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# A REMARK ON APPROXIMATION OF CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS 

VLASTIMIL PTÁK, Praha<br>(Received September 16, 1957)


#### Abstract

The author gives a direct geometrical proof of Haar's theorem on approximation of continuous functions and of the Čebyšev characterization of the polynomial of best approximation.


In his beautiful paper [2] on the application of Minkowskian geometry to the theory of approximation, A. Haar has given a necessary and sufficient condition that the best approximation of any continuous function by means of linear combinations of $n$ given continuous functions be unique. His proof is based on the following idea. Suppose we have $n$ linearly independent continuous functions $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ defined on $\langle 0,1\rangle$. In $E_{n}$ we consider the set $K$ of all vectors $\left[\xi_{1}, \ldots, \xi_{n}\right]$ which fulfil the inequality

$$
\max _{0 \leqq t \leqq 1}\left|\xi_{1} x_{1}(t)+\ldots+\xi_{n} x_{n}(t)\right| \leqq 1
$$

It is easy to see that $K$ is a convex body in $E_{n}$ in the sense of Minkowski. The discussion of the best approximation by linear combinations of $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ is then reduced to the study of properties of the Minkowskian geometry defined by $K$. The proof, though simple and clear enough, is by no means a short one. It is especially the sufficiency of Haar's condition which requires more subtle considerations. Even modern proofs (see, e. g. [1]) devote to the sufficiency more than three pages.

It is the purpose of the present remark to give a simple proof of Haar's theorem using only the simplest geometrical notions.

Theorem 1. Let $T$ be a compact Hausdorff space and let us denote by $C(T)$ the space of all continuous functions on $T$ with the usual norm. Let $E$ be a given $n$-dimensional subspace of $C(T)$. The best approximation of every $x \in C(T)$ by means of elements of $E$ is unique if and only if there does not exist an $e \in E$, $e \neq 0$, such that the equation $e(t)=0$ has at least $n$ distinct solutions.
We begin with a simple

Lemma. Let L be a p-dimensional subspace of $C(T)$. Let $f$ be a linear functional on $L$ of norm one. Then there exist $p$ distinct points $t_{i} \in T$ and numbers $\lambda_{i}$ such that $f=\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_{i} t_{i}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{p}\left|\lambda_{i}\right|=1$. The equation $f=\sum \lambda_{i} t_{i}$ is, of course, taken to mean $\langle x, f\rangle=\sum \lambda_{i} x\left(t_{i}\right)$ for every $x \in L$.

To prove this lemma, we note first that, with every point $t \in T$, we may associate a linear functional $\varphi(t)$ on $L$ defined by the relation $\langle x, \varphi(t)\rangle=x(t)$ for every $x \in L$. Clearly $p$ is a continuous mapping of $T$ into $L^{\prime}$. At the same time, the norm of $\varphi(t)$ is at most one for every $t \in T$ and it is easy to see that the unit sphere of $L^{\prime}$ coincides with the closed symmetrical convex envelope of the set $\varphi(T)$. Indeed, suppose we have an $x^{\prime} \in L^{\prime},\left|x^{\prime}\right| \leqq 1$ such that $x^{\prime}$ does not belong to the closed symmetrical convex envelope of $\varphi(T)$. It follows ${ }^{1}$ ) that there exists a point $x \in L$ such that $\sup |\langle x, \varphi(T)\rangle|<\left\langle x, x^{\prime}\right\rangle$. This is, however, a contradiction, since $\left|x^{\prime}\right| \leqq 1$ and $\sup |\langle x, \varphi(T)\rangle|=|x|$. The mapping $\varphi$ being continuous, $\varphi(T)$ is compact and it follows from a result of Carathéodory ${ }^{2}$ ) that every point $f$ of the unit sphere of $L^{\prime}$ may be expressed in the form $\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_{i} p\left(t_{i}\right)$ with $\sum\left|\lambda_{i}\right| \leqq 1$. If the norm of $f$ is one, $\sum\left|\lambda_{i}\right|<1$ is impossible which concludes the proof.

Before going into the proof it is convenient to state Haar's condition in another equivalent form. We have the following equivalence. There exists in

[^0]$E$ a nonzero element $e$ with at least $n$ distinct zero points $t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}$ if and only if there exists a nonzero linear combination $f=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} t_{i}$ which vanishes on $E$. Indeed, if $e_{1}, \ldots, e_{n}$ is a basis of $E$, both conditions express the fact that $\operatorname{det} e_{i}\left(t_{j}\right)=0$.

