

# On a theorem of A. C. Offord and its analogue for Fourier series

G. P. NÉVAI

(Budapest)<sup>1)</sup>

1. Let  $l_n$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) be a sequence of natural numbers such that  $l_n = o(n)$  and let

$$\delta_n = \frac{2l_n\pi}{2n+1}. \quad (1)$$

Let further,  $f$  be a Lebesgue integrable function of period  $2\pi$ . Let us denote by  $f_n(x)$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) the average of  $f$  over the interval  $(x - \delta_n, x + \delta_n)$ , that is

$$f_n(x) = \frac{1}{2\delta_n} \int_{x-\delta_n}^{x+\delta_n} f(t) dt. \quad (2)$$

The function  $f_n$  is continuous and we may consider the uniquely determined trigonometric interpolating polynomial  $\tilde{S}_n(x, f_n)$  of degree at most  $n$  which coincides with the function  $f_n$  at the nodes

$$x_k \equiv x_{kn} = \frac{2k\pi}{2n+1} \quad (k = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots).$$

It is well known that (see A. Zygmund [11]),

$$\tilde{S}_n(x, f_n) = \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=-n}^n f_n(x_{kn}) D_n(x - x_{kn}), \quad (3)$$

---

<sup>1)</sup> This paper was written during the first term of the 1973/74 academic year while the author visited the Mittag-Leffler Institute, Sweden. The author seizes the opportunity to thank the Swedish Academy of Sciences and in particular Professor L. Carleson for the scholarship at the Mittag-Leffler Institute given to the author.

where  $D_n(t)$  is the  $n$ -th Dirichlet kernel defined by

$$D_n(t) = \frac{\sin(n + \frac{1}{2})t}{2 \sin \frac{t}{2}}. \tag{4}$$

In his paper [9], A. C. Offord claimed that the following statement is valid:

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $x$  is a Lebesgue point of  $f \in L^1_{2\pi}$  then*

$$\tilde{S}_n(x, f_n) \rightarrow f(x) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \tag{5}$$

At first sight this result seems to be very surprising since there is a well known classical result that there exists a continuous function  $f_1$  of period  $2\pi$  such that  $\tilde{S}_n(x, f_1)$  diverges almost everywhere. (See J. Marcinkiewicz [7] and for a very similar result G. GRÜNWARD [4]. Actually,  $f_1$  may be chosen so that  $\tilde{S}_n(x, f_1)$  diverges for all  $x$  except for  $x = 0$  (see A. Zygmund [11])). But a deeper analysis shows, however, that in case  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} l_n < \infty$  (5) is almost obvious for continuous functions.

Indeed, let for simplicity  $l_n = 1$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ). It is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S}_n(x, f_n) - f(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \tilde{S}_n(x, f_n^* - f) + \tilde{S}_n\left(x - \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}, f_n^* - f\right) \right] + \\ &+ \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \tilde{S}_n(x, f) + \tilde{S}_n\left(x - \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}, f\right) \right] - f(x) \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where  $f_n^*$  is defined by

$$f_n^*(x) = \frac{2n+1}{2\pi} \int_x^{x + \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}} f(t) dt. \tag{7}$$

Since the inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=-n}^n |D_n(x - x_k) + D_n(x - x_{k+1})| \leq \frac{4}{\pi} \tag{8}$$

holds independently of  $n$  (see S. Bernstein [1]), we obtain from (6) and (7) that

$$|\tilde{S}_n(x, f_n) - f(x)| \leq \frac{4}{\pi} \omega\left(f; \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}\right) + \left| \frac{1}{2} \left[ \tilde{S}_n(x, f) + \tilde{S}_n\left(x - \frac{2\pi}{2n+1}, f\right) \right] - f(x) \right|,$$

where the expression between the absolute value signs tends uniformly to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because of S. Bernstein's and W. Rogosinski's results. (See e.g. A. Zygmund [11]).

Offord's theorem is less trivial for arbitrary integrable functions  $f$  and sequences  $l_n$ . Unfortunately, the proof of this theorem given by A. C. Offord turned out to be false. This fact was observed by G. Róna, who has given another proof of this theorem. (See G. Róna [10]). It can be easily checked that this second proof given by G. Róna is also false. For this reason now we turn to Offord's theorem and give a really correct proof of it. To prove (5) we need two lemmas.

