

# THE BOUNDED LINEAR OPERATORS THAT COMMUTE WITH THE BERNSTEIN OPERATORS

BY A. G. KONHEIM AND T. J. RIVLIN

Communicated by R. C. Buck, August 10, 1967

Let  $C[0, 1]$  denote the linear space of real-valued continuous functions on  $[0, 1]$  normed by

$$\|f\| = \max_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |f(x)|$$

and  $P_n$  the subspace of  $C[0, 1]$  consisting of the polynomials of degree  $\leq n$ . For each  $n$  ( $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) we denote by  $B_n$  the operator

$$B_n: C[0, 1] \rightarrow P_n$$

defined by

$$(B_n f)(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n f(k/n) \binom{n}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-k} \quad (n \geq 1),$$

$$(B_0 f)(x) = f(0).$$

We call  $B_n$  the *Bernstein operator of order  $n$*  and  $B_n f$  the  *$n$ th Bernstein polynomial of  $f$* . The purpose of this note is to characterize those bounded linear operators  $T$

$$T: C[0, 1] \rightarrow C[0, 1]$$

which satisfy

$$(1) \quad TB_n = B_n T \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$$

on  $C[0, 1]$ . We observe that it is sufficient to require (1) to hold on  $P = \bigcup_n P_n$  since  $P$  is dense in  $C[0, 1]$ .

LEMMA 1. (a)  $B_n f = 0$  if and only if

$$f \in N_n = \{g \in C[0, 1]: g(k/n) = 0, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n\}, \quad (n \geq 1),$$

$$(N_0 = \{g \in C[0, 1]: g(0) = 0\}).$$

(b)  $B_n$  is onto  $P_n$ .

LEMMA 2. If  $T$  satisfies (1) on  $P$  then

(a)  $T: P_n \rightarrow P_n$ ;

(b)  $f \in N_n$  implies  $Tf \in N_n$ .

PROOF.  $B_n T f \in P_n$  and hence  $T B_n f \in P_n$ . Since  $B_n$  is onto  $P_n$ , (a) is

established. Next, suppose that  $f \in N_n$ . Then  $TB_n f = 0$  and hence  $B_n T f = 0$ , which implies that  $T f \in N_n$ .

DEFINITION. Let  $\{p_k: k = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  be the family of polynomials

$$\begin{aligned} p_k(x) &= 1 && \text{if } k = 0, \\ &= x && \text{if } k = 1, \\ &= \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(x - \frac{i}{k-1}\right) && \text{if } 2 \leq k < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 3. (a) *The  $\{p_k: k = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  are linearly independent and each  $p \in P_n$  admits a unique expansion  $p = a_0 p_0 + a_1 p_1 + \dots + a_n p_n$ .*

(b) *If  $B_n p_k = \sum_{s=0}^n C_s(n, k) p_s$  then*

- (i)  $C_s(n, k) = 0$  if  $s \not\equiv k \pmod{2}$ ,
- (ii)  $C_0(n, k) = C_1(n, k) = 0$  if  $2 \leq k < \infty$ ,
- (iii)  $C_s(n, k) = 0$  if  $s > k$ .

PROOF. (a) is obvious. To prove (b, i) we observe that for  $k \neq 1$

$$(-1)^k (B_n p_k)(x) = (B_n p_k)(1 - x) = \sum_{s=0}^n C_s(n, k) (-1)^s p_s(x) + C_1(n, k).$$

For  $2 \leq k < \infty$  we have  $(B_n p_k)(0) = p_k(0) = 0$  so that  $C_0(n, k) = 0$ . In addition  $(B_n p_k)(1) = p_k(1) = 0$  ( $2 \leq k < \infty$ ) from which we may conclude that  $C_1(n, k) = 0$  ( $2 \leq k < \infty$ ). Finally, the image of  $P_k$  under  $B_n$  is just  $P_k$  for  $k \leq n$ , and this gives (b, iii).

DEFINITION. Define the operators  $U_0, U_1, U$  and  $\tilde{U}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} (U_0 f)(x) &= f(0), & (U_1 f)(x) &= (f(1) - f(0))x, \\ (U f)(x) &= \frac{1}{2}(f(x) + f(1 - x)), & \tilde{U} &= I - U. \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 4. *For each  $n, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} U_0 B_n &= B_n U_0, & U_1 B_n &= B_n U_1, \\ U B_n &= B_n U, & \tilde{U} B_n &= B_n \tilde{U}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF.  $(U_0 B_n f)(x) = (B_n f)(0) = f(0) = (B_n U_0 f)(x)$ .  $(U_1 B_n f)(x) = ((B_n f)(1) - (B_n f)(0))x = (f(1) - f(0))x = (B_n U_1 f)(x)$ . Finally

$$\begin{aligned} (B_n U f)(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{f(k/n) + f(1 - k/n)}{2} \binom{n}{k} x^k (1 - x)^{n-k} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n f(k/n) \binom{n}{k} \frac{x^k (1 - x)^{n-k} + (1 - x)^k x^{n-k}}{2} \\ &= (U B_n f)(x). \end{aligned}$$

The result for  $\tilde{U}$  now follows, since  $\tilde{U} = I - U$ .

