

Astérisque

THOMAS W. KÖRNER

A pseudofunction on a Helson set. II.

Astérisque, tome 5 (1973), p. 231-239

[<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AST_1973__5__231_0>](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AST_1973__5__231_0)

© Société mathématique de France, 1973, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la collection « Astérisque » (<http://smf4.emath.fr/Publications/Asterisque/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
<http://www.numdam.org/>

A PSEUDOFUNCTION ON A HELSON SET. II.

Thomas Körner

ABSTRACT. A simpler proof is given of the existence of a pseudofunction on a Helson set.

This note is devoted to the bitter sweet task of replacing the contents of sections 1 to 3 of the paper above by a short demonstration of the main result. This is achieved by a much simpler demonstration of the main combinatorial lemma (Lemma 1 below) without using Conway's lemma and by passing directly from the result for weak Dirichlet to the result for weak Kronecker sets.

LEMMA 1. Let $\Psi(m) = \{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}\}$ and set

$$f_S(T) = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad S \subseteq T$$

$$f_S(T) = 0 \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

If $1 > \lambda > 0$ write

$$B(\lambda, m) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{S \in \Psi(m)} |a_S| : \sum_{S \in \Psi(m)} a_S f_S(T) = 1 \text{ for all } T \in \Psi(m), \text{ card } T \geq \lambda m \right\}.$$

Then $B(\lambda, m) \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Suppose $\sum_{S \in \Psi(m)} a_S f_S(T) = 1$ for all $T \in \Psi(m)$, $\text{card } T \geq \lambda m$.

Then if $\Sigma(m)$ is the permutation group on $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ it follows that

$\sum_{S \in \Psi(m)} a_S f_S(\sigma T) = 1$ for all $T \in \Psi(m)$, $\text{card } T \geq \lambda m$, $\sigma \in \Sigma(m)$ and so

$\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(m)} \sum_{S \in \Psi(m)} a_S f_S(\sigma T) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(m)} 1$ for all $T \in \Psi(m)$, $\text{card } T \geq \lambda m$. Thus

$$\sum_{s=1}^m \left(\sum_{S \in \Psi(m), \text{card } S=s} a_S \right) \gamma_{s,t,m} = 1 \text{ for all } m \geq t \geq \lambda m \text{ where}$$

$$\gamma_{s,t,m} = \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(m)} f_S(\sigma T)}{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(m)} 1} = \frac{t}{m} \frac{(t-1)}{(m-1)} \cdots \frac{(t-s+1)}{(m-s+1)} \left[\text{card } T = t, \quad 1 \leq t, s \leq m \right].$$

Thus, noting that $\sum_{1 \leq s \leq m} \left| \sum_{\text{card } S=s} a_S \right| \leq \sum |a_S|$, we see that if

$B(\lambda, m) \not\rightarrow \infty$ we can find a $B > 0$ and $m(1), m(2), \dots$ together with

$\alpha_{s,m(j)}$ such that

$$\sum_{s=1}^{m(j)} |\alpha_{s,m(j)}| \leq B$$

and $\sum_{s=1}^{m(j)} \alpha_{s,m(j)} \gamma_{s,t,m(j)} = 1$ for all $m \geq t \geq \lambda m$. Now, since $\sum_{s=1}^{m(j)} |\alpha_{s,m(j)}| \leq B$

it follows that we can find $j(k) \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\alpha_{s,m(j(k))} \rightarrow \alpha_s$ and since

$|\gamma_{s,t,m(j)}| \leq \left(\frac{t}{m(j)} \right)^s$ it follows that allowing $\frac{t}{m(j)} \rightarrow x$ for some $1 > x > \lambda$ we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \alpha_s x^s = 1.$$

Thus $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_s| \leq B$ and $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \alpha_s x^s = 1$ for all $1 \geq x \geq \lambda$ which is absurd. It follows that $B(\lambda, m) \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and the lemma is proved.

