DIFFERENTIABILITY OF CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS IN TERMS OF HAAR-SMALLNESS

ADAM KWELA AND WOJCIECH ALEKSANDER WOŁOSZYN

Abstract. One of the classical results concerning differentiability of continuous functions states that the set $SD$ of somewhere differentiable functions (i.e., functions which are differentiable at some point) is Haar-null in the space $C[0,1]$. By a recent result of Banakh et al., a set is Haar-null provided that there is a Borel hull $B \supseteq A$ and a continuous map $f : \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N} \to C[0,1]$ such that $f^{-1}[B+h]$ is Lebesgue’s null for all $h \in C[0,1]$.

We prove that $SD$ is not Haar-countable (i.e., does not satisfy the above property with "Lebesgue’s null" replaced by "countable", or, equivalently, for each copy $C$ of $\{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$ there is an $h \in C[0,1]$ such that $SD \cap (C+h)$ is uncountable.

Moreover, we use the above notions in further studies of differentiability of continuous functions. Namely, we consider functions differentiable on a set of positive Lebesgue’s measure and functions differentiable almost everywhere with respect to Lebesgue’s measure. Furthermore, we study multidimensional case, i.e., differentiability of continuous functions defined on $[0,1]^k$. Finally, we pose an open question concerning Takagi’s function.

1. Introduction

We follow the standard topological notation and terminology. By $|X|$ we denote the cardinality of a set $X$.

For a function $f \in C[0,1]$, by $D(f)$ we denote the set of all points $x \in [0,1]$ at which $f$ is differentiable. There are examples of continuous functions such that $D(f) = \emptyset$. One of the first and simplest examples is the famous Takagi’s function $T : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $T(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i \cdot \text{dist}(2^i x, \mathbb{Z})}$ (see [1], [2], or [14]). The size of the set of somewhere differentiable functions, i.e., functions $f$ such that $D(f) \neq \emptyset$, is a classical object of studies since Banach’s result stating that this set is meager in $C[0,1]$ (cf. [4]). One of the well-known results in this subject is Hunt’s theorem stating that the aforementioned set is Haar-null in the space $C[0,1]$ (see [11]). This notion was first introduced in [7] by Christensen. He called a subset $A$ of an abelian Polish group $X$ Haar-null provided that there is a Borel hull $B \supseteq A$ and a Borel $\sigma$-additive probability measure $\lambda$ on $X$ such that $\lambda(B+x) = 0$ for all $x \in X$. A big advantage of this concept is that in a locally compact group it is equivalent to the notion of Haar measure zero sets and at the same time it can be used in a significantly larger class of groups. In [12] Hunt, Sauer and Yorke, unaware of Christensen’s paper, reintroduced the notion of Haar-null sets in the context of dynamical systems (in their paper Haar-null sets are called shy sets, and their complements are called prevalent sets).
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Actually, since the set of somewhere differentiable functions is not Borel, Hunt had to show something more: the set of somewhere Lipschitz functions is Haar-null in $C[0,1]$ (a function $f \in C[0,1]$ is somewhere Lipschitz whenever there is an $x \in [0,1]$ and an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq M|x - y|$ for each $y \in [0,1]$; observe that each somewhere differentiable function is somewhere Lipschitz).

In this paper, we are interested in the following notions of smallness. A subset $A$ of an abelian Polish group $X$ is:

- Haar-countable if there is a Borel hull $B \supseteq A$ and a copy $C$ of $\{0, 1\}^\mathbb{N}$ such that $(C + x) \cap B$ is countable for all $x \in X$;
- Haar-finite if there is a Borel hull $B \supseteq A$ and a copy $C$ of $\{0, 1\}^\mathbb{N}$ such that $(C + x) \cap B$ is finite for all $x \in X$;
- Haar-$n$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if there is a Borel hull $B \supseteq A$ and a copy $C$ of $\{0, 1\}^\mathbb{N}$ such that $|(C + x) \cap B| \leq n$ for all $x \in X$.

Clearly,

$$\text{Haar-}n \implies \text{Haar-}(n + 1) \implies \text{Haar-finite} \implies \text{Haar-countable}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The choice of names in the above is due to Banakh et al., who recently unified the notions of Haar-null sets and Haar-meager sets in [5] (defined by Darji in [8]) by introducing the concept of Haar-small sets. A collection of subsets of a set $X$ is called a semi-ideal whenever it is closed under taking subsets. Following [5], for a semi-ideal $\mathcal{I}$ on the Cantor cube $\{0, 1\}^\mathbb{N}$, we say that a subset $A$ of an abelian Polish group $X$ is Haar-$\mathcal{I}$ if there is a Borel hull $B \supseteq A$ and a continuous map $f : \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{N} \to X$ such that $f^{-1}[B + x] \in \mathcal{I}$ for all $x \in X$. It turns out that if $\mathcal{I}$ is the $\sigma$-ideal $\mathcal{N}$ of subsets of $\{0, 1\}^\mathbb{N}$ of Lebesgue’s measure zero, then we obtain Haar-null sets. The same holds for the $\sigma$-ideal $\mathcal{M}$ of meager sets and Haar-meager sets (cf. [5]), the $\sigma$-ideal of countable sets and Haar-countable sets, the ideal of finite sets and Haar-finite sets and the semi-ideal of sets of cardinality at most $n$ and Haar-$n$ sets (cf. [13, Proposition 1.2]).

Obviously, the collection of Haar-$\mathcal{I}$ subsets of an abelian Polish group is a semi-ideal. Observe that $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ implies that each Haar-$\mathcal{I}$ set is Haar-$\mathcal{J}$. Thus, Haar-null sets and Haar-meager sets only allow us to say that some properties are rare (and we cannot put them on a scale and compare with other rare properties), whereas Haar-$\mathcal{I}$ sets allow us to develop a whole hierarchy of small sets.

Haar-countable, Haar-finite, and Haar-$n$ sets were profoundly studied by the first author in [13]. There are compact examples showing that none of the above implications can be reversed in $C(K)$ where $K$ is compact metrizable. Moreover, it is known that neither Haar-finite sets nor Haar-$n$ sets form an ideal (see [13, Corollary 5.2 and Theorem 6.1]). Zakrzewski considered Haar-small sets in [16] under the name of perfectly $\kappa$-small sets. A particular case of Haar-1 sets was investigated by Balcerzak in [3]. He introduced the so-called property (D) of a $\sigma$-ideal $\mathcal{I}$, which says that there is a Borel Haar-1 set not belonging to $\mathcal{I}$. Moreover, Banakh, Lyaskovska, and Repovš considered packing index of a set in [5]. Packing index is closely connected to Haar-1 sets (namely, a Borel set is Haar-1 if and only if its packing index is uncountable). In turn, Haar-countable sets were studied by Darji and Keleti in [9] and by Elekes and Steprāns in [10].
2. Nowhere differentiable functions

Hunt proved in [11] that the set $SD$ of somewhere differentiable functions is Haar-null in $C[0,1]$. Actually, a closer look at his proof gives us something more. Denote by $E$ the $\sigma$-ideal generated by compact Lebesgue null sets and recall that $E$ is a proper subfamily of $N \cap M$ (see [4]).

**Theorem 2.1** (Hunt, [11]). The set $SD$ is Haar-$E$ in $C[0,1]$.

In this Section we show that $SD$ is not Haar-countable in $C[0,1]$.

**Theorem 2.2.** The set of somewhere differentiable functions is not Haar-countable in $C[0,1]$.

**Proof.** Denote by $C$ the ternary Cantor set (which is homeomorphic to $\{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$). Let $\varphi : C \to C[0,1]$ be continuous. We need to find a homeomorphic copy $C'$ of $C$ and a continuous function $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi(c) - g \in SD$ for all $c \in C'$.

Define $D_1 = \{0,1\}$ and $D_n = \left( \left\{ \frac{i}{n} : i \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \cap C \right)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \neq 1$. Let $E_0 = D_0$ and $E_n = D_n \setminus D_{n-1}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n > 1$. Observe that $D = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} D_n$ is the set of all points from $C$ with finite ternary expansion. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d \in E_n$, let:

$$U_d = \left[ d - \frac{1}{3^{n+1}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{3^n}, d + \frac{1}{3^{n+1}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{3^n} \right].$$

Note that $U_d \cap E_n = \{d\}$, for every $d \in E_n$.

First, we need to shrink $C$. Namely, we want to have a homeomorphic copy $C' \subseteq C$ of $C$ such that:

- $\|f_c - f_{c'}\| \leq (c - c')^2$, for all $c, c' \in C$;
- $\|f_d - f_{d'}\| < \frac{1}{5} (\text{dist} (d, U_d))^2 = \frac{1}{5} (\text{dist} (d', U_d))^2$, whenever $d, d' \in E_n$ for some $n$ and $U_d \cap U_{d'} \neq \emptyset$;
- $\|f_d - f_{d'}\| < \frac{1}{5} (\text{dist} (d, U_d))^2$, whenever $d' \in E_n$ and $d \in D_n \setminus E_n$ for some $n$ and $U_d \cap U_{d'} \neq \emptyset$;

where $f_x = \varphi(\psi(x))$ and $\psi : C \to C'$ is the aforementioned homeomorphism.

The construction of $C'$ is rather standard. Nevertheless, we provide a short sketch of it.

Let $e : C^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\|f_e - f_{e'}\| \leq e(c, c')$ guarantees all of the above conditions. For a finite sequence $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in \{0,1\}^n$, let $\overline{s} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2i-1}{3^n}$. In the first inductive step pick any basic clopen set $W_\emptyset \subseteq C$ such that:

$$\text{diam} (\varphi[W_\emptyset]) < \inf \left\{ e(c, c') : c \in C \cap \left[ 0, \frac{1}{3} \right] \wedge c' \in C \cap \left[ \frac{2}{3}, 1 \right] \right\}.$$

If $W_s$ are already defined for all $s \in \{0,1\}^n$, for each $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in \{0,1\}^n$ find two disjoint basic clopen sets $W_{s^-}(0), W_{s^-}(1) \subseteq W_s$ such that:

$$\text{diam} (\varphi[W_{s^-}(i)]) < \inf \left\{ e(c, c') : c \in C \cap \left[ s^-(i,0), \frac{s^-((i,0) + 1}{3^n+1} \right] \wedge c' \in C \cap \left[ s^-(i,1), \frac{s^-((i,1) + 1}{3^n+1} \right] \right\},$$

for $i = 0, 1$. It is easy to check that $C' = \bigcup_{s \in \{0,1\}^n} \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} W_{s(1, \ldots, n)}$ is the required set.
Now, we want to construct a $g \in C[0,1]$ such that $f_c - g$ has a derivative at $c$ equal to 0, for all $c \in C$. Inductively, we will define a sequence of continuous functions $(g_n)_n \subseteq C[0,1]$ such that:

$$
\forall d \in E_n, \forall x \in U_d \left| f_d(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(x) \right| \leq \frac{1}{5} (x - d)^2;
$$

$$
\forall d \in D_n, \forall x \in U_d \left| f_d(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(x) \right| < (x - d)^2.
$$

At the end, we will put $g = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} g_n$.

Start the construction with $g_1 = f_0$ on $U_0 \setminus U_1$;

- $g_1 = f_1$ on $U_1 \setminus U_0$;
- $g_1(x)$ is between $f_0(x)$ and $f_1(x)$ for all $x \in U_0 \cap U_1$.

Note that we have $|f_0(x) - g_1(x)| = 0 \leq \frac{1}{5} (x - 0)^2$ for all $x \in U_0 \setminus U_1$ and $|f_0(x) - g_1(x)| \leq \frac{1}{5} \inf x \leq \frac{1}{5} (x - 1)^2$ for all $x \in U_0 \cap U_1$.

Similarly, $|f_1(x) - g_1(x)| \leq \frac{1}{5} (x - 1)^2$ for all $x \in U_1$. Thus, $g_1$ is as needed.

Once all $g_i$’s, for $i < n$, are defined, let $\tilde{g}_n : \bigcup_{d \in E_n} U_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that:

- $\tilde{g}_n = f_d - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} g_i$ on $U_d \setminus \bigcup_{d' \in E_n \setminus \{d\}} U_{d'}$ for each $d \in E_n$;
- if $d, d' \in E_n$ and $U_d \cap U_{d'} \neq \emptyset$, then $\tilde{g}_n(x)$ is between $f_d(x)$ and $f_{d'}(x)$ for all $x \in U_d \cap U_{d'}$.