LEMMA 1. Let  $n_1, n_2$  be arbitrary integers such that  $n_1 \leq n_2$ ,  $|n_1 - n_2| \leq 2n$ . We have

$$\left| \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=n_1}^{n_2} D_n(x - x_k) \right| \leq C_1 \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots), \quad (9)$$

where  $C_1$  is an absolute constant.

*Proof.* This lemma is known and plays an important role in proving convergence theorems in the theory of trigonometric interpolation. Here we give an extremely simple proof of it based on inequality (8). Let first  $n_2 - n_1 + 1$  be even. In this case we have

$$\frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=n_1}^{n_2} D_n(x - x_k) = \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=n_1, n_1+2, \dots, n_2-1} [D_n(x - x_k) + D_n(x - x_{k+1})]$$

and consequently

$$\left| \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=n_1}^{n_2} D_n(x - x_k) \right| \leq \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=n_1}^{n_2} |D_n(x - x_k) + D_n(x - x_{k+1})|.$$

Hence by virtue of (8) we obtain

$$\left| \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=n_1}^{n_2} D_n(x - x_k) \right| \leq \frac{8}{\pi}. \quad (10)$$

Let now  $n_2 - n_1 + 1$  be odd. If  $n_1 = n_2$  then (9) holds because for every  $k$

$$\frac{2}{2n+1} |D_n(x - x_k)| \leq 1. \quad (11)$$

If  $n_1 < n_2$  then

$$\frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=n_1}^{n_2} D_n(x - x_k) = \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=n_1}^{n_2-1} D_n(x - x_k) + \frac{2}{2n+1} D_n(x - x_{n_2}).$$

Since  $n_2 - n_1$  is even, we have by virtue of (10) and (11)

$$\left| \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=n_1}^{n_2} D_n(x - x_k) \right| \leq \frac{8}{\pi} + 1.$$

LEMMA 2. Let  $l$  and  $n$  be natural numbers. If  $0 < l < n/3$  and  $\pi \geq |x| \geq 6l\pi/(2n + 1)$  then the inequality

$$\left| \frac{2}{2n + 1} \sum_{j=-l+1}^l D_n(x - x_j) \right| \leq C_2 \frac{l}{n^2 x^2}$$

holds with an absolute constant  $C_2$ .

*Proof.* We obviously have

$$\frac{2}{2n + 1} \sum_{j=-l+1}^l D_n(x - x_j) = \frac{2}{2n + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} [D_n(x - x_{-l+1+2j}) + D_n(x - x_{-l+2+2j})],$$

so we obtain from (4) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{2}{2n + 1} \sum_{j=-l+1}^l D_n(x - x_j) \right| \leq \\ & \leq \frac{|\sin(n + \frac{1}{2})x|}{2n + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \left| \operatorname{cosec} \frac{x - x_{-l+1+2j}}{2} - \operatorname{cosec} \frac{x - x_{-l+2+2j}}{2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we conclude that there exists an absolute constant  $C_3$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{2}{2n + 1} \sum_{j=-l+1}^l D_n(x - x_j) \right| & \leq \frac{C_3}{n^2} \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \left| \frac{1}{|x - x_{-l+1+2j}| |x - x_{-l+2+2j}|} \right| = \\ & = \frac{C_3}{n^2 x^2} \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \frac{|x|}{|x - x_{-l+1+2j}|} \frac{|x|}{|x - x_{-l+2+2j}|}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x - x_{-l+1+2j}| & \geq |x| - |x_{-l+1+2j}| \geq \frac{|x|}{2} + \frac{3l\pi}{2n + 1} - |x_{-l+1+2j}| \geq \\ & \geq \frac{|x|}{2} + \frac{3l\pi}{2n + 1} - \frac{2l\pi}{2n + 1} > \frac{|x|}{2} \end{aligned}$$

for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, l - 1$  and similarly

$$|x - x_{-l+2+2j}| > \frac{|x|}{2}$$

for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, l - 1$ . Hence

$$\left| \frac{2}{2n + 1} \sum_{j=-l+1}^l D_n(x - x_j) \right| \leq \frac{4C_3 l}{n^2 x^2}.$$