LEMMA 2. Let $1 > \lambda > 0$, $m \geq 1$. Then, with the notation of Lemma 1, we can

find $b_T \in \mathbb{C}$ $\left[T \in \Psi(m), \text{card } T \geq \lambda m \right]$ such that

$$(i) \quad \sum_{T \in \Psi(m), \text{card } T \geq \lambda m} b_T = 1$$

$$(ii) \quad \left| \sum_{T \in \Psi(m), \text{card } T \geq \lambda m} b_T f_S(T) \right| \leq B(\lambda, m)^{-1} \text{ for all } S \in \Psi(m).$$

Proof. Write $E = \{T \in \Psi(m) : \text{card } T \geq \lambda m\}$ and observe that

$\Gamma = \left\{ \sum_{S \in \Psi(m)} a_S f_S \mid E : \sum_{S \in \Psi(m)} |a_S| < B(\lambda, m) \right\}$ is a convex balanced subset of

$C(E)$ which does not contain 1. Thus by the theorem of Hahn-Banach there exists a $\mu \in M(E)$ such that

$$(i) \quad \langle \mu, 1 \rangle = 1$$

$$(ii)' \quad |\langle \mu, g \rangle| \leq B(\lambda, m)^{-1} \quad \text{for all } g \in \Gamma$$

and so in particular

$$(ii) \quad |\langle \mu, f_S \mid E \rangle| \leq B(\lambda, m)^{-1} \quad \text{for all } S \in \Psi(m).$$

Writing $b_T = \mu(\{T\})$ we have the result.

Next let us establish some notation. Let D be the direct product of a countable number of copies of the group $\{-1, 1\}$ on 2 elements. We shall write the element $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots) \in D$ [$\alpha_i = \pm 1$] as $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2\alpha_i/3^i$. The dual $\hat{D}$ of D consists of all strings $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots)$ with $\beta_i = \pm 1$ and only a finite number of β_i equal to -1 . We shall write β as $\chi \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \beta_i 2^i$. Thus for example

$$\chi_5(2/3 + 2/9) = \langle (-1, 1, -1, 1, 1, \dots), (-1, -1, 1, 1, \dots) \rangle = -1.$$

LEMMA 3. Let $1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_{m+1}$, $1 > \lambda > 0$. Set

$$\rho_i = \sum_{j=n_i}^{n_{i+1}-1} (\delta_{2/3^j} + \delta_0)/2 \quad (\text{where } \delta_t \text{ is the Dirac point mass at } t \in D) \text{ and}$$

$$\sigma_T = \sum_{i \notin T} \rho_i \quad [T \in \Psi(m)]. \quad \text{Then if, with the notation of Lemma 2, we set}$$

$$\mu = \sum_{T \in \Psi(m)} b_T \sigma_T \quad \text{we obtain}$$

$$(i) \quad \hat{\mu}(r) = 1 \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq r < 2^{n_1}$$

$$(ii) \quad |\hat{\mu}(r)| \leq B(\lambda, m)^{-1} \quad \text{for all } 2^{n_1} \leq r < 2^{n_{m+1}}$$

whilst setting $E = \text{supp } \mu$ we have

$$(iii) \quad \left\| m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_{2^{n_i}} - 1 \right\|_{C(E)} \leq 2(1-\lambda).$$

Proof. Since $\hat{\sigma}_T(r) = \prod_{i \notin T} \hat{\rho}_i(r) = 1$ for $0 \leq r < 2^{n_1}$ condition (i) of Lemma 3 follows directly from condition (i) of Lemma 2. On the other hand, suppose $2^{n_1} \leq r < 2^{n_{m+1}}$. Then $r = \sum_{j=1}^{n_{m+1}-1} \gamma_j 2^j$ where $\gamma_j = 0, 1$ and $S(r) = \{i : \exists n_i \leq j < n_{i+1} \text{ with } \gamma_j \neq 0\} \in \Psi_m$. Clearly $\hat{\rho}_i(r) = 0$ if $i \in S(r)$, $\hat{\rho}_i(r) = 1$ otherwise so that $\hat{\sigma}_T(r) = \prod_{i \notin T} \hat{\rho}_i(r) = f_{S(r)}(T)$ and condition (ii) of Lemma 3 follows directly from condition (ii) of Lemma 2.

