additive group of $\mathbf{C}$.) The one-to-one correspondence between Δ and its characteristic function

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i e^{b_i z} \tag{2}$$

is an isomorphism between $\mathcal{R}$ and the ring $\mathcal{E}$ of all exponential polynomials with constant coefficients. The units of the ring $\mathcal{E}$ are the functions of the form $a \cdot e^{bz}$, where $a \neq 0$. The exponential polynomial (2) is called simple if the frequencies $b_1, \dots, b_n$ are pairwise commensurable; that is, if b_i/b_j is rational whenever $b_j \neq 0$. By a theorem of J.F. Ritt [9], every nonzero and non-unit exponential polynomial has a factorization of the form $f_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot f_s \cdot g_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot g_t$, where $f_1, \dots, f_s$ are simple, the frequencies of f_i and f_j are noncommensurable if $i \neq j$, and each g_k is irreducible. The factorization is unique up to unit multiples.

H. S. Shapiro conjectured in [11] that if two exponential polynomials have infinitely many common roots then they have a non-unit common divisor. As Shapiro remarked, the Lech-Mahler theorem implies the conjecture in the special case when one of the exponential polynomials is simple. (See [11, p. 18] and [8].) The conjecture in its general form is still open.

Recall that a topological space Y is Baire if every meager subset of Y has empty interior.

THEOREM 2. *Suppose that Shapiro's conjecture is true. Let Y be a topological space such that Y^n is Baire, and let the functions $a_i\colon Y \to \mathbf{C}$ and $b_i\colon Y \to \mathbf{R}$ $(i = 1, \dots, n)$ satisfy the following conditions: a_i is nonvanishing on Y, b_i is continuous for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $b_i - b_j$ is not constant on any nonempty open subset of Y for every $1 \le i < j \le n$. Let $h\colon Y \to \mathbf{C}$ be an arbitrary function, and let $f_1, \dots, f_n$ be complex valued continuous functions on $\mathbf{R}$ such that* (1) *holds for every $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times Y$. Then each of the functions $f_1, \dots, f_n$ is an exponential polynomial.*

2. TRANSLATION INVARIANT CLOSED SUBSPACES OF $C(\mathbf{R})$

Let $C(\mathbf{R})$ denote the space of complex valued continuous functions on $\mathbf{R}$ endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on compact intervals. In the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 we shall use L. Schwartz's celebrated theorem stating that spectral synthesis holds in $C(\mathbf{R})$; that is, if L is any translation invariant closed subspace of $C(\mathbf{R})$ then the set of exponential polynomials contained in L form a dense subset of L. (See [10], [5] and [6].) Schwartz's theorem immediately implies that if L is a finite dimensional invariant subspace of $C(\mathbf{R})$ then L consists of exponential polynomials. We prove Theorem 1 – at least in the case when $h \equiv 0$ – by showing that the functions f_i must belong to finite dimensional invariant subspaces of $C(\mathbf{R})$.

LEMMA 3. *Let L be a translation invariant closed subspace of $C(\mathbf{R})$. Suppose that*

(i) *there exists a nonzero difference operator Δ such that $\Delta f = 0$ for every $f \in L$, and*

(ii) *every element of L is locally Lipschitz.*

Then L is finite dimensional.

Proof. Let $\Delta f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} a_j f(x + b_j)$ $(f \in C(\mathbf{R}))$, where $a_1, \dots, a_p$ are nonzero and $b_1 < \dots < b_p$. If L is not finite dimensional then, by Schwartz's theorem, the spectrum $\mathrm{sp}(L) = \{\lambda \in \mathbf{C} : e^{\lambda x} \in L\}$ is infinite. If $\lambda \in \mathrm{sp}(L)$ then $\Delta e^{\lambda z} = 0$ by (i), and thus $E(\lambda) = 0$, where $E(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} a_j e^{b_j z}$. That is, $\mathrm{sp}(L)$ is a subset of the set of roots of $E(z)$, and hence the elements of $\mathrm{sp}(L)$ can be listed as $\lambda_n = \sigma_n + it_n$ $(n = 1, 2, \dots)$, where $|\lambda_n| \to \infty$. Now

$$\lim_{\mathrm{Re}\, z \to \infty} \frac{E(z)}{e^{b_p z}} = a_p \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{\mathrm{Re}\, z \to -\infty} \frac{E(z)}{e^{b_1 z}} = a_1 ,$$

and hence there is a positive number K such that $E(\sigma + it) \neq 0$ if $|\sigma| > K$. Therefore $|\sigma_n| \leq K$ for every n. Since $|\lambda_n| \to \infty$, it follows that $|t_n| \to \infty$.

We select a sequence $n_1, n_2 \ldots$ as follows. Let n_1 be chosen such that $|t_{n_1}| > 20\pi K$. If $n_1, \ldots, n_{k-1}$ have been selected then we choose n_k with the following properties: $|t_{n_k}| > 20^k \pi K$, and

$$\left| \exp\left(\frac{\pi \lambda_{n_j}}{t_{n_k}} \right) - 1 \right| < \frac{1}{10^k} \tag{3}$$

for every $j < k$. This defines the indices n_k for every k. Now we put $f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 10^{-j} e^{\lambda_{n_j} x}$ for every $x \in \mathbf{R}$. Since $\left| e^{\lambda_n x} \right| \leq e^{K \cdot |x|}$ for every n and for every $x \in \mathbf{R}$, it follows that the series is uniformly convergent on compact intervals, and thus f is an element of L. We shall prove that f is not locally Lipschitz at 0. By (ii), this will provide a contradiction, proving that $\mathrm{sp}(L)$ must be finite.

