

SOME PROPERTIES OF ASYMPTOTIC DISTRIBUTIONS

(Communicated by T. Kawata)

By Masatomo UDAGAWA.

This note contains two different problems. In §1, §2 we shall give some results similar as the one which were obtained by Kac and Steinhaus.⁽¹⁾ The definitions used here of asymptotic distributions are different from them, and the hypothesis in the theorem are less restrictive. In §3, we are concerned with some limit theorems.

§ 1.

Definition 1. Let $x(t)$ be a measurable function of a real variable t taking values in R^n . For every $T > 0$, we define

$$\varphi_T(E) = \frac{1}{2T} m E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, x(t) \in E],$$

E being an arbitrary Borel set in R^n . Then $\varphi_T(E)$ is a distribution function for every fixed T .

If the distribution function φ_T tends to a distribution function $\varphi(\cdot)$ for $T \rightarrow \infty$, we say that $x(t)$ has an asymptotic distribution function φ . This definition is due to Hartman and Wintner.

Now we shall prove the theorem.

Theorem 1. If $x(t)$ has an asymptotic distribution function, then for any continuous function $f(x)$ in R^n , $f(x(t))$ has an asymptotic distribution function.

To prove the theorem we need a following lemma.

Lemma 1. A measurable function has an asymptotic distribution function φ , if and only if

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T e^{iu \cdot x(t)} dt$$

exists, uniformly in $|u| \leq C$ for any $C > 0$.

This lemma is known.⁽²⁾

Proof of Theorem. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves for the case where $x(t)$ is a real function. We write

$$f(x(t)) = y(t)$$

By Lemma 1, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T e^{iu \cdot y(t)} dt$$

exists, uniformly in $|u| \leq C$ for every $C > 0$. Obviously

$$\frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T e^{iu \cdot y(t)} dt = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iu \cdot f(x)} d\varphi_T(x),$$

so that it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iu \cdot f(x)} d\varphi_T(x)$$

exists, uniformly in $|u| \leq C$.

Since $\varphi_T \rightarrow \varphi$, for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, we can choose x_0 and T_0 which satisfy following conditions:

i) $-x_0, x_0$ are continuity points of φ .

ii) $\{1 - \varphi_T(x_0)\} + \varphi_T(-x_0) < \varepsilon$ for all $T > T_0$.

Then we have

$$\left| \left(\int_{-\infty}^{-x_0} + \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \right) e^{iu \cdot f(x)} d\varphi_T(x) \right| < \varepsilon, \quad (T > T_0)$$

$$\left| \left(\int_{-\infty}^{-x_0} + \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \right) e^{iu \cdot f(x)} d\varphi(x) \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Now, we can choose $F(x)$ which is absolutely continuous in $(-x_0, x_0)$ such that

$$|f(x) - F(x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{C}, \quad \text{for } -x_0 \leq x \leq x_0.$$

Then

$$\left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} e^{iu \cdot f(x)} - e^{iu \cdot F(x)} d\varphi_T(x) \right| \leq \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} |u| |f(x) - F(x)| d\varphi_T(x) < \varepsilon.$$

Similarly

$$\left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} \{e^{iu \cdot f(x)} - e^{iu \cdot F(x)}\} d\varphi(x) \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} e^{iu \cdot f(x)} d\{\varphi_T(x) - \varphi(x)\} \right| \leq \left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} \{e^{iu \cdot f(x)} - e^{iu \cdot F(x)}\} d\varphi_T(x) \right| \\ & + \left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} \{e^{iu \cdot f(x)} - e^{iu \cdot F(x)}\} d\varphi(x) \right| + \left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} e^{iu \cdot F(x)} d\{\varphi_T(x) - \varphi(x)\} \right| \\ & \leq 2\varepsilon + \left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} e^{iu \cdot F(x)} d\{\varphi_T(x) - \varphi(x)\} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

But the integration by parts shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} e^{iu \cdot F(x)} d\{\varphi_T(x) - \varphi(x)\} \right| \leq \left| [e^{iu \cdot F(x)} \{\varphi_T(x) - \varphi(x)\}]_{-x_0}^{x_0} \right| \\ & + \left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} \{\varphi_T(x) - \varphi(x)\} d(e^{iu \cdot F(x)}) \right| \\ & \leq 2\varepsilon + \left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} u F'(x) \{\varphi_T(x) - \varphi(x)\} e^{iu \cdot F(x)} dx \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi_T(x)$ tends to $\varphi(x)$ boundedly, there exists a T_1 such that the last term is less than ε for $T > T_1$, and thus we get

$$\left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} e^{i(u \cdot f(x))} d\{\varphi(x) - \varphi_T(x)\} \right| < 3\varepsilon, \quad \text{for } T > T_1.$$

Hence it results:

$$\left| \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} e^{i(u \cdot f(x))} d\{\varphi_T(x) - \varphi(x)\} \right| < 5\varepsilon, \quad (T > \max(T_0, T_1))$$

which proves our theorem.

