

# PROOF OF A CONJECTURE ABOUT MEASURABLE SETS ON THE REAL LINE

J. J. SCHÄFFER

In [1, p. 243] the author formulated a conjecture concerning Lebesgue-measurable sets on the real line; this conjecture was connected with an analysis of the structure of a class of translation-invariant function spaces. The purpose of this note is to give a proof of that conjecture. The proof is based on an idea of E. Calabi. The research was carried out while the author held a fellowship granted by the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation.

Let  $R$  denote the real line and let  $\mu$  be Lebesgue measure on  $R$ . The sign  $\setminus$  is used to denote set-theoretical differences. If  $F, F' \subset R$  are  $\mu$ -measurable, we say that  $F$  is essentially contained in  $F'$  if  $\mu(F \setminus F') = 0$ .

**THEOREM.** *If  $E \subset R$  is  $\mu$ -measurable and  $\mu(E) > 0$ , there exists a closed, bounded set  $E' \subset R$  with  $\mu(E') > 0$ , such that  $E$  is not essentially contained in any finite union of translates of  $E'$ .*

**PROOF.** For every measurable set  $F \subset R$  with  $\mu(F) > 0$  and for every real  $s > 0$  we define

$$\omega(s; F) = s^{-1} \cdot \inf_{t \in R} \mu(\{t + [0, s]\} \setminus F).$$

Obviously,  $0 \leq \omega(s; F) \leq 1$ . Since  $\mu(F) > 0$ , there exists a point  $t_0 \in F$  of density 1 with respect to  $F$ , and therefore

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} s^{-1} \cdot \mu(\{t_0 + [0, s]\} \setminus F) = 0;$$

a fortiori we have

$$(1) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \omega(s; F) = 0.$$

Let  $E$  be the given set. On account of (1) we may construct a sequence of positive integers  $\{m(n)\}$  such that the following two conditions are satisfied for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ :

$$(2) \quad m(n+1) > m(n) + n + 1,$$

$$(3) \quad \omega(2^{-m(n)+1}; E) < 2^{-sn^2}.$$

We define the closed set

$$A = R \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{r=-\infty}^{\infty} (2^{-m(n)}r + (0, 2^{-m(n)-n-1})).$$

---

Received by the editors June 24, 1960.

The open intervals  $2^{-m(n)r} + (0, 2^{-m(n)-n-1})$ ,  $r = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$ , shall be called the *holes of order  $n$  of  $A$* ; the images of these holes under the translation  $t \rightarrow t' + t$  are the *holes of order  $n$  of  $t' + A$* . We now set

$$E' = [0, 1] \cap A,$$

so that  $E'$  is closed and bounded, and

$$\mu(E') \geq 1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{r=0}^{2^{m(n)}-1} 2^{-m(n)-n-1} = 1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n-1} = 1/2 > 0.$$

We claim that  $E$  is not essentially contained in any finite union of translates of  $A$ , let alone of  $E'$ . Assume, by contradiction, that  $E$  is essentially contained in  $B = \bigcup_{j=1}^k (t_j + A)$  for some positive integer  $k$  and some  $t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{R}$ . From the definition of  $\omega(s; F)$  and from (3) it follows in particular that

$$(4) \quad \omega(2^{-m(k)+1}; B) \leq \omega(2^{-m(k)+1}; E) < 2^{-2k^2}.$$

Let now  $I$  be any closed interval of length  $2^{-m(k)+1}$ ; it contains at least one complete hole of order  $k$  of  $t_1 + A$ ; this hole, being of length  $2^{-m(k)-k-1} > 2^{-m(k+1)}$  (by condition (2)), contains at least  $(2^{-m(k)-k-1}/2^{-m(k+1)}) - 1 \geq 2^{m(k+1)-m(k)-k-2}$  complete holes of order  $k+1$  of  $t_2 + A$ ; each of these holes, being of length  $2^{-m(k+1)-k-2} > 2^{-m(k+2)}$  (by condition (2)), contains at least  $(2^{-m(k+1)-k-2}/2^{-m(k+2)}) - 1 \geq 2^{m(k+2)-m(k+1)-k-3}$  complete holes of order  $k+2$  of  $t_3 + A$ . Continuing in this way, we find certain holes of order  $2k-1$  of  $t_k + A$  contained in holes of order  $2k-2$  of  $t_{k-1} + A$ ,  $\dots$ , contained in a hole of order  $k$  of  $t_1 + A$ ; the union  $H$  of these holes of order  $2k-1$  (each of length  $2^{-m(2k-1)-2k}$ ) is therefore in  $I \setminus B$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(H) &\geq 2^{-m(2k-1)-2k} \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} 2^{m(k+j)-m(k+j-1)-k-j-1} = 2^{-m(k)-(3k^2+3k-2)/2} \\ &\geq 2^{-m(k)-3k^2+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $I$  was an arbitrary interval of length  $2^{-m(k)+1}$ , we have

$$\omega(2^{-m(k)+1}; B) \geq \mu(H)/\mu(I) \geq 2^{-3k^2},$$

and this is in contradiction to (4).

#### REFERENCE

1. J. J. Schaffer, *Function spaces with translations*, Math. Ann. vol. 137 (1959) pp. 209-262.

UNIVERSITY OF URUGUAY AND  
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO