2012

An elementary view of Weyl's theory of equal distribution

William F. Trench, *Trinity University*

An Elementary View of Weyl's Theory of Equal Distribution

William F. Trench

Abstract

Suppose that $-\infty < a < b < \infty$, $a \le u_{1n} \le u_{2n} \le \cdots \le u_{nn} \le b$, and $a \le v_{1n} \le v_{2n} \le \cdots \le v_{nn} \le b$ for $n \ge 1$. We simplify and strengthen Weyl's definition of equal distribution of $\{\{u_{in}\}_{i=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\{\{v_{in}\}_{i=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ by showing that the following statements are equivalent:

(i) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (F(u_{in}) - F(v_{in})) = 0$ for all $F \in C[a,b]$,

(ii) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n |u_{in} - v_{in}| = 0$,

(iii) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n |F(u_{in}) - F(v_{in})| = 0$ for all $F \in C[a,b]$.

We relate this to Weyl's definition of uniform distribution and Szegö's distribution formula for the eigenvalues of a family of Toeplitz matrices $\{[t_{r-s}]_{r,s=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, where $t_r = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{-irx} g(x)\,dx$ and g is real-valued and continuous on $[-\pi,\pi]$.

1 Introduction

We consider four definitions of "distribution" that can be traced back to H. Weyl. We assume throughout that the doubly-indexed sequences

$$\mathbf{U} = \{\{u_{in}\}_{i=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{V} = \{\{v_{in}\}_{i=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$$

are contained in a finite interval $[a,b]$. As usual, $C[a,b]$ is the family of real-valued continuous functions on $[a,b]$. To avoid annoying repetition, every occurence of "distributed" is to be interpreted as "distributed in $[a,b]$."

We have presented part of this discussion in [4] and [5]. However, [4] is interesting mainly to linear algebraists and operator theorists, and [5] is not widely circulated. Moreover, the arguments given here are simpler and we think that the conclusions will be interesting to a wider audience.

Our first definition is stated and attributed to H. Weyl in [1, p. 62].

Definition 1 $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ are *equally distributed* if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(F(u_{in})-F(v_{in}))=0 \quad \text{for all} \quad F\in C[a,b]. \tag{1}$$

Definition 2 $\mathbf{V}$ is *uniformly distributed* if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}F(v_{in})=\frac{1}{b-a}\int_a^b F(x)\,dx \quad \text{for all} \quad F\in C[a,b]. \tag{2}$$

Definition 3 A sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset [a,b]$ is *uniformly distributed* if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}F(x_i)=\frac{1}{b-a}\int_a^b F(x)\,dx \quad \text{for all} \quad F\in C[a,b]. \tag{3}$$

Put another way, $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is uniformly distributed if $\{\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is uniformly distributed as in Definition 2.

Definition 4 If a and b are respectively the minimum and maximum values of a continuous function g on a closed interval $[c,d]$, then $\mathbf{U}$ is *distributed like the values of* g if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}F(u_{in})=\frac{1}{d-c}\int_c^d F(g(x))\,dx \quad \text{for all} \quad F\in C[a,b]. \tag{4}$$

In the setting of linear algebra and operator theory, the members of $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ could be the eigenvalues of two families $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\{B_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of Hermitian matrices, and the problem is to find conditions on $\{A_n - B_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ which imply that $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ are equally distributed.

It is well known that (2) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{C_n(\mathcal{I})}{n}=\frac{\ell(\mathcal{I})}{b-a}$$

for every subinterval $\mathcal{I}$ of $[a,b]$, where $\ell(\mathcal{I})$ is the length of $\mathcal{I}$ and $C_n(\mathcal{I})$ is the cardinality of $\{v_{in}\}_{i=1}^n \cap \mathcal{I}$.