Now we are able to prove Offord's theorem. So let  $f \in L_{2\pi}^1$  and let  $x$  be a Lebesgue point of the function  $f$ . We can easily get from the formulas (2) and (3) that

$$\tilde{S}_n(x, f_n) - f(x) = \frac{1}{2\delta_n} \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=-n}^n \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} [f(t) - f(x)] dt \sum_{j=-l_n+1}^{l_n} D_n(x - x_{k+j}).$$

Let us fix now a positive number  $\varepsilon$  less than  $\pi$  and suppose that  $n$  is so large that  $3\delta_n < \varepsilon$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S}_n(x, f_n) - f(x) &= \frac{1}{2\delta_n} \frac{2}{2n+1} \left\{ \sum_{\varepsilon \leq |x-x_k| \leq \pi} + \sum_{3\delta_n < |x-x_k| < \varepsilon} + \sum_{|x-x_k| \leq 3\delta_n} \right\} \\ &\int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} [f(t) - f(x)] dt \sum_{j=-l_n+1}^{l_n} D_n(x - x_{k+j}) = \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

First let us estimate  $\Sigma_1$ . Using Lemma 2 we obtain

$$|\Sigma_1| \leq \frac{C_2 l_n}{2\delta_n n^2} \sum_{\varepsilon \leq |x-x_k| \leq \pi} \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} |f(t) - f(x)| dt \cdot \frac{1}{|x - x_k|^2} \leq \frac{C_2 l_n}{2\delta_n n^2 \varepsilon^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(t) - f(x)| dt.$$

Thus

$$|\Sigma_1| \leq C_4 \frac{1}{n} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots), \tag{13}$$

where  $C_4$  does not depend on  $n$ . To estimate  $\Sigma_2$  we split the terms contained in  $\Sigma_2$  into two parts so that

$$\Sigma_2 = \sum_{x-\varepsilon < x_k < x-3\delta_n} + \sum_{x+3\delta_n < x_k < x+\varepsilon} = \Sigma_{21} + \Sigma_{22}.$$

We shall estimate  $\Sigma_{22}$ . Let  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  be integers such that

$$x_{\alpha-1} \leq x + 3\delta_n < x_\alpha \leq x_\beta < x + \varepsilon \leq x_{\beta+1}.$$

Since  $\varepsilon$  is assumed to be fixed,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  exists if  $n$  is large enough. We have

$$\Sigma_{22} = \frac{1}{2\delta_n} \frac{2}{2n+1} \sum_{k=\alpha}^{\beta} \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} [f(t) - f(x)] dt \sum_{j=-l_n+1}^{l_n} D_n(x - x_{k+j})$$

and by virtue of Lemma 2 we get

$$|\Sigma_{22}| \leq \frac{C_2 l_n}{2\delta_n n^2} \sum_{k=\alpha}^{\beta} \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} |f(t) - f(x)| dt \frac{1}{|x - x_k|^2}.$$

By Abel's transformation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Sigma_{22}| \leq & \frac{C_2 l_n}{2\delta_n n^2} \sum_{k=\alpha}^{\beta-1} \int_{x_\alpha}^{x_{k+1}} |f(t) - f(x)| dt \left| \frac{1}{|x - x_k|^2} - \frac{1}{|x - x_{k+1}|^2} \right| + \\
& + \frac{C_2 l_n}{2\delta_n n^2} \int_{x_\alpha}^{x_{\beta+1}} |f(t) - f(x)| dt \frac{1}{|x - x_\beta|^2} = \Sigma_{221} + \Sigma_{222}.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

It is quite obvious that there exists an absolute constant  $C_5$  such that

$$\Sigma_{221} \leq \frac{C_5}{n^2} \sum_{k=\alpha}^{\beta-1} \frac{1}{x_{k+1} - x} \int_x^{x_{k+1}} |f(t) - f(x)| dt \cdot \frac{1}{(x - x_k)^2}.$$