We have $f(\pi/t_{n_k}) - f(0) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 10^{-j} A_k^j$, where

$$A_k^j = \exp\left(\frac{\pi \sigma_{n_j} + i\pi t_{n_j}}{t_{n_k}} \right) - 1 .$$

Now $\left| A_k^j \right| < 10^{-k}$ for every $j < k$ by (3),

$$\left| A_k^k \right| = \left| \exp\left(\frac{\pi \sigma_{n_k}}{t_{n_k}} + i\pi \right) - 1 \right| = \exp\left(\frac{\pi \sigma_{n_k}}{t_{n_k}} \right) + 1 > 1 ,$$

and

$$\left| A_k^j \right| \leq \exp\left(\frac{\pi \sigma_{n_j}}{t_{n_k}} \right) + 1 \leq \exp\left(\frac{\pi K}{t_{n_k}} \right) + 1 < 3$$

for every $j > k$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\pi/t_{n_k}) - f(0)| &\geq \frac{1}{10^k} \left| A_k^k \right| - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{10^j} \left| A_k^j \right| - \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{10^j} \left| A_k^j \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{10^k} - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{10^j} \cdot \frac{1}{10^k} - \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{10^j} \cdot 3 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2 \cdot 10^k} . \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\left| \frac{f(\pi/t_{n_k}) - f(0)}{(\pi/t_{n_k})} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2 \cdot 10^k} \cdot \frac{20^k \pi K}{\pi} = 2^{k-1} K$$

for every k, proving that f is not locally Lipschitz. $\square$

REMARK. Condition (i) cannot be omitted from Lemma 3: there are infinite dimensional translation invariant closed subspaces of $C(\mathbf{R})$ that only contain locally Lipschitz functions. One can show, for example, that if λ_n is a sequence of real numbers converging to infinity fast enough, then every element of the closed subspace L generated by the exponentials $e^{\lambda_n x}$ is real analytic, but L is not finite dimensional.

3. REDUCTION

Let G be an Abelian group, and let $\mathcal{R}_G$ denote the algebra of difference operators of the form $\Delta f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \cdot f(x+b_i)$ $(a_i \in \mathbf{C},\ b_i \in G)$. The translation operator T_b $(b \in G)$ is defined by $T_b f = f(x+b)$. Clearly, every difference operator is the linear combination of translation operators. We shall use determinants of the form

$$\begin{vmatrix} \Delta_{1,1} & \dots & \Delta_{1,n-1} & f_1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \Delta_{n,1} & \dots & \Delta_{n,n-1} & f_n \end{vmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

where $\Delta_{i,j} \in \mathcal{R}_G$ $(i = 1,\dots,n;\ \ j = 1,\dots,n-1)$, and $f_i\colon G \to \mathbf{C}$ $(i = 1,\dots,n)$. These determinants are defined as follows. In the formal expansion of (4) every term is of the form $\pm p_1 \cdots p_n$, where exactly one of the factors p_i is a function and the other factors are difference operators. Rearranging the factors such that the function comes last we obtain an expression of the form Δf, defining a map from G into $\mathbf{C}$. Then we define (4) as the sum of these functions.

Let Y be a nonempty set, and suppose that the functions $f_j\colon G \to \mathbf{C}$, $a_j\colon Y \to \mathbf{C}$, $b_j\colon Y \to G$ $(j = 1,\dots,n)$ and $h\colon Y \to \mathbf{C}$ satisfy

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j(y) \cdot f_j(x + b_j(y)) = h(y) \tag{5}$$

for every $(x,y) \in G \times Y$. We can write (5) as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j(y) T_{b_j(y)} f_j = h(y)\,. \tag{6}$$

Let $y_1,\dots,y_n \in Y$ be arbitrary elements. Substituting $y_1,\dots,y_n \in Y$ into (6) we obtain $\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j(y_i) T_{b_j(y_i)} f_j = h(y_i)$ $(i = 1,\dots,n)$.

Then we have

$$(7)\quad \begin{vmatrix} a_1(y_1)T_{b_1(y_1)} & \dots & a_{n-1}(y_1)T_{b_{n-1}(y_1)} & \sum_{j=1}^n a_j(y_1)T_{b_j(y_1)}f_j \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_1(y_n)T_{b_1(y_n)} & \dots & a_{n-1}(y_n)T_{b_{n-1}(y_n)} & \sum_{j=1}^n a_j(y_n)T_{b_j(y_n)}f_j \end{vmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{vmatrix} a_1(y_1)T_{b_1(y_1)} & \dots & a_{n-1}(y_1)T_{b_{n-1}(y_1)} & a_n(y_1)T_{b_n(y_1)}f_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_1(y_n)T_{b_1(y_n)} & \dots & a_{n-1}(y_n)T_{b_{n-1}(y_n)} & a_n(y_n)T_{b_n(y_n)}f_n \end{vmatrix};$$

this can be justified in the same way as for determinants with numerical entries. The left hand side of (7), as a function of x, is constant, since each entry of its last column is constant. If we denote the value of the left hand side by $H(y) = H(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and expand the right hand side of (7), then we obtain the following

LEMMA 4. *Suppose that the functions $f_j\colon G \to \mathbf{C}$, $a_j\colon Y \to \mathbf{C}$, $b_j\colon Y \to G$ $(j = 1, \dots, n)$ and $h\colon Y \to \mathbf{C}$ satisfy* (5) *for every $(x, y) \in G \times Y$. Put $N = n!$. Then there are functions $A_i\colon Y^n \to \mathbf{C}$ and $B_i\colon Y^n \to G$ $(i = 1, \dots, N)$ and $H\colon Y^n \to \mathbf{C}$ such that*

(i) *we have*

$$(8)\qquad \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(y) f_n(x + B_i(y)) = H(y)$$

for every $x \in G$ and $y \in Y^n$;

(ii) *for every $i = 1, \dots, N$ there are indices $j_1, \dots, j_n$ such that $A_i(y) = \pm a_{j_1}(y_1) \cdots a_{j_n}(y_n)$ for every $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in Y^n$;*

(iii) *for every $i = 1, \dots, N$ there are indices $k_1, \dots, k_n$ such that $B_i(y) = b_{k_1}(y_1) + \dots + b_{k_n}(y_n)$ for every $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in Y^n$;*

(iv) *if $b_{j_1} - b_{j_2}$ is not constant for every $1 \le j_1 < j_2 \le n$, then $B_{i_1} - B_{i_2}$ is not constant for every $1 \le i_1 < i_2 \le N$;*

(v) *if $h \equiv 0$ then $H \equiv 0$.*

REMARK. We shall need the following 'almost everywhere' version of Lemma 4 in the special case when $G = \mathbf{R}$ and Y is a subinterval of $\mathbf{R}$. Suppose that the measurable functions $f_j\colon \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{C}$, $a_j\colon Y \to \mathbf{C}$, $b_j\colon Y \to \mathbf{R}$ $(j = 1, \dots, n)$ and $h\colon Y \to \mathbf{C}$ satisfy (5) for a.e. $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times Y$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure λ_2. Then there are functions $A_i\colon Y^n \to \mathbf{C}$ and $B_i\colon Y^n \to \mathbf{R}$ $(i = 1, \dots, N)$ and $H\colon Y^n \to \mathbf{C}$ satisfying (ii)–(v) of Lemma 4

and such that (8) holds for a.e. $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times Y^n$ with respect to λ_{n+1}. The proof of this statement is the same as that of Lemma 4.

