

§3. Deletion of dependent terms

Objekttyp: **Chapter**

Zeitschrift: **L'Enseignement Mathématique**

Band (Jahr): **23 (1977)**

Heft 1-2: **L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE**

PDF erstellt am: **26.04.2024**

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{r=1}^v p_j^k(a_r) f_j^k(q_j^k(a_r)) h_1([a_r, a_{r+1}]) \right. \\
 &\quad - \sum_{r=1}^v p_j^k(a_r) f_j^k(q_j^k(a_r)) h_1([a_r, a_{r+1}]) (1 + O(\gamma) \omega(\delta)) \\
 &\quad \left. + \sum_{r=1}^v (p_j^k(a_r) - p_j^k(b_r)) f_j^k(q_j^k(a_r)) h_1([b_r, b_{r+1}]) \right| + O(\gamma) m \delta \\
 &= \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{r=1}^v p_j^k(a_r) f_j^k(q_j^k(a_r)) h_1([a_r, a_{r+1}]) O(\gamma) \omega(\delta) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \sum_{r=1}^v f_j^k(q_j^k(a_r)) h_1([b_r, b_{r+1}]) O(\gamma) \omega(\delta) \right| + O(\gamma) m \delta \\
 &= O(\gamma) m \alpha \omega(\delta) + O(\gamma) m \alpha \omega(\delta) + O(\gamma) m \delta = O(\gamma) m (\delta + \alpha \omega(\delta)).
 \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left| \int_{s \in [a', a'']} \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} p_i^k(s) f_i^k(q_i^k(s)) ds - \int_{s \in [b', b'']} \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} p_i^k(s) f_i^k(q_i^k(s)) ds \right| \\
 &\leq \left| \int_{s \in [a', a'']} \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} p_i^k(s) f_i^k(q_i^k(s)) ds - \int_{s \in [b', b'']} \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} p_i^k(s) f_i^k(q_i^k(s)) ds \right| \\
 &\quad + \left| \sum_{j \neq i} \int_{s \in [a', a'']} \sum_{k=1}^{m_j} p_j^k(s) f_j^k(q_j^k(s)) ds - \int_{s \in [b', b'']} \sum_{k=1}^{m_j} p_j^k(s) f_j^k(q_j^k(s)) ds \right| \\
 &\leq C_4(\gamma) \alpha \varepsilon + n (\max_{j \neq i} m_j) C_5(\gamma) m (\delta + \alpha \omega(\delta)) \\
 &\leq C_3(\gamma) (\alpha \varepsilon + m \delta + m \alpha \omega(\delta)).
 \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma.

§ 3. Deletion of dependent terms

On a bounded closed set D we consider the space of linear superpositions of the form $\sum_{k=1}^m p_k(x, y) f_k(q(x, y))$, $(x, y) \in D$. Here the functions $\{p_k(x, y)\}$ and $q(x, y)$ are continuous and fixed, and $\{f_k(t)\}$ are arbitrary continuous functions of one variable. We assume that the function $q(x, y)$ is such that for any sequence $t_n \in q(D) \rightarrow t \in q(D)$ we have $\rho[e(q, t_n) \cap D, e(q, t) \cap D] \rightarrow 0$. We put

$$\lambda(t, D, q, p_1, \dots, p_m) = \inf_{\{c_k\}} \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t) \cap D} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k p_k(x, y) \right|,$$

where inf is taken over all sets of numbers $\{c_k\}$ for which $\max_k |c_k| = 1$. The function $\lambda(t, D, q, \{p_k\})$, as a function of t , is defined only on the set $q(D)$.

LEMMA 4.3.1. *The function $\lambda(t, D, q, \{p_k\})$ depends continuously on t .*

Proof. The linear combinations $\sum_{k=1}^m c_k p_k(x, y)$ for all possible systems of numbers $\{c_k\}$ for which $\max_k |c_k| \leq 1$, form an equicontinuous set of functions, considered on the bounded closed set D . Consequently, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that if $|t_1 - t_2| < \delta$, then

$$\left| \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t_1)} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k p_k(x, y) \right| - \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t_2)} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k p_k(x, y) \right| \right| < \varepsilon$$

simultaneously for all systems of numbers $\{c_k\}$ such that $\max_k |c_k| \leq 1$.