Proof of Haar's theorem. Suppose first that the best approximation is not always unique. Then there exist points $x_{0} \in C(T), e_{0} \in E$ and a nonzero $e \epsilon E$ such that, for every $\varepsilon$ small enough in absolute value, the point $e_{0}+\varepsilon e$ is the best approximation of $x_{0}$.

Let us denote by $L$ the linear span of $E$ and $x_{0}$, so that $L$ has $n+1$ dimensions. If we put $w_{0}=x_{0}-e_{0}$, it follows that there exists a linear functional $f$ of norm one on $L$ vanishing on $E$ and assuming the value $\left|w_{0}\right|$ on $w_{0}$. It follows from our lemma that $f$ may be expressed in the form $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} t_{i}$ where $t_{i} \in T$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\left|\lambda_{i}\right|=1$.

We shall distinguish two cases:
$1^{0}$ We have $\lambda_{i} \neq 0$ for every $i$. Since

$$
\left|w_{0}\right|=\left\langle w_{0}, f\right\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} w_{0}\left(t_{i}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\left|\lambda_{i}\right|=1,
$$

we have $\left|w_{0}\left(t_{i}\right)\right|=\left|w_{0}\right|$ for every $i$. Since $\left|w_{0}+\varepsilon e\right|=\left|w_{0}\right|$ for small $\varepsilon$, it follows that $e\left(t_{i}\right)=0$ for every $i$.
$2^{0}$ We have $\lambda_{i}=0$ for some $i$. We may clearly suppose that $\lambda_{n+1}=0$. In this case, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} t_{i}$ is a nonzero linear combination of $n$ points vanishing on $E$.

The sufficiency of Haar's condition is thus proved. On the other hand, suppose that Haar's condition is not fulfilled. Then there exists a nonzero point $e_{0} \in E,\left|e_{0}\right| \leqq 1$ which vanishes in $n$ distinct points $t_{i} \in T$ and a nonzero linear combination $f=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} t_{i}$ which vanishes on $E$. We may clearly suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|\lambda_{i}\right|=1$. Now choose an arbitrary $a \in C(T)$ such that $|a| \leqq 1$ and $a\left(t_{i}\right)=$ $=\operatorname{sign} \lambda_{i}$ whenever $\lambda_{i} \neq 0$. Let us define the function $x_{0}$ by the relation $x_{0}(t)=$ $=a(t)\left(1-\left|e_{0}(t)\right|\right)$. We have clearly $x_{0}\left(t_{i}\right)=a\left(t_{i}\right)=\operatorname{sign} \lambda_{i}$ for $\lambda_{i} \neq 0,\left|x_{0}\right|=1$ and $\left|x_{0}(t)\right|+\left|e_{0}(t)\right| \leqq 1$ for every $t \in T$. It follows that $\left|x_{0}-e_{0}\right| \leqq$ $\leqq \max _{t_{\epsilon} T}\left(\left|x_{0}(t)\right|+\left|e_{0}(t)\right|\right) \leqq 1$. We have, however, $\left|x_{0}-e\right| \geqq 1$ for every $e \in E$. Indeed, if $\left|x_{0}-e\right|<1$ for some $e$, it would follow

$$
1=\left\langle x_{0}, f\right\rangle=\left\langle x_{0}-e, f\right\rangle \leqq\left|x_{0}-e\right||f|<1
$$

which is a contradiction. It follows that both points 0 and $\epsilon_{0}$ are best approximations of $x_{0}$.

We conclude this remark with a few words concerning the characterization of the polynomial of best approximation. First of all, let us have a compact Hausdorff space $T$ and an $n$-dimensional subspace $E \subset C(T)$ fulfilling Haar's condition. Let $x \in C(T), x$ non $\in E$ be given; the best approximation $e \in E$ of $x$ is thus uniquely determined. We assert now that the equation $|x(t)-e(t)|=$ $=|x-e|$ is fulfilled for al least $n+1$ distinct points $t$. In fact, we know that there exist $n+1$ points $t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n+1}$ and real numbers $\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n+1}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\left|\lambda_{i}\right|=1$ such that, for $f=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} t_{i}$ we have $\langle x-e, f\rangle=|x-e|$ and $\langle E, f\rangle=$ $=0$. From the first equation it follows that $\left|x\left(t_{i}\right)-e\left(t_{i}\right)\right|=|x-e|$ whenever $\lambda_{i} \neq 0$. We have, however, $\lambda_{i} \neq 0$ for every $i$ since, in the contrary case, $E$ would not fulfil Haar's condition (see the section $2^{0}$ of the preceding proof).

