

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

## **CONVEXITY WITH RESPECT TO EULER-LAGRANGE DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS**

JUNIUS COLBY KEGLEY

# CONVEXITY WITH RESPECT TO EULER-LAGRANGE DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS

J. COLBY KEGLEY

**This paper is concerned with the problem of characterizing sub-( $L$ ) functions, where  $L$  is the Euler-Lagrange operator for the functional  $I_{cd}[y] = \int_c^d \left[ \sum_{j=0}^n p_j(D^j y)^2 \right]$ , with  $n$  a positive integer,  $[c, d]$  a subinterval of a fixed interval  $[a, b]$ , and  $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_n$  continuous real-valued functions on  $[a, b]$  with  $p_n(x) > 0$  on this interval. Under certain hypotheses on the operator  $L$ , it is shown that if  $f$  is a function in the domain of  $L$  on a subinterval  $[c, d]$  of  $[a, b]$ , then the statement that  $f$  is sub-( $L$ ) on  $[c, d]$  is equivalent to each of the following conditions: (i)  $(-1)^n Lf(x) \leq 0$  on  $[c, d]$  (ii)  $I_{cd}[y] \geq I_{cd}[f]$  whenever  $y$  is a function having continuous derivatives of the first  $n - 1$  orders with  $D^{n-1}y$  having a piecewise continuous derivative on  $[c, d]$  such that  $D^{j-1}y$  and  $D^{j-1}f$  have the same value at  $c$  and at  $d$  for  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , and  $y(x) - f(x) \leq 0$  on  $[c, d]$ .**

Section 2 is devoted to the definition and equivalent formulizations of Euler-Lagrange operators and to a discussion of adjoint operators. In § 3 it is shown that, under a hypothesis which is equivalent to the operator  $L$  being nonoscillatory on  $[a, b]$ ,  $L$  admits a factorization of the form  $(-1)^n L_0^* L_0$ , where  $L_0 y = \sum_{j=0}^n r_j D^j y$  for suitable  $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_n$ . Under the further hypothesis that the operator  $L_0$  possesses the "property  $W$ " of Polya [3], it is established that  $L$  can be written as a composition of first order real linear operators.

In § 4, the analogue of Polya's mean-value theorem in [3] is obtained for  $L$  under the above hypotheses on  $L$  and  $L_0$ . This theorem is used in §§ 5 and 6 to give characterizations, which are generalizations of results of Bonsall [1] and Reid [5] on convexity with respect to second order operators, of sub-( $L$ ) functions in terms of the operator  $L$  and the functional  $I_{cd}$ , as well as a theorem on the constancy of sign of the Green's function for a certain incompatible boundary-value problem.

Finally, in § 7, it is proved under the above assumptions on  $L$  and  $L_0$  that the null-space of  $L$  is a  $2n$ -parameter family in the sense of Tornheim [7], although the relationship between sub-( $L$ ) functions and

---

Received July 24, 1964. The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Professor W. T. Reid for his valuable suggestions and assistance throughout the preparation of this Ph.D. dissertation. (State University of Iowa, August, 1964). The research for this paper was performed while the author was a Research Assistant, supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under grant AF-AFOSR-438-63.

functions which are convex with respect to this family remains undecided.

Matrix notation will be used throughout; in particular, a vector is a matrix having one column. If  $M$  is a matrix, then  $M^*$  denotes its transpose. If  $M$  is a symmetric matrix, (i.e.,  $M = M^*$ ), then  $M$  is *nonnegative* ( $M \geq 0$ ) if and only if  $\eta^* M \eta$  is a nonnegative real number for all admissible vectors  $\eta$ . The symbol  $E_k$  is used to denote the  $k \times k$  identity matrix,  $0$  is used to denote the zero matrix of arbitrary dimensions, and, for  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $e^j$  denotes the vector  $[\delta_{ij}]_{i=1}^n$ . If  $M$  is a function matrix, (i.e., a matrix of real functions), then  $M$  is said to be continuous, differentiable, etc., whenever each of its elements has the corresponding property. If  $M$  is a differentiable function matrix, then  $DM$  denotes the matrix of derivatives of the elements of  $M$ .

All functions appearing are real-valued. In particular, if  $k$  is a nonnegative integer and  $[c, d]$  is a subinterval of  $[a, b]$ , then  $C^k[c, d]$  denotes the class of all real-valued functions which have continuous derivatives of the first  $k$  orders on  $[c, d]$ . The symbol  $\mathcal{A}^n[c, d]$  will stand for the class of all functions  $w$  in  $C^{n-1}[c, d]$  for which  $D^{n-1}w$  has a piecewise continuous derivative on  $[c, d]$ , and  $\mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$  is the class of all those functions  $w$  in  $\mathcal{A}^n[c, d]$  such that  $D^{j-1}w(c) = 0 = D^{j-1}w(d)$  for  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . Also,  $R^k$  denotes the class of all  $k$ -tuples of real numbers. Finally, if  $f$  is an integrable function and  $c$  is a point in its domain, then  $\int_c^x f$  denotes the function whose value at  $x$  is  $\int_c^x f$ .

**2. Properties of differential operators.** Let  $[a, b]$  be a nondegenerate compact interval and, for each  $\alpha$  and each  $\beta$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ , let  $f_{\alpha\beta}$  be a continuous real-valued function on  $[a, b]$ . The first problem of this section is to examine the form of the Euler-Lagrange operator  $L$  which corresponds to the functional  $I_{cd}$ , where  $[c, d]$  is a subinterval of  $[a, b]$ , defined on  $\mathcal{A}^n[c, d]$  by

$$(2.1) \quad I_{cd}[y] = \int_c^d \left[ \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0}^n f_{\alpha\beta} D^\alpha y D^\beta y \right].$$

By definition, a function  $y$  belongs to the domain of  $L$  on a subinterval  $[c, d]$  if and only if  $y \in C^n[c, d]$  and there exists a function  $\varphi[y]$  in  $C^0[c, d]$  such that for every  $w$  in  $\mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$ , the relation

$$(2.2) \quad \int_c^d \left[ \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0}^n f_{\alpha\beta} D^\alpha y D^\beta w \right] = \int_c^d \varphi[y] w$$

holds. In this case,  $\varphi[y]$  is uniquely determined, and  $Ly$  is defined to be  $(-1)^n \varphi[y]$ . The following result gives an explicit form for the operator  $L$ .

**THEOREM 2.1.** *If  $L$  is the Euler-Lagrange operator for the functional defined by (2.1), then  $y$  belongs to the domain of  $L$  on a subinterval  $[c, d]$  of  $[a, b]$  if and only if  $y \in C^n[c, d]$  and there exist functions  $\mu_1[y], \dots, \mu_n[y]$  in  $C^1[c, d]$  such that*

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_n[y] &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha n} D^\alpha y, \\ \mu_{i-1}[y] &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha i-1} D^\alpha y - D\mu_i[y], \quad i \text{ in } \{2, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

In this case,

$$Ly = (-1)^{n+1} \left( D\mu_1[y] - \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha 0} D^\alpha y \right),$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} Ly &= D \left( D \left( \dots D \left( D \left( \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha n} D^\alpha y \right) - \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha n-1} D^\alpha y \right) \dots \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (-1)^{n+1} \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha 1} D^\alpha y \right) + (-1)^n \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha 0} D^\alpha y. \end{aligned}$$

First, if  $y$  is in the domain of  $L$  on  $[c, d]$ , then  $y$  satisfies (2.2) with  $\varphi[y] = (-1)^n Ly$ . Let  $\rho_0[y], \rho_1[y], \dots, \rho_n[y]$  be the functions defined recursively by

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho_0[y] &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha 0} D^\alpha y - \varphi[y] \\ \rho_i[y] &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha i} D^\alpha y - \int_c \rho_{i-1}[y], \quad i \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for every  $w$  in  $\mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$  and each  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$\int_c^d \left[ \left( \sum_{\beta=k}^n \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha \beta} D^\alpha y D^\beta w \right) + \rho_{k-1}[y] D^{k-1} w \right] = 0.$$

In particular, if  $k = n$  then

$$\int_c^d \left[ \left( \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha n} D^\alpha y \right) D^n w + \rho_{n-1}[y] D^{n-1} w \right] = 0,$$

and one final integration by parts gives  $\int_c^d \rho_n[y] D^n w = 0$ . Since  $w$  is an arbitrary member of  $\mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$ , the fundamental lemma of the calculus of variations implies there is a polynomial function  $Q_{n-1}$  of degree at most  $n-1$  such that  $\rho_n[y] = Q_{n-1}$ . If  $Q_{n-1-j}$  denotes the  $j$ th derivative of  $Q_{n-1}$  for  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , then, for  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  let  $\mu_i[y]$  be

$$(-1)^{n-i} Q_{i-1} + \int_c \rho_{i-1}[y].$$

Then

$$\mu_n[y] = \rho_n[y] + \int_c \rho_{n-1}[y] = \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha n} D^\alpha y,$$

and, for  $i$  in  $\{2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $D\mu_i[y]$  exists, is continuous, and

$$\begin{aligned} D\mu_i[y] &= (-1)^{n-i} Q_{i-2} + \rho_{i-1}[y] \\ &= (-1)^{n-i} Q_{i-2} + \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha i-1} D^\alpha y - \int_c \rho_{i-2}[y] \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha i-1} D^\alpha y - \mu_{i-1}[y]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the relations (2.3) hold, and, since  $Q_0$  is a constant function,

$$D\mu_1[y] = \rho_0[y] = \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha 0} D^\alpha y - \varphi[y],$$

so

$$Ly = (-1)^n \varphi[y] = (-1)^{n+1} \left( D\mu_1[y] - \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha 0} D^\alpha y \right).$$

Conversely, suppose  $y \in C^n[c, d]$  and there exist functions  $\mu_1[y], \dots, \mu_n[y]$  in  $C^1[c, d]$  satisfying (2.3). If

$$\varphi[y] = \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha 0} D^\alpha y - D\mu_1[y],$$

then, for any  $w$  in  $A_0^n[c, d]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_c^d \left[ \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0}^n f_{\alpha \beta} D^\alpha y D^\beta w \right] \\ &= \int_c^d \left[ \mu_n[y] D^n w + \sum_{\beta=1}^{n-1} (D\mu_{\beta+1}[y] + \mu_\beta[y]) D^\beta w + (D\mu_1[y] + \varphi[y]) w \right] \\ &= \int_c^d \left[ D \left( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mu_{i+1}[y] D^i w \right) + \varphi[y] w \right] \\ &= \int_c^d \varphi[y] w. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $y$  is in the domain of  $L$  with

$$Ly = (-1)^n \varphi[y] = (-1)^{n+1} \left( D\mu_1[y] - \sum_{\alpha=0}^n f_{\alpha 0} D^\alpha y \right).$$

Since the coefficients  $f_{\alpha\beta}$  are only assumed to be continuous,  $L$  is in general not a  $2n$ th order differential operator in the classical sense but is an example of what has come to be known as a “quasidifferential operator”. However, if the “leading coefficient”  $f_{nn}$  vanishes at no point of  $[a, b]$ , then the equation  $Ly = \varphi$  is equivalent to a first order  $2n$ -dimensional vector system.