Let $d \in E_n$ and notice that $|f_d(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} g_i(x) - \tilde{g}_n(x)| = 0 \leq \frac{1}{5} (x - d)^2$ for all $x \in U_d \setminus \bigcup_{d' \in E_n \setminus \{d\}} U_{d'}$ and $|f_d(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} g_i(x) - \tilde{g}_n(x)| \leq \|f_d - f_{d'}\| < \frac{1}{5} (\text{dist}(d, U_{d'}))^2 \leq \frac{1}{5} (x - d)^2$ for all $x \in U_d \cap U_{d'}$ whenever the latter intersection is non-empty. Moreover, if $d \in D_n \setminus E_n$ and $x \in U_d \cap U_{d'}$ for some $d' \in E_n$, then:

$$
(d' - x) \leq \frac{1}{3^{n+1}} + \frac{1}{3^{n+1}} \leq \frac{1}{3^n - 1} - \frac{1}{3^n + 1} =
$$

$$
2 \left( \frac{1}{3^n - 1} - \frac{1}{3^{n+1}} \right) \leq 2 \text{dist} (d, U_{d'}) \leq 2(d - x).
$$

Therefore,

$$
\left| f_d(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} g_i(x) - \tilde{g}_n(x) \right| \leq \|f_d - f_{d'}\| + \|f_{d'}(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} g_i(x) - \tilde{g}_n(x)\| <
$$

$$
< \frac{1}{5} (\text{dist}(d, U_{d'}))^2 + \frac{1}{5} (d' - x)^2 < \frac{1}{5} (d - x)^2 + \frac{4}{5} (d - x)^2 = (d - x)^2.
$$

Hence, $\tilde{g}_n$ satisfies all the required conditions and it suffices to extend it to a continuous function $g_n$ defined on the whole interval $[0, 1]$ such that:

$$
\left( f_d(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} g_i - (d - x)^2 \right) \leq g_n(x) \leq \left( f_d(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} g_i + (d - x)^2 \right)
$$

for all $d \in D_n$ such that $x \in U_d$.

Once the construction is completed, define $g = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} g_n$. For each $d \in D$, we have $|f_d(x) - g(x)| \leq (x - d)^2$ and $x \in U_d$. Thus, $f_d - g$ has a derivative at $d$ equal
to 0. Now, we want to show that \( f_c - g \) has a derivative at \( c \) equal to 0 for each \( c \in C \).

Fix \( c \in C \setminus D \) and \( h \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( c + h \in [0, 1] \). Assume that \( c + h \in U_d \) for some \( d \in D \) and \( |h| \geq \frac{1}{4}|c - d| \). Observe that:

\[
\left| \frac{f_c(c + h) - f_c(c) + g(c)}{h} \right| \leq \frac{\left| f_c(c + h) - f_d(c + h) \right|}{|h|} + \frac{\left| f_d(c + h) - f_d(c) \right|}{|h|} \leq 2 \frac{|f_c - f_d|}{|h|} + \frac{|f_d(c + h) - f_d(c) + g(c)|}{|h|} \leq (c + h - d)^2 + (c - d)^2 = \frac{2(c - d)^2 + 2h(c - d) + h^2}{|h|} \leq 8|c - d| + 2(c - d) + |h|.
\]

Thus, \( \frac{f_c(c + h) - g(c + h) - f_c(c) + g(c)}{h} \) tends to 0 as \( h \to 0 \) and \( |c - d| \to 0 \). Therefore, to finish the proof, it suffices to show that for each \( c \in C \) there are sequences \( (d_n)_n \subseteq D \cap (c, 1] \) and \( (d'_n)_n \subseteq D \cap [0, c) \) converging to \( c \) and such that \( (c, 1] \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_{d_n} \cap [c + \frac{1}{3}(d_n - c), 1] \) and \( [0, c) \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_{d'_n} \cap [0, c - \frac{1}{3}(c - d_n)] \).

We will construct the sequence \((d_n)_n\). Construction of \((d'_n)_n\) is similar. Let \((c_n) \in \{0, 2\}^\mathbb{N}\) be the ternary expansion of \( c \in C \) and \((i_n)_n \subseteq \mathbb{N}\) be the increasing enumeration of the set \( \{ n \in \mathbb{N} : c_n = 0 \} \). For all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), define \( d_1 = 1, d_{2k} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{2}{3^j} - \frac{1}{3^k} \), and \( d_{2k+1} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{2}{3^j} - \frac{2}{3^k} \). Observe that \( d_{2k+1} - c \leq \frac{2}{3^k} \) and \( d_{2k} - c \leq \frac{1}{3^k} \).

Thus, we show that \((d_n)_n\) is as required. Since

\[
3^{i_k} \left( 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{2}{3^j} \right) \geq 3
\]

for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), we have:

\[
d_{2k} + \frac{1}{3^k} + \frac{1}{3^k + \frac{1}{2}} = 3^{i_k} \left( 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{2}{3^j} \right) - 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{18} > \frac{2}{3^k} \geq \frac{1}{4} (d_{2k-1} - c);
\]

\[
d_{2k+1} + \frac{1}{3^k} + \frac{1}{3^k + \frac{1}{2}} = 3^{i_k} \left( 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{2}{3^j} \right) - 2 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{18} > \frac{1}{3^k} \geq \frac{1}{4} (d_{2k} - c).
\]

Thus, \( \sup U_{d_{n+1}} \geq \frac{1}{4}(d_n - c) \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). This finishes the entire proof.

By the above, the set of functions differentiable at some point is not Haar-countable. However, what about functions differentiable at more than one point? As for a given \( \sigma \)-ideal \( \mathcal{I} \) on \( [0, 1] \) the set \( \{ f \in C[0, 1] : \emptyset \neq D(f) \in \mathcal{I} \} \) is contained in the set of somewhere differentiable functions, this question is natural. The following slight strengthening of Theorem 2.2 gives only a partial answer to this problem.

