

TWO APPROXIMATION RESULTS FOR DIVERGENCE FREE VECTOR FIELDS

JESSE GOODMAN, FELIPE HERNANDEZ, AND DANIEL SPECTOR

ABSTRACT. In this paper we prove two approximation results for divergence free vector fields. The first is a form of an assertion of J. Bourgain and H. Brezis concerning the approximation of solenoidal charges in the strict topology: Given $F \in M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\operatorname{div} F = 0$ in the sense of distributions, there exist C^1 closed curves $\{\Gamma_{i,l}\}_{1,\dots,n_l} \times \mathbb{N}$, with parameterization by ar-length $\gamma_{i,l} \in C^1([0, L_{i,l}]; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $l \leq L_{i,l} \leq 2l$, for which

$$F = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n_l \cdot l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \dot{\gamma}_{i,l} \mathcal{H}^1|_{\Gamma_{i,l}}$$

weakly-star as measures and

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_l \cdot l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} |\Gamma_{i,l}| = 1.$$

The second, which is an almost immediate consequence of the first, is that smooth compactly supported functions are dense in

$$\left\{ F \in M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) : \operatorname{div} F = 0 \right\}$$

with respect to the strict topology.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

In the forthcoming paper [6], the second and third authors give an affirmative answer to the Euclidean analogue of a question of Jean Bourgain and Haim Brezis [3, Open Problem 1 on p. 295] on the optimal Lorentz regularity of solutions to a Div-Curl system, the following

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose $F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$. The function $Z = \operatorname{curl} I_2 F$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{curl} Z &= F \\ \operatorname{div} Z &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

and there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(1) \quad \|Z\|_{L^{3/2,1}(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|F\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

In particular,

$$\frac{Z(x)}{|x-y|} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$$

for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

Here I_2 denotes the Newtonian potential, while in the sequel we will also use I_α to denote the Riesz potential of order $\alpha \in (0, d)$ (for a precise definition see [13, p. 117] or [6]).

Remark 1.2. This estimate implies, for example, new regularity results for Maxwell's equations, i.e. in the static case one can take $F = J$ as the electric current density and deduce an optimal Lorentz space estimate for the magnetic field $B = Z$.

The estimate (1) is deduced as a consequence of the following result concerning fractional integration.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $d \geq 2$ and $\alpha \in (0, d)$. There exists a constant $C = C(\alpha, d) > 0$ such that*

$$(2) \quad \|I_\alpha F\|_{L^{d/(d-\alpha),1}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|F\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

for all fields $F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\operatorname{div} F = 0$ in the sense of distributions.

Theorem 1.3 asserts that I_α embeds

$$\{F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d) : \operatorname{div} F = 0\}$$

into the Lorentz space $L^{d/(d-\alpha),1}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is the same target space known for the embedding for functions in the Hardy space [4, p. 1032] or for curl free L^1 functions [12, Theorem 1.1]. This is noteworthy because these three spaces allow different kinds of singularities in their weak-star limits. The assumption that F is an element of the Hardy space is the strongest possible assumption in that any weak-star limit of a bounded sequence is necessarily absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Slightly weaker is the assumption that F is curl free, in which case we may identify F with ∇u for some $u \in \dot{W}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In particular, from the $BV(\mathbb{R}^d)$ theory one has that any weak-star limit of a norm bounded sequence does not concentrate on a set smaller than dimension $d - 1$ (see [1, Lemma 3.76]). Theorem 1.3 concerns the case of divergence free functions, for which the weak-star limit of a smooth norm-bounded sequence may concentrate on a one-dimensional set, though not smaller (see [8]). On the other hand, one cannot hope to prove a result for measures which concentrate on zero-dimensional sets, as the estimate is false for a Dirac mass.