4. Regularity of solutions

In this section we show that – under the conditions formulated in Theorem 1 – the measurable solutions of (1) are locally Lipschitz. We remark that by imposing more restrictive regularity conditions on the functions a_i and b_i (namely, $a_i, b_i \in C^2$) this result could be deduced from a general theorem of A. Járai [4]. Our result is based on the observation that if f is bounded measurable and g is of bounded variation then their convolution is Lipschitz. (See Lemma 7 below.)

Lemma 5. *If g is a nonconstant d-convex function on J then there are a subinterval $J_1 \subset J$ and a positive number ε such that g is strictly monotonic on J_1; moreover, either $g'(x) \geq \varepsilon$ for a.e. $x \in J_1$ or $g'(x) \leq -\varepsilon$ for a.e. $x \in J_1$.*

Proof. Since g is absolutely continuous and nonconstant, the set $H = \{x \in J : g'(x) \neq 0\}$ is of positive measure. Also, g' is of bounded variation in every closed subinterval of the interior of J, and thus g' is continuous almost everywhere. Consequently, there is a point $x_0 \in H$ at which g' is continuous. Let $0 < \varepsilon < |g'(x_0)|/2$ be fixed, and choose a small neighbourhood J_1 of x_0 such that $|g'(x) - g'(x_0)| < \varepsilon$ whenever $x \in J_1$ and g' exists. It is clear that J_1 and ε satisfy the requirements. $\square$

Lemma 6. *Let $g\colon J \to \mathbf{R}$ be differentiable a.e. on the bounded interval J, and suppose that $g'(x) \neq 0$ for a.e. $x \in J$. Then* (i) *$g^{-1}(H)$ is null for every null set $H \subset \mathbf{R}$, and* (ii) *for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\lambda(H) < \delta$ implies $\lambda(g^{-1}(H)) < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda(H) = 0$, and suppose that $A = g^{-1}(H)$ is of positive outer measure. Since $g'(x) \neq 0$ for a.e. $x \in A$, we can select a positive number ε and a set $B \subset A$ of positive outer measure such that either $g'(x) > \varepsilon$ or $g'(x) < -\varepsilon$ for every $x \in B$. We may assume that $g' > \varepsilon$ on B, since otherwise we replace g by $-g$. Then there is a positive integer n and there is a subset $C \subset B$ of positive outer measure such that $(g(y) - g(x))/(y - x) > \varepsilon$ for every $x \in C$ and for every $y \in J$ with $0 < |y - x| < 1/n$. Let L be a

subinterval of J such that $|L| < 1/n$ and $\lambda(C \cap L) > 0$. Put $D = C \cap L$; then $\lambda(D) > 0$ and $|g(y) - g(x)| \geq \varepsilon|y - x|$ for every $x, y \in D$. In particular, g is one-to-one on D. Let $g(D) = E$ and $f = (g \mid D)^{-1}$. Then $E \subset H$ and f maps E onto D. Also, f is Lipschitz on E, since $|f(u) - f(v)| \leq |u - v|/\varepsilon$ holds for every $u, v \in E$. Since $\lambda(E) \leq \lambda(H) = 0$, this implies $\lambda(D) = 0$, a contradiction. This proves (i).

Suppose that (ii) is false. Then there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ and there are sets H_n such that $\lambda(H_n) < 1/n^2$ and $\lambda\left(g^{-1}(H_n)\right) \geq \varepsilon$ for every $n = 1, 2, \ldots$. We may assume that the sets H_n are open. Since g is measurable (in fact, g is continuous a.e.), it follows that the sets $g^{-1}(H_n)$ are measurable. Let $H = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=N}^{\infty} H_n$. Then $\lambda(H) = 0$, and

$$\lambda\left(g^{-1}(H)\right) = \lambda\left(\bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=N}^{\infty} g^{-1}(H_n)\right) \geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \lambda\left(g^{-1}(H_n)\right) \geq \varepsilon,$$

which contradicts (i). $\square$

LEMMA 7. *Let U be of bounded variation on the interval $[a, b]$. Let I be a compact interval, and let f be measurable and bounded on the interval $I + [a, b]$. Then the function*

$$F(x) = \int_a^b f(x + y)U(y)\,dy \qquad (x \in I)$$

is Lipschitz on I.

Proof. Let $I + [a, b] = [c, d]$, and put $\Phi(x) = \int_c^x f(t)\,dt$ $(x \in [c, d])$. Then Φ is a Lipschitz function such that $\Phi' = f$ a.e. on $I + [a, b]$. Denoting $\Phi(y + x)$ by $T_x\Phi(y)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(9)\qquad F(x) &= \int_a^b U \cdot (T_x\Phi)'\,dy = \int_a^b U\,d(T_x\Phi) = [U \cdot T_x\Phi]_a^b - \int_a^b T_x\Phi\,dU \\ &= U(b) \cdot \Phi(x + b) - U(a) \cdot \Phi(x + a) - \int_a^b T_x\Phi\,dU.\end{aligned}$$