Definition 3 is a special case of Definition 2; nevertheless, a special case of Definition 3 is probably the most famous of all the definitions that we are considering. If x is an arbitrary real, let $[x]$ denote the greatest integer not greater than x, and let $\hat{x} = x - [x]$, so $0 \le \hat{x} < 1$. According to another definition of Weyl, $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is *equidistributed modulo* 1 or *uniformly distributed modulo* 1 if $\{\hat{x}_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is uniformly distributed in $[0,1]$ as in Definition 3, with $a=0$ and $b=1$.

The most famous example of Definition 4 is related to a special case of Szegö's distribution theorem [1, p. 64]. Suppose g is real-valued and continuous on $[-\pi,\pi]$. Let

$$t_r=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}e^{-irx}g(x)\,dx, \quad r=0,\pm1,\pm2,\ldots,$$

and

$$T_n = [t_{r-s}]_{r,s=1}^n, \quad n = 1, 2, 3 \ldots.$$

These are *Toeplitz* matrices. Since g is real-valued, $t_{-\ell} = \overline{t}_\ell$, so T_n is Hermitian and therefore has real eigenvalues λ_{1n}, λ_{2n}, $\ldots$, λ_{nn}; in fact, they are all in $[a, b]$, where a and b are respectively the minimum and maximum values of g on $[-\pi, \pi]$.

Szegö showed that $\{\{\lambda_{in}\}_{i=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is distributed like the values of g; i.e.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(\lambda_{in}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} F(g(x))\, dx \quad \text{for all} \quad F \in C[a, b]$$

if g is essentially bounded and Lebesgue integrable on $[-\pi, \pi]$. Moreover, there are many results on this question under still weaker assumptions on g. We consider only the case where g is continous.

Although we have stated four definitions to provide a historical perspective, Definitions 2–4 are special cases of Definition 1. In connection with Definitions 2 and 3, let

$$w_{in} = a + \frac{i}{n}(b - a) \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le n \quad \text{and } n = 2, 3, \ldots. \tag{5}$$

From first year calculus, we know that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(w_{in}) = \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b F(x)\, dx \quad \text{for all} \quad F \in C[a, b].$$

From this and (1), $\mathbf{U}$ is uniformly distributed if and only if $\mathbf{U}$ and $\{\{w_{in}\}_{i=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ are equally distributed. Similarly, from (3), $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is uniformly distributed if and only if $\{\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\{\{w_{in}\}_{i=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ are equally distributed.

As for Definition 4, let

$$y_{in} = c + \frac{i}{n}(d - c) \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le n \quad \text{and } n = 2, 3 \ldots. \tag{6}$$

Since g is continuous on $[c, d]$, it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(g(y_{in})) = \frac{1}{d-c} \int_c^d F(g(x))\, dx \quad \text{for all} \quad F \in C[a, b].$$

From this and (4), $\mathbf{U}$ is distributed like the values of F if and only $\mathbf{U}$ and $\{\{g(y_{in})\}_{i=1}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ are equally distributed.

2 The Main Theorem and Corollaries

Henceforth we assume – without loss of generality – that

$$a \le u_{1n} \le u_{2n} \le \cdots \le u_{nn} \le b \quad \text{and } a \le v_{1n} \le v_{2n} \le \cdots \le v_{nn} \le b.$$

Here is our main result. We will prove it in Section 4.

Theorem 1 *The following assertions are equivalent*:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (F(u_{in}) - F(v_{in})) = 0 \quad \textit{for all } F \in C[a,b]; \tag{7}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |u_{in} - v_{in}| = 0; \tag{8}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |F(u_{in}) - F(v_{in})| = 0 \quad \textit{for all } F \in C[a,b]. \tag{9}$$

This theorem and the discussion of Definitions 2–4 in Section 1 yield the following corollaries.

Corollary 1 $\mathbf{U}$ *and* $\mathbf{V}$ *are equally distributed if and only if* (8) *is true.*

Corollary 2 $\mathbf{V}$ *is uniformly distributed if and only if*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |v_{in} - w_{in}| = 0, \tag{10}$$

with $\{\{w_{in}\}_{i=1}^{n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *as in* (5). *Moreover, each of the following statements is equivalent to* (10):

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (F(v_{in}) - F(w_{in})) = 0 \quad \textit{for all } F \in C[a,b],$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |F(v_{in}) - F(w_{in})| = 0 \quad \textit{for all } F \in C[a,b].$$

Corollary 3 *For each* $n \geq 2$, *let* σ_n *be a permutation of* $\{1, 2, \dots n\}$ *such that*

$$x_{\sigma_n(1)} \leq x_{\sigma_n(2)} \leq \cdots \leq x_{\sigma_n(n)}.$$

Then $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ *is uniformly distributed if and only if*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_{\sigma_n(i)} - w_{in}| = 0. \tag{11}$$

Moreover, each of the following statements is equivalent to (11):

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (F(x_i) - F(w_{in})) = 0 \quad \textit{for all } F \in C[a,b],$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |F(x_{\sigma_n(i)}) - F(w_{in})| = 0 \quad \textit{for all } F \in C[a,b].$$

Corollary 4 *Let* $\{\{y_{in}\}_{i=1}^{n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *be as in* (6) *and, for each* $n \geq 2$, *let* ρ_n *be a permutation of* $\{1, 2, \dots n\}$ *such that*

$$g(y_{\rho_n(1),n}) \leq g(y_{\rho_n(2),n}) \leq \cdots \leq g(y_{\rho_n(n),n}).$$

Then $\mathbf{U}$ *is distributed like the values of* g *if and only*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |u_{in} - g(y_{\rho_n(i),n})| = 0. \tag{12}$$

Moreover, each of the following statements is equivalent to (12):

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (F(u_{in}) - F(g(y_{in})) = 0 \quad \text{for all } F \in C[a,b],$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |F(u_{in}) - F(g(y_{\rho_n(i),n})| = 0 \quad \text{for all } F \in C[a,b].$$

We hope that the following suggestion will be taken as constructive rather than offensive: if (7), (8), and (9) are equivalent, then regarding (7) as the definition of equal distribution is putting the cart before the horse. Therefore – with some trepidation – we suggest that (8) should be the definition. Analogous suggestions apply to (10), (11), and (12) in connection with Definitions 2–4.

For examples that support this suggestion, suppose

$$\mathbf{U}_\ell = \{\{u_{in}^{(\ell)}\}_{i=1}^{n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset [a,b],\ \mathbf{V}_\ell = \{\{v_{in}^{(\ell)}\}_{i=1}^{n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset [a,b] \ \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq k,$$

$$\lambda_{in} \geq 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{1n} + \lambda_{2n} + \cdots + \lambda_{nn} = 1.$$

Further, let $\mathbf{U} = \{\{u_{in}\}_{i=1}^{n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\mathbf{V} = \{\{v_{in}\}_{i=1}^{n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, where

$$u_{in} = \lambda_{1n}u_{in}^{(1)} + \lambda_{2n}u_{in}^{(2)} + \cdots + \lambda_{kn}u_{in}^{(k)} \ \text{ and } v_{in} = \lambda_{1n}v_{in}^{(1)} + \lambda_{2n}v_{in}^{(2)} + \cdots + \lambda_{kn}v_{in}^{(k)}.$$

Then Corollary 1 obviously implies that $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ are equally distributed if $\mathbf{U}_\ell$ and $\mathbf{V}_\ell$ are equally distributed for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, and Corollary 2 obviously implies that $\mathbf{V}$ is uniformly distributed if $\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \dots, \mathbf{V}_k$ are uniformly distributed. These conclusions are not obvious from Definitions 1 and 2.

3 Required Lemmas

We need the following lemmas, in which $V_a^b(\phi)$ is the total variation of a function ϕ on $[a,b]$.