**THEOREM 2.2.** *Suppose  $f_{nn}(x) \neq 0$  on  $[a, b]$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  are the  $n \times n$  matrices*

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ \vdots & & & & \\ 0 & & E_{n-1} & & \\ -f_{0n}/f_{nn} & -f_{1n}/f_{nn} & \cdots & -f_{n-1n}/f_{nn} & \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} & 0 & & & \\ & \vdots & & & \\ 0 & & & & \\ & & & & 0 \\ 0 \cdots 0 & 1/f_{nn} & & & \end{bmatrix},$$

respectively,  $F$  is the  $n \times n$  matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \cdots 0 & f_{n0}/f_{nn} \\ & f_{n1}/f_{nn} \\ -E_{n-1} & \vdots \\ & f_{nn-1}/f_{nn} \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $C$  is the  $n \times n$  matrix whose element in the  $i$ th row and  $j$ th column is  $f_{j-1i-1} - (f_{ni-1}f_{j-1n})/f_{nn}$ . Then  $Ly = \varphi$  if and only if  $u = [D^{i-1}y]_{i=1}^n, v = [\mu_i[y]]_{i=1}^n$  is a solution of

$$(2.5) \quad Du = Au + Bv, \quad Dv = Cu + Fv + (-1)^{n+1}\varphi e^1.$$

Moreover, if  $f_{nn}(x) > 0$  on  $[a, b]$ , then the matrix  $B(x) \geq 0$  on  $[a, b]$ , and if the matrix  $[f_{\alpha\beta}]_{\alpha=0}^n \beta=0^n$  is symmetric then so is the matrix  $C$ , and (2.5) becomes

$$(2.6) \quad Du = Au + Bv, \quad Dv = Cu - A^*v + (-1)^{n+1}\varphi e^1.$$

The first part of the theorem follows immediately from Theorem 2.1, particularly the fact that the functions  $\mu_1[y], \dots, \mu_n[y]$  are determined uniquely by (2.3) for a given  $y$  in the domain of  $L$ . The last statement of the theorem is obvious from the definitions of the matrices involved.

We shall be concerned in particular with the homogeneous vector systems

$$(2.5') \quad Du = Au + Bv, \quad Dv = Cu + Fv,$$

$$(2.6') \quad Du = Au + Bv, \quad Dv = Cu - A^*v.$$

and the related matrix systems

$$(2.5'') \quad DU = AU + BV, \quad DV = CU + FV,$$

$$(2.6'') \quad DU = AU + BV, \quad DV = CU - A^*V.$$

For convenience, if each of  $U$  and  $V$  is an  $n \times r$  function matrix, then  $(U; V)$  will stand for the  $2n \times r$  function matrix whose  $j$ th column consists of the functions  $U_{1j}, \dots, U_{nj}, V_{1j}, \dots, V_{nj}$ .

The following property of the system (2.5') will be especially important for discussing the oscillation properties of  $L$  in the case that  $f_{nn}(x) > 0$  and the matrix  $[f_{\alpha\beta}]$  is symmetric.

**THEOREM 2.3.** *The system (2.5') is identically normal on  $[a, b]$ , that is, if  $(u; v)$  is a function vector which satisfies (2.5') and there is a nondegenerate subinterval  $I$  of  $[a, b]$  on which  $u$  vanishes identically, then both  $u$  and  $v$  vanish identically on  $[a, b]$ .*

If  $(u; v)$  satisfies (2.5') with  $u(x) \equiv 0$  on a nondegenerate subinterval  $I$  of  $[a, b]$ , then the relations

$$v_n = f_{nn}Du_n + \sum_{\alpha=0}^{n-1} f_{\alpha n}u_{\alpha+1},$$

$$v_{i-1} = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{n-1} f_{\alpha i-1}u_{\alpha+1} + f_{ni-1}Du_n - Dv_i, \quad i \text{ in } \{2, \dots, n\}$$

imply that  $v(x) \equiv 0$  on  $I$  and, therefore, both  $u$  and  $v$  must vanish identically on all of  $[a, b]$ .

Indeed, if  $(u; v)$  is a solution of (2.5') with  $u_i(x) \equiv 0$  on a nondegenerate subinterval  $I$  of  $[a, b]$ , then the first  $n - 1$  component equations of (2.5') imply that  $u(x) \equiv 0$  on  $I$ , so  $u$  and  $v$  vanish identically on  $I$ . Thus, in view of the results of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3, together with the elementary existence and uniqueness theorems for first-order vector differential equations, it follows that if  $f_{nn}(x) \neq 0$  on  $[a, b]$  then the null-space of  $L$  has a basis of  $2n$  linearly independent functions, so that  $L$  deserves to be called a "2nth order operator".

We conclude this section with the well-known formulization of the adjoint  $L_0^*$  of an operator  $L_0$  which is defined by

$$(2.7) \quad L_0 y = \sum_{j=0}^n r_j D^j y,$$

where the coefficients  $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_n$  are continuous real-valued functions on  $[a, b]$ . By definition, a function  $z$  belongs to the domain of  $L_0^*$  on a subinterval  $[c, d]$  of  $[a, b]$  if and only if  $z \in C^0[c, d]$  and there exists a function  $\varphi[z]$  in  $C^0[c, d]$  such that, for every  $w$  in  $\Delta_0^n[c, d]$ ,

$$\int_c^d z L_0 w = \int_c^d \varphi[z] w.$$

In this case,  $\varphi[z]$  is unique, and  $L_0^* z$  is defined to be  $\varphi[z]$ . Using much the same integration-by-parts technique, and subsequent application of the fundamental lemma of the calculus of variations as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we find that  $z$  belongs to the domain of  $L_0^*$  on  $[c, d]$  if and only if  $z \in C^0[c, d]$  and there exist functions  $\nu_1[z], \dots, \nu_n[z]$  in  $C^1[c, d]$  such that

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu_n[z] &= r_n z, \\ \nu_{i-1}[z] &= r_{i-1} z - D\nu_i[z], \quad i \text{ in } \{2, \dots, n\}, \end{aligned}$$

in which case  $L_0^* z = r_0 z - D\nu_1[z]$ .

It is easily verified that if  $r_n(x) \neq 0$  on  $[a, b]$  and  $G$  is the  $n \times n$  function matrix

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ \vdots & & & & \\ 0 & & E_{n-1} & & \\ -r_0/r_n & -r_1/r_n & \cdots & -r_{n-1}/r_n & \end{bmatrix},$$

then  $L_0 y = f$  if and only if there exists a function vector  $u = [u_i]_{i=1}^n$  such that  $Du = Gu + (f/r_n)e^n$  and  $y = u_1$ , and  $L_0^* z = g$  if and only if there exists a function vector  $v = [v_i]_{i=1}^n$  such that  $Dv = -G^* v - ge^1$  with  $z = v_n/r_n$ .

**3. Factorization of Euler-Lagrange operators.** In this section we shall consider a particular functional of the form (2.1) which is given by

$$(3.1) \quad I_{cd}[y] = \int_c^d \left[ \sum_{j=0}^n p_j (D^j y)^2 \right],$$

where  $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_n$  are continuous real-valued functions on  $[a, b]$  with  $p_n(x) > 0$  on this interval, and  $[c, d]$  is a subinterval of  $[a, b]$ . We then have the following special case of results of § 2.

