

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

PLESSNER'S THEOREM FOR RIESZ CONJUGATES

GERALD E. PETERSON AND GRANT WELLAND

PLESSNER'S THEOREM FOR RIESZ CONJUGATES

G. E. PETERSON AND G. V. WELLAND

Plessner's theorem states that if a trigonometric series converges everywhere in a set E of positive measure, then its conjugate series converges almost everywhere in E . Recently, Ash and Gluck have shown that this theorem is false in two dimensions by exhibiting a Fourier series of an L^1 function which converges almost everywhere, but each of its conjugates is divergent almost everywhere. We show that if instead of the usual conjugates in two dimensions, one uses Riesz conjugates, then Plessner's theorem remains true provided the conjugates are required only to be restrictedly convergent almost everywhere in E . The techniques used to obtain this result are similar to those used in the one-dimensional case and involve the notions of stable convergence, nontangential convergence, the theory of Riesz conjugates as developed by E. M. Stein and G. Weiss, and a Tauberian theorem for Abel summability.

1. Introduction. In [1], J. M. Ash and L. Gluck presented some results for Fourier series in several variables. They proved in dimension 2 that each of the conjugate series of a Fourier series of a function in L^p ($p > 1$) converges almost everywhere in the set where the Fourier series converges. In the case $p = 1$, however, they exhibited a function whose Fourier series converges almost everywhere such that each of its conjugates is also a Fourier series of an L^1 function, but is square divergent almost everywhere. Furthermore, in dimension 3 or greater, they found a continuous function whose Fourier series converges almost everywhere such that each of its conjugates is also a Fourier series of a continuous function, but is restrictedly divergent almost everywhere.

On a philosophical level, this distressing state of affairs can be explained by the fact that the "singularity" of each conjugate transformation they use, thought of as a "singular integral operator", has changed from a point to a pair of lines as the dimension of the space was increased from 1 to 2. This can be altered by using instead of the ordinary conjugate series, the Riesz conjugates. This is done also to take advantage of the theory of conjugate transformations developed by Stein and Weiss in [3] or [4] and [5]. By doing this, we are able to retain Plessner's theorem in its original form except that the conjugates will be

required only to converge restrictedly almost everywhere in the set where the original series converges.

The arguments will be presented in two dimensions. However, similar arguments should obtain for higher dimensional spaces.

2. Definitions and statement of the main theorem.

Bold face letters such as \mathbf{N} will represent two-dimensional vectors with coordinates N_1 and N_2 . However, we will not use bold face letters for variables x, t in the torus. The norm $\|\mathbf{N}\|$ is $(N_1^2 + N_2^2)^{1/2}$. The notation $\mathbf{N} > M$ means $N_1 > M$ and $N_2 > M$, whereas $\mathbf{N} > \mathbf{k}$ means that $N_1 > k_1$ and $N_2 > k_2$. For each vector \mathbf{N} of integers, let $S_{\mathbf{N}}$ be a scalar. Then, we speak of $\{S_{\mathbf{N}}\}$ as a sequence. By $S_{\mathbf{N}} \rightarrow S$ as $\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \infty$, we will mean that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists M such that $\mathbf{N} > M$ implies $|S_{\mathbf{N}} - S| < \epsilon$ (this is unrestricted rectangular convergence and in this case we speak of convergence without qualifiers). We will say that $S_{\mathbf{N}} \rightarrow S$ as $\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \infty$ restrictedly if for every $\delta > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists M such that $\mathbf{N} > M$ and $\delta^{-1} < N_1/N_2 < \delta$ imply $|S_{\mathbf{N}} - S| < \epsilon$. To say that $S_{\mathbf{N}}$ is restrictedly bounded means that for every $\delta > 0$ there exists H such that $\delta^{-1} < N_1/N_2 < \delta$ implies $|S_{\mathbf{N}}| < H$. The notation $S_{\mathbf{N}} = o(A_{\mathbf{N}})$ will mean that $S_{\mathbf{N}}/A_{\mathbf{N}}$ is bounded and $\rightarrow 0$ as $\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \infty$. Finally $\sum_{\mathbf{k}=0}^{\infty}$ means $\sum_{k_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k_2=0}^{\infty}$.