Lemma 1 (Helly's First Theorem) *Let* $\{\phi_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ *be an infinite sequence of functions on* $[a,b]$ *and suppose that*

$$|\phi_m(x)| \leq K < \infty \ \text{ for } a \leq x \leq b \ \text{ and } V_a^b(\phi_m) \leq K, \quad m \geq 1.$$

Then there is a subsequence of $\{\phi_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ *that converges at every point of* $[a,b]$ *to a function of bounded variation on* $[a,b]$.

Lemma 2 (Helly's Second Theorem) *Let $\{\phi_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ be an infinite sequence of functions on $[a, b]$ such that $V_a^b(\phi_m) \le K < \infty$, $m \ge 1$, and*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \phi_m(x) = \phi(x) \quad \text{for } a \le x \le b.$$

Then $V_a^b(\phi) \le K$ and

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \int_a^b F(x)\, d\phi_m(x) = \int_a^b F(x)\, d\phi(x) \quad \text{for all } F \in C[a, b].$$

Lemma 3 *Suppose $\phi(a) = \phi(b) = 0$, ϕ is of bounded variation on $[a, b]$, and*

$$\int_a^b F(x)\, d\phi(x) = 0, \quad \text{for all } F \in C[a, b].$$

Then $\phi(x) = 0$ at all points of continuity of ϕ. Thus, $\phi(x) \ne 0$ for at most countably many values of x.

For proofs of Lemmas 1–3, see [2, p. 222], [2, p. 233], and [3, p. 111].

Lemma 4 *Suppose $x_1 \le x_2 \le \cdots \le x_n$ and $y_1 \le y_2 \le \cdots \le y_n$. Let $\{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots \ell_n\}$ be a permutation of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and define*

$$S(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i - y_{\ell_i}|. \tag{13}$$

Then

$$S(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_n) \ge S(1, 2, \ldots, n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i - y_i|. \tag{14}$$

Proof The proof is by induction. Let P_n be the stated proposition. P_1 is trivial. Suppose that $n > 1$ and P_{n-1} is true. If $\ell_n = n$ then P_{n-1} implies P_n. If $\ell_n = s < n$ then choose r so that $\ell_r = n$, and define

$$\ell_i' = \begin{cases} \ell_i & \text{if } i \ne r \text{ and } i \ne n, \\ s & \text{if } i = r, \\ n & \text{if } i = n. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$S(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_n) - S(\ell_1', \ell_2', \ldots, \ell_n') = \sigma(x_n) - \sigma(x_r), \tag{15}$$

where

$$\sigma(x) = |x - y_s| - |x - y_n| = \begin{cases} y_s - y_n, & x < y_s, \\ 2x - y_s - y_n, & y_s \le x \le y_n, \\ y_n - y_s, & x > y_n. \end{cases}$$

Since σ nondecreasing, (15) implies that

$$S(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_n) \geq S(\ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ldots, \ell'_n).$$

Since $\ell'_n = n$, P_{n-1} implies that

$$S(\ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ldots, \ell'_n) \geq S(1, 2, \ldots, n).$$

Therefore (15) implies (14), which completes the induction.

4 Proof of Theorem 1

Obviously, (9) implies (7). To see that (8) implies (9), suppose that $F \in C[a, b]$ and $\epsilon > 0$. By the Weierstrass approximation theorem, there is a polynomial P such that

$$|F(x) - P(x)| < \epsilon/2 \text{ for } a \leq x \leq b.$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |F(u_{in}) - F(v_{in})| &\leq |F(u_{in}) - P(u_{in})| + |P(u_{in}) - P(v_{in})| \\ &\quad + |P(v_{in}) - F(v_{in})| \\ &< |P(u_{in}) - P(v_{in})| + \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Let $M = \max_{a \leq x \leq b} |P'(x)|$. By the mean value theorem,

$$|P(u_{in}) - P(v_{in})| \leq M|u_{in} - v_{in}|.$$

This and (16) imply that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |F(u_{in}) - F(v_{in})| < \epsilon + \frac{M}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |u_{in} - v_{in}|.$$

From this and (8),

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |F(u_{in}) - F(v_{in})| \leq \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, this implies (9).