Let now  $\mu$  be an arbitrary small positive number and let us choose an  $\varepsilon$  such that

$$\frac{1}{x_{k+1} - x} \int_x^{x_{k+1}} |f(t) - f(x)| dt \leq \mu \quad (k = \alpha, \alpha + 1, \dots, \beta - 1)$$

in case  $n$  is large enough ( $n \geq n_0$ ). Then we have

$$\Sigma_{221} \leq \frac{C_5 \mu}{n^2} \sum_{k=\alpha}^{\beta-1} \frac{1}{(x - x_k)^2} \quad (n \geq n_0)$$

and consequently we can choose an absolute constant  $C_6$  such that

$$\Sigma_{221} \leq C_6 \mu \quad (n \geq n_0) \tag{15}$$

since  $x_\alpha > x + 3\delta_n$ . Further

$$\Sigma_{222} \leq \frac{C_2 l_n}{2\delta_n n^2 \varepsilon^2} \int_x^{x+2\varepsilon} |f(t) - f(x)| dt \leq C_7 \frac{1}{n} \quad (n \geq n_0), \tag{16}$$

where  $C_7$  does not depend on  $n$ . It follows from (14), (15) and (16) that

$$|\Sigma_{22}| \leq C_6 \mu + C_7 \frac{1}{n} \quad (n \geq n_0)$$

and we may obtain similarly

$$|\Sigma_{21}| \leq C_6 \mu + C_7 \frac{1}{n} \quad (n \geq n_0).$$

Hence

$$|\Sigma_2| \leq 2C_6 \mu + 2C_7 \frac{1}{n} \quad (n \geq n_0). \tag{17}$$

To obtain a useful estimate for  $\Sigma_3$  in (12) we have to apply Lemma 1. By virtue of it we have

$$|\Sigma_3| \leq \frac{C_1}{2\delta_n} \sum_{|x-x_k| \leq 3\delta_n} \int_{x_k}^{x_{k+1}} |f(t) - f(x)| dt \leq \frac{C_1}{2\delta_n} \int_{x-4\delta_n}^{x+4\delta_n} |f(t) - f(x)| dt$$

and so if  $n$  is large enough ( $n \geq n_1$ ) then

$$|\Sigma_3| \leq \mu \quad (n \geq n_1) \tag{18}$$

We infer now from (12), (13), (17), and (18) that for an arbitrary small positive  $\nu$  and for arbitrary large  $n \geq n_2(f, \nu)$  we have

$$|\tilde{S}_n(x, f_n) - f(x)| \leq \nu + \frac{C_8}{n} \quad (n \geq n_2)$$

with a constant  $C_8$  independent of  $n$ . Thus (5) holds at every Lebesgue point of the function  $f$ , and this was to be proved.

2. The purpose of this section is to discuss the following problem. Let  $\lambda_n$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) be an arbitrary sequence of real numbers such that  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $f \in L^1_{2\pi}$  let us define  $f_n(x)$  as

$$f_n(x) \equiv f_{n, \lambda_n}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \int_{x-\lambda_n}^{x+\lambda_n} f(t) dt & \text{if } \lambda_n \neq 0, \\ f(x) & \text{if } \lambda_n = 0, \end{cases}$$

and let us consider the  $n$ -th partial sum  $S_n(x, f_n)$  of the Fourier series of the function  $f_n$ , that is

$$S_n(x, f_n) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f_n(t) D_n(x-t) dt.$$

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $f \in L^1_{2\pi}$  and  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then*

$$S_n(x, f_n) \rightarrow f(x) \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

*if and only if*

$$\frac{\sin n\lambda_n}{n\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f) - f(x)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

*more precisely*

$$[S_n(x, f_n) - f(x)] - \frac{\sin n\lambda_n}{n\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f) - f(x)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

To prove Theorem 2 we need the following result which can be easily proved by using a classical result of D. K. Faddeev [3]. (A very particular case of Lemma 3 when  $l_n \equiv 1$  and  $f \in C_{2\pi}$  was proved by C. Lanczos [6]).