If $|\Phi(x_1) - \Phi(x_2)| \leq K \cdot |x_1 - x_2|$ for every x_1, x_2 then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_a^b T_{x_1}\Phi\,dU - \int_a^b T_{x_2}\Phi\,dU\right| &= \left|\int_a^b \left(T_{x_1}\Phi - T_{x_2}\Phi\right)\,dU\right| \\ &\leq K \cdot |x_1 - x_2| \cdot V(U; [a, b]),\end{aligned}$$

and thus the function $x \mapsto \int_a^b T_x\Phi\,dU$ is Lipschitz. Then, by (9), so is F. $\square$

LEMMA 8. *Suppose that*

$$F(x) = \int_a^b c(y) f(x + g(y))\, dy \qquad (x \in I),$$

where

- $c\colon [a,b] \to \mathbf{C}$ *is of bounded variation,*
- $g\colon [a,b] \to \mathbf{R}$ *is d-convex and Lipschitz,*
- *there is a positive number* ε *such that* $|g'(x)| \geq \varepsilon$ *at every point* $x \in [a,b]$ *where* $g'(x)$ *exists,*
- I *is a compact interval, and*
- f *is measurable and bounded on the interval* $I + g([a,b])$.

Then the function F *is Lipschitz on* I.

Proof. Since g' is of bounded variation, the oscillation of g' is less than 2ε everywhere, except at the points of a finite set. Then, by $|g'| \geq \varepsilon$ it follows that there is a subdivision $a = a_0 < a_1 < \ldots < a_n = b$ of $[a,b]$ such that, for every $i = 1, \ldots, n$, g is strictly monotonic on $[a_{i-1}, a_i]$, and either $g'(x) \geq \varepsilon$ for a.e. $x \in [a_{i-1}, a_i]$ or $g'(x) \leq -\varepsilon$ for a.e. $x \in [a_{i-1}, a_i]$. Let $F_i(x) = \int_{a_{i-1}}^{a_i} c(y) f(x+g(y))\, dy$ $(x \in I\,;\ i = 1, \ldots, n)$. Since $F = F_1 + \ldots + F_n$, it is enough to show that each F_i is Lipschitz on I.

Let i be fixed. We may assume that g is strictly increasing on $[a_{i-1}, a_i]$; the case when g is decreasing can be treated similarly. Let $A = g(a_{i-1})$, $B = g(a_i)$, and let G denote the inverse of $g \mid [a_{i-1}, a_i]$. Then G is absolutely continuous (in fact, Lipschitz) and strictly increasing on $[A,B]$. Since $G' = 1/(g' \circ G)$, $g' \geq \varepsilon$ and g' is of bounded variation on $[A,B]$, it follows that G' is also of bounded variation on $[A,B]$. Let U be an extension of $(c \circ G) \cdot G'$ to $[A,B]$ having finite variation. Then we have $F_i(x) = \int_A^B f(x+u) U(u)\, du$ for every $x \in I$, and thus, by Lemma 7, F_i is Lipschitz on I. $\square$

For every closed interval J and positive integer n we shall denote by Φ_J^n the family of all functions of the form

$$A(y) = a_1(y_1) \cdots a_n(y_n) \qquad (y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in J^n),$$

where $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ are complex valued nonvanishing functions of bounded variation defined on J. The set of the functions $b_1(y_1) + \ldots + b_n(y_n)$, where $b_i\colon J \to \mathbf{R}$ is a d-convex function on J for every $i = 1, \ldots, n$ will be denoted by Ψ_J^n.

By a subinterval of J^n we shall mean a set of the form $J_1 \times \ldots \times J_n$, where $J_1, \ldots, J_n$ are nondegenerate subintervals of J.

LEMMA 9. *Let $A_i \in \Phi_J^n$ and $B_i \in \Psi_J^n$ for every $i = 1, \dots, N$, and suppose that $B_i - B_j$ is not constant on any subinterval of J^n for every $1 \le i < j \le N$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_N$ be complex valued measurable functions on $\mathbf{R}$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(y) f_i(x + B_i(y)) = 0 \tag{10}$$

for almost every $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J^n$. Then each of the functions $f_1, \dots, f_N$ equals a locally Lipschitz function almost everywhere.

Proof. By symmetry, it is enough to show that f_1 equals a locally Lipschitz function almost everywhere.

Let U denote the set of points $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J^n$ for which (10) holds. Then $(x - B_1(y), y) \in U$ for a.e. $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J^n$, and thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(y) f_i(x + B_i(y) - B_1(y)) = 0$$

holds for a.e. $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J^n$. Therefore we may replace B_i by $B_i - B_1$ for every i. After these replacements we find that $B_1 \equiv 0$.

Let $A_i(y) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} a_{i,k}(y_k)$ and $B_i(y) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} b_{i,k}(y_k)$, where $a_{i,k} \colon J \to \mathbf{C}$ is a nonvanishing function of bounded variation, and $b_{i,k} \colon J \to \mathbf{R}$ is a d-convex function for every $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $k = 1, \dots, n$. Since the functions $a_{i,k}$ are continuous everywhere on J apart from a countable set, they have a common point of continuity x_0. As $a_{i,k}(x_0) \neq 0$ for every i and k, there is an $\eta > 0$ and there is a neighbourhood J_0 of x_0 such that $|a_{i,k}(x)| > \eta$ for every $i = 1, \dots, N$, $k = 1, \dots, n$ and $x \in J_0$. Replacing J by J_0 we may clearly assume that $|a_{i,k}(x)| > \eta$ holds everywhere on J for every i and k. Then $a_{i,k}/a_{1,k}$ is of bounded variation for every i and k, and thus $A_i/A_1 \in \Phi_J^n$ for every $i = 1, \dots, N$. We replace A_i by A_i/A_1 for every i; then we have $A_1 \equiv 1$ and

$$f_1(x) = -\sum_{i=2}^{N} A_i(y) f_i(x + B_i(y)) \tag{11}$$

for a.e. $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J^n$.