This relation between divergence free functions and concentrations along one-dimensional sets is also manifest in the proof. In particular, we begin with a result of S. Smirnov [10] which asserts that any divergence free $F \in M_b(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$ can be expressed in terms of curves. To explain this idea, consider a smooth curve $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ parametrized by arc length via $\gamma: [0, l] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|\dot{\gamma}(t)| = 1$. Then, by construction, the total length of Γ is l . We can pair γ against $\Phi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$ to form

$$\Phi \mapsto \int_0^l \dot{\gamma}(t) \cdot \Phi(\gamma(t)) dt,$$

a bounded linear functional on $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$. This can be identified with a Radon measure R_γ in the sense that

$$\langle R_\gamma, \Phi \rangle = \int_0^l \dot{\gamma}(t) \cdot \Phi(\gamma(t)) dt$$

for all $\Phi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$. In fact, this Radon measure is given by $R_\gamma = \dot{\gamma} \mathcal{H}^1|_\Gamma$, where $\mathcal{H}^1|_\Gamma$ is one-dimensional Hausdorff measure restricted to Γ . Moreover, the norm of this measure is $\|R_\gamma\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)} = l$, the length of Γ .

Smirnov's result states in part that for any fixed $l > 0$, there is a measure μ supported on the set \mathcal{C}_l of curves of length l such that

$$\langle F, \Phi \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{C}_l} \langle R, \Phi \rangle d\mu(R)$$

for all $\Phi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$, and the total mass of μ is $l^{-1} \|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)}$. Furthermore, Smirnov's result identifies the distribution of the beginning and end points of the curves R , in terms of the total variation measure associated to F . As noted by J. Bourgain and H. Brezis in [2, 3], this implies an approximation in the strict topology by convex combinations of closed loops, which we here state as

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose $F \in M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is such that $\operatorname{div} F = 0$ in the sense of distributions. Then there exist C^1 closed curves $\Gamma_{i,l}$, which we parameterize by arclength via $\gamma_{i,l} \in C^1([0, L_{i,l}]; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $l \leq L_{i,l} \leq 2l$, such that*

$$F = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n_l \cdot l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \dot{\gamma}_{i,l} \mathcal{H}^1|_{\Gamma_{i,l}}$$

weakly-star in the sense of measures and

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_l \cdot l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} |\Gamma_{i,l}| = 1.$$

Smirnov's decomposition is in terms of curves of a fixed but arbitrary length. However, such a decomposition fails if we require the curves R to be closed loops: see [10, Example 2]. Theorem 1.4 shows that one can approximate using loops that are both smooth and closed. The price is that our result is a limiting statement, in which the lengths of the loops tend to infinity and may vary moderately, $l \leq L_{i,l} \leq 2l$. On the other hand, the second assertion of the theorem means that most of the $\Gamma_{i,l}$ will have lengths asymptotically close to l .

From Theorem 1.4 one argues that it suffices to prove the estimate (2) for piecewise C^1 closed curves, in which case the estimate reads

$$(3) \quad \|I_\alpha \dot{\gamma} \mathcal{H}^1|_\Gamma\|_{L^{d/(d-\alpha),1}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C' |\Gamma|.$$

The establishment of (3) in [6] is via an extension of a technique pioneered by the third author in [12] and clarified in [7, 11]. In particular, we show that (3) holds with a constant $C' > 0$ that depends only on α , the dimension, and the constant $C > 0$ in the ball growth condition for Γ :

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma \cap B(x, r)) \leq Cr,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $r > 0$. Of course, every C^1 closed loop satisfies (4) for some choice of constant. Therefore, to complete the proof it remains to show that any C^1 closed loop Γ can be written as the sum of piecewise C^1 closed loops Γ_i drawn from a family satisfying (4) with some universal constant, and that this construction increases the total length by a bounded factor. This is accomplished in [6, Lemma 4.1] by a construction we call the Surgery Lemma:

Lemma 1.5 (Surgery). *There exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for every C^1 closed curve Γ and every $\epsilon \in (0, 1/10)$ one can find piecewise C^1 closed curves $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i=1}^{N(\epsilon, \Gamma)}$ which satisfy*