LEMMA 3. If  $\lambda_n \equiv \delta_n$ , where  $\delta_n$  is defined in (1) and  $x$  is a Lebesgue point of  $f \in L^1_{2\pi}$  then

$$S(x, f_n, \delta_n) \rightarrow f(x) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* We may obviously assume that  $\lambda_n \geq 0$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) since  $f_{n, \lambda_n} \equiv f_{n, |\lambda_n|}$ . Further, for  $\lambda_n = 0$

$$S_n(x, f_n) - f(x) = \frac{\sin n\lambda_n}{n\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f) - f(x)]$$

therefore without loss of generality we may suppose  $\lambda_n > 0$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ). Let us now represent  $\lambda_n$  in the form

$$\lambda_n = \frac{2l_n\pi}{2n + 1} + \frac{2\Theta_n\pi}{2n + 1} = \delta_n + \varepsilon_n,$$

where  $l_n$  is a non-negative integer and  $0 < \Theta_n \leq 1$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(x, f_{n, \lambda_n}) - f(x) &= \frac{\delta_n}{\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f_{n, \delta_n}) - f(x)] + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \int_{x-\delta_n}^{x-\varepsilon_n} [S_n(t, f) - f(x)]dt + \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \int_{x+\varepsilon_n}^{x+\lambda_n} [S_n(t, f) - f(x)]dt. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Let  $n_1, n_2, \dots$  be the indices  $n$  for which  $\delta_n \neq 0$  ( $n = n_1, n_2, \dots$ ). By virtue of Lemma 3 we have

$$S_{n_i}(x, f_{n_i, \delta_{n_i}}) - f(x) \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } i \rightarrow \infty,$$

therefore

$$\frac{\delta_n}{\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f_{n, \varepsilon_n}) - f(x)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty. \tag{20}$$

To estimate the second expression on the rightside of (19), let us notice that

$$\frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \int_{x-\lambda_n}^{x-\delta_n} [S_n(t, f) - f(x)]dt + \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \int_{x+\delta_n}^{x+\lambda_n} [S_n(t, f) - f(x)]dt =$$



$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2\pi\lambda_n} \left[ 1 - \frac{\sin \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}}{\frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}} \cos \left( \delta_n + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \right) \right] \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [f(t) - f(x)] dt + \\
 &+ \frac{\varepsilon_n}{\lambda_n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [S_k(x, f) - f(x)] \left[ \frac{\sin \frac{k\varepsilon_n}{2}}{\frac{k\varepsilon_n}{2}} - \frac{\sin \frac{(k+1)\varepsilon_n}{2}}{\frac{(k+1)\varepsilon_n}{2}} \right] \cos k \left( \delta_n + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \right) + \quad (21) \\
 &+ \frac{\varepsilon_n}{\lambda_n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [S_k(x, f) - f(x)] \frac{\sin \frac{(k+1)\varepsilon_n}{2}}{\frac{(k+1)\varepsilon_n}{2}} \left[ \cos k \left( \delta_n + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \right) - \cos (k+1) \left( \delta_n + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \right) \right] + \\
 &+ \frac{\sin \frac{n\varepsilon_n}{2}}{\frac{n\lambda_n}{2}} \cos n \left( \delta_n + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \right) [S_n(x, f) - f(x)] = A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4.
 \end{aligned}$$

It is very easy to estimate  $A_1$ . Since  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , it follows that  $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore

$$\frac{\varepsilon_n}{2\pi\lambda_n} \left[ 1 - \frac{\sin \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}}{\frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}} \cos \left( \delta_n + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \right) \right] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and consequently

$$A_1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (22)$$

Now we recall that the function  $z \curvearrowright \sin z/z$  together with its first derivative is bounded on the real line. Hence

$$|A_2| \leq C_9 \frac{(\varepsilon_n)^2}{\lambda_n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |S_k(x, f) - f(x)| \leq C_9 \pi \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |S_k(x, f) - f(x)|$$

and

$$|A_3| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_n \left( \delta_n + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \right)}{\lambda_n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |S_k(x, f) - f(x)| \leq \pi \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |S_k(x, f) - f(x)|,$$

where  $C_9$  is the upper bound for  $|(\sin z/z)'$ . By a theorem of J. Marcinkiewicz [8]<sup>2)</sup> we have for every  $f \in L^1_{2\pi}$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |S_k(x, f) - f(x)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

that is,

$$A_2, A_3 \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (23)$$

Let us turn to the expression  $A_4$ . Since  $\lambda_n = \delta_n + \varepsilon_n$  we have

$$A_4 = \frac{\sin n\lambda_n}{n\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f) - f(x)] + \frac{\sin n\delta_n}{n\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f) - f(x)].$$