§ 2.

Definition 2. Let $x(t)$, $y(t)$ be measurable, real valued functions in $(-\infty, \infty)$. If these functions satisfy the following conditions, they are called to be statistically independent.

i) A vector function $z(t) = (x(t), y(t))$ has an asymptotic distribution function, (so that each of $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ have also asymptotic distribution functions.)

ii) Let $Q = [a_1, b_1; a_2, b_2]$ be an interval in R^2 , and $Q^1 = [a_1, b_1]$, $Q^2 = [a_2, b_2]$ be intervals in R^1 . Whenever Q, Q^1, Q^2 are continuity intervals of distribution functions ϕ, ϕ^1, ϕ^2 respectively, ϕ, ϕ^1, ϕ^2 being asymptotic distribution functions of $z(t), x(t), y(t)$ respectively, it holds

$$\phi(Q) = \phi^1(Q^1) \cdot \phi^2(Q^2).$$

We shall prove following result which is, in some sense, a generalization of the result of Kac and Steinhaus.

Theorem 2. Let $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ be statistically independent and both bounded, that is, there exists a constant M , such that

$$|x(t)| \leq M, \quad |y(t)| \leq M, \quad \text{for } -\infty < t < \infty.$$

If $f(x), g(x)$ are real and continuous in the interval $[-M, M]$, then $f(x(t)), g(y(t))$ are also statistically independent.

To prove the theorem, we shall state a number of lemmas.

Lemma 2. If $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ are bounded real measurable functions, then in order that $x(t), y(t)$ are statistically independent, it is necessarily and sufficient that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T x^k(t) y^l(t) dt = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T x^k(t) dt \cdot \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T y^l(t) dt,$$

for any positive integers k, l .

This is known.⁽⁶⁾

Lemma 3. Under the hypothesis of Lemma 2,

$$f_1(t) = a_0 x^m(t) + a_1 x^{m-1}(t) + \dots + a_m,$$

$$f_2(t) = b_0 y^n(t) + b_1 y^{n-1}(t) + \dots + b_n$$

are statistically independent.

This is readily derived from Lemma 2, that is

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T f_1^k(t) f_2^l(t) dt \\ = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T (a_0 x^m(t) + \dots + a_m)^k (b_0 y^n(t) + \dots + b_n)^l dt \\ = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T f_1^k(t) dt \cdot \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T f_2^l(t) dt \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4. Let $x_n(t), y_n(t)$ be statistically independent and be bounded. If $x_n(t) \rightarrow x(t)$, $y_n(t) \rightarrow y(t)$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$) uniformly in $(-\infty, \infty)$, then $x(t), y(t)$ are also statistically independent.

By uniform convergence, we can prove easily the validity of conditions of Lemma 1.

Proof of Theorem 2. If we choose polynomials sequence $\{f_n(x)\}, \{g_n(y)\}$ such that $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$, $g_n(y) \rightarrow g(y)$ holds uniformly in $[-M, M]$ then $f_n(x(t)) \rightarrow f(x(t))$, $g_n(y(t)) \rightarrow g(y(t))$ uniformly in $(-\infty, \infty)$. By Lemma 3, $f_n(x(t)), g_n(y(t))$ are statistically independent, and hence by Lemma 4, $f(x(t)), g(y(t))$ are statistically independent.

§ 3.

Definition 3. Let $x_n(t)$ and $x(t)$ be measurable in $(-\infty, \infty)$, and let

$$m E_t [-T \leq t \leq T, |x_n(t) - x(t)| > \varepsilon] \equiv D_\varepsilon^{(-T, T)}(x_n - x),$$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} D_\varepsilon^{(-T, T)}(x_n - x) \equiv D_\varepsilon(x_n - x),$$

for every positive ε .