(1)

$$\dot{\gamma} \mathcal{H}^1|_\Gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{N(\epsilon, \Gamma)} \dot{\gamma}_i \mathcal{H}^1|_{\Gamma_i}$$

(2) *Each Γ_i satisfies the ball growth condition*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma_i \cap B(x, r)) \leq C_1 [\epsilon^{-1}] r \quad \text{for all } r > 0.$$

(3) *The total length of the decomposition satisfies*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N(\epsilon, \Gamma)} |\Gamma_i| \leq (1 + C_2 \epsilon) |\Gamma|.$$

While Lemma 1.5 has a parameter $\epsilon > 0$ that can be chosen, to prove the inequality (3) we only utilize the lemma for a single choice of ϵ . Our decision to prove this more general result was because it did not increase the difficulty of proof substantially and is perhaps a result of independent interest.

The proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.3 and Lemma 1.5 can be found in [6]. However, we are not aware of a proof of Theorem 1.4, verifying Bourgain and Brezis' assertion concerning the deduction of a strict approximation from Smirnov's decomposition. Therefore an initial motivation of this paper, beyond announcing some of the result of [6], was to provide a proof of this assertion.

A secondary motivation is provided by the following interesting consequence of Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 1.6. *Suppose $F \in M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is such that $\operatorname{div} F = 0$ in the sense of distributions. Then there exists a sequence $F_l \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\operatorname{div} F_l = 0$ and*

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F_l \cdot \Phi \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi \cdot dF$$

and

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|F_l\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} = \|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

In particular, while the approximation of curl free functions by compactly supported measures in the strict topology is well-known and follows from a classical construction, the ability to approximate divergence free measures by smooth, *compactly supported* divergence free functions does not seem so obvious.

The remainder of this paper is dedicated to proofs of Theorems 1.4 and 1.6. Our approach is via probabilistic methods, and so we first recall the requisite preliminaries in Section 2 before proceeding to the proof in Section 3.

2. APPROXIMATING GENERAL INTEGRALS BY SUMS

Let μ be a finite non-zero measure on a measurable space $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{G})$, and let $h : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a \mathcal{G} -measurable function for which $\int h \, d\mu$ exists (including the case $\int h \, d\mu \in \{\pm\infty\}$). We wish to express $\int h \, d\mu$ as a limit of weighted sums: we wish to arrange

$$(5) \quad \int h \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n c_{i,n} h(x_{i,n}),$$

where $c_{i,n}$ are suitably chosen scalars and $x_{i,n} \in \mathcal{C}$ are suitably chosen points.

For common choices of space \mathcal{C} we can find points $x_{i,n} \in \mathcal{C}$ explicitly. For instance, when \mathcal{C} is a finite interval $[a, b]$, we can choose equally spaced points $x_{i,n} = a + i \frac{b-a}{n}$, with $c_{i,n} = 1/n$ for all i . Many other choices are possible: for instance, Simpson's rule for integration (with $n = 2k + 1$ odd and, for convenience, i running from 0 to $2k$) takes $x_{i,n} = a + i \frac{b-a}{2k}$ and $(c_{0,n}, \dots, c_{n,n}) = \frac{1}{6k}(1, 4, 2, 4, 2, \dots, 2, 4, 2, 4, 1)$.

The quantity in (5) resembles a Riemann sum approximation to the integral $\int_a^b h \, d\mu$. There are however notable differences: Riemann integration requires that the limit in (5) should exist when $h(x_{i,n})$ is replaced by the supremum, or infimum, of h over a suitably chosen subinterval to which $x_{i,n}$ belongs, and the limit should exist for any subdivision of $[a, b]$ into small subintervals [9, Chapter 6 and Theorem 11.33].

For a general space \mathcal{C} , there may be no natural way to choose points $x_{i,n}$ *a priori*. We will avoid this difficulty by choosing random points $X_{i,n}$. As we next explain, the limit (5) will equal $\int h \, d\mu$ almost surely with respect to the random choice of points $X_{i,n}$.