Further,

$$\frac{\sin n\delta_n}{n\lambda_n} = \frac{\sin [(n + \frac{1}{2})\delta_n - \frac{1}{2}\delta_n]}{n\lambda_n} = (-1)^{n+1} \frac{\sin \frac{\delta_n}{2}}{n\lambda_n}.$$

Hence we obtain

$$\left| \frac{\sin n\delta_n}{n\lambda_n} \right| \leq \frac{\delta_n}{2n\lambda_n} \leq \frac{1}{2n}.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{n}{\log n} \frac{\sin n\delta_n}{n\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f) - f(x)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

since it is a well known classical result, that for every  $f \in L^1_{2\pi}$  (See e.g. A. Zygmund [11].)

$$\frac{1}{\log n} |S_n(x, f) - f(x)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (24)$$

Therefore we conclude that

$$A_4 - \frac{\sin n\lambda_n}{n\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f) - f(x)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (25)$$

By virtue of formulas (19)–(23) and (25) we have

$$[S_n(x, f_n) - f(x)] - \frac{\sin n\lambda_n}{n\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f) - f(x)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

which was to be proved.

<sup>2)</sup> Actually, J. Marcinkiewicz proved only that  $1/n \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [S_k(x, f) - f(x)]^2 \rightarrow 0$  a.e. as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , but using the Hölder inequality one can obtain the result we need.

COROLLARY 1. Let  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . If

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\sin n\lambda_n}{n\lambda_n} \right| \log n < \infty$$

then for every  $f \in L^1_{2\pi}$  we have

$$\frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \int_{x-\lambda_n}^{x+\lambda_n} S_n(t, f) dt \rightarrow f(x) \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This follows immediately from Theorem 2 and (24). Let us remark that (26) is necessarily fulfilled if  $|\lambda_n| > C_{10} \log n/n$  ( $C_{10} > 0$ ) or

$$\lambda_n = \frac{l_n\pi}{n} + O\left(\frac{1}{n \log n}\right),$$

where  $l_n$  are integers such that  $l_n \neq 0$ .

COROLLARY 2. Let  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . If

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\sin n\lambda_n}{n\lambda_n} \right| > 0 \tag{27}$$

then there exists a function  $f$  belonging to  $L^1_{2\pi}$  such that

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{2\lambda_n} \int_{x-\lambda_n}^{x+\lambda_n} S_n(t, f) dt \right| = \infty \text{ a.e.} \tag{28}$$

Indeed, let us choose a sequence  $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_i < \dots$  so that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sin n_i \lambda_{n_i}}{n_i \lambda_{n_i}} > 0.$$

By a result of Kolmogorov [5] there is a function  $f \in L^1_{2\pi}$  such that<sup>3)</sup>

$$\overline{\lim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} |S_{n_i}(x, f)| = \infty \text{ a.e.}$$

Therefore we have for this function  $f$ ,

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\sin n\lambda_n}{n\lambda_n} [S_n(x, f) - f(x)] \right| = \infty \text{ a.e.}$$

---

<sup>3)</sup> Kolmogorov proved only that there exists a function  $f$  belonging to  $L^1_{2\pi}$  such that  $S_n(x, f)$  diverges everywhere as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , but the result we need also follows from the arguments used in the course of the proof of this theorem given by A. N. Kolmogorov. This fact was noticed by A. Zygmund (see [11], vol. I, p. 314).

Hence, applying Theorem 2, we obtain (28).