**THEOREM.** *A necessary and sufficient condition that a bounded linear operator  $T: C[0, 1] \rightarrow C[0, 1]$  satisfy (1) is that*

$$(2) \quad T = a_0U_0 + a_1U_1 + aU(I - U_0 - U_1) + \tilde{a}\tilde{U}(I - U_0 - U_1).$$

**PROOF.** (i) By Lemma 4 it follows that any operator of the form (2) satisfies (1).

(ii) By Lemma 2(a) we have  $Tp_0 = \sigma_0p_0$  and by Lemma 2(a, b)  $Tp_k = \sigma_kp_k$  for  $1 \leq k < \infty$ . By Lemma 3(a) this determines  $T$  on  $P$ . It suffices to determine the  $\{\sigma_k\}$  such that  $TB_n p_k = B_n T p_k$  for all  $k$  and  $n$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} TB_n p_0 &= T p_0 = \sigma_0 p_0 = B_n T p_0 & (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots), \\ TB_n p_1 &= T p_1 = \sigma_1 p_1 = B_n T p_1 & (n = 1, 2, \dots), \end{aligned}$$

while  $TB_0 p_1 = 0 = B_0 T p_1$ . Thus  $\sigma_0$  and  $\sigma_1$  may be chosen arbitrarily. Henceforth assume that  $2 \leq k < \infty$ . Then

$$TB_n p_k = \sum_{s=2}^n C_s(n, k) \sigma_s p_s$$

while

$$B_n T p_k = \sum_{s=2}^n C_s(n, k) \sigma_k p_s$$

so that  $C_s(n, k)(\sigma_s - \sigma_k) = 0$  ( $2 \leq s \leq n, 2 \leq k < \infty, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ). If we take  $n = 2$ , then  $B_n p_k \neq 0$  for  $k \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  and hence  $C_2(2, k) \neq 0$  for  $k \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ . Thus  $\sigma_k = \sigma_2$  for  $k \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ . Assume next that  $\sigma_3 = \sigma_5 = \dots = \sigma_{2j+1}$ . Then by Lemma 3(b, i)

$$B_{2j+1} p_{2j+3} = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq s \leq 2j+1; \\ s \equiv 1 \pmod{2}}} C_s(2j+1, 2j+3) p_s.$$

Since  $B_{2j+1} p_{2j+3} \neq 0$  there exists a  $j_0, 0 < j_0 \leq j$  such that  $C_{2j_0+1}(2j+1, 2j+3) \neq 0$  and this implies that  $\sigma_{2j+3} = \sigma_{2j+1}$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k &= \sigma_2 & \text{if } k \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \quad 2 \leq k < \infty, \\ \sigma_k &= \sigma_3 & \text{if } k \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \quad 2 \leq k < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

so that if  $p = \sum_{s=0}^n b_s p_s$  then

$$T p = \sigma_0 b_0 p_0 + \sigma_1 b_1 p_1 + \sigma_2 \sum_{\substack{2 \leq s \leq n; \\ s \equiv 0 \pmod{2}}} b_s p_s + \sigma_3 \sum_{\substack{2 \leq s \leq n; \\ s \equiv 1 \pmod{2}}} b_s p_s.$$

Finally  $b_0 = p(0)$  and  $b_0 + b_1 = p(1)$  and thus

$$T p = \sigma_0 U_0 p + \sigma_1 U_1 p + \sigma_2 U(I - U_0 - U_1) p + \sigma_3 \tilde{U}(I - U_0 - U_1) p$$

satisfies (2) on  $P$ . But  $P$  is dense in  $C[0, 1]$  and hence  $T$  satisfies (2) on  $C=[0, 1]$ .

REMARK. The same methods lead to a somewhat more general result. Suppose that for each  $n, n=0, 1, 2, \dots$   $X_n$  denotes the set  $\{x_0^{(n)}, x_1^{(n)}, \dots, x_n^{(n)}\}$  of distinct points on  $[0, 1]$ , with the properties that for  $n \geq 3$  there exists some  $i$  such that  $X_i \not\subseteq X_n$  and that  $x_0^{(n)}=0$  ( $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ). Let  $B_k$  ( $k=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) be a bounded linear operator  $B_k: C[0, 1] \rightarrow P_k$  ( $k=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) satisfying:

- (1)  $B_k 1 = 1$  ( $k=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ),  $B_k x = x$  ( $k=1, 2, \dots$ ),  $B_0 f = f(0)$ .
- (2)  $B_k f = 0$  if and only if

$$f \in N_k = \{g \in C[0, 1]: g(x_k^{(j)}) = 0, \quad 0 \leq j \leq k\}.$$

- (3)  $B_k S = S B_k$  ( $k=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) where  $(Sf)(x) = f(1-x)$ .

Then the Theorem holds with an identical proof which we omit. In addition to the Bernstein operators, the (Lagrange) interpolation operators,  $L_k$ , defined by

$$(L_k f)(x) = \sum_{j=0}^k f(x_j^{(k)}) \prod_{\substack{i=0; \\ i \neq j}}^k \frac{x - x_i^{(k)}}{x_j^{(k)} - x_i^{(k)}}$$

are included in the more general result, provided that the interpolating sets  $X_k$  are invariant under the transformation  $x \rightarrow 1-x$ .

We want to thank G. Rota for bringing this problem to our attention.

IBM WATSON RESEARCH CENTER, YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NEW YORK