Normalize the measure μ to produce a probability measure $\nu = \mu / \|\mu\|_{M_b(\mathcal{C})}$ on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{G})$. Construct $\Omega = \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$, the set of infinite sequences with values in \mathcal{C} , equipped with the product σ -algebra $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. On the measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) , assign the

product measure $\mathbb{P} = \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Set $X_{i,n}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ to be the i^{th} coordinate function: for a sequence $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$, set $X_{i,n}(\omega) = \omega_i$. As $X_{i,n}$ is the same for all n , we will drop the subscript n and write X_i only. From the definition of product σ -algebra, the function $X_i: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is measurable as a mapping from the measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) to the measurable space $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{G})$.

In probabilistic language, the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ corresponds to a random experiment where each point X_i is chosen according to $\mathbb{P}(X_i \in A) = \nu(A) = \mu(A)/\mu(\mathcal{C})$ for any $A \in \mathcal{G}$. Furthermore, the events $\{X_i \in A_i\}$ are independent across different i . Thus the X_i 's are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables with values in \mathcal{C} and law ν . (As is standard, this formulation elides the role of the σ -algebra \mathcal{G} and the underlying probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$.)

Given a measurable function $h: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we can define real-valued random variables $H_i = h(X_i)$. Then the random variables H_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$, are themselves i.i.d. with

$$\mathbb{E}(H_i) = \int_{\Omega} h(X_i(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} h(\omega_i) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} h(x) d\nu(x)$$

by the properties of product measure.

In this setting, the Strong Law of Large Numbers, see for instance [5, Theorems 7.1–7.2], asserts that

$$(6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} h(x) d\nu(x) \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

More precisely, the function

$$\omega \mapsto \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i(\omega))$$

exists and equals the constant $\int_{\mathcal{C}} h(x) d\nu(x)$ for \mathbb{P} -almost-every ω . In other words, if we set $x_{i,n} = X_i(\omega)$ and $c_{i,n} = \|\mu\|_{M_b(\mathcal{C})}/n$, then the set $B_h = \{\omega \in \Omega: (5) \text{ holds}\}$ has $\mathbb{P}(B_h) = 1$, and in particular B_h is non-empty.

Note that the random points $X_{i,n}$ depend neither on n nor on h . However, the proof is non-constructive: the fact that B_h is non-empty implies the existence of some sequence of points $x_{i,n}$ for which (5) holds, but does not give a specific sequence. In particular, arguments based on (6) must contend with the fact that (5) holds only almost everywhere, and the exceptional set $\Omega \setminus B_h$ (and hence the chosen points $x_{i,n}$) may *a priori* depend on h .

The quantity inside the limit in (6) can be interpreted as the integral of h with respect to a random measure: if we define a measure η_n on \mathcal{C} by

$$\eta_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$$

(with δ_x denoting the Dirac mass at $x \in \mathcal{C}$) then

$$\int h(x) d\eta_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i).$$

If \mathcal{C} has additional structure, it is possible to argue that η_n converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to ν in the weak topology for measures on \mathcal{C} . In this case, (6) holds simultaneously for all continuous bounded functions h , a.s., with a single exceptional set of measure zero for all such functions h . Specifically, this will occur if we can find a countable collection of functions h_j that are convergence-determining for the weak topology for measures on \mathcal{C} . In the proof of Theorem 3.1 below, we construct such a collection, but since ν is not our primary focus we will carry out this part of the argument for F rather than for ν .

We encapsulate this discussion in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let μ be a non-zero finite measure on \mathcal{C} , and let $h : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any measurable function on \mathcal{C} for which $\int |h(x)|d\mu(x) < \infty$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\mu\|_{M_b(\mathcal{C})}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} h(x)d\mu(x) \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

holds with probability one, where $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of samples drawn independently from \mathcal{C} according to the law $\mu/\|\mu\|_{M_b(\mathcal{C})}$.