**Corollary 2.3.** Let \( \mathcal{I} \) be a \( \sigma \)-ideal on \([0, 1]\) containing some perfect set. The set of functions \( f \in C[0, 1] \) such that \( D(f) \) is a nonempty set which belongs to \( \mathcal{I} \) is not Haar-countable.
Proof. First, assume that the ternary Cantor set $C$ belongs to $\mathcal{I}$. We need to make two modifications of the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Since, by Hunt’s result, the set of somewhere Lipschitz functions is Borel and Haar-null (see [11]), the set $\mathcal{N}\mathcal{L}$ of nowhere Lipschitz functions cannot be Haar-null. Thus, for $\varphi$ from the proof of Theorem 2.2 there is a $z \in C[0, 1]$ such that $\varphi^{-1}[\mathcal{N}\mathcal{L} - z]$ is not Lebesgue’s null. In particular, this is a Borel uncountable subset of $C$. Hence, it must contain a homeomorphic copy $P$ of $C$. Then, $\varphi(c) + z$ is nowhere differentiable for each $c \in P$. Thus, by performing the construction of $C'$ inside $P$ and defining $f_x = \varphi(\psi(x)) + z$ where $\psi$ is a homeomorphism from $C$ to $C'$, we may assume that $f_x$ is nowhere differentiable for each $c \in C$. Moreover, this changes do not affect the rest of the proof. If we find $g \in C[0, 1]$ such that $f_c - g$ is somewhere differentiable for all $c \in C$, then $\varphi(c) + (z - g)$ is somewhere differentiable for uncountably many $c \in C$ (namely, for all $c \in C'$).

Now, we move to the second modification. We can ensure that $g$ is differentiable outside $C = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{d \in E_n} U_d$. Indeed, it suffices to require, additionally, in the inductive construction of $(g_n)_n$, that for each connected component $I$ of $[0, 1] \setminus \bigcup_{d \in E_n} U_d$ the function $g_n$ is such that $\sum_{i=1}^n g_i$ is constant on the interval $[\min(I) + \text{lh}(I)/3, \max(I) - \text{lh}(I)/3]$ ($\text{lh}(I)$ denotes the length of the interval $I$).

After the these modifications, as $g$ is differentiable at each point $x \in [0, 1] \setminus C$ while $f_c$ is not, we get that $D(f_c - g) \subseteq C$ for all $c \in C$.

The case where $C \notin \mathcal{I}$ requires one additional modification. Since every perfect set contains a homeomorphic copy of the ternary Cantor set $C$, we simply need to find such a copy $R$ that belongs to $\mathcal{I}$. Then, we can replace $C$ with $R$, modify sets $D_n$ and $U_d$, and perform similar reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 2.2 \[\Box\]

It is known that $D(f)$ is Borel (of type $\mathcal{G}_{\delta_0}$) for each $f \in C[0, 1]$ (see [15]). Thus, we can consider Lebesgue’s measure of the set $D(f)$. Since there are perfect sets of Lebesgue’s measure zero, the following is immediate.

**Corollary 2.4.** The set of functions $f \in C[0, 1]$ such that $D(f)$ is a nonempty set of Lebesgue’s measure zero is not Haar-countable.

As the $\sigma$-ideal of countable sets does not contain any perfect set, the following question arises.

**Problem 2.5.** Is the set of functions $f \in C[0, 1]$ such that $D(f)$ is countable but non-empty Haar-countable in $C[0, 1]$?

### 3. Differentiability and Lebesgue’s measure

In this Section, we examine functions differentiable on a set of positive Lebesgue’s measure.

We will need the following notation. By the symbol $\lambda$ we will denote the Lebesgue’s measure. Moreover, for a function $f \in C[0, 1]$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$L_M(f) = \{x \in [0, 1] : \forall y \in [0, 1] \ |f(x) - f(y)| \leq M|x - y|\}.$$ 

Then, $f$ is somewhere Lipschitz if and only if the set $L(f) = \bigcup_{M \in \mathbb{N}} L_M(f)$ is non-empty.

The next two rather folklore lemmas will be useful in our further considerations.

**Lemma 3.1.** For any $f \in C[0, 1]$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $L_M(f)$ is closed.
Proof. We will show that $[0, 1] \setminus L_M(f)$ is open. Fix any $x \in [0, 1] \setminus L_M(f)$. Then, there is $y \in [0, 1]$ such that $|f(x) - f(y)| > M|x - y|$. Find $\alpha > 0$ such that $|f(x) - f(y)| > M(|x - y| + \alpha)$. By continuity of $f$ at $x$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|f(x) - f(z)| < |f(x) - f(y)| - M(|x - y| + \alpha)$$

whenever $|x - z| < \delta$. Then, for each $z \in [0, 1]$ such that $|x - z| < \min\{\delta, \alpha\}$, we have:

$$|f(z) - f(y)| \geq |f(x) - f(y)| - |f(x) - f(z)| > M(|x - y| + \alpha) > M|y - z|.$$

Hence, $z \notin L_M(f)$. \hspace{1cm} \Box

This result implies that $L(f)$ is Borel (of type $F_\sigma$). Thus, we can consider Lebesgue’s measure of the sets $L_M(f)$ and $L(f)$.

**Lemma 3.2.** For each $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c \in (0, 1]$, the set of functions $f \in C[0, 1]$ such that $\lambda(L_M(f)) \geq c$ is closed in $C[0, 1]$.

**Proof.** Fix a sequence $(f_n) \subseteq C[0, 1]$ converging to some $f \in C[0, 1]$ and such that $\lambda(L_M(f_n)) \geq c$ for each $n$. We need to show that $\lambda(L_M(f)) \geq c$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $\lambda(L_M(f)) < c$. Using regularity of Lebesgue’s measure, find on open set $G \subseteq [0, 1]$ such that $L_M(f) \subseteq G$ and $\lambda(G) < c$.