Let $1 < i \le N$ and the subinterval $J' \subset J$ be fixed. We claim that there is a $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and there is a subinterval $J'' \subset J'$ such that $b_{i,k}$ is not constant in every subinterval of J''. Indeed, otherwise we could find, successively, the intervals $J' \supset J_1 \supset J_2 \supset \dots \supset J_n$ such that $b_{i,k}$ is constant in J_k for every $k = 1, \dots, n$. Then $B_i = B_i - B_1$ would be constant in $(J_n)^n$,

contrary to the assumption. Applying this observation for every $1 < i \leq N$ successively, we find a subinterval $\bar{J} \subset J$ with the following property: for every $1 < i \leq N$ there is a $k(i) \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $b_{i,k(i)}$ is not constant in every subinterval of $\bar{J}$. Clearly, we may assume that $J = \bar{J}$. By taking another subinterval of J, we can suppose that each $b_{i,k}$ is Lipschitz in J.

Applying Lemma 5, $N-1$ times in succession, we find a positive ε and a subinterval $J_1 \subset J$ such that, for every $1 < i \leq N$, $b_{i,k(i)}$ is strictly monotonic on J_1, and $\left|b'_{i,k(i)}\right| \geq \varepsilon$ almost everywhere on J_1. Again, we may assume that $J_1 = J$. Then, by Lemma 6, we can find a positive number δ such that $\lambda\left(b^{-1}_{i,k(i)}(H)\right) < |J|/N$ whenever $\lambda(H) < \delta$ and $i = 2, \dots, N$.

Let $i \in \{2, \dots, N\}$ be arbitrary. We show that $\lambda_n(B_i^{-1}(H)) < |J|^n/N$ for every $H \subset \mathbf{R}$, $\lambda(H) < \delta$. We may suppose that H is open, and then so is $B_i^{-1}(H)$. If $y_j \in J$ is fixed for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k(i)\}$ then

$$(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in B_i^{-1}(H) \iff b_{i,k(i)}(y_{k(i)}) \in H - \sum_{j \neq k(i)} b_{i,j}(y_j),$$

and thus

$$\lambda(\{y_{k(i)} : (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in B_i^{-1}(H)\}) = \lambda\left(b^{-1}_{i,k(i)}\left(H - \sum_{j \neq k(i)} b_{i,j}(y_j)\right)\right) < |J|/N,$$

since $\lambda\left(H - \sum_{j \neq k(i)} b_{i,j}(y_j)\right) = \lambda(H) < \delta$. Therefore, by Fubini's theorem, we obtain

$$\lambda_n\left(B_i^{-1}(H)\right) < |J|^{n-1} \cdot |J|/N = |J|^n/N,$$

as we stated.

We prove that f_1 is locally essentially bounded. Let I be an arbitrary compact interval. Fubini's theorem implies that there is a set $X \subset \mathbf{R}$ of full measure such that for every $x \in X$, (11) holds for a.e. $y \in J^n$. If K is large enough then the measure of each of the sets $H_K^i = \{x \in I + B_i(J^n) : |f_i(x)| > K\}$ $(i = 2, \dots, N)$ is less than δ. Therefore, by the choice of δ, the set

$$E_x = \bigcup_{i=2}^{N} B_i^{-1}\left(H_K^i - x\right)$$

is of measure less than $|J|^n$ for every x. Then the set $J^n \setminus E_x$ is of positive measure for every $x \in \mathbf{R}$, and hence we can choose a point $y_x \in J^n \setminus E_x$ for every $x \in X$ such that (11) holds with $y = y_x$. Since $x + B_i(y_x) \notin H_K^i$ for every $i = 2, \dots, N$, we have

$$|f_1(x)| \leq \sum_{i=2}^{N} \sup_{J^n} |A_i| \cdot K$$

for every $x \in I \cap X$. Since the interval I was arbitrary, it follows that f_1 is locally essentially bounded. Clearly, the same is true for every f_i.

Now we show that f_1 equals a locally Lipschitz function almost everywhere. By (11) we have

$$|J|^n \cdot f_1(x) = -\sum_{i=2}^{N} \int_{J^n} A_i(y) f_i(x + B_i(y))\, d\lambda_n(y)$$

for a.e. x. Clearly, it is enough to show that

$$F_i(x) = \int_{J^n} A_i(y) f_i(x + B_i(y))\, d\lambda_n(y) \qquad (x \in \mathbf{R})$$

defines a locally Lipschitz function for every $i = 2, \dots, N$. Let i be fixed. Putting

$$u(z) = \prod_{j \neq k(i)} a_{i,j}(y_j) \qquad (z = (y_1, \dots, y_{k(i)-1}, y_{k(i)+1}, \dots, y_n))$$

we have

$$(12) \qquad F_i(x) = \int_{J^{n-1}} u(z) \cdot \left[\int_J a_{i,k(i)}(t) \cdot f_i\left(x + d(z) + b_{i,k(i)}(t)\right) dt \right] d\lambda_{n-1}(z),$$

where $d(z) = \sum_{j \neq k(i)} b_{i,j}(y_j)$. By Lemma 8, the function

$$L(x) = \int_J a_{i,k(i)}(t) \cdot f_i(x + b_{i,k(i)}(t))\, dt$$

is locally Lipschitz on $\mathbf{R}$. Since

$$F_i(x) = \int_{J^{n-1}} u(z) \cdot L(x + d(z))\, d\lambda_{n-1}(z)$$

by (12), it follows that F_i is also locally Lipschitz. Indeed, let I be a compact interval. Since d is continuous on J^{n-1}, it follows that $I' = I + d(J^{n-1})$ is also a compact interval. Let K be the Lipschitz constant of L on I'. If $x_1, x_2 \in I$ and $z \in J^{n-1}$ then $x_1 + d(z)$, $x_2 + d(z) \in I'$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} |F_i(x_2) - F_i(x_1)| &\leq \int_{J^{n-1}} |u(z)| \cdot |L(x_2 + d(z)) - L(x_1 + d(z))|\, d\lambda_{n-1}(z) \\ &\leq K \cdot |x_2 - x_1| \cdot \int_{J^{n-1}} |u(z)|\, d\lambda_{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

proving that F_i is locally Lipschitz. $\square$

5. Proof of Theorem 1

First we shall assume that the function h is identically zero. By symmetry, it is enough to show that f_n equals an exponential polynomial almost everywhere.