If for every positive ε , $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_\varepsilon(x_n - x) = 0$, then we say after A. Wintner that the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is convergent in relative measure to x and we write $x_n \rightarrow x$.

Definition 4. If the function $x_n(t)$ and $x(t)$ have asymptotic distribution functions φ_n and φ respectively, and if $\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi$ at the continuity points of the latter function then after A. Wintner, the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is said to con-

verge to x in distribution; and we write $x_n \rightarrow x$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$)

Theorem 3. If $x_n \rightarrow x$, $y_n \rightarrow y$, and x_n, y_n are statistically independent, then x, y are statistically independent.

To prove the theorem, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 5. If $x_n \rightarrow x$, $y_n \rightarrow y$, then $x_n + y_n \rightarrow x + y$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} E_t(-T \leq t \leq T; x_n + y_n - x - y > \varepsilon) \\ = E_t(-T \leq t \leq T; x_n - x < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, x_n + y_n - x - y > \varepsilon) \\ + E_t(-T \leq t \leq T; x_n - x > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, x_n + y_n - x - y > \varepsilon) \\ \leq E_t(-T \leq t \leq T, y_n - y > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \\ + E_t(-T \leq t \leq T; x_n - x > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2T} m E_t[-T \leq t \leq T; x_n + y_n - x - y > \varepsilon] \\ \leq \frac{1}{2T} D_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{(-T, T)}(|x_n - x|) + \frac{1}{2T} D_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{(-T, T)}(|y_n - y|). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2T} m E_t[-T \leq t \leq T; x_n + y_n - x - y < -\varepsilon] \\ \leq \frac{1}{2T} D_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{(-T, T)}(|x_n - x|) + \frac{1}{2T} D_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{(-T, T)}(|y_n - y|) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$\frac{1}{2T} D_{\varepsilon}^{(-T, T)}(|x_n + y_n - x - y|) \leq \frac{1}{2T} D_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{(-T, T)}(|x_n - x|) + \frac{1}{2T} D_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{(-T, T)}(|y_n - y|)$$

That is

$$D_{\varepsilon}(|x_n + y_n - x - y|) \leq D_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(|x_n - x|) + D_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(|y_n - y|)$$

which proves

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_{\varepsilon}(|x_n + y_n - x - y|) = 0, \text{ for every } \varepsilon > 0.$$

The proof of Theorem 3. From a theorem of Hartman, van Kampen and A. Wintner(?) for any real constants u_1, u_2 , the function $u_1 x_n(t) + u_2 y_n(t)$ has the asymptotic distribution function $F_n * G_n$, where F_n, G_n are asymptotic distribution functions of $u_1 x_n(t), u_2 y_n(t)$ respectively, and $F_n * G_n$ signifies the convolution of F_n and G_n . By the above lemma

$$u_1 x_n(t) + u_2 y_n(t) \rightarrow u_1 x(t) + u_2 y(t)$$

So from another known theorem(?) $u_1 x(t) + u_2 y(t)$ has an asymptotic distribution function and

$$u_1 x_n(t) + u_2 y_n(t) \rightarrow u_1 x(t) + u_2 y(t).$$

But from our hypothesis, $F_n \rightarrow F, G_n \rightarrow G$, where F and G are asymptotic distribution functions of $u_1 x(t), u_2 y(t)$ respectively. So we have $F_n * G_n \rightarrow F * G$. Thus $F * G$ is an asymptotic distribution function of $u_1 x(t) + u_2 y(t)$, which proves from the theorem of Hartman, van Kampen and A. Wintner(?) that $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ are statistically independent.

Theorem 4. If $x_n \rightarrow x, y_n \rightarrow y$ and $x_n + y_n$ have asymptotic distribution functions for every n , then $x_n + y_n \rightarrow x + y$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, x_n(t) + y_n(t) > \alpha] \\ = E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, x_n(t) < \varepsilon, x_n + y_n > \alpha] + E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, x_n > \varepsilon, x_n + y_n > \alpha] \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2T} m E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, x_n + y_n > \alpha] \\ \leq \frac{1}{2T} m E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, y_n > \alpha - \varepsilon] + \frac{1}{2T} m E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, x_n > \varepsilon], \end{aligned}$$

from which by letting $T \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$1 - \varphi_{x_n + y_n}(\alpha) \leq 1 - \varphi_{y_n}(\alpha - \varepsilon) + 1 - \varphi_{x_n}(\varepsilon),$$

where φ_x denotes the asymptotic distribution function of $x(t)$. Thus we have, by the assumptions