3. PROOFS

By Theorem A in [10] we have

$$(7) \quad \langle F, \Phi \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{C}_l} \langle R, \Phi \rangle d\mu(R),$$

where the measure μ satisfies $\|\mu\|_{M_b(\mathcal{C}_l)} = l^{-1}\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}$ and

$$\frac{F_{TV}}{l} = \int_{\mathcal{C}_l} \delta_{b(R)} d\mu(R) = \int_{\mathcal{C}_l} \delta_{e(R)} d\mu(R)$$

where $b(R)$ and $e(R)$ are the beginning and endpoints of the curve R and the total variation measure F_{TV} is the non-negative measure on \mathbb{R}^d defined by

$$\langle F_{TV}, \varphi \rangle = \sup_{\Phi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d), \|\Phi\|_{C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1} \langle F, \varphi \Phi \rangle$$

This implies the auxiliary

Theorem 3.1. *For any $l > 0$ there exists a sequence of curves $R_i \in \mathcal{C}_l$ satisfying the following conditions: For any $\Phi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$*

$$\langle F, \Phi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\langle R_i, \Phi \rangle}{l}.$$

Moreover, with $b(R)$ and $e(R)$ denoting the beginning and end points of the curve R , we have for any $\varphi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$(8) \quad \langle \|F\|, \varphi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \delta_{b(R_i)}, \varphi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \delta_{e(R_i)}, \varphi \rangle.$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1 using Theorem 2.1. Let $\nu = l\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}^{-1}\mu$ be the measure obtained by scaling the measure μ in (7). Define $\mathbb{P} := \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}_l^{\mathbb{N}})$ to be the product measure on $\mathcal{C}_l^{\mathbb{N}}$, as in Section 2. Further let $\{\Phi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be dense sequences of functions in $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, respectively. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the continuous functions $h_j : \mathcal{C}_l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $h_j^b : \mathcal{C}_l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $h_j^e : \mathcal{C}_l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h_j(R) := \langle R, \Phi_j \rangle, \quad h_j^b(R) := \langle \delta_{b(R)}, \varphi_j \rangle, \quad h_j^e(R) := \langle \delta_{e(R)}, \varphi_j \rangle.$$

Note that the inequalities

$$|h_j(R)| \leq \|\Phi_j\|_{C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} l, \quad |h_j^b(R)| \leq \|\varphi_j\|_{C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad |h_j^e(R)| \leq \|\varphi_j\|_{C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

imply the moment conditions

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}_l} |h_j| d\nu < \infty, \quad \int_{\mathcal{C}_l} |h_j^b| d\nu < \infty, \quad \int_{\mathcal{C}_l} |h_j^e| d\nu < \infty.$$

By Theorem 2.1, for each j , the equalities

$$\begin{aligned}\langle F, \Phi_j \rangle &= \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{l} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle R_i, \Phi_j \rangle, \\ \langle \|F\|, \varphi_j \rangle &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \delta_{b(R_i)}, \varphi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \delta_{e(R_i)}, \varphi \rangle\end{aligned}$$

hold for $\mathbb{P} = \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -almost-every sequence $\{R_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$. In particular, the probability that this limit holds for *all* j is also one, since we have only a countable union of null sets to avoid, and so we may choose a sequence, which we also denote by $\{R_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, for which all of these limits hold. This verifies the claim in the theorem for these dense subsets in $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For arbitrary $\Phi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, we utilize the equalities

$$\begin{aligned}\langle F, \Phi \rangle &= \langle F, \Phi_j \rangle + \langle F, \Phi - \Phi_j \rangle, \\ \langle R, \Phi \rangle &= \langle R, \Phi_j \rangle + \langle R, \Phi - \Phi_j \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

to write

$$\langle F, \Phi \rangle = \langle F, \Phi - \Phi_j \rangle + \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{l} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle R_i, \Phi \rangle + \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{l} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle R_i, \Phi_j - \Phi \rangle.$$