Suppose that the functions a_i, b_i, f_i, and $h \equiv 0$ are as in Theorem 1. Applying the a.e.-version of Lemma 4, we find the functions $A_i\colon J^n \to \mathbf{C}$, $B_i\colon J^n \to \mathbf{R}$ $(i = 1, \dots, N)$ satisfying (ii)–(v) of Lemma 4 with $G = \mathbf{R}$ and $Y = J$ and such that (8) holds for a.e. $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J^n$.

By (iv) of Lemma 4, $B_i - B_j$ is not constant on any subinterval of J^n for every $i \neq j$. Therefore, by Lemma 9, f_n equals a locally Lipschitz function $\widetilde{f}_n$ almost everywhere.

By Fubini's theorem, there is a subset Y of J^n of full measure such that for every $y \in Y$, (8) holds for a.e. $x \in \mathbf{R}$. Since $f_n = \widetilde{f}_n$ a.e., it follows that, for every $y \in Y$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(y)\widetilde{f}_n(x + B_i(y)) = 0 \tag{13}$$

for a.e. x. Then, by the continuity of the functions $\widetilde{f}_n$ and B_i we find that (13) holds for every $x \in \mathbf{R}$ and $y \in Y$.

Let L denote the set of continuous functions $f \in C(\mathbf{R})$ satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(y)f(x + B_i(y)) = 0 \tag{14}$$

for every $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times Y$. Then L is a translation invariant closed subspace of $C(\mathbf{R})$ and, by the argument above, $\widetilde{f}_n \in L$. If $f \in L$ then (14) holds for a.e. $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J^n$ and thus, by Lemma 9, f is locally Lipschitz. That is, each element of L is locally Lipschitz. We claim that there exists a nonzero difference operator Δ such that $\Delta f = 0$ for every $f \in L$. In fact, if $f \in L$ then we have $\Delta(y)f = 0$ for every $y \in Y$, where $\Delta(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(y)T_{B_i(y)}$. We have to show that $\Delta(y)$ is nonzero for at least one $y \in Y$. But this is clear, because $A_i(y) \neq 0$ for every $y \in J^n$, and $B_1(y), \dots, B_n(y)$ are distinct on a dense open subset of J^n.

Therefore we may apply Lemma 3. We find that L is finite dimensional, and thus each element of L is an exponential polynomial. Since $\widetilde{f}_n \in L$ and f_n equals $\widetilde{f}_n$ almost everywhere, this completes the proof, assuming $h \equiv 0$.

The general case can be reduced to the previous one as follows. It is enough to show that f_n equals an exponential polynomial almost everywhere.

Let Δ_b denote the difference operator defined by $\Delta_b f(x) = f(x+b) - f(x)$. Suppose that the functions a_i, b_i, f_i, and h are as in Theorem 1. Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i(y)\, \Delta_b f_i(x + b_i(y)) = 0$$

for almost every $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times J$ and for every $b \in \mathbf{R}$. As we proved already, this implies that $\Delta_b f_n$ equals an exponential polynomial almost everywhere for every $b \in \mathbf{R}$. Then, in particular, $\Delta_b f_n$ equals a continuous function almost everywhere for each $b \in \mathbf{R}$. By a theorem of T. Keleti [7, Theorem 2.9] it follows that f_n equals a continuous function $\bar{f}_n$ almost everywhere. Since $\Delta_b \bar{f}_n$ equals an exponential polynomial almost everywhere and $\bar{f}_n$ is continuous, we find that $\Delta_b \bar{f}_n$ equals an exponential polynomial everywhere for every $b \in \mathbf{R}$. Therefore, by a theorem of F. W. Carroll [2], $\bar{f}_n$ is exponential polynomial, which completes the proof. $\square$

6. Proof of Theorem 2

For every $E \in \mathcal{E}$ we shall denote by $\Lambda(E)$ the set of roots of E.

Lemma 10. *Shapiro's conjecture implies that if $\{E_j : j \in J\}$ is a system of exponential polynomials with constant coefficients such that $\bigcap_{j \in I} \Lambda(E_j)$ is infinite, then either*

(i) *there is a non-unit exponential polynomial that divides each E_j, or*

(ii) *there is a nonzero complex number γ such that each E_j has a divisor of the form $e^{r\gamma z} - c$, where $c \neq 0$ and $r \neq 0$ is rational.*

Proof. By Ritt's theorem [9] we have $E_j = F_j \cdot G_j$ $(j \in J)$, where each F_j is the product of finitely many simple exponential polynomials, and each G_j is the product of finitely many irreducible factors. Let $\Lambda = \bigcap_{j \in J} \Lambda(E_j)$. Then $\Lambda \subset \Lambda(E_j) = \Lambda(F_j) \cup \Lambda(G_j)$ for every $j \in J$. Suppose that there exists a $j_0 \in J$ such that $\Lambda \cap \Lambda(G_{j_0})$ is infinite. Then there is an irreducible factor H of G_{i_0} such that $\Lambda \cap \Lambda(H)$ is infinite. Then $\Lambda(H) \cap \Lambda(E_j)$ is infinite for every $i \in J$, as it contains $\Lambda \cap \Lambda(H)$. If Shapiro's conjecture is true then H and E_j have a common non-unit factor. Since H is irreducible, this factor must be (a unit multiple of) H. Thus, in this case, H divides each E_j; that is, (i) holds.

Next suppose that $\Lambda \cap \Lambda(G_j)$ is finite for every $j \in J$. Then $\Lambda \cap \Lambda(F_j)$ must be infinite for every j. It is easy to see that if $F \in \mathcal{E}$ is simple then F is the product of a unit and of finitely many factors of the form $e^{az} - c$, where $a \neq 0$ and $c \neq 0$. Therefore, $\Lambda(F)$ is the union of finitely many arithmetical progressions (AP's).

Let $j_0 \in J$ be arbitrary. Since $\Lambda \cap \Lambda(F_{j_0})$ is infinite and $\Lambda(F_{j_0})$ is the union of finitely many AP's, there exists an arithmetical progression $A = \{b + nd : n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ such that $\Lambda \cap A$ is infinite. Let $\gamma = d/(2\pi i)$. We show that every E_i has a divisor of the form $e^{r\gamma z} - c$, where $c \neq 0$ and $r \neq 0$ is rational. That is, in this case (ii) holds.