Let

$$t = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \geq 0} (a_{\mathbf{k}} \cos k_1 x_1 \cos k_2 x_2 + b_{\mathbf{k}} \sin k_1 x_1 \cos k_2 x_2 \\ + c_{\mathbf{k}} \cos k_1 x_1 \sin k_2 x_2 + d_{\mathbf{k}} \sin k_1 x_1 \sin k_2 x_2), \\ T_{\mathbf{k}} = (\cos k_1 x_1 \cos k_2 x_2, \sin k_1 x_1 \cos k_2 x_2, \\ \cos k_2 x_2 \sin k_1 x_1, \sin k_1 x_1 \sin k_2 x_2)$$

and $V_{\mathbf{k}} = (a_{\mathbf{k}}, b_{\mathbf{k}}, c_{\mathbf{k}}, d_{\mathbf{k}})$, then we can write $t = \Sigma(V_{\mathbf{k}}, T_{\mathbf{k}}) \equiv \Sigma A_{\mathbf{k}}(x)$, where (\cdot, \cdot) is the standard euclidean inner product in 4 dimensional space, \mathbf{E}^4 .

Let

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $M_3 = M_1 M_2$. By using M_1 and M_2 as transformations on \mathbf{E}^4 we can define the Riesz conjugate series

$$t_1 = \sum \frac{k_1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} (M_1 V_{\mathbf{k}}, T_{\mathbf{k}}) \equiv \sum \frac{k_1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} B_{\mathbf{k}}(x)$$

and

$$t_2 = \sum \frac{k_2}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} (M_2 V_{\mathbf{k}}, T_{\mathbf{k}}) \equiv \sum \frac{k_2}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} C_{\mathbf{k}}(x).$$

We will also use the double conjugate series

$$t_3 = \sum \frac{k_1 k_2}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^2} (M_3 V_{\mathbf{k}}, T_{\mathbf{k}}) \equiv \sum \frac{k_1 k_2}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^2} D_{\mathbf{k}}(x).$$

In these definitions and elsewhere, $0/0$ is interpreted as 0 . The essential difference in these definitions and those used by Ash and Gluck is that the factors $k_1/\|\mathbf{k}\|$, $k_2/\|\mathbf{k}\|$ and $k_1 k_2/\|\mathbf{k}\|^2$ do not appear in the definitions of conjugates they use.

THEOREM 1. *Suppose $\sum A_{\mathbf{k}}(x)$ converges in a set E of positive measure. Then*

$$\sum \frac{k_1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} B_{\mathbf{k}}(x), \quad \sum \frac{k_2}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} C_{\mathbf{k}}(x), \quad \text{and} \quad \sum \frac{k_1 k_2}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^2} D_{\mathbf{k}}(x),$$

each converge restrictedly almost everywhere in E .

3. LEMMAS. *Let $S_{\mathbf{N}}(x) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{N}} A_{\mathbf{k}}(x)$, then straight forward calculations show that*

$$(2.1) \quad S_{\mathbf{N}}(x_1 + t_1, x_2) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{N}} (A_{\mathbf{k}}(x) \cos k_1 t_1 + B_{\mathbf{k}}(x) \sin k_1 t_1),$$

$$(2.2) \quad S_{\mathbf{N}}(x_1, x_2 + t_2) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{N}} (A_{\mathbf{k}}(x) \cos k_2 t_2 + C_{\mathbf{k}}(x) \sin k_2 t_2),$$

$$(2.3) \quad S_{\mathbf{N}}(x_1 + t_1, x_2 + t_2) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{N}} (A_{\mathbf{k}}(x) \cos k_1 t_1 \cos k_2 t_2 \\ + B_{\mathbf{k}}(x) \sin k_1 t_1 \cos k_2 t_2 + C_{\mathbf{k}}(x) \cos k_1 t_1 \sin k_2 t_2 \\ + D_{\mathbf{k}}(x) \sin k_1 t_1 \sin k_2 t_2).$$

The sequence $\{S_{\mathbf{N}}(x)\}$ is said to converge stably to s at x° as $\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \infty$ (unrestrictedly) if for each sequence $t_{\mathbf{N}} = (t_{N_1}, t_{N_2})$ for which $t_{N_i} = O(1/N_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$), $S_{\mathbf{N}}(x^\circ + t_{\mathbf{N}}) \rightarrow s$.

We need the following lemmas for which the proofs follow in much the same way as those in [7, vol. 2, pp. 216–219]. In these lemmas it is to be understood that convergence or stable convergence of double series also means that the partial sums are bounded.