Then the bounds

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle F, \Phi - \Phi_j \rangle| &\leq \|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \|\Phi - \Phi_j\|_{C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \\ |\langle R, \Phi - \Phi_j \rangle| &\leq l \|\Phi - \Phi_j\|_{C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}\end{aligned}$$

imply

$$\langle F, \Phi \rangle = \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{l} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle R_i, \Phi \rangle + O(\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \|\Phi - \Phi_j\|_{C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}),$$

and it suffices to send $\Phi_j \rightarrow \Phi$. The argument for the other two limits is similar. \square

We now prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $F \in M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\operatorname{div} F = 0$, and by scaling let us assume $\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} = 1$. By Theorem 3.1 there exists a sequence of curves $R_{i,l} \in \mathcal{C}_l$ such that

$$\langle F, \Phi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \langle R_{i,l}, \Phi \rangle.$$

Let us write $\tilde{R}_{i,l}$ for the measure which consists of a closed loop formed by adjoining to $R_{i,l}$ the straight line segment connecting the end point $e(R_{i,l})$ to the beginning point $b(R_{i,l})$. Write $\bar{R}_{i,l}$ for the measure which is integration along the straight line segment in reverse, from beginning to end. Then the preceding result may be rewritten as

$$\langle F, \Phi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \langle \tilde{R}_{i,l}, \Phi \rangle + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \langle \bar{R}_{i,l}, \Phi \rangle.$$

We claim that the result will follow once we have established that

$$(9) \quad \limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \|\bar{R}_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} = 0.$$

Indeed, this directly yields the weak convergence

$$\langle F, \Phi \rangle = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \langle \tilde{R}_{i,l}, \Phi \rangle,$$

while the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \langle \tilde{R}_{i,l}, \Phi \rangle \right| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \|R_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \|\bar{R}_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \|\bar{R}_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \end{aligned}$$

shows that it is actually a convergence in the strict topology of measures. Therefore, utilizing that $\tilde{R}_{i,l} \in \mathbb{I}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we may approximate $\tilde{R}_{i,l}$ by smooth, closed loops $\tilde{R}_{i,l,\eta}$ in the strict topology, i.e. weak-star convergence

$$\langle F, \Phi \rangle = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \langle \tilde{R}_{i,l,\eta}, \Phi \rangle$$

and an upper bound for the total variations

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \|\tilde{R}_{i,l,\eta}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1.$$

In particular, a diagonal argument yields

$$\langle F, \Phi \rangle = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \frac{1}{l} \langle \tilde{R}_{i,l,\eta_l}, \Phi \rangle$$

and

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \frac{1}{l} \|\tilde{R}_{i,l,\eta_l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1.$$

The former limit is precisely the weak-star convergence of the convex sum of loops claimed, while it implies

$$\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \frac{1}{l} \|\tilde{R}_{i,l,\eta_l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)},$$

as the total variation is lower semicontinuous with respect to the weak-star convergence. Thus, when combined with the latter inequality, using $\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} = 1$ one obtains the convergence of total variations claimed.

It only remains to adapt the notation to match the statement of the theorem. Observe that we have found an approximation in terms of smooth curves \tilde{R}_{i,l,η_l} , which we denote by $\Gamma_{i,l} := \tilde{R}_{i,l,\eta_l}$. For these smooth curves $\Gamma_{i,l}$, we can, in turn, find parametrizations by arclength $\gamma_{i,l} \in C^1([0, L_{i,l}]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ (with $l \leq L_{i,l} \leq 2l$). Then our result in this notation reads

$$F = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n_l \cdot l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \dot{\gamma}_{i,l} \mathcal{H}^1|_{\Gamma_{i,l}}$$

weakly-star as measures with

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_l \cdot l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} |\Gamma_{i,l}| = 1.$$