To complete the proof, we must show that (7) implies (8). The proof is by contradiction. If (8) is false, there is an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and an increasing sequence $\{\ell_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of positive integers such that

$$\frac{1}{\ell_k} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_k} |u_{i\ell_k} - v_{i\ell_k}| \geq \epsilon_0, \quad k \geq 1. \tag{17}$$

However, we will show that if (7) holds, then any increasing infinite sequence $\{\ell_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of positive integers has a a subsequence $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} |u_{in_k} - v_{in_k}| = 0, \tag{18}$$

which contradicts (17).

If S is a set, let card(S) be the cardinality of S. For $a \le x \le b$, let

$$\nu_n(x;\mathbf{U}) = \mathrm{card}(\{i \,|\, u_{in} < x\}) \ \text{ and } \ \nu_n(x;\mathbf{V}) = \mathrm{card}(\{i \,|\, v_{in} < x\}).$$

Define

$$\rho_n(x;\mathbf{U}) = \begin{cases} \nu_n(x;\mathbf{U})/n, & a \le x < b, \\ 1, & x = b, \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

and

$$\rho_n(x;\mathbf{V}) = \begin{cases} \nu_n(x;\mathbf{V})/n, & a \le x < b, \\ 1, & x = b. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} F(u_{in}) = \int_a^b F(x)\, d\rho_n(x;\mathbf{U}) \ \text{ for all } \ F \in C[a,b] \tag{21}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} F(v_{in}) = \int_a^b F(x)\, d\rho_n(x;\mathbf{V}) \ \text{ for all } \ F \in C[a,b] \tag{22}$$

[2, p. 231]. If

$$\phi_n = \rho_n(\cdot;\mathbf{U}) - \rho_n(\cdot;\mathbf{V}),$$

then (7), (21), and (22) imply that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_a^b F(x)\, d\phi_n(x) = 0 \ \text{ for all } \ F \in C[a,b]. \tag{23}$$

Since

$$|\phi_n(x)| \le 1, \quad a \le x \le b, \ \text{ and } V_a^b(\phi_n) \le 2, \quad n \ge 1,$$

Lemma 1 implies that every sequence $\{\ell_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of positive integers has a subsequence $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) = \phi(x) \ \text{ for } \ a \le x \le b,$$

where ϕ is of bounded variation on $[a,b]$. From (23) and Lemma 2,

$$\int_a^b F(x)\, d\phi(x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \ F \in C[a,b].$$

This and Lemma 3 imply that $\phi(x) = 0$ for all but countably many values of x.

Since $\lim_{k\to\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) = 0$ for all but countably many values of x, (19) and (20) imply that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\nu_{n_k}(x,\mathbf{U}) - \nu_{n_k}(x,\mathbf{V})}{n_k} = 0$$

for all but countably many values of x. Therefore, given $\epsilon > 0$, we can choose x_0, x_1, …, x_m so that

$$a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_m = b,$$

$$x_j - x_{j-1} < \epsilon \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le j \le m, \tag{24}$$

and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\nu_{n_k}(x_j, \mathbf{U}) - \nu_{n_k}(x_j, \mathbf{V})}{n_k} = 0. \tag{25}$$

Let

$$I_j = [x_{j-1}, x_j) \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le j \le m-1, \quad \text{and} \quad I_m = [x_{m-1}, x_m],$$

and denote

$$U_{jk} = \operatorname{card}\{i \,|\, u_{in_k} \in I_j\}, \quad V_{jk} = \operatorname{card}\{i \,|\, v_{in_k} \in I_j\}.$$