LEMMA 1. *A necessary and sufficient condition for $\sum a_n \cos n_1 x_1 \cos n_2 x_2$ or $\sum a_n \cos n_1 x_1$ or $\sum a_n \cos n_2 x_2$ to converge stably to s at $x = 0$ is that $\sum a_n$ converges to s .*

LEMMA 2. (i) *A necessary and sufficient condition for $\sum b_n \sin n_1 x_1$ or $\sum b_n \sin n_1 x_1 \cos n_2 x_2$ to converge stably to zero at $x = 0$ is that*

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{\nu_1=0}^{n_1} \sum_{\nu_2=0}^{n_2} \nu_1 b_\nu = o(1).$$

(ii) *A necessary and sufficient condition for $\sum c_n \sin n_2 x_2$ or $\sum c_n \cos n_1 x_1 \sin n_2 x_2$ to converge stably to zero at $x = 0$ is that*

$$\frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{\nu_1=0}^{n_1} \sum_{\nu_2=0}^{n_2} \nu_2 c_\nu = o(1).$$

LEMMA 3. *A necessary and sufficient condition that $\sum d_n \sin n_1 x_1 \sin n_2 x_2$ converge stably to zero at $x = 0$ is that*

$$\frac{1}{n_1 n_2} \sum_{\nu_1=0}^{n_1} \sum_{\nu_2=0}^{n_2} \nu_1 \nu_2 d_\nu = o(1).$$

LEMMA 4. *The series $\sum A_k(x)$ is stably convergent at x° to the sum s if and only if*

- (i) $\sum A_k(x^\circ)$ converges to s ,
- (ii) $\sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} k_1 B_k(x^\circ) = o(N_1)$,
- (iii) $\sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} k_2 C_k(x^\circ) = o(N_2)$,
- (iv) $\sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} k_1 k_2 D_k(x^\circ) = o(N_1 N_2)$.

Proof. Suppose $\sum A_k(x)$ converges stably at x° to s . Then (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3) (with $x = x^\circ$) each converge stably to s at $t = 0$. Part (i) is obvious. Since $\sum A_k(x^\circ)$ converges, Lemma 1 implies that $\sum A_k(x^\circ) \cos k_1 t_1$ is stably convergent at $t = 0$ and by (2.1), $\sum B_k(x^\circ) \sin k_1 t_1$ is stably convergent to 0 at $t = 0$ and Lemma 2 gives (ii). Similarly we obtain (iii). Using these results and similar reasoning applied to (2.3) gives (iv). The converse follows easily.

LEMMA 5. *If $\sum A_k(x)$ converges stably at x° to the sum s , then the harmonic function $\sum A_k(x) r^{|k|}$ tends to s as (x, r) tends to $(x^\circ, 1)$ nontangentially; that is, with $\|x - x^\circ\| \leq C(1 - r)$ as $x \rightarrow x^\circ$ and $r \rightarrow 1$.*

LEMMA 6. *If $\sum A_k(x)$ converges for $x \in E$, where E is of positive measure, then it converges stably at almost all points of E .*

The final two lemmas come from different sources.

LEMMA 7. [2, Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.3] *Suppose $\sum A_k(x)$ converges (no hypothesis on the nature of the partial sums) in a set E , $|E| > 0$. Then, for almost all points $x \in E$, all the partial sums of $\sum A_k(x)$ are bounded. Furthermore, the coefficients of $\sum A_k(x)$ are bounded.*

LEMMA 8. *If $t(x, r) = \sum A_k(x) r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}$ converges nontangentially in a set E , $|E| > 0$ then*

$$t_1(x, r) = \sum \frac{k_1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} B_k(x) r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}$$

and

$$t_2(x, r) = \sum \frac{k_1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} C_k(x) r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}$$

converge nontangentially for almost every point in the set E .

The proof is achieved by appealing to the following theorem which we list as a lemma.

LEMMA 8'. [3, page 213] *Let $u(x, y)$ be a function which is defined and harmonic on $\mathbf{E}_3^+ = \{(x, y) \mid x \in \mathbf{E}^2, y > 0\}$. Let u_1 and u_2 be the conjugate harmonic functions associated with u (see [3] for definitions). Assume u converges nontangentially $((x, y) \rightarrow (x^\circ, 0)$ with $\|x - x^\circ\| < Cy$) in a set E , $|E| > 0$. Then u_1 and u_2 converge nontangentially almost everywhere in the set E .*

In order to see how Lemma 8 follows from this, we first point out that after a simple change of variable, we may think of $\sum A_k(x)$ as a distribution on $\mathbf{T}^2 = [0, 1) \times [0, 1)$, since by the hypothesis of our theorem and Lemma 7 the coefficients of $\sum A_k(x)$ are bounded. Extend $\sum A_k(x)$ periodically so that it is defined on \mathbf{E}^2 . In this case, we will also denote the resulting distribution by $t(x)$. Since we now have a tempered distribution on \mathbf{E}^2 , we will be able to "convolve" it with the Poisson kernel for the upper half-plane \mathbf{E}_3^+ . In general, suppose that φ is a rapidly decreasing function and that Λ is the 2-dimensional lattice plane. Define $\Phi(\cdot) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \Lambda} \varphi(\cdot + \mathbf{m})$. In this case, Φ is an infinitely differentiable function which is periodic on \mathbf{E}^2 and hence defined on \mathbf{T}^2 . We then obtain $(t * \varphi)(x) = \sum \hat{\Phi}(\mathbf{m}) A_{\mathbf{m}}(x)$ where the $\hat{\Phi}(\mathbf{m})$ are the Fourier coefficients of Φ expressed in the real form. In particular, if $P_y(\cdot)$ is the Poisson kernel for the half-plane \mathbf{E}_3^+ and $P_r(\cdot)$ is the