For each $n$, there is an $x_n \in L_M(f_n) \setminus G$ (as $\lambda(G) < \lambda(L_M(f_n))$). Since $[0, 1]$ is compact, without loss of generality we may assume that $(x_n)$ converges to some $x \in [0, 1]$. Observe that $x \notin L_M(f)$ as $G$ is an open hull of $L_M(f)$ and whole sequence $(x_n)$ is outside of $G$. However,

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq |f(x) - f_n(x)| + |f_n(x) - f_n(x_n)| + |f_n(x_n) - f_n(y)| + |f_n(y) - f(y)| \leq$$

$$\|f - f_n\| + |f_n(x) - f_n(x_n)| + M|x_n - y| + \|f - f_n\|$$

for each $y \in [0, 1]$. Convergence of $(f_n)$ to $f$ implies equicontinuity of $(f_n)$ at $x$. So, if $n$ tends to infinity, we get that $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq M|x - y|$. This contradicts $x \notin L_M(f)$. \hspace{1cm} \Box

First, we want to focus on functions differentiable almost everywhere.

**Proposition 3.3.** The set of functions differentiable almost everywhere is Haar-1 in $C[0, 1]$.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the set of functions $f \in C[0, 1]$ such that $\lambda(L(f)) = 1$. Note that each function differentiable almost everywhere is in $\mathcal{A}$. Since $L(f) = \bigcup_{M \in \mathbb{N}} L_M(f)$ and $L_M(f) \subseteq L_{M+1}(f)$, we have $\lambda(L(f)) = \lim_{M \to \infty} \lambda(L_M(f))$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{M \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ f \in C[0, 1] : \lambda(L_M(f)) \geq \frac{k - 1}{k} \right\}$$

and $\mathcal{A}$ is Borel by Lemma 3.2.

Observe that $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}$ is meager. Indeed, $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}$ is a subset of the set of somewhere Lipschitz functions, which is meager by the Banach theorem [4] (see also the proof of Proposition 4.4).

The thesis follows now from [5] Theorem 12.8], which states that a Borel set $B$ is Haar-1 if and only if $B - B$ is meager. \hspace{1cm} \Box

Actually, this reasoning gives us something more.
Lemma 3.7. The set of functions \( f \in C[0,1] \) such that \( \lambda(D(f)) > \frac{1}{2} \) is Haar-1 in \( C[0,1] \).

Now, we will study functions \( f \in C[0,1] \) such that \( \lambda(D(f)) \in (0,1) \).

Proposition 3.5. Let \( I \) be a \( \sigma \)-ideal on \([0,1]\) containing no interval. The set of functions \( f \in C[0,1] \) such that neither \( D(f) \) nor \([0,1] \setminus D(f) \) belongs to \( I \) is not Haar-finite in \([0,1]\).

Proof. Denote by \( \mathcal{A} \) the set of functions \( f \in C[0,1] \) such that \( D(f) \notin I \) and \([0,1] \setminus D(f) \notin I \).

Let \( \varphi: \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N} \to C[0,1] \) be a continuous map. We need to show that \( \varphi^{-1}\{A + h\} \) is infinite for some \( h \in C[0,1] \).

If \( \varphi([0,1]^\mathbb{N}) \) is finite, then let \( g \in \mathcal{A} \) and \( h \in C[0,1] \) be such that \( \varphi^{-1}\{h\} \) is infinite. Observe that \( h \in \mathcal{A} + h - g \). Hence, \( \varphi^{-1}\{A + h - g\} \) is infinite as well.

Assume now that \( \varphi([0,1]^\mathbb{N}) \) is infinite and take any injective convergent sequence \( (f_n)_n \subseteq \varphi([0,1]^\mathbb{N}) \). Denote \( f = \lim_n f_n \). For each \( n \), let \( a_n, b_n, c_n \in \left( \frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n} \right) \) be such that \( a_n < b_n < c_n \) and denote \( I_n^1 = [a_n, b_n] \) and \( I_n^2 = [b_n, c_n] \). Let also \( J_n = [c_{n+1}, a_n] \) and \( g_n: J_n \to \mathbb{R} \) be the linear function given by \( g_n(c_{n+1}) = 0 \) and \( g_n(a_n) = (f_n - f_{n+1})(a_n) \). Fix any nowhere differentiable function \( z \in C[0,1] \) such that \( \|z\| \leq 1 \) and \( z(b_n) = z(c_n) = 0 \) for each \( n \). Define \( h: [0,1] \to \mathbb{R} \) by:

- \( h \upharpoonright [c_1,1] = f_1(c_1) \);
- \( h \upharpoonright I_n^1 = f_n \upharpoonright I_n^1 \) for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \);
- \( h \upharpoonright I_n^2 = f_n \upharpoonright I_n^2 - \frac{x}{n} \upharpoonright I_n^2 \) for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \);
- \( h \upharpoonright J_n = (f_{n+1} + g_n) \upharpoonright J_n \) for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \);
- \( h(0) = f(0) \).

Note that the function \( h \) is continuous (continuity in 0 follows from \( \lim_n f_n = f \), \( \lim_n \sup_{x \in J_n} g_n(x) = 0 \), and \( \lim_n \frac{\|g_n\|}{n} = 0 \)) and \( f_n \in \mathcal{A} + h \) for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) (as \( (f_n - h) \upharpoonright I_n^1 \) is constant and \( (f_n - h) \upharpoonright I_n^2 \) is nowhere differentiable). Since \( (f_n)_n \) is injective, we conclude that \( \varphi^{-1}\{A + h\} \) is infinite.

The next Corollary is immediate.

Corollary 3.6. The set of functions \( f \in C[0,1] \) such that \( \lambda(D(f)) \in (0,1) \) is not Haar-finite in \([0,1]\).

Now, we will show that the set of functions \( f \in C[0,1] \) such that \( D(f) \) is of positive Lebesgue’s measure is Haar-countable. The next lemma is a straightforward modification of one of the proofs showing that the Weierstrass function is nowhere Lipschitz.

Lemma 3.7. There is an \( a \in (0,1) \) and there is a \( b \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for any \( x \in [0,1] \) and any increasing sequence \( (s_j) \) of positive integers, and any \( (r_j) \in \{-1,1\}^\mathbb{N} \), the expression

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} r_j a^{s_j} \cos(b^{r_j} \pi y) - \cos(b^{s_j} \pi x))
\]

\[
\frac{y - x}{y - x}
\]

where \( y \) runs over \([0,1]\), is unbounded.