Finally suppose $x \in E$. Then $x \in \text{supp } \sigma_T$ for some $T \in \Psi_m$, $\text{card } T \geq \lambda m$. automatically $\chi_{2^{n_i}}(x) = 1$ if $i \notin T$, $\chi_{2^{n_i}}(x) = \pm 1$ in general and so

$$\left| m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_{2^{n_i}}(x) - 1 \right| \leq 2(1-\lambda).$$

LEMMA 4. We can find $1 = k(1) < k(2) < \dots$ and $n(1) < n(2) < \dots$ together with a closed set E such that E supports a pseudofunction T with $\hat{T}(0) = 1 = \|T\|_{PM}$ and

$$\|(k(j+1) - k(j))^{-1} \sum_{i=k(j)}^{k(j+1)-1} \chi_{2^{n(i)}} - 1\|_{C(E)} \leq 2^{-j} \quad [j \geq 1].$$

Proof. By Lemma 1 we can find $k(1) < k(2) < \dots$ such that $B(1-2^{j+1}, k(j+1)-k(j)) \leq 2^{-j}$. Now choose integers $n(1) < n(2) < \dots$. By Lemma 3 we can find measures μ_j such that

$$(i) \quad \hat{\mu}_j(r) = 1 \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq r < 2^{n(k(j))}$$

$$(ii) \quad |\hat{\mu}_j(r)| \leq 2^{-j} \quad \text{for all} \quad 2^{n(k(j))} \leq r < 2^{n(k(j+1))}$$

whilst setting $E_j = \text{supp } \mu_j$ we have

$$(iii) \quad \left\| (k(j+1) - k(j)) \sum_{i=k(j)}^{k(j+1)-1} \chi_{2^i} - 1 \right\|_{C(E_j)} \leq 2^{-j}$$

and (iv) $\|\chi_{2^i} - 1\|_{C(E_j)} = 0$ whenever $0 \leq i < k(j)$ or $k(j+1) \leq i$. Note that (i),

(ii) and (iv) show that $\|\mu_j\|_{PM} = 1$.

Now set $T_j = \sum_{i=1}^j \mu_j$. It is clear that $\|T_j\|_{PM} = \hat{T}_j(0) = 1$ and $\hat{T}_j(r) = \hat{T}_{j+1}(r)$

for all $r < k(j)$. Thus T_j converges weakly to a pseudomesure T with

$$\|T\|_{PM} = \hat{T}(0) = 1. \quad \text{Since} \quad |\hat{T}_j(r)| = \prod_{i=1}^j |\hat{\mu}_i(r)| \leq 2^{-\ell} \quad \text{for all} \quad 2^{k(\ell)} \leq r < 2^{k(\ell+1)}$$

$[1 \leq \ell \leq j]$ it follows that $|\hat{T}(r)| \leq 2^{-\ell}$ for all $2^{k(\ell)} \leq r < 2^{k(\ell+1)}$ and so T is

a pseudofunction. Using (iv) we see that $F_j = E_1 + E_2 + \dots + E_j$ converges (in the topological sense) to a closed set E .

We want to show that $T \in \text{TCPM}(E)$. To this end suppose $f \in A(D)$, $\text{supp } f \cap E = \emptyset$.

Then $\text{supp } f \cap E_j = \emptyset$ for j sufficiently large and so (since $T_j \in M(E_j)$)

$\langle T_j, f \rangle = 0$ for j sufficiently large. Thus $\langle T, f \rangle = 0$ and $\text{supp } T \subseteq E$ as required.

On the other hand, suppose $e \in E$. Then we can write $e = e_1 + e_2 + \dots$

where $e_j \in E_j$. In particular, using (iv) we obtain $\chi_{2^{n(i)}}(e) = \chi_{2^{n(i)}}(e_j)$ for all $k(j) \leq i < k(j+1)$. Thus by (iii)

$$\left| (k(j+1) - k(j))^{-1} \sum_{i=k(j)}^{k(j+1)-1} \chi_{2^{n(i)}}(e) - 1 \right| = \left| (k(j+1) - k(j))^{-1} \sum_{i=k(j)}^{k(j+1)-1} \chi_{2^{n(i)}}(e_j) \right| \leq 2^{-j}$$

and the full result is proved.