Poisson kernel for the torus \mathbb{T}^2 , we have $P_r(\cdot) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \Lambda} P_y(\cdot + \mathbf{m})$ [see 6, page 255] and $(t * P_y)(x) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \Lambda} \hat{P}_r(\mathbf{m}) A_{\mathbf{m}}(x)$. The following identification between r and y is necessary for the above formulas, $r = e^{-2\pi y}$. With these preliminaries one can see that $t * P_y$ is a periodic function on \mathbb{E}^2 which as a function of (x, y) is a harmonic function on \mathbb{E}_3^+ . With the additional remark that $\hat{P}_r(\mathbf{m}) = r^{|\mathbf{m}|}$ we see that nontangential limits for $t * P_y(x)$ and $\sum A_{\mathbf{k}}(x) r^{|\mathbf{k}|}$ for $x \in \mathbb{T}^2$ are the same.

Again for φ a rapidly decreasing function and with the Fourier transform defined in the appropriate normalization, the Fourier coefficients $\hat{\Phi}(\mathbf{m}) = \hat{\varphi}(\mathbf{m})$ where these are understood now in complex form. It then follows with $u = t * \tilde{P}_y$ that the conjugate functions u_1 and u_2 are $t * \tilde{P}_{y,1}$ and $t * \tilde{P}_{y,2}$ with

$$\tilde{P}_{y,1}(\xi) = \frac{i\xi_1}{\|\xi\|} \hat{P}_y \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{P}_{y,2} = \frac{i\xi_2}{\|\xi\|} \hat{P}_y.$$

Expressing these results in series form and writing the coefficients in real form gives $u_1(x) = \sum (k_1/\|\mathbf{k}\|) B_{\mathbf{k}}(x) r^{|\mathbf{k}|}$ and

$$u_2(x) = \sum (k_2/\|\mathbf{k}\|) B_{\mathbf{k}}(x) r^{|\mathbf{k}|}.$$

The nontangential convergence of these series now follows directly from Lemma 8'. By repeating an application of this lemma we get that $\sum (k_1 k_2 / \|\mathbf{k}\|^2) D_{\mathbf{k}}(x) r^{|\mathbf{k}|}$ also converges nontangentially almost everywhere in E .

4. The Tauberian theorem. Before we can prove Theorem 1, we must have available a Tauberian theorem for Abel summability so that results about nontangential convergence can be translated to results about restricted convergence. This is the purpose of Theorem 2. We need a preliminary lemma.

LEMMA 9. *Suppose $A_{\mathbf{nk}}$ is a scalar for each two vectors of nonnegative integers \mathbf{n} and \mathbf{k} . If*

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_{k_i=0}^{\infty} |A_{\mathbf{nk}}| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty \text{ restrictedly for each } k_{3-i} (i = 1, 2),$$

and

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{k}=0}^{\infty} |A_{\mathbf{nk}}| \text{ is restrictedly bounded,}$$

then $\sigma_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}=0}^{\infty} A_{\mathbf{nk}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow 0$ as $\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty$ restrictedly whenever $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = o(1)$.

Proof. Choose $\delta > 0$ and suppose during the rest of this proof that $\delta^{-1} < N_1 |N_2| < \delta$. Suppose $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = o(1)$. By (4.2) $\sum |A_{\mathbf{nk}}|$ is bounded, say

by H , and since ϵ_k is bounded, σ_n exists for each n . Choose $\epsilon > 0$. Since $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ we may choose an M such that $k > M$ implies $|\epsilon_k| < \epsilon/2H$. By (4.1) we can choose M' such that $N > M'$ implies $\sum_{N_1 \leq M \text{ or } N_2 \leq M} |A_{Nk} \epsilon_k| < \epsilon/2$. If $N > M'$, then

$$|\sigma_N| \leq \sum_{k=M+1}^{\infty} |A_{Nk} \epsilon_k| + \sum_{N_1 \leq M \text{ or } N_2 \leq M} |A_{Nk} \epsilon_k| < \frac{\epsilon}{2H} \cdot H + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon.$$

THEOREM 2. *Suppose*

$$(4.3) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|} = S$$

and

$$(4.4) \quad \epsilon_N \equiv \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{N}\|^i} \sum_{k=0}^N \|\mathbf{k}\|^i a_k = o(1), \quad i = 1 \text{ or } i = 2,$$

then $S_N \equiv \sum_{k=0}^N a_k \rightarrow S$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ restrictedly.