Proof. Let \( a \in (0,1) \) and \( b \in \mathbb{N} \) be such that \( b \) is odd, \( ab > 1 \), and \( \frac{2}{3} \frac{4a}{1-a} - \frac{\pi}{ab-1} > 0 \).
For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $w_m \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $x_m = xb^m - w_m \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ and define $y_m = \frac{x_m}{b^m}$. Fix any $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $|\sin(z)/z| \leq 1$, for each $z$ we have:

$$
\left| \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} r_j a^{s_j} \left( \cos (b^{s_j} \pi y_m) - \cos (b^{s_j} \pi x) \right) \right| = y_m - x
$$

$$
= \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} r_j (ab)^{s_j} \pi \sin \left( \frac{b^{s_j} \pi (y_m + x)}{2} \right) \sin \left( \frac{b^{s_j} \pi (y_m - x)}{2} \right)
\leq \pi \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (ab)^{s_j} \frac{\pi((ab)^{s_j} - 1)}{ab - 1} \leq \pi (ab)^{s_m} \frac{\pi((ab)^{s_m} - 1)}{ab - 1}.
$$

We will need two observations: if $j \geq m$, then $\cos(b^{s_j} \pi y_m) = (-1)^{w_m} = \frac{(-1)^{w_m}}{w_m}$ (as $b$ is odd and $w_m \in \mathbb{Z}$) and

$$
\cos(b^{s_j} \pi x) = \cos(b^{s_j-s_m} \pi w_m) \cos(b^{s_j-s_m} \pi x_m) - \sin(b^{s_j-s_m} \pi w_m) \sin(b^{s_j-s_m} \pi x_m) = (-1)^{w_m} \cos(b^{s_j-s_m} \pi x_m)
$$

(as $x = (x_m + w_m)/b^m$).

Thus, as $b^m(x - y_m) = 1 + x_m$, we have:

$$
\left| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} r_j a^{s_j} \left( \cos (b^{s_j} \pi y_m) - \cos (b^{s_j} \pi x) \right) \right| = y_m - x
$$

$$
= \left| (ab)^{s_m} \sum_{j=m}^{\infty} r_j a^{s_j-s_m} \frac{1 + \cos(b^{s_j-s_m} \pi x_m)}{1 + x_m} \right|.
$$

Recall that $x_m \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, which implies $\cos(\pi x_m) \geq 0$. Hence, we can bound the above from below by:

$$
(ab)^{s_m} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{2}} - \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} a^{s_j-s_m} \frac{1 + \cos(b^{s_j-s_m} \pi x_m)}{1 + x_m} \right) \geq
$$

$$
\geq (ab)^{s_m} \left( \frac{2}{3} - 4 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a^j \right) = (ab)^{s_m} \left( \frac{2}{3} - \frac{4a}{1-a} \right).
$$

Therefore, we get:

$$
\left| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} r_j a^{s_j} \left( \cos (b^{s_j} \pi y_m) - \cos (b^{s_j} \pi x) \right) \right| \geq
$$

$$
\geq \left| \sum_{j=m}^{\infty} r_j a^{s_j} \left( \cos (b^{s_j} \pi y_m) - \cos (b^{s_j} \pi x) \right) \right| - \left| \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} r_j a^{s_j} \left( \cos (b^{s_j} \pi y_m) - \cos (b^{s_j} \pi x) \right) \right|
\geq
$$

$$
\geq (ab)^{s_m} \left( \frac{2}{3} - \frac{4a}{1-a} - \frac{\pi}{ab-1} \right) \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{m}{ab-1} \to \infty,
$$

since $ab > 1$ and $\frac{2}{3} - \frac{4a}{1-a} - \frac{\pi}{ab-1} > 0$. \qed
Recall that the $\sigma$-ideal of Lebesgue’s null sets is ccc, i.e., every family of pairwise disjoint Borel sets of positive Lebesgue’s measure is countable.

**Proposition 3.8.** The set of functions $f \in C[0,1]$ such that $\lambda(D(f)) > 0$ is Haar-countable in $C[0,1]$.

**Proof.** Denote by $A$ the set of functions $f \in C[0,1]$ such that $\lambda(L(f)) > 0$ and note that each function $f \in C[0,1]$ such that $\lambda(D(f)) > 0$ is in $A$. Moreover, analogously to the proof of Proposition 3.3, we get that $A$ is Borel, because

\[
A = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{M \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ f \in C[0,1] : \lambda(L_M(f)) \geq \frac{1}{k} \right\}.
\]

Let $a \in (0,1)$ and $b \in \mathbb{N}$ be as in Lemma 3.7 and let $\varphi : \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N} \to C[0,1]$ be given by:

\[
\varphi(\alpha)(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{\alpha(j)} a^j \cos(b^j \pi x)
\]

for each $\alpha \in \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$ and $x \in [0,1]$. Continuity of each $\varphi(\alpha)$ as well as continuity of $\varphi$ are obvious.

We claim that $\varphi$ witnesses that $A$ is Haar-countable. Suppose, to the contrary, that there is an $h \in C[0,1]$ and an uncountable set $T \subseteq \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$ such that $\varphi(\alpha) \in A + h$ for each $\alpha \in T$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \alpha(i) \neq \beta(i)\}$ is infinite for each two distinct $\alpha, \beta \in T$ (since for every $\alpha \in \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$ there are only countably many $\beta \in \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$ such that $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \alpha(i) \neq \beta(i)\}$ is finite).

For $\alpha \in T$, consider the sets $L(\varphi(\alpha) - h)$. They are Borel (cf. Lemma 3.1) and of positive Lebesgue’s measure. By the ccc property, we conclude that there are $\alpha, \beta \in T$, $\alpha \neq \beta$ such that $L(\varphi(\alpha) - h) \cap L(\varphi(\beta) - h) \neq \emptyset$. Let $x$ belong to that intersection.