Let $j \in J$ be arbitrary. Since $\Lambda(G_j) \cap (\Lambda \cap A)$ is finite, there is a factor $e^{az} - c$ of F_j such that $\Lambda(e^{az} - c) \cap (\Lambda \cap A)$ is infinite. Now $\Lambda(e^{az} - c)$ is an AP with difference $(2\pi i)/a$, and thus $(2\pi i)/a$ and d must be commensurable; that is, $(2\pi i)/ad$ is rational. Thus $a/\gamma = r$ is rational, which completes the proof. $\square$

REMARK. As the following simple example shows, we cannot omit case (ii) from the statement of Lemma 10. Let G_n $(n = 1, 2, \ldots)$ be a sequence of non-associate irreducible exponential sums such that $\{1, \ldots, n!\} \subset \Lambda(G_n)$ for every n. Let $E_n = \left(e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n} z} - 1\right) \cdot G_n$ $(n = 1, 2, \ldots)$. It is easy to check that $\{n! : n = 1, 2, \ldots\} \subset \Lambda(E_n)$ for every n, but the E_n's do not have a common non-unit divisor.

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 2. First we consider the case when the function h is identically zero. Suppose (1). Clearly, it is enough to show that f_n is an exponential polynomial. By Lemma 4, there are functions $A_i \colon Y^n \to \mathbf{C}$ and $B_i \colon Y^n \to \mathbf{R}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, N = n!)$ such that (8) holds for every $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in Y^n$, A_i is nonvanishing and B_i is continuous on Y^n for every i. Also, it follows from (iv) of Lemma 4 that $B_i - B_j$ is not constant on any nonempty open subset of Y^n for every $1 \leq i < j \leq N$. Consequently, there is a nonempty open set $U \subset Y^n$ such that $B_1(y), \ldots, B_N(y)$ are distinct and of the same order for every $y \in U$. We may assume that $B_1(y) < \ldots < B_N(y)$ $(y \in U)$.

Let L denote the set of functions $f \in C(\mathbf{R})$ satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(y) f(x + B_i(y)) = 0 \tag{15}$$

for every $(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times Y^n$. Then L is a translation invariant closed subspace

of $C(\mathbf{R})$, and $f_n \in L$. By Schwartz's theorem, it is enough to show that L is finite dimensional.

First we shall prove that the spectrum $\mathrm{sp}(L) = \{\lambda \in \mathbf{C} : e^{\lambda x} \in L\}$ is finite. Suppose $\lambda \in \mathrm{sp}(L)$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(y)\, e^{\lambda B_i(y)} = 0$ for every $y \in Y^n$; that is, λ is a root of the exponential sum $E_y(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(y)\, e^{B_i(y)z}$ for every $y \in Y^n$. We prove, assuming Shapiro's conjecture, that the exponential sums E_y have only a finite number of common roots. Suppose this is not true. Then, by Lemma 10, one of the following two statements must be true:

(i) there is a non-unit exponential polynomial that divides each E_y, or

(ii) there is a nonzero complex number γ such that each E_y has a divisor of the form $e^{r\gamma z} - c$, where $c \neq 0$ and $r \neq 0$ is rational.

We show that each of these statements contradicts the condition that $B_i - B_j$ is not constant on nonempty open sets.

Suppose (i), and let $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_i e^{\delta_i z}$ be a non-unit exponential polynomial that divides each E_y. We may assume that $k \geq 2$, $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k$ are nonzero, $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k$ are distinct, and that $\delta_1 = 0$. Then we have

$$E_y(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_i e^{\delta_i z} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{m(y)} a_j(y)\, e^{\beta_j(y) z} \tag{16}$$

for every $y \in Y^n$, where $a_1(y), \ldots, a_{m(y)}(y)$ are nonzero and $\beta_1(y), \ldots, \beta_{m(y)}(y)$ are distinct for every y. By a theorem of Ritt, there is a complex number δ such that each of the numbers $\delta_i - \delta$ $(i = 1, \ldots, k)$ and $\beta_j(y) + \delta$ $(j = 1, \ldots, m(y))$ is a linear combination of $B_1(y), \ldots, B_N(y)$ with rational coefficients. (See [9, p. 585] and [3, Lemma 2].) Since $B_i(y)$ is real for every i and y, it follows that $\delta_i - \delta$ and $\beta_j(y) + \delta$ are also real for every i, j and y. Now $\delta_1 = 0$ implies that δ is real, and thus δ_i and $\beta_j(y)$ are real for every $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $j = 1, \ldots, m(y)$ and $y \in Y^n$. We may assume that $0 = \delta_1 < \ldots < \delta_k$.

Let $K(m) = \{y \in U : m(y) = m\}$ $(m = 1, 2, \ldots)$. Then $U = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} K(m)$. Since Y^n is a Baire space, it follows that $K(m)$ is not nowhere dense for at least one m. Fix such an m, and partition $K(m)$ into $m!$ subsets according to the ordering of the numbers $\beta_1(y), \ldots, \beta_m(y)$. Then at least one of these subsets is not nowhere dense. In other words, there exists a non-nowhere dense subset K of $K(m)$ such that the ordering of the numbers $\beta_1(y), \ldots, \beta_m(y)$ is the same for every $y \in K$. We may assume that $\beta_1(y) < \ldots < \beta_m(y)$ $(y \in K)$. By (16) and $\delta_1 = 0$ we have $B_1(y) = \beta_1(y)$ for every $y \in K$.

Let J denote the set of those indices $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ for which $\beta_j - \beta_1$ is constant on a non-nowhere dense subset of K. Obviously, $1 \in J$. Let j_0 be the largest element of J, and let K_0 be a non-nowhere dense subset of K such that $\beta_{j_0} - \beta_1$ is constant on K_0. Put $K_i = \{y \in K_0 : \delta_k + \beta_{j_0}(y) = B_i(y)\}$ $(i = 2, \dots, N)$. If $y \in K_i$ then

$$B_i(y) - B_1(y) = \delta_k + \beta_{j_0}(y) - \beta_1(y),$$

and thus $B_i(y) - B_1(y)$ is constant on K_i. Therefore, K_i is nowhere dense for every $i = 2, \dots, N$. Consequently, the set $\bigcup_{i=2}^N K_i$ is also nowhere dense, and $K' = K_0 \setminus \bigcup_{i=2}^N K_i$ is not. Note that $\delta_k + \beta_{j_0}(y) \neq B_i(y)$ for every $y \in K'$ and $i = 2, \dots, N$.