Proof. We will first prove the theorem in the case $i = 1$. Let $r = 1 - 1/N_1$ and consider

$$A_N = \sum_{k=0}^N a_k - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{k}\| a_k B_{Nk}$$

where $B_{Nk} = 0$ if $k = 0$, $B_{Nk} = (1 - r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|})/\|\mathbf{k}\|$ if $0 \leq k \leq N$, $k \neq 0$, and $B_{Nk} = -r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}/\|\mathbf{k}\|$ otherwise. The proof will be completed by showing that $A_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ restrictedly. Using summation by parts we obtain (with $t_k = \|\mathbf{k}\| \epsilon_k$)

$$\begin{aligned} A_N &= \lim_{J \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{J-1} t_k \Delta^{11} B_{Nk} + \sum_{k_1=0}^{J_1-1} t_{k_1, J_2} \Delta^{10} B_{N; k_1, J_2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{k_2=0}^{J_2-1} t_{J_1, k_2} \Delta^{01} B_{N, J_1, k_2} + t_J B_{NJ} \right] \\ &= \lim_{J \rightarrow \infty} [C_1 + C_2 + C_3 + C_4]. \end{aligned}$$

However, $\lim_{J \rightarrow \infty} C_4 = \lim_{J \rightarrow \infty} (-\epsilon_J r^{\|\mathbf{J}\|}) = 0$ by (4.4). Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{10} B_{N; k_1, J_2} &= \int_{k_1}^{k_1+1} \frac{d}{dx} \left[\frac{r^{\|(x, J_2)\|}}{\|(x, J_2)\|} \right] dx \\ &= \int_{k_1}^{k_1+1} \frac{x r^{\|(x, J_2)\|}}{\|(x, J_2)\|^3} \left[\|(x, J_2)\| \log \frac{1}{r} + 1 \right] dx \\ &\leq \frac{D r^{\|(k_1, J_2)\|}}{\|(k_1, J_2)\|} \end{aligned}$$

where D is independent of \mathbf{J} . Therefore, since $k_1 + J_2 \leq \sqrt{2} \|(k_1, J_2)\|$,

$$\begin{aligned} |C_2| &\leq D \sum_{k_1=0}^{J_1-1} |\epsilon_{k_1, J_2}| r^{\|(k_1, J_2)\|} \\ &\leq D \rho^{J_2} \sum_{k_1=0}^{J_1-1} |\epsilon_{k_1, J_2}| \rho^{k_1} \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho = r^{1/\sqrt{2}}$. Since ϵ_{k_1, J_2} is assumed bounded, it follows that $\lim_{\mathbf{J} \rightarrow \infty} C_2 = 0$. Similarly, $\lim_{\mathbf{J} \rightarrow \infty} C_3 = 0$. This leaves

$$A_N = \sum_{\mathbf{k}=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \|\mathbf{k}\| \Delta^{11} B_{N\mathbf{k}},$$

and we may complete the proof by showing that $\|\mathbf{k}\| \Delta^{11} B_{N\mathbf{k}}$ satisfies conditions (4.1) and (4.2) of Lemma 9.

We will first obtain bounds on $\Delta^{11} B_{N\mathbf{k}}$. If $\mathbf{k} < N$ ($\mathbf{k} \neq 0$), then

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta^{11} B_{N\mathbf{k}}| &= \left| \int_{k_1}^{k_1+1} \int_{k_2}^{k_2+1} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} \int_r^1 y^{\|\mathbf{x}\|-1} dy dx_1 dx_2 \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{k_1}^{k_1+1} \int_{k_2}^{k_2+1} \int_r^1 \frac{x_1 x_2}{\|x\|^2} y^{\|\mathbf{x}\|-1} \log \frac{1}{y} \left(\log \frac{1}{y} + \frac{1}{\|x\|} \right) dy dx_1 dx_2 \right| \\ &\leq (1-r) \log \frac{1}{r} \left(\log \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} \right) \\ &\leq 2(1-r)^2 \left(2(1-r) + \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} \right) \end{aligned}$$

whenever $r > \frac{1}{2}$.