In effect we have constructed a Weak Dirichlet set supporting a true non zero pseudofunction. But any such set can be perturbed to give a Weak Kronecker set

supporting a true non zero pseudofunction. (We shall give a proof of this in the simple special case given in Lemma 4 but the general proof is hardly more complicated).

LEMMA 5. Suppose E and T are given as in Lemma 4. Suppose further $j_0 \geq 1$ and an $f \in C(E)$ with $f(e) = \pm 1$ for all $e \in E$ is given. Then $E_1 = \{e \in E : f(e) = 1\}$ and $E_2 = \{e \in E : f(e) = -1\}$ are closed and we can find a $j > j_0$ and an x such that writing $T' = T|_{E_1} + (T|_{E_2}) * \delta_x$ $E' = E_1 \cup (E_2 + x)$ we have

$$(i) \quad \chi_{2^i}(x) = 1 \quad \text{for all } i < k(j_1) \quad \text{and for all } i \geq k(j_1+1)$$

$$(ii) \quad \chi_{2^i}(x) = -1 \quad \text{for all } k(j_1) \leq i < k(j_1+1)$$

so in particular, setting $f_0|_{E_1} = 1$, $f_0|_{E_2+x} = -1$ we have $f_0 \in C(E')$ and

$$(i)' \quad \left\| (k(j_1+1) - k(j))^{-1} \sum_{i=k(j)}^{k(j_1+1)-1} \chi_{2^{n(i)}} - 1 \right\|_{C(E')} \leq 2^{-j} \quad [j \geq 1, j \neq j_1]$$

$$(ii)' \quad \left\| (k(j_1+1) - k(j))^{-1} \sum_{i=k(j_1)}^{k(j_1+1)-1} \chi_{2^{n(i)}} - f_0 \right\|_{C(E')} \leq 2^{-j_1}$$

whilst on the other hand T' is a pseudo function with $T' \in PM(E')$, $\hat{T}'(0) = 1 = \|\hat{T}\|_{PM}$ and

$$(iii) \quad |\hat{T}'(r)| \leq |\hat{T}(r)| + 2^{-j_0}.$$

Proof. Since E_1 and E_2 are disjoint closed sets we can find $g_\ell \in A(D)$ with $g_\ell(e) = 1$ if e lies in a neighborhood of E_ℓ , $g_\ell(e) = 0$ if e lies in a neighborhood of $E_{3/2-(-1)\ell/2}$ [$\ell = 1, 2$]. Thus since $\hat{T}(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ it follows that $\hat{T}_\ell(r) = T|_{E_\ell} \hat{T}(r) = T g_\ell \hat{T}(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

Choose $j_1 \geq j_0$ such that $|\hat{T}_\ell(r)| \leq 2^{-j_0-3}$ for all $r \geq k(j_1)$. Set

$x = \sum_{i=k(j_1)}^{k(j_1+1)-1} 2^{j_1 n(i)}$. Conditions (i) and (ii) (and so (i)' and (ii)') follow trivially.

Further since $\hat{\delta}_x(r) = 1$ we have $\hat{T}(r) = \hat{T}'(r)$ for all $r < k(j_1)$. On the other hand if $r \geq k(j_1)$ we know that $\hat{\delta}_x(r) = \pm 1$, $|\hat{T}_\ell(r)| \leq 2^{-j_0-2}$ [$\ell = 1, 2$] so that $|(T - T')^\wedge(r)| \leq 4 \cdot 2^{-j_0-2} = 2^{-j_0}$ so condition (iii) is proved. Finally since $\hat{T}_1(r), \hat{T}_2(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ it follows that $\hat{T}'(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

THEOREM. There exists a closed set $F \subseteq D$ which is of interpolation for $A(D)$ but carries a non zero pseudo measures.

Proof. This is an easy consequence of Lemmas 4 and 5. Take E as in Lemma 4.