Let us observe that (27) holds whenever we can choose a sequence  $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_i < \dots$  such that  $n_i \lambda_{n_i}$  converges as  $i \rightarrow \infty$  and

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} n_i \lambda_{n_i} \neq k\pi \quad (k = \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots).$$

COROLLARY 3. *Let  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . If*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\sin n \lambda_n}{n \lambda_n} \log \log n \right| = \infty \quad (29)$$

then one can find a function  $f \in L_{2\pi}^1$  such that (28) holds.

To prove this let us write

$$\left| \frac{\sin n \lambda_n}{n \lambda_n} \right| S_n(x, f) = \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \cdot \frac{S_n(x, f)}{\alpha_n \log \log n},$$

where

$$\alpha_n = \left( \left| \frac{\sin n \lambda_n}{n \lambda_n} \right| \log \log n \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since  $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , by virtue of a theorem of Y.-M. Chen [2] there exists a function  $f \in L_{2\pi}^1$  such that

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n(x, f)}{\alpha_n \log \log n} > 1 \quad \text{a.e.},$$

that is,

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\sin n \lambda_n}{n \lambda_n} S_n(x, f) \right| = \infty \quad \text{a.e.}$$

Using Theorem 2 we obtain (28).

We remark that (29) holds if for example  $n \lambda_n = o(1)$  and

$$\min_{k=\pm 1, \pm 2, \dots} |n \lambda_n - k\pi| > C_{11} (\log \log n)^{-\varepsilon} \quad (0 \leq \varepsilon < 1).$$

3. To study the behaviour of the polynomials  $\tilde{S}_n(x, f_{n, \lambda_n})$  for arbitrary sequences  $\lambda_n$  and functions  $f \in L_{2\pi}^1$  seems to be much more difficult than that of  $S_n(x, f_{n, \lambda_n})$ . For the time being we have no deep results concerning the convergence or divergence of  $\tilde{S}_n(x, f_{n, \lambda_n})$ . In particular, we do not know what to expect in the case  $\lambda_n = 1/\sqrt{n}$  which is a »good» parameter for the Fourier sums as it has been proved in Theorem 2. At the same time, however, we think that the following conjectures are true:

a) Let  $\lambda_n = \pi/2n$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ). Then there exists a function  $f \in C_{2\pi}$  such that  $\tilde{S}_n(x, f_{n, \lambda_n})$  diverges almost everywhere.

b) Let  $\lambda_n = \pi/n$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ). Then there exists a function  $f \in L^1_{2\pi}$  such that  $\tilde{S}_n(x, f_{n, \lambda_n})$  diverges almost everywhere.

We hope to return soon to these questions.

### References

1. BERNSTEIN, S., On trigonometric interpolation by method of least squares (in Russian), *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 4 (1934), 1–8.
2. CHEN, Y.-M., A remarkable divergent Fourier series, *Proc. Japan Acad.* 38 (1962), 239–244.
3. FADDEEV, D. K., On representation of summable functions by singular integrals at the Lebesgue points (in Russian), *Mat. Sb.* 1 (43) (1936), 351–368.
4. GRUNWALD, G., Über Divergenzerscheinungen der Lagrangeschen Interpolationspolynome, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 7 (1935), 207–221.
5. KOLMOGOROV, A. N., Un série de Fourier-Lebesgue divergente partout, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 183 (1926), 1327–1328.
6. LANCZOS, C., *Discourse on Fourier Series*, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1966.
7. MARCINKIEWICZ, J., Interpolating polynomials for absolutely continuous functions (in Polish), *Wiadom. Mat.* 39 (1935), 85–115.
8. —»— Sur la sommabilité forte de séries de Fourier, *J. London Math. Soc.* 14 (1939), 22–34.
9. OFFORD, A. C., Approximation to functions by trigonometric polynomials, *Duke Math. J.* 6 (1940), 505–510.
10. RÓNA, G., A theorem on trigonometric interpolation (in Hungarian), *Mat. Lapok* 19 (1968), 363–365.
11. ZYGMUND, A., *Trigonometric Series*, vol. I–II, Cambridge, University Press, 1959.

Received January 9, 1974

G. P. Névai  
 Mathematical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences  
 1053 Budapest  
 Realtanoda u. 13–15.