If $k_1 > N_1$ or $k_2 > N_2$, then using integration by parts we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta^{11} B_{N\mathbf{k}}| &= \left| \int_{k_1}^{k_1+1} \int_{k_2}^{k_2+1} \int_0^r \frac{x_1 x_2}{\|x\|^2} y^{\|\mathbf{x}\|-1} \log \frac{1}{y} \left(\log \frac{1}{y} + \frac{1}{\|x\|} \right) dy dx_1 dx_2 \right| \\ &\leq \int_{k_1}^{k_1+1} \int_{k_2}^{k_2+1} \frac{r^{\|\mathbf{x}\|} \log^2 \frac{1}{r}}{\|x\|} dx_1 dx_2 \\ &\quad + 3 \int_{k_1}^{k_1+1} \int_{k_2}^{k_2+1} \int_0^r \frac{\left(\log \frac{1}{y} \right) y^{\|\mathbf{x}\|-1}}{\|x\|} dy dx_1 dx_2 \\ &\leq \log^2 \frac{1}{r} \frac{r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} + 3 \log \frac{1}{r} \frac{r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^2} + 3 \frac{r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^3} \\ &\equiv Q(r, \mathbf{k}). \end{aligned}$$

A short calculation shows that if $k_1 = N_1, k_2 < N_2$ or if $k_1 < N_1, k_2 = N_2$, then

$$|\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{Nk}}| \leq Q(r, \mathbf{k}) + \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^2}.$$

Finally, if $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{N}$, it is easily seen that

$$|\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{Nk}}| \leq Q(r, \mathbf{k}) + \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|}.$$

Combining these estimates, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{k}=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{k}\| |\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{Nk}}| &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}=0}^{N_1-1} \|\mathbf{k}\| |\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{Nk}}| + \sum_{k_1 \geq N_1 \text{ or } k_2 \geq N_2} \|\mathbf{k}\| |\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{Nk}}| \\ &\leq 4(1-r)^3 \sum_{\mathbf{k}=0}^{N_1-1} \|\mathbf{k}\| + 2(1-r)^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}=0}^{N_1-1} 1 \\ &\quad + \sum_{k_1 \geq N_1 \text{ or } k_2 \geq N_2} \left[\left(\log^2 \frac{1}{r} \right) r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|} + 3 \log \frac{1}{r} \frac{r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}}{\|\mathbf{k}\|} + 3 \frac{r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^2} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k_2=0}^{N_2-1} \frac{1}{\|(N_1, k_2)\|} + \sum_{k_1=0}^{N_1-1} \frac{1}{\|(k_1, N_2)\|} + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{4}{N_1^3} (N_1^2 N_2 + N_1 N_2^2) + \frac{2}{N_1^2} N_1 N_2 \\ &\quad + \left[\log^2 \frac{1}{r} + \frac{3 \log \frac{1}{r}}{\min(N_1, N_2)} + \frac{3}{(\min(N_1, N_2))^2} \right] \left[\frac{1}{1-r} + \frac{1}{\log \frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\pi}{2 \log^2 r} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N_1} + \log \left(\frac{N_2}{N_1} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{N_2}{N_1} \right)^2 + 1} \right) + \frac{1}{N_2} + \log \left(\frac{N_1}{N_2} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{N_1}{N_2} \right)^2 + 1} \right) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

and if $\delta^{-1} \leq N_1/N_2 \leq \delta$, then this is easily seen to be bounded. Thus condition (4.2) of Lemma 9 is satisfied. In a similar, but easier, manner, one can also show that condition (4.1) of Lemma 9 is satisfied. The proof of Theorem 2 in case $i = 1$ is, therefore, complete.

The proof is similar in case $i = 2$. Only the changes will be noted. The $B_{\mathbf{nk}}$ will be defined as in the previous case except that the denominator will be $\|\mathbf{k}\|^2$ instead of $\|\mathbf{k}\|$. In showing that $\lim_{J \rightarrow \infty} C_2 = 0$ it is necessary to estimate

$$(4.5) \quad \int_{k_1}^{k_1+1} \frac{d}{dx} \frac{r^{\|(x, J_2)\|}}{\|(x, J_2)\|^2} dx$$

instead of the similar term of the previous case. Carrying out the differentiation and proceeding as before we find that (4.5) is majorized by

$$\frac{C r^{\|(k_1, J_2)\|}}{\|(k_1, J_2)\|^2}$$

and the rest of the proof of this part of the theorem proceeds as before. In obtaining bounds on $\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{nk}}$, note first that if $\mathbf{k} < \mathbf{N} (\mathbf{k} \neq 0)$, then

$$|\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{nk}}| = \left| \int_{k_1}^{k_1+1} \int_{k_2}^{k_2+1} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} \frac{1 - r^{\|x\|}}{\|x\|^2} dx_1 dx_2 \right|.$$