We can find a sequence of partitions $P_n = \{E_{n1}, E_{n2}, \dots, E_{n2^n}\}$ such that E_{nr} is closed $[1 \leq r \leq 2^n]$, $E_{nr} \cap E_{ns} = \emptyset$ $[1 \leq r < s \leq 2^n]$, $\bigcup_{r=1}^{2^n} E_{nr} = E$, $E_{n+1, 2t-1} \cup E_{n+1, 2t} = E_{nt}$ $[1 \leq t \leq 2^n]$.

By repeated use of Lemma 5 we can find $Q(1) < Q(2) < \dots$, trigonometric polynomials $f_n \in \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_{2^n}$ [$\epsilon_i = \pm 1$] and points $x_{nr} \in D$ $[1 \leq r \leq 2^n]$ such that setting $E_n = \bigcup_{r=1}^{2^n} (E_{nr} + x_{nr})$, $T_n = \sum_{r=1}^{2^n} (T|_{E_{nr}}) * \delta_{x_{nr}}$ we have

$$(i) \quad \|f_n \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_{2^n} - \epsilon_r\|_{C(E_{nr} + x_{nr})} \leq 2^{-n}$$

$$(ii) \quad \|f_n \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_{2^n}\|_{A(D)} = 1$$

$$(iii) \quad \hat{f}_n \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_{2^n}(s) = 0 \quad \text{for all } s \geq 2^{Q(n)}$$

$$(iv) \quad \chi_{2^p}(x_{n+1, 2t-1} - x_{nt}) = \chi_{2^p}(x_{n+1, 2t} - x_{nt}) = 1 \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq p \leq Q(n), 1 \leq t \leq 2^n$$

$$(v) \quad |\hat{T}_n(r)| \leq |\hat{T}_{n-1}(r)| + 2^{-n} \quad \text{for all } r \quad [n \geq 1] \quad \text{where } T_0 = T$$

(vi) T_n, E_n satisfy the conditions of Lemma 4 for a suitable choice of $k(j), n(j)$.

Under these conditions it is clear that T_n converges weakly to a pseudofunction S with $\|S\| = \hat{S}(0) = 1$, and that E_n converges topologically to a set F with $SEPM(F)$. (Use argument of the paragraph before last of Lemma 4). It only remains to show that F is of interpolation.

To prove this suppose $\epsilon > 0$ given, $f \in C(D)$ and f takes only the values 1 and -1 . Then we can find an $n \geq 1$ such that $\epsilon \leq 2^{-n}$, f is constant on each $E_{nr} + x_{nr}$ $[1 \leq r \leq 2^n]$ and $f(x+y) = f(y)$ whenever $\chi_{2^D}(x) = 1$ for all $0 \leq r \leq Q(n)$. Set $\epsilon_{2t} = \epsilon_{2t-1} = f(E_{nt} + x_{nt})$ $[1 \leq t \leq 2^n]$. It follows from (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) that $\|f_{n+1} \epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{2^{n+1}}\|_{A(D)} = 1$ and $\|f_{n+1} \epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{2^{n+1}} - f\|_{C(F)} \leq \epsilon$. Thus F is of interpolation.

Remark. The work above was done after but in ignorance of Kaufman's elegant work reported above. However it may be useful to have a simple version of my original method to compare with that of Kaufman and the earlier results of Piatecki-Shapiro.

In particular it prompts the following remark. Consider the set

$$E = \left\{ \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_r 2^{-r} \pi : \sum_{r=1}^S |\epsilon_r| \leq s 2^{-10000}, \epsilon_r = 0, 1 \right\} \subset T. \text{ By the theorem of Piatecki-Shapiro } E \text{ supports a non zero pseudofunction } T. \text{ But it is clear that given } n(0)$$

we can find an $n(1)$ sufficiently large that $\|(n(1)-n(0))^{-1} \sum_{r=n(0)}^{n(1)-1} \chi_{2^{100r}} - 1\|_{C(E)} \leq 2^{-10}$.

Thus perturbing E and T as in Lemmas 4 and 5 we obtain such that

$$\inf_{f \in A(T), \|f\|_{A(T)}=1} \|f - g\|_{C(E')} \leq 2^{-8} \text{ for all } g \in C(T) \text{ with } |g(t)| = 1 \text{ } [t \in T].$$

Such a set is a Helson set and we have another proof of the existence of Helson sets not of synthesis.