**THEOREM 3.1.** *If  $L$  is the Euler-Lagrange operator for the functional  $I_{cd}$  given by (3.1), then a function  $y$  belongs to the domain of  $L$  on a subinterval  $[c, d]$  of  $[a, b]$  if and only if  $y \in C^n[c, d]$  and there exist functions  $\mu_1[y], \dots, \mu_n[y]$  in  $C^1[c, d]$  such that*

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_n[y] &= p_n D^n y, \\ \mu_{i-1}[y] &= p_{i-1} D^{i-1} y - D\mu_i[y], \quad i \text{ in } \{2, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

In this case  $Ly = (-1)^{n+1}(D\mu_1[y] - p_0 y)$ , that is,

$$\begin{aligned} Ly &= D(D(\cdots D(D(p_n D^n y) - p_{n-1} D^{n-1} y) \cdots) + (-1)^{n+1} p_1 D y) \\ &\quad + (-1)^n p_0 y. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the equation  $Ly = \varphi$  is equivalent under the transformation

$$\begin{aligned} u_i &= D^{i-1} y, \quad i \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ v_i &= \mu_i[y], \quad i \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\} \end{aligned}$$

to the vector system

$$(3.3) \quad Du = Au + Bv, \quad Dv = Cu - A^*v + (-1)^{n+1}\varphi e^1,$$

where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & \\ \vdots & E_{n-1} & & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} & 0 & & \\ & \vdots & & \\ & 0 & & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1/p_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} p_0 & & & 0 \\ & p_1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & p_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular, the equation  $Ly = 0$  is equivalent under the above transformation to the identically normal system

$$(3.3') \quad Du = Au + Bv, \quad Dv = Cu - A^*v.$$

As was indicated in § 2, we shall also make use of the related matrix equation

$$(3.3'') \quad DU = AU + BV, \quad DV = CU - A^*V.$$

In particular, consider the following condition:

(H<sub>1</sub>). *There exist solutions  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  of  $Ly = 0$  such that if  $U = [D^{i-1}y_j]_{i=1}^n_{j=1}^n$  and  $V = [\mu_i[y_j]]_{i=1}^n_{j=1}^n$  then  $U^*(x)V(x) - V^*(x)U(x) \equiv 0$  on  $[a, b]$  and  $U(x)$  is nonsingular on  $[a, b]$ .*

Since the matrix  $(U; V)$  based on the matrices  $U$  and  $V$  of (H<sub>1</sub>) is a solution of (3.3''),  $U^*V - V^*U$  is a constant function matrix, and the particular condition that this constant matrix be the zero matrix is what has been termed the condition that  $(U; V)$  be a "select solution" of (3.3''), or that the columns of  $(U; V)$  be "mutually conjugate" or "conjoined" solutions of (3.3'), (see, e.g., Reid [4]).

Hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) has an important bearing on conditions of oscillation involving  $L$  and on the variational behavior of the functional  $I_{cd}$ . At the present, however, we are concerned with the following property of  $L$ .

**THEOREM 3.2.** *If (H<sub>1</sub>) holds, then there exist continuous real-valued functions  $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_n$  on  $[a, b]$  with  $r_n(x) > 0$  on this interval such that if  $L_0$  is the  $n$ th order differential operator defined by*

$$(3.4) \quad L_0 y = \sum_{j=0}^n r_j D^j y,$$

and  $L$  is the Euler-Lagrange operator for the functional (3.1), then

$$L = (-1)^n L_0^* L_0 .$$

Moreover, the functions  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  specified in  $(H_1)$  form a basis for the null-space of  $L_0$ .

It is useful for the proof of this theorem to introduce the following notation. Let  $R$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 \dots 0 & p_n \end{bmatrix},$$

let  $P = C$ , and let  $\omega$  be the function defined on  $[a, b] \times R^n \times R^n$  by the formula  $2\omega(x, \sigma, \tau) = \tau^* R(x) \tau + \sigma^* P(x) \sigma$ . Then  $L$  is also the Euler-Lagrange operator for the functional

$$\int_c^d 2\omega(x, \eta(x), D\eta(x)) dx$$

subject to the restraints

$$D\eta_i = \eta_{i+1}, \quad i \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n - 1\} .$$

Now, if  $U$  and  $V$  are as in  $(H_1)$ , and, for a subinterval  $[c, d]$  of  $[a, b]$ ,  $y \in C^n[c, d]$  and  $w \in \mathcal{A}^n[c, d]$ , then with

$$\eta^1 = [D^{i-1}y]_{i=1}^n, \quad \eta^2 = [D^{i-1}w]_{i=1}^n,$$

we have

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & (D\eta^1)^* R(D\eta^2) + \eta^{1*} P \eta^2 \\ & = (UD[U^{-1}\eta^1])^* R(UD[U^{-1}\eta^2]) + D[\eta^{1*} (VU^{-1})\eta^2] . \end{aligned}$$

This identity is essentially formula (5.3) in Reid [6]. Since

$$UD[U^{-1}\eta^\alpha] = U(DU^{-1})\eta^\alpha + D\eta^\alpha$$

and the matrix  $U$  is independent of both  $y$  and  $w$ , as is also the matrix  $R$ , it follows that there exist continuous functions  $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_n$  independent of  $y$  and  $w$  such that if  $L_0$  is defined by (3.4), then

$$(3.6) \quad (UD[U^{-1}\eta^1])^* R(UD[U^{-1}\eta^2]) = (L_0 y)(L_0 w) .$$

In particular,  $r_n = p_n^{1/2}$ , so  $r_n(x) > 0$  on  $[a, b]$ . If  $w$  also belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$ , then (3.5) and (3.6) imply that

$$(3.7) \quad \int_c^d [(D\eta^1)^* R(D\eta^2) + \eta^{1*} P \eta^2] = \int_c^d [(L_0 y)(L_0 w)] .$$

Theorem 2.1, with  $f_{\alpha\beta} = r_\alpha r_\beta$ , and the remarks at the end of §2 concerning the adjoint  $L_0^*$  of an operator  $L_0$  of the form (3.4), show that  $(-1)^n L_0^* L_0$  is the Euler-Lagrange operator for the functional given by  $\int_c^d (L_0 y)^2$  on  $\mathcal{A}^n[c, d]$  and that  $y$  belongs to the domain of  $(-1)^n L_0^* L_0$  if and only if  $y \in C^n[c, d]$  and

$$\int_c^d [(L_0 y)(L_0 w)] = \int_c^d [L_0^*(L_0 y)w]$$

whenever  $w \in \mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$ . On the other hand, the left-hand member of (3.7) is just  $\int_c^d \sum_{j=0}^n p_j D^j y D^j w$ . These remarks together with the definition of  $L$  show that a function  $y$  in  $C^n[c, d]$  belongs to the domain of  $L$  if and only if it belongs to the domain of  $(-1)^n L_0^* L_0$  and, in this case,  $Ly = (-1)^n L_0^* L_0 y$ .

Finally, if  $y$  is one of the functions  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  specified in (H<sub>1</sub>) and  $\eta^1 = [D^{i-1}y]_{i=1}^n$ , then  $U^{-1}\eta^1$  is constant and (3.6) implies that  $L_0 y = 0$ . The linear independence of  $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$  follows from the assumption that  $U(x)$  is nonsingular on  $[a, b]$ .

In [3], Polya showed that, under a certain hypothesis which he called "property  $W$ ", the operator  $L_0$  can be written as a composition of first order operators. We shall show that, under this same hypothesis, the operator  $L_0^*$  can also be written in this form, and, therefore, so can  $L$  if the additional hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) holds. The "property  $W$ " of Polya shall be referred to in this paper as:

(H<sub>2</sub>). *There exist solutions  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  of  $L_0 y = 0$  such that if  $W_k$  denotes the Wronskian*

$$(3.8) \quad W(y_1, \dots, y_k) = \det [D^{i-1}y_j]_{i=1}^k \quad j=1}^k,$$

*then  $W_k(x) > 0$  on  $[a, b]$  for each  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .*

It should be noticed that if hypotheses (H<sub>1</sub>) and (H<sub>2</sub>) were always to be applied simultaneously, then one could assume without loss of generality that the functions  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  specified in (H<sub>1</sub>) also satisfied the condition on the corresponding Wronskians which is stated in (H<sub>2</sub>). This follows directly from the last statement of Theorem 3.2 and the identical normality of (3.3'). However, we shall be interested in certain statements which are true under (H<sub>2</sub>) alone.

The following known property of Wronskians is stated here for convenience.

LEMMA. *If each of  $f_1, \dots, f_k, f$  belongs to  $C^k[a, b]$ , and  $W(f_1, \dots, f_k)$  vanishes at no point of  $[a, b]$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & D[W(f_1, \dots, f_{k-1}, f) / W(f_1, \dots, f_{k-1}, f_k)] \\
 & = W(f_1, \dots, f_{k-1}) W(f_1, \dots, f_{k-1}, f_k, f) / [W(f_1, \dots, f_{k-1}, f_k)]^2 .
 \end{aligned}$$

This equality is most easily seen by noting that each side is the value at  $f$  of a  $k$ th order linear differential operator whose null-space has  $\{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$  as a basis. Hence, the two expressions must be proportional, and examination of the leading coefficients shows that the expressions are, in fact, identical.

**THEOREM 3.3.** *If (H<sub>2</sub>) holds, then there exist positive functions  $\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n$  with  $\pi_j$  in  $C^{n-j}[a, b]$  for  $j$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  such that if  $\Gamma_j$  and  $A_j$  are the operators defined recursively by:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \Gamma_0 z = \pi_n z, & A_0 y & = (1/\pi_0) y, \\
 (3.9) \quad & \Gamma_j z = \pi_{n-j} D \Gamma_{j-1} z, & j \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n-1\}, & A_j y = \pi_j D A_{j-1} y, \\
 & \Gamma_n z = (-1)^n (1/\pi_0) D \Gamma_{n-1} z, & j \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\}, &
 \end{aligned}$$

then  $L_0 = A_n$  and  $L_0^* = \Gamma_n$ .

It is to be emphasized that a real-valued function  $f$  belongs to the domain of  $\Gamma_j$  (respectively,  $A_j$ ) on a subinterval  $[c, d]$  of  $[a, b]$  if and only if  $f$  is continuous on  $[c, d]$  and if  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , then  $\Gamma_{j-1} f$  (respectively,  $A_{j-1} f$ ) is in  $C^1[c, d]$ .

By a theorem of Polya [3], if  $W_0 = 1$ ,  $W_k$  is as specified in (H<sub>2</sub>) for  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\pi_0 = W_1$ ,  $\pi_j = W_j^2 / (W_{j-1} W_{j+1})$  for  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , and  $\pi_n = r_n W_n / W_{n-1}$ , then  $L_0 = A_n$ . Furthermore, since each  $y_k$  appearing in (H<sub>2</sub>) is necessarily in  $C^n[a, b]$ , it follows that each  $\pi_j$  is in  $C^{n-j}[a, b]$ , and there exist continuous functions  $p_{ij}$ ,  $i$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $j$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ , such that

$$(3.10) \quad A_j y = \sum_{i=0}^j p_{ij} D^i y, \quad \text{for } j \text{ in } \{0, 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Moreover,  $p_{jj} = W_j / W_{j+1}$  for  $j$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$  and  $p_{nn} = r_n$ , so that  $p_{ii}(x) > 0$  on  $[a, b]$  for  $i$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ . This implies that a function  $w$  is in  $\Delta_0^n[c, d]$  for a subinterval  $[c, d]$  of  $[a, b]$  if and only if  $w \in \Delta^n[c, d]$  and  $A_j w$  vanishes at  $c$  and at  $d$  for  $j$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ .

As to the factorization (3.9) of  $L_0^*$ , notice that if  $z$  is in the domain of  $\Gamma_n$  on a subinterval  $[c, d]$  of  $[a, b]$  and  $w \in \Delta_0^n[c, d]$ , then repeated use of integration by parts and the fact that  $A_j$  is of the form (3.10) gives  $\int_c^d z L_0 w = \int_c^d z A_n w = \int_c^d w \Gamma_n z$ . Hence, by definition of  $L_0^*$ ,  $z$  belongs to the domain of  $L_0^*$  on  $[c, d]$ , and  $\Gamma_n z = L_0^* z$ . In particular, since  $\Gamma_n$  is clearly a linear operator, the null-space of  $\Gamma_n$  has dimension at most  $n$ .

On the other hand, suppose that, for  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$(3.11) \quad z_k = W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \dots, y_n) / (r_n W_n) .$$

Then  $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$  is a basis for the null-space of  $L_0^*$ . For the discussion of adjoints in § 2 shows that  $L_0 y = 0$  and  $L_0^* z = 0$  are, respectively, equivalent to vector systems

$$(3.12) \quad Du = Gu ,$$

$$(3.13) \quad Dv = -G^* v .$$

But if  $Y$  is the function matrix  $[D^{i-1} y_j]_{i=1, j=1}^{n, n}$ , then  $Y$  is a fundamental matrix for (3.12), by choice of  $y_1, \dots, y_n$ . Hence, the matrix  $Y^{*-1}$  is a fundamental matrix for (3.13). It follows that the elements in the last row of  $Y^{*-1}$ , each multiplied by  $1/r_n$ , form a basis for the null-space of  $L_0^*$ . But these elements, after a proper choice of sign, are just the functions  $z_k$ .

Now,  $z_n = W_{n-1} / (r_n W_n) = 1/\pi_n$ , so  $D(\pi_n z_n) = 0$  and  $\Gamma_n z_n = 0$ . For  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n-1\}$  and  $j$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n-(k+1)\}$ , it will be shown by induction on  $j$  that  $\Gamma_j z_k$  is defined, and

$$\Gamma_j z_k = W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \dots, y_{n-j}) / W_{n-j-1} .$$

For the case  $j=0$ ,  $\Gamma_0 z_k = \pi_n z_k = W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \dots, y_n) / W_{n-1}$ , since  $\pi_n = r_n W_n / W_{n-1}$ . Assume the result holds for some index  $j$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n-k-2\}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{n-j-1-k} \Gamma_j z_k \\ = W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \dots, y_{n-j}) / W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \dots, y_{n-j-1}, y_k) . \end{aligned}$$

Since both Wronskians appearing have at least one derivative, so does  $\Gamma_j z_k$ , and by the above lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{n-j-1-k} [D\Gamma_j z_k] [W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \dots, y_{n-j-1}, y_k)]^2 \\ = W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \dots, y_{n-j-1}) / W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \dots, y_{n-j-1}, \\ y_k, y_{n-j}) . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$D\Gamma_j z_k = W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \dots, y_{n-j-1}) W_{n-j} / [W_{n-j-1}]^2 ,$$

and then

$$\Gamma_{j+1} z_k = \pi_{n-j-1} D\Gamma_j z_k = W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \dots, y_{n-j-1}) / W_{n-j-2} ,$$

which completes the induction. In particular,

$$\Gamma_{n-k-1} z_k = W(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}) / W_k ,$$

so

$$D\Gamma_{n-k-1} z_k = W_{k-1} W_{k+1} / W_k^2 = 1/\pi_k .$$

Thus  $\Gamma_{n-k}z_k = \pi_k D\Gamma_{n-k-1}z_k = 1$ , so  $D\Gamma_{n-k}z_k = 0$  and  $\Gamma_n z_k = 0$ . This shows that  $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$  is not only a subset of the domain of  $\Gamma_n$ , but, by the previous remarks, it is also a basis for the null-space of  $\Gamma_n$ .

Now, suppose  $z$  is in the domain of  $L_0^*$  on  $[c, d]$ . The form of the operator  $\Gamma_n$  clearly implies the existence of a function  $z_0$  such that  $\Gamma_n z_0 = L_0^* z$ . But then  $z_0$  is in the domain of  $L_0^*$  on  $[c, d]$  as well, and  $\Gamma_n z_0 = L_0^* z_0$ , so  $L_0^*(z - z_0) = 0$ . Therefore there exist constants  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  such that  $z - z_0 = \sum_{k=1}^n c_k z_k$ , so  $z$  is a linear combination of elements in the domain of  $\Gamma_n$  and must therefore be in the domain of  $\Gamma_n$ . Moreover,  $\Gamma_n z = \Gamma_n z_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n c_k \Gamma_n z_k = L_0^* z$ . Thus, the operators  $L_0^*$  and  $\Gamma_n$  are identical.

*Throughout the remainder of this discussion,  $I_{cd}$  will denote the functional given by (3.1) for which  $L$  will be the Euler-Lagrange operator with the corresponding operators  $L_0$  and  $L_0^*$  as in Theorem 3.2 and  $\Gamma_j$  and  $\Lambda_j$  defined by (3.9).*

4. A mean-value theorem. In this section, theorems analogous to Polya's Theorem I, II, III of [3] are obtained under hypotheses  $(H_1)$  and  $(H_2)$  for the operator  $L$ . For these theorems and certain preliminary results, we shall adopt the following terminology: if  $X$  is a finite set of real numbers, then a number  $x$  is said to be *intermediate with respect to  $X$*  if and only if  $x$  lies in the interior of the smallest compact interval containing  $X$ , unless  $X$  is a one-point set  $\{x\}$ , in which case the only intermediate point is defined to be the point  $x$ . The first result is an analogue of Polya's Theorem I for the operator  $L_0^*$ .

**THEOREM 4.1.** *Under hypothesis  $(H_2)$ , if  $z$  is in the domain of  $L_0^*$  on a subinterval  $I$  of  $[a, b]$  and one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i)  *$z$  vanishes at  $n + 1$  points  $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_{n+1}$  of  $I$ ,*
  - (ii)  *$z$  vanishes at  $n$  points  $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n$  of  $I$  and there is a  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  for which  $D(r_n z)(t_j) = 0$ ,*
- then there is a point  $t$  intermediate with respect to the set  $\{t_i\}$  such that  $L_0^* z(t) = 0$ .*

Notice that no additional condition of differentiability of the function  $z$  has been asserted in (ii), since  $r_n z$  has a continuous derivative whenever  $z$  is in the domain of  $L_0^*$ , (see 2.8).

In case (i), it will be shown by induction that for every  $j$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  there exist  $n - j + 1$  points  $t_1^j < t_2^j < \dots < t_{n-j+1}^j$  in  $[t_1, t_{n+1}]$  at which  $\Gamma_j z(t_i^j) = 0$ . The assertion for  $j = 0$  is just the condition (i). If the statement is true for some  $j$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$ , then, by Rolle's theorem, for each  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, n - j\}$  there is a point  $t_i^{j+1}$  in  $(t_i^j, t_{i+1}^j)$  such that  $D\Gamma_j z(t_i^{j+1}) = 0$ . Hence  $\Gamma_{j+1} z(t_i^{j+1}) = 0$  for  $i$

in  $\{1, \dots, n - j\}$ , and  $t_1 < t_1^{j+1} < t_2^{j+1} < \dots < t_{n-j}^{j+1} < t_n$ . Thus the induction is complete, and, in particular, there is a point  $t$  which lies in  $(t_1, t_{n+1})$  at which  $L_0^*z(t) = \Gamma_n z(t) = 0$ .

In case (ii), Rolle's theorem implies that for each  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, j - 1\}$  there exists a point  $t_i^1$  in  $(t_i, t_{i+1})$ , and for each  $i$  in  $\{j, \dots, n - 1\}$  there exists a point  $t_{i+1}^1$  in  $(t_i, t_{i+1})$ , such that  $\Gamma_1 z(t_i^1) = 0$ ,  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, j - 1\}$ , and  $\Gamma_1 z(t_{i+1}^1) = 0$ ,  $i$  in  $\{j, \dots, n - 1\}$ . But

$$D\langle r_n z \rangle(t_j) = 0, \quad \pi_n z = r_n z W_n / W_{n-1},$$

and  $W_n / W_{n-1}$  has a derivative, so

$$D(\pi_n z)(t_j) = [D(W_n / W_{n-1})r_n z + (W_n / W_{n-1})D(r_n z)](t_j) = 0,$$

since  $z$  also vanishes at  $t_j$ . Hence, if  $t_j^1 = t_j$ , then the  $n$  points  $t_1^1 < t_2^1 < \dots < t_n^1$  of  $(t_1, t_n)$  satisfy  $\Gamma_1 z(t_i^1) = 0$  for  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . The same inductive process used in the proof of (i) then gives the existence of a number  $t$  intermediate with respect to  $\{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$  such that  $L_0^*z(t) = 0$ .

Theorem 4.1, together with results of § 3, result in the following analogue of Polya's Theorem 1 of [3] for the operator  $L$ .