A more precise result is hardly to be expected in the general case. It may be shown on examples that there may be exactly $n+1$ points $t_{i}$ where $\left|x\left(t_{i}\right)-e\left(t_{i}\right)\right|=|x-e|$ and $x\left(t_{i}\right)-e\left(t_{i}\right)=|x-e|$ for every $i$.
Let us consider now the case where $T$ is a compact interval $\langle a, b\rangle$. In this case the above method yields a particularly simple proof of the classical theorem of Čebyšev. We intend to show that the theorem of Čebyšev as well as the related result of de la Vallée-Poussin are both immediate consequences of the following lemma:

Let $T=\langle a, b\rangle$ and let $E$ an n-dimensional subspace of $C(T)$ fulfilling Haar's condition. If $t_{1}<t_{2}<\ldots<t_{n+1}$ are given points of $T$, there exists exactly one (apart from a scalar factor) nonzero linear combination $f=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} t_{i}$ vanishing on $E$. All numbers $\lambda_{i}$ are different from zero and they alternate in sign.

Proof. The space $E$ being $n$-dimensional, the $n+1$ functionals $t_{i}$ are linearly dependent on $E$. There exists a nonzero linear combination $f=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} t_{i}$ such that $\langle E, f\rangle=0$. The assumption that $\lambda_{i}=0$ for some $i$ would lead to a contradiction with our assumption concerning $E$. First of all, let $n=1$ and let $e$ be a nonzero element of $E$. It follows from Haar's condition that $e(t)$ is different from zero on the whole of $T$. Suppose now that $\lambda_{1} e\left(t_{1}\right)+\lambda_{2} e\left(t_{2}\right)=0$. We have $\operatorname{sign} e\left(t_{1}\right)=\operatorname{sign} e\left(t_{2}\right)$ so that $\lambda_{1}$ and $\lambda_{2}$ cannot be of the same sign. Suppose now that $n>1$ and that there is an index $p$ such that $\lambda_{p}$ and $\lambda_{p+1}$ are of the same sign. It follows that there exists an $i$ such that at least one of the numbers $\lambda_{i-1}$ or $\lambda_{i+1}$ is of the same sign as $\lambda_{i}$. Clearly we may suppose that $\lambda_{i}>0$. Choose now two positive numbers $\alpha_{i-1}$ and $\alpha_{i+1}$ such that

$$
\lambda_{i-1} \alpha_{i-1}+\lambda_{i+1} \alpha_{i+1}>0
$$

Now there exists an $e \in E$ such that $e\left(t_{i-1}\right)=\alpha_{i-1}, e\left(t_{i+1}\right)=\alpha_{i+1}$ and $e\left(t_{j}\right)=0$ for every $j$ different from $i-1, i, i+1$. Since $\langle E, f\rangle=0$, we have, in particular, $\langle e, f\rangle=0$.

This reduces to

$$
\lambda_{i-1} \alpha_{i-1}+\lambda_{i} e\left(t_{i}\right)+\lambda_{i+1} \alpha_{i+1}=0 .
$$

It follows that $e\left(t_{i}\right)<0$. Since $e\left(t_{i-1}\right)$ and $e\left(t_{i+1}\right)$ are positive, there exist points $s_{i-1} \in\left(t_{i-1}, t_{i}\right)$ and $s_{i+1} \in\left(t_{i}, t_{i+1}\right)$ with $e\left(s_{i-1}\right)=e\left(s_{i+1}\right)=0$. This is a contradiction with Haar's condition.

Theorem 2. Let $T=\langle a, b\rangle$ and let $E$ be an $n$-dimensional subspace of $C(T)$ fulfilling Haar's condition. Let $x \in C(T)$ be given. The following condition is sufficient and necessary for a point $e \in E$ to be the best approximation of $x$ :

There exist $n+1$ points $t_{1}<t_{2}<\ldots<t_{n+1}$ of $T$ and a number $\varepsilon$ with $|\varepsilon|=1$ such that $x\left(t_{i}\right)-e\left(t_{i}\right)=(-1)^{i} \varepsilon|x-e|$.

Proof. Let $e$ be the best approximation of $x$. We have then a functional $f=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} t_{i}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\left|\lambda_{i}\right|=1$ vanishing on $E$ and such that $\langle x-e, f\rangle=|x-e|$. Hence $x\left(t_{i}\right)-e\left(t_{i}\right)=|x-e| \operatorname{sign} \lambda_{i}$ whenever $\lambda_{i} \neq 0$. If the $t_{i}$ are arranged in increasing order, it follows from the preceding lemma that the $\lambda_{i}$ are different from zero and alternate in sign. The rest is easy.