We therefore proceed with the proof of the claim (9). If we recall from the preceding Theorem that $b(R), e(R)$ denote the beginning and ending of the curve R , we can write

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \|\bar{R}_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|b(R_{i,l})-e(R_{i,l})| \leq \epsilon l} \frac{1}{l} \|\bar{R}_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|b(R_{i,l})-e(R_{i,l})| > \epsilon l} \frac{1}{l} \|\bar{R}_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

For the first term, we can estimate by the length of the curve to obtain the bound

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{|b(R_{i,l})-e(R_{i,l})| \leq \epsilon l} \frac{1}{l} \|\bar{R}_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \epsilon.$$

Meanwhile, for the second term we have that $\|\bar{R}_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq l$ and so

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{|b(R_{i,l})-e(R_{i,l})| > \epsilon l} \frac{1}{l} \|\bar{R}_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \frac{\#\{R_i : |b(R_{i,l}) - e(R_{i,l})| > \epsilon l\}}{n}.$$

As

$$\{R_i : |b(R_{i,l}) - e(R_{i,l})| > \epsilon l\} \subset \{R_i : b(R_{i,l}) \in B(0, \epsilon l/2)^c\} \cup \{R_i : e(R_{i,l}) \in B(0, \epsilon l/2)^c\},$$

we can bound the second term by

$$\frac{\#\{R_i : b(R_{i,l}) \in B(0, \epsilon l/2)^c\}}{n} + \frac{\#\{R_i : e(R_{i,l}) \in B(0, \epsilon l/2)^c\}}{n}.$$

We claim that the double limit in l and n of this quantity converges to zero. To this end, we let $\varphi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a cutoff function, i.e. $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$, $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B(0, \epsilon l/2)$, and $\varphi \equiv 1$ on $B(0, \epsilon l/2 - 1)$. For such a function we see that, for l sufficiently large,

$$F_{TV}(B(0, \epsilon l/2 - 1)) \leq \langle F_{TV}, \varphi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \delta_{b(R_{i,l})}, \varphi \rangle \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{R_i : b(R_{i,l}) \in B(0, \epsilon l/2)\}}{n}.$$

In particular,

$$1 = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} F_{TV}(B(0, \epsilon l/2 - 1)) \leq \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{R_i : b(R_{i,l}) \in B(0, \epsilon l/2)\}}{n},$$

and therefore

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{R_i : b(R_{i,l}) \in B(0, \epsilon l/2)^c\}}{n} \leq 1 - \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{R_i : b(R_{i,l}) \in B(0, \epsilon l/2)\}}{n} = 0$$

Thus we have shown that

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{l} \|\bar{R}_{i,l}\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \epsilon$$

and it suffices to send ϵ to zero and the claim is proved. \square

We conclude by proving Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let $\{\Gamma_{i,l}\}_{\{1, \dots, n_l\} \times \mathbb{N}}$ be the smooth, closed loops given by Theorem 1.4 for which

$$F = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n_l \cdot l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \dot{\gamma}_{i,l} \mathcal{H}^1|_{\Gamma_{i,l}}$$

and

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_l \cdot l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} |\Gamma_{i,l}| = 1.$$

Denote by G_l the l^{th} approximation of F by loops, i.e.

$$G_l := \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n_l \cdot l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \dot{\gamma}_{i,l} \mathcal{H}^1|_{\Gamma_{i,l}}.$$

Then if $\{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a smooth, compactly supported approximation of the identity, we claim $F_l := G_l * \rho_l$ has the desired properties.