**THEOREM 4.2.** *If (H<sub>1</sub>) and (H<sub>2</sub>) hold,  $y$  is in the domain of  $L$  on a subinterval  $I$  of  $[a, b]$ ,  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are points of  $I$  with  $x_1 < x_2$ , and there is a point  $x_0$  of  $I$  different from  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  such that  $y(x_0) = 0$ , while  $y$  satisfies the conditions*

$$(4.1) \quad D^{j-1}y(x_1) = 0 = D^{j-1}y(x_2), \quad j \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\},$$

*then there is a point  $t$  intermediate with respect to  $\{x_0, x_1, x_2\}$  at which  $Ly(t) = 0$ .*

An induction argument will show that for each  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n - 1\}$  there exist points  $s_1^k < s_2^k < \dots < s_{k+1}^k$  which are all different from  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  and lie in  $(x_1, x_2)$ ,  $(x_1, x_0)$ , or  $(x_0, x_2)$ , depending as  $x_1 < x_0 < x_2$ ,  $x_2 < x_0$ , or  $x_0 < x_1$ , such that  $A_k y(s_i^k) = 0$  for  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, k + 1\}$ , and  $A_k y(x_1) = 0 = A_k y(x_2)$ .

First, the statement that  $A_k y(x_1) = 0 = A_k y(x_2)$  for  $k$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$  follows from the fact that  $A_k y$  is of the form (3.10) and the hypothesis that  $y$  satisfies (4.1). Since  $A_0 y(x_0) = (1/\pi_0)y(x_0) = 0$ , and  $x_0$  is different from  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , an application of Rolle's theorem gives the assertion when  $k = 1$ . If the statement is true for some  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n - 2\}$ , then points  $s_1^{k+1} < s_2^{k+1} < \dots < s_{k+2}^{k+1}$  are chosen as follows. If  $x_1 < x_0 < x_2$ , then the points  $s_1^k, s_2^k, \dots, s_{k+1}^k$  are in  $(x_1, x_2)$  and, by Rolle's theorem, choose  $s_1^{k+1}$  in  $(x_1, s_1^k)$ ,  $s_{k+2}^{k+1}$  in  $(s_{k+1}^k, x_2)$ , and  $s_i^{k+1}$  in  $(s_{i-1}^k, x_i^k)$ , for  $i$  in  $\{2, \dots, k + 1\}$ , such that  $DA_k y(s_i^{k+1}) = 0$  for  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, k + 2\}$ . If, on the

other hand,  $x_2 < x_0$ , then there is an index  $q$  such that  $s_q^k < x_2 < s_{q+1}^k$  while  $x_1 < s_i^k$  for  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, k+1\}$ . Therefore, choose  $s_1^{k+1}$  in  $(x_1, s_1^k)$ ,  $s_i^{k+1}$  in  $(s_{i-1}^k, s_i^k)$  for  $i$  in  $\{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $s_{q+1}^{k+1}$  in  $(s_q^k, x_2)$ ,  $s_{q+2}^{k+1}$  in  $(x_2, s_{q+1}^k)$ , and  $s_i^{k+1}$  in  $(s_{i-2}^k, s_{i-1}^k)$  for  $i$  in  $\{q+3, \dots, k+2\}$  such that  $DA_{k+1}y(s_i^{k+1}) = 0$ ,  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, k+2\}$ . A similar method of choice gives the values  $s_i^{k+1}$  in case  $x_1$  lies between  $x_0$  and  $x_2$ . But then  $A_{k+1}y(s_i^{k+1}) = (\pi_{k+1}DA_{k+1}y)(s_i^{k+1}) = 0$  for  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, k+2\}$ , and the induction is complete.

In particular, there are points  $s_1^{n-1} < s_2^{n-1} < \dots < s_n^{n-1}$  different from  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  at which  $A_{n-1}y$  vanishes, and, as the above construction shows, these points are also intermediate with respect to  $\{x_0, x_1, x_2\}$ . But  $A_{n-1}y$  also vanishes at  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  so, applying Rolle's theorem once more, there exist points  $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_{n+1}$  different from  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  at which  $L_0y(t_i) = A_ny(t_i) = (\pi_n DA_{n-1}y)(t_i) = 0$ . By Theorem 4.1 there is a point  $t$  intermediate with respect to  $\{t_1, \dots, t_{n+1}\}$ , (hence, with respect to  $\{x_0, x_1, x_2\}$ ), at which  $Ly(t) = (-1)^n L_0^*(L_0y)(t) = 0$ .

Before continuing with the development of this section, we introduce an important property of the operator  $L$ . Since the equation  $Ly = 0$  is equivalent to the identically normal system (3.3') in which the matrix  $B(x)$  is nonnegative on  $[a, b]$ , it follows, (see Theorem 5.2 of Reid [6]), that a necessary and sufficient condition for hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) to hold is that  $L$  be *nonoscillatory on  $[a, b]$* , that is, if  $a \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq b$ , then the boundary-value problem

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} &Ly = 0, \\ &D^{j-1}y(x_1) = 0 = D^{j-1}y(x_2), \quad j \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\}, \end{aligned}$$

is incompatible, i.e., has the function which vanishes identically on  $[x_1, x_2]$  as its only solution. The equivalence of  $Ly = 0$  to (3.3') then implies that (H<sub>1</sub>) is also equivalent to the statement that if  $(x_1, y_1^1, y_1^2, \dots, y_1^n)$  and  $(x_2, y_2^1, y_2^2, \dots, y_2^n)$  are points of  $R^{n+1}$  with  $a \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq b$  and  $\varphi \in C^0[x_1, x_2]$ , then there exists a unique solution of the nonhomogeneous boundary-value problem

$$(4.2') \quad \begin{aligned} &Ly = \varphi, \\ &D^{j-1}y(x_i) = y_i^j, \quad i \text{ in } \{1, 2\}, j \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

This enables us to formulate the following extension of Polya's mean-value theorem, the proof of which is identical to that of Polya.

**THEOREM 4.3.** *Suppose (H<sub>1</sub>) and (H<sub>2</sub>) hold,  $f$  is a function in the domain of  $L$  on a subinterval  $I$  of  $[a, b]$ ,  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are points of  $I$  with  $x_1 < x_2$ , and  $y_{12}$  denotes the solution of*

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} &Ly = 0, \\ &D^{j-1}y(x_i) = D^{j-1}f(x_i), \quad i \text{ in } \{1, 2\}, j \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $h_{12}$  denotes the solution of

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} Ly &= 1, \\ D^{j-1}y(x_i) &= 0, \quad i \text{ in } \{1, 2\}, j \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\}, \end{aligned}$$

then for each point  $x$  in  $I$ , there is a point  $t_x$  in  $I$  such that

$$(M) \quad f(x) = y_{12}(x) + h_{12}(x)Lf(t_x).$$

If  $x = x_1$  or  $x = x_2$ , then (M) holds for any choice of  $t_x$ . If  $x \in I$  and  $x$  is different from  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , then  $h_{12}(x) \neq 0$  by Theorem 4.2, so there is a (unique) number  $c_x$  such that  $f(x) = y_{12}(x) + h_{12}(x)c_x$ . Let  $\theta_x$  denote the function  $f - y_{12} - c_x h_{12}$ . Then  $\theta_x$  is in the domain of  $L$ ,  $D^{j-1}\theta_x(x_i) = 0$  for  $i$  in  $\{1, 2\}$ ,  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , and  $\theta_x(x) = 0$ . By Theorem 4.2, there is a point  $t_x$  intermediate with respect to  $\{x, x_1, x_2\}$  at which  $L\theta_x(t_x) = 0$ . But

$$L\theta_x = Lf - Ly_{12} - c_x Lh_{12} = Lf - c_x \cdot 1,$$

so  $c_x = Lf(t_x)$  and (M) follows.

It was noted that the solution  $h_{12}$  of (4.4) does not vanish in  $[a, b]$  except at  $x_1$  and at  $x_2$ . We now determine exactly what the sign of  $h_{12}$  is on  $(x_1, x_2)$  and on the union of  $[a, x_1)$  and  $(x_2, b]$ .

**THEOREM 4.4.** *Under hypotheses (H<sub>1</sub>) and (H<sub>2</sub>), if  $h_{12}$  is the solution of (4.4), then*

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^n h_{12}(x) &> 0, & \text{if } x_1 < x < x_2, \\ h_{12}(x) &> 0, & \text{if } a \leq x < x_1 \text{ or } x_2 < x \leq b. \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  in  $[a, b]$  with  $x_1 < x_2$ , and suppose  $z = L_0 h_{12}$ . As in the proof of Theorem 4.2, one obtains by use of Rolle's theorem a set of  $n$  points  $t_1^k < t_2^k < \dots < t_n^k$  in  $(x_1, x_2)$  such that  $z(t_1^k) = 0$  for  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . Applying Rolle's theorem as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, for each  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  there exist  $n - j + 1$  points  $t_j^k < t_{j+1}^k < \dots < t_{n-j+1}^k$  such that  $t_j^k < t_{j+1}^k < t_{j+2}^k$  for  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n-j\}$ , and  $\Gamma_{j-1} z(t_j^k) = 0$  for  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n-j+1\}$ . If, for example,  $s_j = t_j^{n-j+1}$ , then  $x_1 < s_n < s_{n-1} < \dots < s_1 < x_2$  and  $\Gamma_{j-1} z(s_j) = 0$  for  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . But  $Lh_{12} = (-1)^n L_0^* z$ , so  $L_0^* z = (-1)^n$  and  $(1/\pi_0) D\Gamma_{n-1} z = 1$ . Therefore,

$$z = (1/\pi_n) \int_{s_1} \left[ (1/\pi_{n-1}) \int_{s_2} \left[ (1/\pi_{n-2}) \int_{s_3} \left[ \dots \left[ (1/\pi_1) \int_{s_n} \pi_0 \right] \dots \right] \right] \right].$$

In particular, suppose  $s_1 < x \leq x_2$ . Then  $z(x) > 0$ , because each of the functions  $\pi_j$  is positive on  $[a, b]$ , and at the  $j$ th stage of the indicated iterative procedure used to calculate  $z(x)$  the integral function

$$\int_{s_{n-j+1}} \left[ (1/\pi_{j-1}) \int_{s_{n-j+2}} \left[ \cdots \left[ (1/\pi_1) \int_{s_a} \pi_0 \right] \cdots \right] \right]$$

is necessarily restricted to an interval with left end-point  $s_{n-j+1}$  and is therefore positive. However, Theorem 4.1 and the fact that  $L_0^*z = (-1)^n$  imply that  $z$  cannot vanish at any point other than  $t_1^1, t_1^2, \dots, t_1^n$ , and that  $z$  must change sign at each of these points. Since  $z(x) > 0$  on  $(t_1^n, x_2] = (s_1, x_2]$ , it follows that  $(-1)^n z(x) > 0$  on  $[x_1, t_1^1)$ . But  $z(x_i) = L_0 h_{12}(x_i) = [\sum_{j=0}^n r_j D^j h_{12}](x_i) = [r_n D^n h_{12}](x_i)$  for  $i$  in  $\{1, 2\}$ , and  $r_n(x_i) > 0$ , so  $(-1)^n D^n h_{12}(x_1) > 0, D^n h_{12}(x_2) > 0$ , and the conclusion follows.