The second part of the theorem is a consequence of the following result of de la Vallée-Poussin.

Let $T=\langle a, b\rangle$ and let $E$ be an n-dimensional subspace of $C(T)$ fulfilling Haar's condition. Let $x_{0} \in C(T)$ and $e_{0} \in E$ be given. Suppose there exist $n+1$ points $t_{1}<t_{2}<\ldots<t_{n+1}$, positive numbers $\varepsilon_{i}$ and a number $\varepsilon$ with $|\varepsilon|=1$ such that

$$
x_{0}\left(t_{i}\right)-e_{0}\left(t_{i}\right)=(-1)^{i} \varepsilon \varepsilon_{i} .
$$

We have then

$$
\min _{e \in \boldsymbol{E}}\left|x_{0}-e\right| \geqq \min _{1 \leqq i \leqq n+1} \varepsilon_{i}
$$

Proof. According to the preceding lemma there exist positive numbers $\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n+1}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i}=1$ such that

$$
f=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}(-1)^{i} \varepsilon \lambda_{i} t_{i}
$$

vanishes on $E$. For every $e \in E$, we have

$$
\left|x_{0}-e\right| \geqq\left\langle x_{0}-e, f\right\rangle=\left\langle x_{0}-e_{0}, f\right\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} \varepsilon_{i} \geqq \min \varepsilon_{i}
$$

which concludes the proof.
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## Резюме

## ЗАМЕТКА ОБ АППРОКСИМАЦИИ НЕПРЕРЫВНЫХ ФУНКЦИЙ

ВЛАСТИМИЛ ПТАК (Vlastimil Pták), Прага
(Поступило в редакцию 16/IX 1957 г.)
В статье дается прямое геометрическое доказательство теоремы Хаара о приближении непрерывных функций.

Теорема. Пусть $T$ - компактное хаусдорфово пространство; обозначим через $C(T)$ пространство всех непрерывных функйий на $T$ с обьчной нормой. Пусть $E$ - данное п-мерное подпространство пространства $C(T)$. Наилучшее приближение каждого $x \in C(T)$ при помоши элементов пространства $E$ будет однозначно определенным тогда и только тогда, если не будет существовать ненулевой элемент е $\epsilon E$, имеющий не менее чем $n$ различных нулей.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ ) If $W$ is a closed convex subset of a finite-dimensional vector space and $w$ a point outside $W$, there exists, according to a well-known theorem, a hyperplane separating $W$ and $w$. Since $x^{\prime}$ does not belong to the closed symmetrical convex envelope of $\varphi(T)$, it does not belong to the closed convex envelope of the union of $\varphi(T)$ and $-\varphi(T)$. Acording to the separation theorem there exists a linear functional $g$ on $L^{\prime}$ such that $\sup |g(\varphi(T))|<g\left(x^{\prime}\right)$. The space $L^{\prime}$ being finite dimensional, linear functionals on $L^{\prime}$ may be identified with elements of $L$.
    .${ }^{2}$ ) The result of Carathéodory referred to is the following: Let $E$ be a $p$-dimensional vector space and let $M$ be a compact subset of $E$. The closed convex envelope $K$ of $M$ consists of all vectors of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} \lambda_{i} m_{i}$, where $m_{i} \in M, \lambda_{i} \geqq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{p_{i}} \lambda_{i}=1$. If $k$ is a point of the boundary of $K$, it may be expressed in the form $k=\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_{i} m_{i}$ where $m_{i} \in M, \lambda_{i} \geqq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_{i}=1$. Now suppose we have a compact set $B$ and a point $x$ of its closed symmetrical convex envelope $S$. There exists a number $\delta \geqq 1$ such that $\delta x$ belong to the boundary of $S$. Since $S$ clearly coincides with the closed convex envelope of the union of $B$ and $-B$, we may express $\delta x$ in the form $\delta x=\sum_{i=1}^{p} \omega_{i} \varepsilon_{i} b_{i}$, where $b_{i} \in B, \varepsilon_{i}= \pm 1, \omega_{i} \geqq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{p} \omega_{i}=1$. If we put $\lambda_{i}=\frac{\omega_{i} \varepsilon_{i}}{\delta}$, we have $x=\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_{i} b_{i}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{p}\left|\lambda_{i}\right| \leqq 1$. For a simple proof of these results, using the definition of convexity only, see a recent paper of the author's [3].