In particular, it is smooth by properties of ρ_l , compactly supported by the compact support of the loops and ρ_l , and for any $\Phi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$(10) \quad \langle F_l, \Phi \rangle = \langle G_l * \rho_l, \Phi \rangle = \langle G_l, \Phi * \rho_l \rangle.$$

This shows firstly that F_l is divergence free, since if $\Phi = \nabla \varphi$ for some $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the fact that derivatives commute with convolution implies that

$$\langle F_l, \nabla \varphi \rangle = \langle G_l, \nabla(\varphi * \rho_l) \rangle = -\langle \operatorname{div} G_l, \varphi * \rho_l \rangle = 0,$$

as $\varphi * \rho_l \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Toward the convergence, letting $l \rightarrow \infty$ in (10), utilizing that $\Phi * \rho_l \rightarrow \Phi$ in the strong topology of $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $G_l \rightarrow F$ weakly-star, we obtain

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \langle F_l * \rho_l, \Phi \rangle = \langle F, \Phi \rangle,$$

which is to say that the sequence $\{F_l\} \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ converges to F in the weak-star topology. As this implies

$$\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|F_l\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)},$$

it only remains to show that

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|F_l\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}$$

to obtain the strict convergence. However, Fubini's theorem and the fact that $\int \rho_l = 1$ implies

$$\|F_l\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (G_l)_{TV} * \rho_l \, dx \leq \|G_l\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)},$$

and since

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|G_l\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}{n_l \cdot l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} |\Gamma_{i,l}| = \|F\|_{M_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)},$$

the result is demonstrated. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first author was supported in part by a grant from the Marsden Fund administered by the Royal Society of New Zealand. The second author was supported by the Fannie and John Hertz Foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco, and Diego Pallara, *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000. MR1857292 ↑2
- [2] Jean Bourgain and Haïm Brezis, *New estimates for the Laplacian, the div-curl, and related Hodge systems*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **338** (2004), no. 7, 539–543. MR2057026 ↑2
- [3] ———, *New estimates for elliptic equations and Hodge type systems*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **9** (2007), no. 2, 277–315. MR2293957 ↑1, 2
- [4] José R. Dorronsoro, *Differentiability properties of functions with bounded variation*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **38** (1989), no. 4, 1027–1045. MR1029687 ↑2
- [5] Rick Durrett, *Probability: theory and examples*, Third, Duxbury Advanced Series, Duxbury, 2005. ↑5
- [6] Felipe Hernandez and Daniel Spector, *Fractional integration and optimal estimates for elliptic systems*, preprint, arXiv:2008.05639. ↑1, 3, 4

- [7] Steven G. Krantz, Marco M. Peloso, and Daniel Spector, *Some remarks on L^1 embeddings in the subelliptic setting*, *Nonlinear Anal.* **202** (2021), 112149. MR4156975 ↑3
- [8] Maria Roginskaya, *Singularity of vector valued measures in terms of fourier transform*, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* **12** (2006), no. 2, 213–223. MR2224396 ↑2
- [9] Walter Rudin, *Principles of mathematical analysis*, Third, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Auckland-Düsseldorf, 1976. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics. MR0385023 ↑4
- [10] S. K. Smirnov, *Decomposition of solenoidal vector charges into elementary solenoids, and the structure of normal one-dimensional flows*, *Algebra i Analiz* **5** (1993), no. 4, 206–238. MR1246427 ↑2, 3, 6
- [11] Daniel Spector, *A noninequality for the fractional gradient*, *Port. Math.* **76** (2019), no. 2, 153–168. MR4065096 ↑3
- [12] ———, *An optimal Sobolev embedding for L^1* , *J. Funct. Anal.* **279** (2020), no. 3, 108559, 26. MR4093790 ↑2, 3
- [13] Elias M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 30, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970. MR0290095 ↑1

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND, PRIVATE BAG 92019, AUCKLAND 1142, NEW ZEALAND

Email address, J. Goodman: `jesse.goodman@auckland.ac.nz`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BUILDING 380, STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305, USA

Email address, F. Hernandez: `felipehb@stanford.edu`

OKINAWA INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY GRADUATE UNIVERSITY, NONLINEAR ANALYSIS UNIT, 1919-1 TANCHI, ONNA-SON, KUNIGAMI-GUN, OKINAWA, JAPAN

Email address, D. Spector: `daniel.spector@oist.jp`