Let $(s_i)$ be the increasing enumeration of the set $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \alpha(i) \neq \beta(i)\}$ and denote $r_j = s_j - s_{j-1} \in \{-1,1\}$. Observe that:

\[
\frac{\varphi(\alpha)(y) - \varphi(\beta)(y) - \varphi(\alpha)(x) - \varphi(\beta)(x)}{y-x} = 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} r_j a^{x_j} \left( \cos(b^{x_j} \pi y) - \cos(b^{x_j} \pi x) \right)
\]

for any $y \in [0,1]$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.7, the above expression is unbounded. On the other hand, there are $M_\alpha, M_\beta \in \mathbb{N}$ witnessing that $\varphi(\alpha) - h$ and $\varphi(\beta) - h$ are Lipschitz at $x$. Thus:

\[
\left| \frac{\varphi(\alpha)(y) - \varphi(\beta)(y) - \varphi(\alpha)(x) - \varphi(\beta)(x)}{y-x} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\varphi(\alpha)(y) - h(y) - \varphi(\alpha)(x) - h(x)}{y-x} \right| + \left| \frac{\varphi(\beta)(y) - h(y) - \varphi(\beta)(x) - h(x)}{y-x} \right| \leq M_\alpha + M_\beta
\]

for any $y \in [0,1]$. This is a contradiction. \hfill $\Box$

The next table summarizes results of Sections 2 and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$A = { f \in SD : \lambda(D(f)) \in A }$</th>
<th>$0$</th>
<th>$(0,1)$</th>
<th>${1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haar-$\mathcal{E}$</td>
<td>Haar-countable</td>
<td>Haar-finite</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Multidimensional case

In this Section, we study nowhere differentiable functions on \([0, 1]^k\), i.e., functions defined on \([0, 1]^k\) which do not have a finite directional derivative at any point along any vector. Such functions exist, however, it is hard to find a suitable example in the literature. Therefore, below we provide one for \(k = 2\) (with an informal proof).

Example 4.1. Let \(T \in C[0, 1]\) be the Takagi function. We define a new function:

\[
F(x_1, x_2) = T\left(\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}\right).
\]

Choose a point \((0, 0) \neq (\chi_0, \chi_1) \in [0, 1]^2\) and a unit vector \(v \in \mathbb{R}^2\). Denote by \(\ell\) a line that goes through \((\chi_1, \chi_2)\) and that is parallel to \(v\). For every point \((x_1, x_2)\) of \(\ell \cap [0, 1]^2\), consider the circle \(O(x_1, x_2)\) centered at the origin that passes through \((x_1, x_2)\). Let \(x\) be the \(x\)-intercept of \(O(x_1, x_2)\) and define a one-to-one correspondence between \([0, 1]\) and \(\ell \cap [0, 1]^2\) by \(x \mapsto (x_1, x_2)\). We will always denote by \(x\) a point on \([0, 1]\) that corresponds to the point \((x_1, x_2)\) on \(\ell\). Note that \(F(x_2, x_2) = F(x, 0) = T(x)\). Denote by \(d^2_v\) the standard euclidian metric on \([0, 1]^2\). Moreover, denote by \(a\) and \(b\) the slope of \(\ell\) and its \(y\)-intercept respectively. Choose two sequences \((u^n)\) and \((v^n)\) that tend to \(\chi\). Now, for every \(n\), assume that all elements of \((u^k)_{k \geq n}\) and \((v^k)_{k \geq n}\) are within some interval \((\alpha_n, \beta_n)\). Without loss of generality, we may assume that both \((\alpha_n)\) and \((\beta_n)\) tend to \(\chi\). Using elementary analytical geometry and a little bit of estimation, we can show that:

\[
\frac{\alpha_n \sqrt{a^2 + 1}}{\sqrt{\beta_n^2(a^2 + 1) - b^2}} |u^n - v^n| \leq d^2_v((u^n_1, u^n_2), (u^n_1, u^n_2)) \leq \frac{\beta_n \sqrt{a^2 + 1}}{\sqrt{\alpha_n^2(a^2 + 1) - b^2}} |u^n - v^n|.
\]

For simplicity, let \(c_n = \frac{\alpha_n \sqrt{a^2 + 1}}{\sqrt{\beta_n^2(a^2 + 1) - b^2}}\) and \(d_n = \frac{\beta_n \sqrt{a^2 + 1}}{\sqrt{\alpha_n^2(a^2 + 1) - b^2}}\). Observe that \((c_n)\) and \((d_n)\) have the same limit. Note that:

\[
\frac{c_n}{d^2_v((u^n_1, u^n_2), (u^n_1, u^n_2))} \leq \frac{|T(u^n) - T(v^n)|}{|u^n - v^n|} \leq \frac{d_n}{d^2_v((u^n_1, u^n_2), (u^n_1, u^n_2))}.
\]

Finally, it follows by the Squeeze Theorem that if \(F\) is differentiable at \((\chi_1, \chi_2)\) in the direction \(v\), then \(T\) must be differentiable at \(\chi\). This is impossible. Thus, \(F\) is not differentiable at any point of \([0, 1]^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}\) in any direction. To complete the proof, proceed analogously for \((\chi_0, \chi_1) = (0, 0)\) and use the fact that \(T\) does not possess a finite one-sided derivative at 0.

Now, we want to show that, unlike the one-dimensional case, the set of somewhere differentiable functions on \([0, 1]^k\) is not Haar-null. Actually, this follows from a more general fact. We will need the following notion.

A subset \(A\) of an abelian Polish group \(X\) is called thick if for any compact set \(K \subseteq X\) there is an \(x \in X\) such that \(K + x \subseteq A\) (for more on thick sets see [5, Section 7]).

Remark 4.2. The following are equivalent for any Borel set \(A\):

(a) \(A\) is thick;
(b) \(A\) is not Haar-(\(P(X) \setminus \{X\}\));
(c) \(A\) is not Haar-I for any proper semi-ideal \(I\).

Moreover, if \(A\) is arbitrary, then (b) and (c) are equivalent and (a) implies both of them.
Proof. Indeed, (b)$\iff$(c) is trivial. As $f[{0,1}]^N$ is compact for every continuous $f$, thickness of $A$ ensures us that $A$ is not Haar-$\mathcal{P}(X \setminus \{X\})$. Conversely, if $A$ is not thick, then the compact set $K$ witnessing it is a continuous image of $\{0,1\}^N$. This continuous map witnesses that $A$ is Haar-$\mathcal{P}(X \setminus \{X\})$ provided that it is Borel.