**5. Sub-(L) functions.** We are now prepared to define the notion of a sub-(L) function and to examine some of the properties of functions of this type. *Throughout this section, it is assumed that hypotheses (H<sub>1</sub>) and (H<sub>2</sub>) hold.*

A function  $f$  which has derivatives of the first  $n - 1$  orders on a subinterval  $I$  of  $[a, b]$  is said to be *sub-(L) on  $I$*  if and only if for every pair of points  $x_1 < x_2$  in  $I$ , if  $y_{12}$  is the solution of the boundary-value problem (4.3), then  $f(x) \leq y_{12}(x)$  on  $[x_1, x_2]$ , and a sub-(L) function  $f$  is *strictly sub-(L) on  $I$*  if and only if for every pair of points  $x_1 < x_2$  in  $I, f(x) < y_{12}(x)$  on  $(x_1, x_2)$ . We have the following characterization of sub-(L) functions.

**THEOREM 5.1.** *If  $f$  is a function in the domain of  $L$  on a subinterval  $I$  of  $[a, b]$ , then  $f$  is sub-(L) on  $I$  if and only if  $(-1)^n Lf(t) \leq 0$  on  $I$ . Moreover, if  $(-1)^n Lf(t) < 0$  on  $I$ , then  $f$  is strictly sub-(L) on  $I$ .*

Suppose  $(-1)^n Lf(t) \leq 0$  on  $I$ . Let  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  be points of  $I$  with  $x_1 < x_2$ , let  $y_{12}$  be the solution of (4.3), and let  $h_{12}$  be the solution of (4.4). By Theorem 4.3, if  $x \in I$  then there is a point  $t_x$  in  $I$  such that

$$(M) \quad f(x) = y_{12}(x) + h_{12}(x)Lf(t_x).$$

But  $(-1)^n Lf(t_x) \leq 0$  and, by Theorem 4.4,  $(-1)^n h_{12}(x) > 0$  on  $(x_1, x_2)$ , so that if  $x_1 < x < x_2$  then  $f(x) \leq y_{12}(x)$ . It is also seen that, since  $h_{12}(x) > 0$  outside the interval  $[x_1, x_2]$ ,

$$(-1)^n f(x) \leq (-1)^n y_{12}(x) \quad \text{if } x \in I \text{ and } x \notin [x_1, x_2].$$

Conversely, if  $f$  is sub-(L) on  $I$ , but there is a point  $t_0$  of  $I$  such that  $(-1)^n Lf(t_0) > 0$ , then there is a nondegenerate subinterval  $[x_1, x_2]$  of  $I$  on which  $(-1)^n Lf(t) > 0$ . Applying the mean-value formula (M) on  $[x_1, x_2]$ , one has  $f(x) > y_{12}(x)$  on  $(x_1, x_2)$ , a contradiction.

The last statement of the theorem clearly follows from formula (M).

In view of the equivalence of  $Ly = \varphi$  to the nonhomogeneous first

order linear system (3.3) and the classical properties of the Green's matrix for the corresponding incompatible first order system which is equivalent to (4.2), it follows that the solution  $f$  of  $Ly = \varphi$  which satisfies the boundary conditions (4.1) is given by

$$f(x) = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} g(x, t)\varphi(t)dt ,$$

where the *Green's function*  $g$  is real-valued on  $[x_1, x_2] \times [x_1, x_2]$  and has the following properties:

(i)  $g$  and the first  $n$  partial derivatives with respect to its first argument are continuous.

(ii) If  $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ , then, in the notation of (3.2), the mapping  $T_i: (x, t) \rightarrow \mu_i[g(t)](x)$  is continuous on  $[x_1, x_2] \times [x_1, x_2]$ .

(iii) On each of  $\{(x, t): x_1 \leq x < t \leq x_2\}$  and  $\{(x, t): x_1 \leq t < x \leq x_2\}$ , the mapping  $T_1: (x, t) \rightarrow \mu_1[g(t)](x)$  is continuous, and if  $x_1 < t < x_2$ , then  $T_1(t^-, t) - T_1(t^+, t) = (-1)^n$ .

(iv) If  $x_1 < t < x_2$ , then on each of the half-open intervals  $[x_1, t)$  and  $(t, x_2]$  the function  $\mu_1[g(t)]$  has a continuous derivative, and  $Lg(t) = 0$  on each of these intervals; moreover,  $g(t)$  satisfies the boundary conditions (4.1).

(v)  $g(x, t) \equiv g(t, x)$  on  $[x_1, x_2] \times [x_1, x_2]$ .

The following theorem on the Green's function gives a strengthening of the second assertion of Theorem 5.1.

**THEOREM 5.2.** *If  $a \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq b$  and  $g$  is the Green's function for the incompatible problem (4.2), then  $(-1)^n g(x, t) \geq 0$  on  $[x_1, x_2] \times [x_1, x_2]$ .*

If not, then, since  $g$  is continuous, there is a point  $(x_0, t_0)$  in  $(x_1, x_2) \times (x_1, x_2)$  such that  $(-1)^n g(x_0, t_0) < 0$ . Using the fact that  $g(x, t) = 0$  on the boundary of  $[x_1, x_2] \times [x_1, x_2]$ , let  $t_1$  denote  $\text{LUB}\{t: x_1 \leq t < t_0, g(x_0, t) = 0\}$ , and let  $t_2$  denote  $\text{GLB}\{t: t_0 < t \leq x_2, g(x_0, t) = 0\}$ . Then  $t_1 < t_0 < t_2$  and the continuity of  $g$  implies that  $(-1)^n g(x_0, t) < 0$  on  $(t_1, t_2)$  and  $g(x_0, t_1) = 0 = g(x_0, t_2)$ .

Suppose  $\varphi$  is the function whose value at  $t$  is  $g(x_0, t)$  for  $t$  in  $[t_1, t_2]$  and is zero otherwise. Then  $\varphi$  is continuous, and if  $f$  is defined on  $[x_1, x_2]$  by

$$f(x) = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} g(x, t)\varphi(t)dt ,$$

then  $Lf = \varphi$  and, since  $(-1)^n \varphi(t) \leq 0$  on  $[x_1, x_2]$ ,  $f$  is sub- $(L)$ . But  $D^{j-1}f(x_1) = 0 = D^{j-1}f(x_2)$  for  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , so, by definition of sub- $(L)$  functions,  $f(x) \leq 0$  on  $[x_1, x_2]$ . On the other hand,

$$f(x_0) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} [g(x_0, t)]^2 dt ,$$

which is positive, a contradiction.

**THEOREM 5.3.** *If  $f$  is in the domain of  $L$  on a subinterval  $I$  of  $[a, b]$  and  $f$  is sub- $(L)$  on  $I$ , then a necessary and sufficient condition that  $f$  fail to be strictly sub- $(L)$  on  $I$  is that there be a nondegenerate subinterval of  $I$  on which  $Lf(x) \equiv 0$ .*

If  $f$  fails to be strictly sub- $(L)$  on  $I$ , then there are points  $x_1 < x_2$  in  $I$  such that if  $y_{12}$  is the solution of (4.3), then  $f(x) \leq y_{12}(x)$  on  $[x_1, x_2]$  and there is a point  $x_0$  in  $(x_1, x_2)$  at which  $f(x_0) = y_{12}(x_0)$ . If  $\varphi = Lf$ , then  $\varphi = L(f - y_{12})$ , and if  $g$  is the Green's function for (4.2), then

$$f(x) - y_{12}(x) = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} g(x, t)\varphi(t)dt$$

on  $[x_1, x_2]$ . But then

$$\int_{x_1}^{x_2} g(x_0, t)\varphi(t)dt = f(x_0) - y_{12}(x_0) = 0 ,$$

and, since  $g(x_0, t)$  and  $\varphi$  do not change sign on  $[x_1, x_2]$ , it follows that  $g(x_0, t)\varphi(t) \equiv 0$  on  $[x_1, x_2]$ . Now, the restriction of  $g(x_0, t)$  to  $[x_1, x_0]$ , using the appropriate one-sided limits at  $x_0$ , is a solution of  $Ly = 0$ . Hence, if  $g(x_0, t)$  vanishes on some subinterval of  $[x_1, x_0]$ , then  $g(x_0, t)$  vanishes identically on  $[x_1, x_0]$ . Since at least the first  $n - 1$  derivatives of the function  $g(x_0, t)$  are continuous at  $x_0$ , it follows that on  $[x_0, x_2]$ , the function  $g(x_0, t)$  is a solution of

$$Ly = 0 \\ D^{j-1}y(x_0) = 0 = D^{j-1}y(x_2) , \quad j \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\} ,$$

so  $g(x_0, t) \equiv 0$  on  $[x_0, x_2]$  as well. But then  $g(x_0, t) \equiv 0$  on  $[x_1, x_2]$ , which violates the discontinuity condition which the function  $\mu_1[g(x_0)]$  must satisfy at  $x_0$ . Correspondingly, the assumption that  $g(x_0, t)$  vanishes on some subinterval of  $[x_0, x_2]$  leads to a contradiction, so that any subinterval of  $[x_1, x_2]$  contains a point  $t$  at which  $g(x_0, t) \neq 0$ , which implies that  $\varphi$  vanishes at this point. Hence,  $\varphi$  is a continuous function whose set of zeroes is dense in  $[x_1, x_2]$ , so  $\varphi(x) \equiv 0$  on  $[x_1, x_2]$ . This, in turn, implies that  $f(x) = y_{12}(x)$  on  $[x_1, x_2]$  and  $Lf(x) \equiv 0$  on  $[x_1, x_2]$ .