For definiteness, suppose that $\lambda(t_2, D, q, \{p_k\}) \geq \lambda(t_1, D, q, \{p_k\})$. Since the expression $\sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t_1)} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k p_k(x, y) \right|$ depends continuously on the coefficients $\{c_k\}$, there exists a system of numbers $\{c_k^1\}$ such that $\max_k |c_k^1| = 1$ and

$$\lambda(t_1, D, q, \{p_k\}) = \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t_1)} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k^1 p_k(x, y) \right|.$$

Since

$$\lambda(t_2, D, q, \{p_k\}) \leq \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t_2)} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k^1 p_k(x, y) \right|,$$

we have

$$0 \leq \lambda(t_2) - \lambda(t_1) \leq \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t_2)} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k^1 p_k(x, y) \right| - \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t_1)} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k^1 p_k(x, y) \right| < \varepsilon.$$

This proves the lemma.

LEMMA 4.3.2. *The function $\lambda(t, D, q, \{p_k\})$ depends continuously on D in the sense that there exists a function $\mu(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, having the property: if the set $D_\varepsilon \subset D$ is such that, for any t , $D_\varepsilon \cap e(q, t)$ forms an ε -net in the set $e(q, t) \cap D$, then*

$$\max_{t \in q(D)} \left| \lambda(t, D, q, \{p_k\}) - \lambda(t, D_\varepsilon, q, \{p_k\}) \right| \leq \mu(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. Using the equicontinuity of the set of functions $\sum_{k=1}^n c_k p_k(x, y)$ where $\max_k |c_k| \leq 1$, we conclude that there exists a function $\mu(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ such that the inequality

$$0 \leq \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t) \cap D} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k p_k(x, y) \right| - \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t) \cap D_\varepsilon} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k p_k(x, y) \right| \leq \mu(\varepsilon).$$

uniformly over all $t \in q(D)$ and over all systems of numbers $\{c_k\}$ for which $\max_k |c_k| \leq 1$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a system of numbers $\{c_k^\varepsilon\}$ such that $\max_k |c_k^\varepsilon| = 1$ and

$$\lambda(t, D_\varepsilon, q, \{p_k\}) = \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t) \cap D_\varepsilon} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k^\varepsilon p_k(x, y) \right|.$$

Since for any ε

$$\lambda(t, D, q, \{p_k\}) \leq \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t) \cap D} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k^\varepsilon p_k(x, y) \right|$$

and, on the other hand, $\lambda(t, D, q, \{p_k\}) \geq \lambda(t, D_\varepsilon, q, \{p_k\})$ (we recall that $D_\varepsilon \subset D$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \lambda(t, D, q, \{p_k\}) - \lambda(t, D_\varepsilon, q, \{p_k\}) &\leq \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t) \cap D} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k^\varepsilon p_k(x, y) \right| \\ &- \sup_{(x, y) \in e(q, t) \cap D_\varepsilon} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m c_k^\varepsilon p_k(x, y) \right| < \mu(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma.

LEMMA 4.3.3. Let F be a closed set on the t -axis; $F \subset q(D)$. For every $t \in F$, suppose that there exists one and only one system of numbers $\{C_k\}$ ($\max_k |C_k| = 1$) such that $\sum_{k=1}^m C_k p_k(x, y) \equiv 0$ on the set $e(q, t) \cap D$. Then each of the functions $\{C_k(t)\}$ depends continuously on t on the set F .

Proof. Suppose that $t_n \in F$, $t \in F$ and $t_n \rightarrow t$. We put $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_k(t_n) = \tilde{C}_k$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_k(t_n) = \tilde{\tilde{C}}_k$. Since $\sum_{k=1}^m C_k(t_n) p_k(x, y) \equiv 0$ on the set $e(q, t_n) \cap D$ and $\rho[e(q, t) \cap D, e(q, t_n) \cap D] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\sum_{k=1}^m \tilde{C}_k p_k(x, y)$

$\equiv 0 \equiv \sum_{k=1}^m \tilde{C}_k p_k(x, y)$ on the set $e(q, t) \cap D$. Consequently, by the condition of the lemma, $\tilde{C}_k = \tilde{\tilde{C}}_k = C_k(t)$. This proves the lemma.

LEMMA 4.3.4. Suppose that $\lambda(t, D, q, \{p_k\}) \equiv 0$ on some non-empty portion δ of the set $q(D)$. Then there is a non-empty portion $\delta^* \subset \delta$ and an index l such that for any continuous functions $\{f_k(t)\}$ there are continuous functions $\{f_k^*(t)\}$ such that

$$\sum_{k \neq l} f_k^*(q(x, y)) p_k(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^m f_k(q(x, y)) p_k(x, y)$$

on the set $q^{-1}(\delta^*) \cap D$.

We recall that a portion δ of a set E is that part of it which lies in the interval δ .