We are ready to prove the aforementioned general result.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let $k > 1$. The set of somewhere differentiable functions is thick in $C[0,1]^k$.

**Proof.** We will assume that $k = 2$. In other cases the reasoning is similar.

Let $C$ be the ternary Cantor set (which is homeomorphic to $\{0,1\}^N$) and $\varphi: C \to C[0,1]^2$ be continuous. We will define a continuous function $f : [0,1]^2 \to \R$ such that $\varphi(c) - f$ is differentiable along $(0,1)$ in each point of the form $(c,x)$ for all $c \in C$.

Let $F : C \times [0,1] \to \R$ be given by $F \restriction \{c\} \times [0,1] = \varphi(c) \restriction \{c\} \times [0,1]$ for each $c \in C$.

We need to show that $F$ is continuous. Fix any $(c_0,y_0) \in C \times [0,1]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\varphi(c_0)$ is continuous at $(c_0,y_0)$, there is an open neighborhood $(c_0,y_0) \in U \subseteq [0,1]^2$ such that $|\varphi(c_0)(x,y) - \varphi(c_0)(c_0,y_0)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for every $(x,y) \in U$. Moreover, since $\varphi$ is continuous, there is an open neighborhood $c_0 \in V \subseteq [0,1]$ such that $||\varphi(c) - \varphi(c_0)|| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for each $c \in V \cap C$. Thus, we have:

$$
|F(c,y) - F(c_0,y_0)| = |\varphi(c)(c,y) - \varphi(c_0)(c_0,y_0)| 
\leq |\varphi(c)(c,y) - \varphi(c_0)(c,y)| + |\varphi(c_0)(c,y) - \varphi(c_0)(c_0,y_0)| 
\leq ||\varphi(c) - \varphi(c_0)|| + |\varphi(c_0)(c,y) - \varphi(c_0)(c_0,y_0)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon
$$

for all $(c,y) \in U \cap ((V \cap C) \times [0,1])$. Hence, $F$ is continuous.

Using Tietze extension theorem we get a continuous function $f : [0,1]^2 \to \R$ such that $f \restriction C \times [0,1] = F$. Then, $\varphi(c) - f \restriction \{c\} \times [0,1]$ is constantly equal to 0 for each $c \in C$. Hence, $\varphi(c) - f$ is somewhere differentiable and we are done.

Although the set of somewhere differentiable functions on $[0,1]^k$ is not Haar-$\mathcal{I}$ for any semi-ideal $\mathcal{I}$, it is meager. In the one-dimensional case this was shown by Banach (see [4]). The following reasoning is only a slight modification of the one-dimensional proof.

**Proposition 4.4.** The set of nowhere differentiable functions on $[0,1]^k$ is comeager in $C[0,1]^k$.

**Proof.** We will consider $k = 2$, but the argument works for other $k$’s as well. Let $E_n$ be the set of these functions $f \in C[0,1]^2$ such that there is a pair $(x,y) \in [0,1 - \frac{1}{n}]^2$ and there is a unit vector $(v_1, v_2) \in [\frac{1}{n}, 1] \times [-1,1]$ such that for all $h \in (0, \frac{1}{n})$ it holds that $|f((x,y) + h(v_1, v_2)) - f(x,y)| < nh$. Similarly, let $F_n$ be the set of these functions $f \in C[0,1]^2$ such that there is a pair $(x,y) \in [0,1 - \frac{1}{n}]^2$ such that for all $h \in (0, \frac{1}{n})$ it holds that $|f(x,y + h) - f(x,y)| < nh$. It suffices to prove that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

a) $E_n$ is closed;

b) $F_n$ is closed;

c) $E_n$ is nowhere dense;

d) $F_n$ is nowhere dense;
and also that:

e) $C[0,1]^2 \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (E_n \cup F_n)$ is a subset of nowhere differentiable functions on $[0,1]^2$.

For $a)$ and $b)$, it is enough to use the argument from the standard one-dimensional case.

For $c)$, we will prove that for every two-dimensional piecewise linear function $g$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a function $f \notin E_n$ such that the norm of $f - g$ is below $\varepsilon$. Let $g$ and $\varepsilon$ be defined as above and let $M$ be equal to the maximal slope of $g$. Subsequently, choose $m$ such that $\frac{m\varepsilon}{n^2} > M + n$. Now, define a function $f(x,y) = g(x,y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{dist}(mx,Z)$. It is easy to see that $|f(x,y) - g(x,y)| < \varepsilon$ for all $(x,y)$. Let $(x,y) \in [0,1-\frac{1}{n}]^2$ and let $v = (v_1,v_2) \in [\frac{1}{n},1] \times [-1,1]$ be a unit vector. Observe that:

$$\left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial v} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial v} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} m v_1 \frac{\partial \text{dist}(.Z)}{\partial x} \right| > n.$$ 

For $d)$, we just repeat an argument we just gave.

Finally, for $e)$, let us suppose that $f \in C[0,1]^2 \setminus (\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n \cup \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} F_n)$, choose $(x,y) \in (0,1)^2$, and choose a unit vector $v$. There are two cases to consider, but they essentially come down to the same argument. If the vector $v$ is different than $(0,1)$, we will use the sets $E_n$, if not, we will use $F_n$. Without loss of generality, we will continue under assumption that $v = (0,1)$. Since $f \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C[0,1]^2 \setminus F_n$, it follows that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $(x,y) \in [0,1-\frac{1}{n}]^2$ there is an $h_n \in (0,\frac{1}{n})$ such that $|f(x,y+h_n) - f(x,y)| \geq nh_n$. It is now easy to see that $f$ is nowhere differentiable.

We end with an open problem which occurred during our studies.

Here, we examine the function $F: [0,1]^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $F(x,y) = T(x) + T(y)$, where $T: [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is the Takagi’s function. We considered this function in the context of nowhere differentiable functions on $[0,1]^2$ as $F$ seemed to be a nice example of such a function. It is obvious that it is differentiable neither along $(1,0)$ nor along $(1,0)$. Moreover, we managed to obtain one partial result. $F$ is differentiable at no point along $(1,1)$. However, we were unable to solve the following.

**Problem 4.5.** Is $F$ nowhere differentiable on $[0,1]^2$?
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