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \varphi_{x_n + y_n}(\alpha)) \leq 1 - \varphi_y(\alpha - \varepsilon).$$

That is

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{x_n + y_n}(\alpha) \geq \varphi_y(\alpha - \varepsilon).$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, if α is the continuous point of φ_y , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{x_n + y_n}(\alpha) \geq \varphi_y(\alpha)$$

On the other hand, since

$$\begin{aligned} E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, x_n + y_n < \alpha] \\ = E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, x_n > -\varepsilon, x_n + y_n < \alpha] \\ + E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, x_n < -\varepsilon, x_n + y_n < \alpha] \\ \leq E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, y_n < \alpha + \varepsilon] + E_t[-T \leq t \leq T, x_n < -\varepsilon], \end{aligned}$$

by the same argument as above, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{x_n + y_n}(\alpha) \leq \varphi_y(\alpha).$$

Combining this with above result, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{x_n + y_n}(\alpha) = \varphi_y(\alpha).$$

This completes the proof.

Theorem 5. If $x(t)$ has the unit asymptotic distribution function and $y(t)$ has an asymptotic distribution function φ_y , then $x(t) + y(t)$ has also an asymptotic distribution function φ_y .

Proof. By the same way as in the proof of Theorem 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} m E_t [-T \leq t \leq T, x(t) + y(t) > \alpha] \\ \leq 1 - \varphi_y(\alpha - \varepsilon) + 1 - \varphi_x(\varepsilon) = 1 - \varphi_y(\alpha - \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, if α is a continuity point of φ_y , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} m E_t [-T \leq t \leq T, x(t) + y(t) > \alpha] \\ \leq 1 - \varphi_y(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} m E_t [-T \leq t \leq T, x(t) + y(t) < \alpha] \\ \leq 1 - \varphi_y(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} m E_t [-T \leq t \leq T, x(t) + y(t) < \alpha] \geq \varphi_y(\alpha).$$

Analogously we have

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} m E_t [-T \leq t \leq T, x(t) + y(t) < \alpha] \leq \varphi_y(\alpha)$$

That is

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} m E_t [-T \leq t \leq T, x(t) + y(t) < \alpha] = \varphi_y(\alpha).$$

This completes the proof.

(*) Received March 1, 1949.

Tokyo High Normal School.

A NOTE ON GENERATORS OF COMPACT LIE GROUPS

By Hiraku TOYAMA and Masatake KURANISHI.

H. Auerbach has obtained the following theorem [1]:

THEOREM: Let G be a (connected) compact Lie group, and for any integer k let

$$\begin{aligned} M(x, y, k) = \{ p; p = \prod_{i=1}^k v_i, \\ v_i = x^{n_i} \text{ when } i \text{ is odd,} \\ v_i = y^{n_i} \text{ when } i \text{ is even} \} \end{aligned}$$

$$M(x, y) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} M(x, y, k)$$

Then there exist x and y such that $G = M(x, y)$.

Here arises a question: Is there any integer k such that $G = M(x, y, k)$. The affirmative answer for this question can easily be obtained. Let $f(G)$ be the minimum of such k . The next problem, to determine $f(G)$ for each compact Lie group, is not yet solved for the writers, but it can be seen

$$f(G) \geq \dim(G) / \text{rank}(G)$$

where $\text{rank}(G)$ is the dimension of a maximal abelian subgroup of G .

This note will contain the proofs of these two propositions.

For any element x of G , let $T(x)$ be the abelian closed subgroup of G generated by x , and put

$$(1) \quad H(x, y, k) = \{ p; p = \prod_{i=1}^k \omega_i, \quad \omega_i \in T(x) \text{ when } i \text{ is odd and } \omega_i \in T(y) \text{ when } i \text{ is even} \}$$

$$(2) \quad H(x, y) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} H(x, y, k)$$

Then it is clear that

$$(3) \quad H(x, y, k) \subseteq \overline{M(x, y, k)}$$

If $G = M(x, y)$ and if $T(x)$ and $T(y)$ are connected, we shall say that x and y constitute a pair of generators of G . The existence of such x and y is proved in [1].

(1) When G is simply connected: Take a pair of generators x, y of G . Then $H(x, y)$ is an arc-wise connected subgroup of G and everywhere dense in G . It follows from these that $H(x, y) = G$ (for the proof see [2]). From