Let $y \in K'$. The product on the right hand side of (16) contains the term $\gamma_k a_{j_0}(y)\, e^{(\delta_k + \beta_{j_0}(y))z}$. Now $\delta_k + \beta_{j_0}(y) > \delta_1 + \beta_1(y) = B_1(y)$ and $\delta_k + \beta_{j_0}(y) \neq B_i(y)$ for every $i \geq 2$ by $y \in K'$. Thus $\delta_k + \beta_{j_0}(y) \neq B_i(y)$ for every i and, consequently, this term must be cancelled out by other terms. That is, there are indices $i(y) < k$ and $j(y) > j_0$ such that $\delta_k + \beta_{j_0}(y) = \delta_{i(y)} + \beta_{j(y)}$. Now there must exist indices $i < k$ and $j > j_0$ and a non-nowhere dense subset K'' of K' such that $i(y) = i$ and $j(y) = j$ for every $y \in K''$. Then

$$\beta_j(y) - \beta_1(y) = \big(\beta_{j_0}(y) - \beta_1(y)\big) + (\delta_k - \delta_i)$$

for every $y \in K''$. Now $\beta_{j_0} - \beta_1$ is constant on K'' (even on K_0), and thus so is $\beta_j - \beta_1$. Therefore, $j \in J$. This, however, contradicts the fact that j_0 was the maximal element of J. This contradiction proves the finiteness of $\mathrm{sp}(L)$ in the case when (i) holds.

Next assume (ii). Then there is a nonzero complex number γ such that

$$E_y(z) = \big(e^{r(y)\gamma z} - c(y)\big) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{m(y)} a_j(y)\, e^{\beta_j(y) z} \tag{17}$$

for every $y \in Y^n$, where $r(y) \neq 0$ is rational, $c(y), a_1(y), \dots, a_{m(y)}(y)$ are nonzero and $\beta_1(y), \dots, \beta_{m(y)}(y)$ are distinct for every y. We can prove, in the same way as in the case (i), that the numbers γ and $\beta_1(y), \dots, \beta_{m(y)}$ are real for every y. Since Y^n is a Baire space, there is a nonzero rational number r and there is a positive integer m such that the set $R = \{y \in U : r(y) = r,\ m(y) = m\}$ is not nowhere dense. Then there is a non-nowhere dense subset R_0 of R such that the ordering of the numbers $\beta_1(y), \dots, \beta_m(y)$ is the same for every $y \in R_0$ We may assume that $\beta_1(y) < \dots < \beta_m(y)$ $(y \in R_0)$. From this point we can arrive at a contradiction in the same way as in the case of (i), using (17) instead of (16).

This proves that $\mathrm{sp}(L)$ is finite. If $e^{\lambda_1 z}, \dots, e^{\lambda_s z}$ are the only exponential functions contained in L, then every exponential polynomial contained in L must be of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i(z)\, e^{\lambda_i z}$, where $p_1, \dots, p_s$ are polynomials. Since the set of all polynomials is dense in $C(\mathbf{R})$ and $L \neq C(\mathbf{R})$, it follows that the degrees of $p_1, \dots, p_s$ must be bounded. As the set of exponential polynomials is dense in L, we find that each element of L is an exponential polynomial, which completes the proof of Theorem 2 in the case when $h \equiv 0$.

The general case can be reduced to the previous one in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 1. Again, it is enough to show that f_n is an exponential polynomial. Since $\Delta_b f_n$ satisfies the homogeneous version of (1), it follows that $\Delta_b f_n$ is an exponential polynomial for every b. Therefore, by Carroll's theorem [2], f_n is also an exponential polynomial. $\square$

REFERENCES

[1] BAKER, J. A. Functional equations, distributions and approximate identities. *Canad. J. Math. 42* (1990), 696–708.

[2] CARROLL, F. W. A difference property for polynomials and exponential polynomials on Abelian locally compact groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 114* (1965), 147–155.

[3] EVEREST, G. R. and A. J. VAN DEN POORTEN. Factorization in the ring of exponential polynomials. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 125* (1997), 1293–1298.

[4] JÁRAI, A. On Lipschitz property of solutions of functional equations. *Aequationes Math. 47* (1994), 69–78.

[5] KAHANE, J.-P. Sur quelques problèmes d'unicité et de prolongement, relatifs aux fonctions approchables par des sommes d'exponentielles. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 5* (1953–54), 39–130.

[6] —— *Lectures on Mean Periodic Functions*. Tata Institute, 1956.

[7] KELETI, T. Difference functions of periodic measurable functions. *Fund. Math. 157* (1998), 15–32.

[8] VAN DEN POORTEN, A. J. and R. TIJDEMAN. On common zeros of exponential polynomials. *L'Enseignement Math. (2) 21* (1975), 57–67.

[9] RITT, J. F. A factorization theory for functions $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i e^{\alpha_i x}$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 29* (1927), 584–596.

[10] SCHWARTZ, L. Théorie générale des fonctions moyenne-périodiques. *Ann. of Math. (2) 48* (1947), 857–929.

[11] SHAPIRO, H. S. The expansion of mean-periodic functions in series of exponentials. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 11* (1958), 1–21.

[12] ŚWIATAK, H. On the regularity of the locally integrable solutions of the functional equations $\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i(x,t)f(x+\phi_i(t)) = b(x,t)$. *Aequationes Math. 1* (1968), 6–19.

(Reçu le 27 juillet 2003)

M. Laczkovich

Department of Analysis
Eötvös Loránd University
Pázmány Péter sétány 1/C
H-Budapest
Hungary 1117
e-mail: laczk@cs.elte.hu

and

Department of Mathematics
University College London
Gower Street
GB-London WC1E 6BT
England