Carrying out the indicated differentiations and using estimates as before, we find that

$$|\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{nk}}| \leq C \frac{(1-r)^2}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^2} + \frac{(1-r)}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^3}.$$

If $k_1 > N_1$ or $k_2 > N_2$, then we have

$$|\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{nk}}| = \left| \int_{k_1}^{k_1+1} \int_{k_2}^{k_2+1} \int_0^r \frac{1}{y} \int_0^y \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} s^{\|x\|-1} ds dy dx_1 dx_2 \right|$$

and we may proceed through several integrations by parts and some simple estimates to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{nk}}| &\leq \log^2 \frac{1}{r} \frac{r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^2} + 5 \log \frac{1}{r} \frac{r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^3} + 8 \frac{r^{\|\mathbf{k}\|}}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^4} \\ &\equiv P(r, \mathbf{k}). \end{aligned}$$

In case $k_1 = N_1$, $k_2 < N_2$ or $k_1 < N_1$, $k_2 = N_2$ we find

$$|\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{nk}}| \leq P(r, \mathbf{k}) + \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^3},$$

and if $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{N}$, then

$$|\Delta^{11} B_{\mathbf{nk}}| \leq P(r, \mathbf{k}) + \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{k}\|^2}.$$

Multiplying these estimates by $\|\mathbf{k}\|^2$, summing and proceeding as before will complete the proof for the case $i = 2$.

5. Proof of Theorem 1. Suppose $\Sigma A_{\mathbf{k}}(x)$ converges in a set E with positive measure. By Lemma 7 the partial sums of $\Sigma A_{\mathbf{k}}(x)$ are bounded almost everywhere in E . By Lemma 6, $\Sigma A_{\mathbf{k}}(x)$ converges

stably at almost all points of E . By Lemma 5, $\sum A_k(y)r^{\|k\|}$ tends to $\sum A_k(x)$ as (y, r) tends to $(x, 1)$ nontangentially almost everywhere in E . By Lemma 8,

$$\sum \frac{k_1}{\|k\|} B_k(x)r^{\|k\|}, \quad \sum \frac{k_2}{\|k\|} C_k(x)r^{\|k\|} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum \frac{k_1 k_2}{\|k\|^2} D_k(x)r^{\|k\|}$$

each converge as $r \rightarrow 1^-$ almost everywhere in E . Furthermore, the Tauberian conditions

$$\sum_{k=0}^N k_1 B_k(x) = o(\|N\|), \quad \sum_{k=0}^N k_2 C_k(x) = o(\|N\|)$$

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^N k_1 k_2 D_k(x) = o(\|N\|)$$

follow from Lemma 4. Thus Theorem 2 is applicable and yields $\sum k_1/\|k\| B_k(x)$ and $\sum k_2/\|k\| C_k(x)$ converge restrictedly almost everywhere in E by the use of case $i = 1$, and that $\sum k_1 k_2/\|k\|^2 D_k(x)$ converges restrictedly almost everywhere in E follows from an application of Theorem 2 in the case $i = 2$.

REFERENCES

1. J. M. Ash and L. Gluck, *Convergence and divergence of series conjugate to a convergent multiple Fourier series*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., (to appear).
2. J. M. Ash and G. V. Welland, *Convergence, uniqueness, and summability of multiple trigonometric series*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **163** (1972), 401–436.
3. E. M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.
4. ———, *On the theory of harmonic functions of several variables II*, Acta. Math., **106** (1961), 137–174.
5. E. M. Stein and G. Weiss, *On the theory of harmonic functions of several variables I*, Acta. Math., **103** (1960), 263–284.
6. ———, *Introduction to Fourier analysis on Euclidean spaces*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1971.
7. A. Zygmund, *Trigonometric series*, Vols. 1, 2, 2nd rev. ed., Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 1959.

Received September 26, 1974. The first author's research was partially supported by a grant from the University of Missouri-St. Louis, and the second author's research was partially supported by NSF. grant GP-34630.