Since

$$U_{jk} = \begin{cases} \nu_{n_k}(x_1; \mathbf{U}), & j = 1, \\ \nu_{n_k}(x_j; \mathbf{U}) - \nu_{n_k}(x_{j-1}; \mathbf{U}), & 2 \le j \le m-1, \\ n_k - \nu_{n_k}(x_{m-1}; \mathbf{U}), & j = m, \end{cases}$$

and

$$V_{jk} = \begin{cases} \nu_{n_k}(x_1; \mathbf{V}), & j = 1, \\ \nu_{n_k}(x_j; \mathbf{V}) - \nu_{n_k}(x_{j-1}; \mathbf{V}), & 2 \le j \le m-1, \\ n_k - \nu_{n_k}(x_{m-1}; \mathbf{V}), & j = m, \end{cases}$$

(25) implies that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{U_{jk} - V_{jk}}{n_k} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le j \le m. \tag{26}$$

Since

$$\min(U_{jk}, V_{jk}) = \frac{U_{jk} + V_{jk} - |U_{jk} - V_{jk}|}{2},$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} U_{jk} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} V_{jk} = n_k,$$

it follows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \min(U_{jk}, V_{jk}) = n_k - r_k, \tag{27}$$

where

$$r_k = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} |U_{jk} - V_{jk}|.$$

From (26),

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{r_k}{n_k} = 0. \tag{28}$$

From (24) and (27), there is a permutation τ_k of $\{1, \ldots, n_k\}$ such that

$$|u_{in_k} - v_{\tau_k(i), n_k}| < \epsilon$$

for at least $n_k - r_k$ values of i; hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} |u_{in_k} - v_{\tau_k(i),n_k}| < n_k\epsilon + r_k(b-a).$$

Now Lemma 4 implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} |u_{in_k} - v_{in_k}| < n_k\epsilon + r_k|b-a|.$$

Hence, from (28),

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} |u_{in_k} - v_{in_k}| \le \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, this implies (18), which completes the proof.

Acknowledgments. I thank Professor Paolo Tilli for a suggestion that enabled me to complete the proof of Theorem 1 in my earlier papers [4, 5].

Lemma 4 and its proof are similar to a well known result [6, p. 108] applicable in the case where (13) is replaced by

$$S(\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - y_{\ell_i})^2.$$

I thank a referee for pointing out that the present version of Lemma 4 shortens my previous proofs of Theorem 1. I also thank the referee for a remark that motivated the last paragraph of Section 2.

References

[1] Grenander, U., Szegö, G, *Toeplitz Forms and Their Applications,* Univ. of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1958.

[2] Natanson, I. P. *Theory of Functions of a Real Variable,* Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1955.

[3] Riesz, F.,Sz.–Nagy, B, Functional Analysis, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1955.

[4] Trench, W. F., *Absolute equal distribution of families of finite sets,* Linear Algebra Appl. 367 (2003), 131-146.

[5] Trench, W. F., *Simplification and strengthening of Weyl's definition of asymptotic equal distribution of two families of finite sets,* Cubo A Mathematical Journal Vol. 06 N 3 (2004), 47–54.

[6] Wilkinson, J., *The Algebraic Eigenvalue Problem,* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1965.

William F. Trench received his B.A. from Lehigh University in 1953, and his M. A. and Ph.D as a part time student from the University of Pennsylvania in 1955 and 1958. After working in industrial settings from 1953 through 1964, he was a member of the Drexel University Mathematics Department as Associate Professor from 1964 through 1967 and Professor from 1967 through 1986. He was Andrew G. Distinguished Professor of Mathematics at Trinity University from 1986 through 1997. He has published research papers on numerical analysis, smoothing and prediction, differential equations, difference equations, special functions, classical analysis, and linear algebra. He is also the author of undergraduate textbooks on real analysis and differential equations.

659 Hopkinton Road, Hopkinton, NH 03229
wtrench@trinity.edu

Trinity University
San Antonio, Texas