The sufficiency of the condition is obvious.

It is to be remarked that the result of Theorem 5.3 is weaker than the result that might be expected for sub- $(L)$  functions. In the classical case where  $L = D^2$ , any convex function which fails to be

strictly convex must be a solution of  $D^2y = 0$  on some interval of its domain, and in [5] Reid generalized this statement exactly for a second-order Euler-Lagrange operator. However, for higher-order operators a generalization stronger than the above theorem is not immediately apparent.

**6. Variational properties of sub-( $L$ ) function.** In addition to the classes  $\mathcal{A}^n[c, d]$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$ , we shall be concerned with the class  $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_0^n[c, d]$  consisting of those functions  $w$  in  $\mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$  for which  $w(x) \leq 0$  on  $[c, d]$ . If  $M$  is any real linear functional on any of these three classes, then  $M$  is *positive definite* if and only if  $M[w] \geq 0$  whenever  $w$  belongs to the given class with equality holding only if  $w = 0$ . The next two preliminary results are analogues of those in Reid [5], and the proofs are nearly identical to his.

**THEOREM 6.1.** *The statement that  $L$  is nonoscillatory is equivalent to each of the following conditions:*

(i)  $(H_1)$  holds;

(ii) *For each subinterval  $[c, d]$  of  $[a, b]$ , the functional  $I_{ca}$  is positive definite on  $\mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$ .*

Since the system (3.3') is identically normal and the matrix  $B(x) \geq 0$  on  $[a, b]$ , it follows from Theorem 5.2 of Reid [6] that the nonoscillation of  $L$  is equivalent to each of the conditions (i) and (ii).

**THEOREM 6.2.** *The condition  $(H_1)$  implies that if  $[c, d]$  is a subinterval of  $[a, b]$  and  $f \in \mathcal{A}^n[c, d]$ , then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i)  $I_{ca}[y] \geq I_{ca}[f]$  whenever  $y - f \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}_0^n[c, d]$ .

(ii) *If  $J_{ca}$  is the bilinear functional defined on  $\mathcal{A}^n[c, d] \times \mathcal{A}^n[c, d]$*

*by*

$$J_{ca}[(y, w)] = \int_c^d \left[ \sum_{j=0}^n p_j D^j y D^j w \right],$$

*then  $J_{ca}[(f, w)] \geq 0$  whenever  $w \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}_0^n[c, d]$ .*

If  $w \in \mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$ , then  $I_{ca}[w] \geq 0$  by Theorem 6.1. Also, if  $w \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}_0^n[c, d]$  and  $t$  is any positive number, then  $tw \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}_0^n[c, d]$ . The result then follows from the identity

$$I_{ca}[f + tw] = I_{ca}[f] + 2tJ_{ca}[(f, w)] + t^2I_{ca}[w].$$

We now obtain a characterization of sub-( $L$ ) functions which are in the domain of  $L$  in terms of unilateral variational property.

**THEOREM 6.3.** *If  $(H_1)$  and  $(H_2)$  hold and  $f$  is a function in the domain of  $L$  on a subinterval  $[c, d]$  of  $[a, b]$ , then a necessary and sufficient condition for  $f$  to be sub- $(L)$  on  $[c, d]$  is that*

$$(6.1) \quad I_{cd}[y] \geq I_{cd}[f] \text{ whenever } y - f \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}_0^n[c, d].$$

If  $w \in \mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$ , then

$$J_{cd}[(f, w)] = \int_c^d \left[ \sum_{j=0}^n p_j D^j f D^j w \right],$$

which, by definition, means that

$$J_{cd}(f, w) = \int_c^d [w(-1)^n Lf].$$

Therefore,  $J_{cd}(f, w) \geq 0$  for every  $w$  in  $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_0^n[c, d]$  if and only if  $(-1)^n Lf(x) \leq 0$  on  $[c, d]$ . The conclusion then follows from Theorems 5.1 and 6.2.

It would be desirable to remove the condition that  $f$  belong to the domain of  $L$  from the hypothesis of this theorem. One possibility which might be examined is the simple case where  $L = D^{2n}$ , for if  $f \in \mathcal{A}^n[c, d]$ ,  $w \in \mathcal{A}_0^n[c, d]$ ,  $\rho_0[f] = p_0 f$ , and

$$\rho_i[f] = p_i D^i f - \int_c^d \rho_{i-1}[f]$$

for  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , then

$$J_{cd}(f, w) = \int_c^d D^n w p_n[f],$$

which is of the form

$$\int_c^d D^n w D^n \varphi,$$

exactly that which arises in considering the case  $L = D^{2n}$ . It is to be noted, however, that the “sufficiency” part of Theorem 6.3 does not require  $f$  to be in the domain of  $L$ .

**THEOREM 6.4.** *If  $(H_1)$  and  $(H_2)$  hold and  $f \in \mathcal{A}^n[c, d]$ , then  $f$  is sub- $(L)$  on  $[c, d]$  in case (6.1) holds.*

Suppose  $c \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq d$  and  $y_{12}$  is the solution of (4.3). Let  $t$  be an arbitrary point in  $(x_1, x_2)$ , and let  $w_t$  be the function whose value at  $x$  is zero outside  $[x_1, x_2]$  and is  $(-1)^{n+1}g(x, t)$  on  $(x_1, x_2)$ , where  $g$  is the Green’s function for (4.2). Then  $w_t \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}_0^n[c, d]$  by Theorem 5.2, so that

$$0 \leq J_{ca}[f, w_i] = (-1)^{n+1} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} D^i f \mu_{i+1}[g(t)] \right]_{x_1}^{x_2} - f(t).$$

But, for arbitrary  $w$  in  $\Delta_0^n[c, d]$ ,

$$J_{ca}[y_{12}, w] = \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} D^i w \mu_{i+1}[y_{12}] \right]_c^d = 0.$$

In particular,

$$0 = J_{ca}[y_{12}, w_i] = (-1)^{n+1} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} D^i y_{12} \mu_{i+1}[g(t)] \right]_{x_1}^{x_2} - y_{12}(t),$$

and, in view of the boundary conditions of (4.3),

$$0 \leq y_{12}(t) - f(t).$$

Hence,  $f$  is sub- $(L)$  on  $[c, d]$ .

**7. Strong nonoscillation of  $L$ .** Under hypotheses  $(H_1)$  and  $(H_2)$  we are able to conclude that the null-space of the operator  $L$  is a  $2n$ -parameter family on  $[a, b]$ , i.e., that there is exactly one solution of  $Ly = 0$  which assumes  $2n$  given values at  $2n$  given (distinct) points of  $[a, b]$ . We first establish the following result, the proof of which is modeled after a proof of Polya [3].

**THEOREM 7.1.** *Suppose  $(H_2)$  holds,  $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$  is the basis for the null-space of  $L_0^*$  given by (3.11) and, for each  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $Z_k$  is the set of all linear combinations of  $\{z_k, \dots, z_n\}$ . If  $z \in Z_k$ , then either  $z(x) \equiv 0$  or else  $z$  has at most  $n - k$  zeroes on  $[a, b]$ . In particular, if  $a \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n \leq b$ , then the  $n$ -point boundary-value problem*

$$(7.1) \quad L_0^* z = 0, \quad z(t_i) = 0, \quad i \text{ in } \{1, \dots, n\},$$

*is incompatible.*

If  $z = c_n z_n$  then, since  $z_n(x) > 0$  on  $[a, b]$ , either  $z(x) \equiv 0$  or else  $z$  vanishes nowhere on  $[a, b]$ . Assume that  $k + 1$  is an index for which the assertion is true and suppose  $z \in Z_k$ , say  $z = \sum_{j=k}^n c_j z_j$ . If  $c_k = 0$  then  $z \in Z_{k+1}$ , so either  $z(x) \equiv 0$  or else  $z$  has less than  $n - k$  zeroes on  $[a, b]$ . If  $c_k \neq 0$ , then  $z(x) \not\equiv 0$  and we may write  $z_k = (1/c_k)z - z_0$ , where  $z_0 = \sum_{j=k+1}^n (c_j/c_k)z_j$ . If it were possible that there exist  $n - k + 1$  points  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n-k+1}$  at which  $z$  vanishes, then  $z_k + z_0$  would also vanish at these points and, as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, there would exist a point  $t$  intermediate with respect to  $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n-k+1}\}$  at which  $\Gamma_{n-k}[z_k + z_0](t) = 0$ . But the proof of Theorem 3.3 shows that  $\Gamma_{n-k} z_j = 0$  if  $j \geq k + 1$  and  $\Gamma_{n-k} z_k = 1$ . In particular,  $\Gamma_{n-k}[z_k + z_0](t) = 1$ , a contradiction.

**THEOREM 7.2.** *Under  $(H_1)$  and  $(H_2)$ , if  $a \leq x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_m \leq b$  and, for each  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\lambda_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n + 1\}$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i = 2n$ , then the  $m$ -point boundary-value problem*

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{aligned} Ly &= 0, \\ D^{j-1}y(x_i) &= 0, \quad i \text{ in } \{1, \dots, m\}, j \text{ in } \{1, \dots, \lambda_i\}, \end{aligned}$$

is incompatible.