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on m . For $m = 1$ the assertion of the lemma is obvious. We denote by δ_k the set of all points t of the portion δ for which $\lambda(t, D, q, p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}, p_{k+1}, \dots, p_m) = 0$. By Lemma 4.3.1, the set is closed. Two cases are possible.

1) For some k the set δ_k contains a non-empty portion δ'_k of the set $q(D)$. Since $\lambda(t, D, q, p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}, p_{k+1}, \dots, p_m) = 0$ for every $t \in \delta'_k$, then by the inductive hypothesis there is a non-empty portion $\delta^* \subset \delta'_k$ and an index $l \neq k$ such that for any continuous functions $f_1(t), \dots, f_{k-1}(t), f_{k+1}(t), \dots, f_m(t)$ there are continuous functions $f_1^*(t), \dots, f_{k-1}^*(t), f_{k+1}^*(t), \dots, f_m^*(t)$ such that

$$\sum_{i \neq k} f_i(q(x, y)) p_i(x, y) = \sum_{i \neq k, l} f_i^*(q(x, y)) p_i(x, y).$$

on the set $q^{-1}(\delta^*) \cap D$. Putting $f_k^*(t) = f_k(t)$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^m f_i(q(x, y)) p_i(x, y) = \sum_{i \neq l} f_i^*(q(x, y)) p_i(x, y).$$

So in case 1) the lemma is proved.

2) None of the sets δ_k contains non-empty portions of the set $q(D)$, that is, $\bigcup_{k=1}^m \delta_k$ is nowhere dense in $q(D)$. Therefore there exists a non-

empty portion $\delta^* \subset \delta \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^m \delta_k$. Since $\lambda(t, D, q, \{p_k\}) \equiv 0$ on δ^* , for every

$t \in \delta^*$ there are numbers $\{C_k(t)\}$ ($\max_k |C_k(t)| = 1$) such that $\sum_{k=1}^m C_k$

$(q(x, y)) p_k(x, y) \equiv 0$ on $e(q, t) \cap D$. If we had $C_k(t) = 0$ for some k , then it would turn out that $t \in \delta_k$. Consequently, $C_k(t) \neq 0$ for any k . We show that for every $t \in \delta^*$ the numbers $\{C_k(t)\}$ are uniquely determined. Assume the contrary. Then there are numbers $\{C'_k(t)\}$ ($\max |C'_k(t)| = 1$) such that $\sum_{k=1}^m C'_k(q(x, y)) p_k(x, y) = 0$ on $e(q, t) \cap D$ and $C_k \neq C'_k$ for some k . Then

$$\sum_{k \neq 1} [C_k(t) C'_1(t) - C'_k(t) C_1(t)] p_k(x, y) = \sum_{k \neq 1} C'_k(t) p_k(x, y) \equiv 0$$

on $e(q, t) \cap D$ and in addition, $C''_k \neq 0$ for some k . Consequently, $t \in \delta_1$. So we have obtained a contradiction, and the uniqueness of the choice of the numbers $C_k(t)$ is proved. Further, we may regard $\{C_k(t)\}$ as single-valued functions of t on the portion δ^* . By Lemma 4.3.3, the functions $C_k(t)$ are continuous and, as noted above, $C_k(t) \neq 0$ for any $t \in \delta^*$. Then

$$p_1(x, y) = \sum_{k=2}^m - \frac{C_k(q(x, y))}{C_1(q(x, y))} p_k(x, y), \quad (x, y) \in q^{-1}(\delta^*) \cap D.$$

Putting $f(t) = f_k(t) - \frac{C_k(t)}{C_1(t)} f_1(t)$, $t \in \delta^*$, we have $\sum_{k=2}^m f_k^*(q(x, y)) p_k(x, y)$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{k=1}^m f_k(q) p_k(x, y) - \sum_{k=2}^m \frac{C_k(q)}{C_1(q)} p_k(x, y) \\ &= \sum_{k=2}^m f_k(q) p_k(x, y) + f_1(q) p_1(x, y) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^m f_k(q(x, y)) p_k(x, y), \quad (x, y) \in q^{-1}(\delta^*) \cap D. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma.

§ 4. *Reduction of linear superpositions to a form with independent terms*

We fix the continuous functions $p_i^k(x, y)$ and continuously differentiable functions $q_i(x, y)$ ($i=0, 1, 2, \dots, n; k=1, 2, \dots, m_i$) $n \geq 2$, where $\{q_i(x, y)\}$ satisfy in D conditions (1) and (3) of Lemma 4.2.2, and we consider in D superpositions of the form

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} p_i^k(x, y) f_i^k(q_i(x, y)),$$

where $\{f_i^k(t)\}$ are arbitrary continuous functions of one variable.