D. E. Bennett, <i>Strongly unicoherent continua</i>	1
Walter R. Bloom, <i>Sets of p-spectral synthesis</i>	7
R. T. Bumby and D. E. Dobbs, <i>Amitsur cohomology of quadratic extensions: Formulas and number-theoretic examples</i>	21
W. W. Comfort, <i>Compactness-like properties for generalized weak topological sums</i>	31
D. R. Dunninger and J. Locker, <i>Monotone operators and nonlinear biharmonic boundary value problems</i>	39
T. S. Erickson, W. S. Martindale, 3rd and J. M. Osborn, <i>Prime nonassociative algebras</i>	49
P. Fischer, <i>On the inequality $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \frac{f(p_i)}{f(q_i)} \geq 1$</i>	65
G. Fox and P. Morales, <i>Compact subsets of a Tychonoff set</i>	75
R. Gilmer and J. F. Hoffmann, <i>A characterization of Prüfer domains in terms of polynomials</i>	81
L. C. Glaser, <i>On tame Cantor sets in spheres having the same projection in each direction</i>	87
Z. Goseki, <i>On semigroups in which $X = XYX = XZX$ if and only if $X = XYZX$</i>	103
E. Grosswald, <i>Rational valued series of exponentials and divisor functions</i>	111
D. Handelman, <i>Strongly semiprime rings</i>	115
J. N. Henry and D. C. Taylor, <i>The $\bar{\beta}$ topology for w^*-algebras</i>	123
M. J. Hodel, <i>Enumeration of weighted p-line arrays</i>	141
S. K. Jain and S. Singh, <i>Rings with quasiprojective left ideals</i>	169
S. Jeyaratnam, <i>The diophantine equation $Y(Y + m)(Y + 2m) \times (Y + 3m) = 2X(X + m)(X + 2m)(X + 3m)$</i>	183
R. Kane, <i>On loop spaces without p torsion</i>	189
Alvin J. Kay, <i>Nonlinear integral equations and product integrals</i>	203
A. S. Kechris, <i>Countable ordinals and the analytic hierarchy, I</i>	223
Ka-Sing Lau, <i>A representation theorem for isometries of $C(X, E)$</i>	229
I. Madsen, <i>On the action of the Dyer-Lashof algebra in $H_*(G)$</i>	235
R. C. Metzler, <i>Positive linear functions, integration, and Choquet's theorem</i>	277
A. Nobile, <i>Some properties of the Nash blowing-up</i>	297
G. E. Petersen and G. V. Welland, <i>Plessner's theorem for Riesz conjugates</i>	307

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 60, No. 1

September, 1975

Donald Earl Bennett, <i>Strongly unicoherent continua</i>	1
Walter Russell Bloom, <i>Sets of p-spectral synthesis</i>	7
Richard Thomas Bumby and David Earl Dobbs, <i>Amitsur cohomology of quadratic extensions: formulas and number-theoretic examples</i>	21
W. Wistar (William) Comfort, <i>Compactness-like properties for generalized weak topological sums</i>	31
Dennis Robert Dunninger and John Stewart Locker, <i>Monotone operators and nonlinear biharmonic boundary value problems</i>	39
Theodore Erickson, Wallace Smith Martindale, III and J. Marshall Osborn, <i>Prime nonassociative algebras</i>	49
Pál Fischer, <i>On the inequality $\sum_{i=0}^n [f(p_i)/f(q_i)]p_i \geq i$</i>	65
Geoffrey Fox and Pedro Morales, <i>Compact subsets of a Tychonoff set</i>	75
Robert William Gilmer, Jr. and Joseph F. Hoffmann, <i>A characterization of Prüfer domains in terms of polynomials</i>	81
Leslie C. Glaser, <i>On tame Cantor sets in spheres having the same projection in each direction</i>	87
Zensiro Goseki, <i>On semigroups in which $x = xyx = xzx$ if and only if $x = xyzx$</i>	103
Emil Grosswald, <i>Rational valued series of exponentials and divisor functions</i>	111
David E. Handelman, <i>Strongly semiprime rings</i>	115
Jackson Neal Henry and Donald Curtis Taylor, <i>The $\bar{\beta}$ topology for W^*-algebras</i>	123
Margaret Jones Hodel, <i>Enumeration of weighted p-line arrays</i>	141
Surender Kumar Jain and Surjeet Singh, <i>Rings with quasi-projective left ideals</i>	169
S. Jeyaratnam, <i>The Diophantine equation $Y(Y + m)(Y + 2m)(Y + 3m) = 2X(X + m)(X + 2m)(X + 3m)$</i>	183
Richard Michael Kane, <i>On loop spaces without p torsion</i>	189
Alvin John Kay, <i>Nonlinear integral equations and product integrals</i>	203
Alexander S. Kechris, <i>Countable ordinals and the analytical hierarchy. I</i>	223
Ka-Sing Lau, <i>A representation theorem for isometries of $C(X, E)$</i>	229
Ib Henning Madsen, <i>On the action of the Dyer-Lashof algebra in $H_*(G)$</i> ...	235
Richard C. Metzler, <i>Positive linear functions, integration, and Choquet's theorem</i>	277
Augusto Nobile, <i>Some properties of the Nash blowing-up</i>	297
Gerald E. Peterson and Grant Welland, <i>Plessner's theorem for Riesz conjugates</i>	307