It will be shown that if  $y$  is any function in the domain of the operator  $L_0$  which satisfies the boundary conditions of (7.2), then there exist  $n$  points of  $[a, b]$  at which  $L_0y$  vanishes.

Let  $\nu = \max \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m\}$ . If  $\nu = 1$ , then  $m = 2n$ , and repeated application of Rolle's theorem using the decomposition (3.9) gives the result. If  $\nu > 1$ , then for each  $k$  in  $\{2, \dots, \nu\}$  let  $\alpha_k$  denote the number of points  $x_i$  at which  $\lambda_i = k$ , and for  $j$  in  $\{1, 2\}$ , let  $s_{j,k}$  denote the set of integers  $r$  with  $j \leq r \leq \nu$  and  $r \neq k$ . Now, if  $i$  is an index such that  $\lambda_i = k$  then, by (3.10),  $A_jy(x_i) = 0$  for  $j$  in  $\{0, 1, \dots, k - 1\}$ , so Rolle's theorem implies that  $A_1y$  vanishes at  $\beta_1 = m - 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\nu} \alpha_k$  points of  $[a, b]$ . It will be shown that for each  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, \nu - 1\}$ ,  $A_jy$  vanishes at

$$\beta_j = m - j + \sum_{k=2}^j (k - 1)\alpha_k + j \sum_{k=j+1}^{\nu} \alpha_k$$

points of  $[a, b]$ . Since the assertion is known for  $j = 1$ , assume that it holds for some  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, \nu - 2\}$ . Applying Rolle's theorem,  $A_{j+1}y$  must vanish first of all at  $\beta_j - 1$  points, none of which will be an  $x_i$  with  $\lambda_i \geq j + 2$ . But  $A_{j+1}y$  also vanishes at exactly these points  $x_i$  as well, and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{j+1} &= m - j - 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{j+1} (k - 1)\alpha_k + j \sum_{k=j+2}^{\nu} \alpha_k + \sum_{k=j+2}^{\nu} \alpha_k \\ &= m - j - 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{j+1} (k - 1)\alpha_k + (j + 1) \sum_{k=j+2}^{\nu} \alpha_k. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $A_{\nu-1}y$  vanishes at

$$\beta_{\nu-1} = m - (\nu - 1) + \sum_{k=2}^{\nu} (k - 1)\alpha_k$$

points of  $[a, b]$ . But

$$\alpha_k = \sum_{i=1}^m [\prod_{s_1, k} (\lambda_i - r) / (k - r)],$$

so

$$(k - 1)\alpha_k = \sum_{i=1}^m [\prod_{s_2, k} (\lambda_i - 1)(\lambda_i - r) / (k - r)].$$

Hence,

$$\beta_{\nu-1} = m - (\nu - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^m \left\{ \sum_{k=2}^{\nu} [\prod_{s_2, k} (\lambda_i - r)/(k - r)] \right\} (\lambda_i - 1).$$

The expression in braces is a polynomial in  $\lambda_i$  of degree at most  $\nu - 2$  which has the value 1 for each of the  $\nu - 1$  values  $\lambda_i = 2, 3, \dots, \nu$ . Hence, this expression is identically 1 in  $\lambda_i$ , and

$$\beta_{\nu-1} = m - (\nu - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^m (\lambda_i - 1) = 2n - (\nu - 1),$$

i.e.,  $A_{\nu-1}y$  vanishes at  $2n - (\nu - 1)$  distinct points of  $[a, b]$ . The same use of Rolle's theorem as that for the case  $\nu = 1$  now gives the conclusion that  $L_0y$  must vanish at  $n$  distinct points of  $[a, b]$ .

If  $y$  satisfies (7.2), then  $z = L_0y$  satisfies (7.1) for some set  $\{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$  of points in  $[a, b]$ , so  $z = 0$ , i.e.,  $L_0y = 0$ , and, by Theorem II of Polya [3] for the operator  $L_0$ , it follows that  $y$  must also vanish identically.

In particular, the problem (7.2) with  $m = 2n$  is incompatible, and the elementary solvability theorems for vector differential systems imply that the null-space of  $L$  is indeed a  $2n$ -parameter family. Hence, it is possible to examine  $L$ -convexity in the sense of Tornheim [7] and Hartman [2], whereby a function  $f$  defined on an open subinterval  $(c, d)$  of  $[a, b]$  is  $L$ -convex if and only if for every set of  $2n$  points  $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{2n}$  of  $(c, d)$ , if  $y$  is the unique function satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} Ly &= 0, \\ y(x_i) &= f(x_i), \quad i \text{ in } \{1, \dots, 2n\}, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$(-1)^i y(x) \leq (-1)^i f(x) \quad \text{on } (x_i, x_{i+1}).$$

However, the exact relationship between the two types of convexity remains undecided.

It is also natural to ask about the properties of the operator  $\tilde{L} = (-1)^n L_0 L_0^*$ . It is easily seen that  $\tilde{L}y = 0$  is equivalent to an identically normal system of the type (2.6') and that if  $U$  and  $V$  are as specified in  $(H_1)$  then  $(U^{*-1}; 0)$  satisfies an analogous condition  $(\tilde{H}_1)$  for  $\tilde{L}$ . Moreover, in the notation of (2.8), if  $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$  is contained in the domain of  $L_0^*$  then for each  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  we define the "generalized Wronskian"  $W^*(z_n, z_{n-1}, \dots, z_{n-k+1})$  to be the determinant of the  $k \times k$  matrix  $[\nu_{n-i+1}[z_{n-j+1}]]_{i=1}^k \substack{k \\ j=1}$ . In particular, if  $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$  is the basis for the null-space of  $L_0^*$  defined by (3.11) and  $W_k^* = W^*(z_n, z_{n-1}, \dots, z_{n-k+1})$ , then  $W_k^*$  is equal to the lower right principal minor of order  $k$  in the matrix  $U^{*-1}$ . Hence, if  $\mathfrak{U}$  is the adjoint matrix of  $U^*$  and  $\mathfrak{u}_k$  is the lower right principal minor of order  $k$  in the matrix  $\mathfrak{U}$ , then a well-

known formula (see, e.g., Hohn's *Elementary Matrix Algebra*, p. 61) gives

$$W_k^* = \mathfrak{U}_k / (\det U)^k = (\det U)^{k-1} W_{n-k} / (\det U)^k = W_{n-k} / W_n ,$$

which, by hypothesis  $(H_2)$ , is positive. Thus, we have an analogue  $(\tilde{H}_2)$  of  $(H_2)$ . However, it is not evident that properties of convexity, etc., with respect to  $\tilde{L}$  shed any light at all on the questions already raised concerning  $L$ .

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. F. F. Bonsall, *The characterization of generalized convex functions*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Second Series, **1** (1950), 100-111.
2. P. Hartman, *Unrestricted  $n$ -parameter families*, Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo (2), **7** (1958), 1-20.
3. G. Polya, *On the mean-value theorem corresponding to a given linear homogeneous differential equation*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **24** (1922), 312-324.
4. W.T.Reid, *Oscillation criteria for linear differential systems with complex coefficients*, Pacific J. Math. **6** (1956), 733-751.
5. ———, *Variational aspects of generalized convex functions*, Pacific J. Math. **9** (1959), 571-581.
6. ———, *Riccati matrix differential equations and nonoscillation criteria for associated linear differential systems*, Pacific J. Math. **13** (1963), 665-685.
7. L. Tornheim, *On  $n$ -parameter families of functions and associated convex functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **69** (1950), 457-467.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA



# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

## EDITORS

H. SAMELSON

Stanford University  
Stanford, California

R. M. BLUMENTHAL

University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98105

\*J. DUGUNDJI

University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, California 90007

RICHARD ARENS

University of California  
Los Angeles, California 90024

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSIDA

## SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA  
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY  
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
OSAKA UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO  
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

\* \* \*

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY  
CHEVRON RESEARCH CORPORATION  
TRW SYSTEMS  
NAVAL ORDNANCE TEST STATION

Larry Armijo, <i>Minimization of functions having Lipschitz continuous first partial derivatives</i> .....	1
Edward Martin Bolger and William Leonard Harkness, <i>Some characterizations of exponential-type distributions</i> .....	5
James Russell Brown, <i>Approximation theorems for Markov operators</i> .....	13
Doyle Otis Cutler, <i>Quasi-isomorphism for infinite Abelian <math>p</math>-groups</i> .....	25
Charles M. Glennie, <i>Some identities valid in special Jordan algebras but not valid in all Jordan algebras</i> .....	47
Thomas William Hungerford, <i>A description of <math>\text{Mult}_i(A^1, \dots, A^n)</math> by generators and relations</i> .....	61
James Henry Jordan, <i>The distribution of cubic and quintic non-residues</i> ....	77
Junius Colby Kegley, <i>Convexity with respect to Euler-Lagrange differential operators</i> .....	87
Tilla Weinstein, <i>On the determination of conformal imbedding</i> .....	113
Paul Jacob Koosis, <i>On the spectral analysis of bounded functions</i> .....	121
Jean-Pierre Kahane, <i>On the construction of certain bounded continuous functions</i> .....	129
V. V. Menon, <i>A theorem on partitions of mass-distribution</i> .....	133
Ronald C. Mullin, <i>The enumeration of Hamiltonian polygons in triangular maps</i> .....	139
Eugene Elliot Robkin and F. A. Valentine, <i>Families of parallels associated with sets</i> .....	147
Melvin Rosenfeld, <i>Commutative <math>F</math>-algebras</i> .....	159
A. Seidenberg, <i>Derivations and integral closure</i> .....	167
S. Verblunsky, <i>On the stability of the set of exponents of a Cauchy exponential series</i> .....	175
Herbert Walum, <i>Some averages of character sums</i> .....	189