

ON HERMITE-FEJÉR TYPE INTERPOLATION

H.-B. KNOOP AND B. STOCKENBERG

For the Hermite-Fejér interpolation operator of higher order $K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ constructed on the roots $x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)}$, $1 \leq k \leq m$, of the Jacobi-polynomial $P_m^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ it is shown that $K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ is positive for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, if $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$. Further there is given an error bound, which implies $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|f - K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)} f\| = 0$ for arbitrary $f \in C(I)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$.

1. Formulation of the problem and main results

In this paper we investigate the question of convergence for Hermite-Fejér interpolation of higher order, introduced by Kryloff and Stayermann [8]. To state the problem, let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\alpha, \beta) \in]-1, \infty[^2$ and let

$$(1.1) \quad -1 < x_{mn}^{(\alpha, \beta)} < x_{m-1, m}^{(\alpha, \beta)} < \dots < x_{1m}^{(\alpha, \beta)} < 1$$

be the roots of the Jacobi-polynomial $P_m^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ of degree m (with regard to the weight function $x \mapsto (1-x)^\alpha \cdot (1+x)^\beta$). We denote by $C(I)$ the Banach-space of all continuous real-valued functions on $I = [-1, 1]$ with the sup-norm $\|\cdot\|$. For any $f \in C(I)$ there is a uniquely determined polynomial $K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)} f$ of degree at most $4m - 1$ satisfying the conditions

Received 21 March 1983.

$$K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)} f \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right] = f \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right], \quad 1 \leq k \leq m,$$

$$\left(K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)} f \right)^{(i)} \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right] = 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq m, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

This polynomial can be represented in the following form:

$$K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)} f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^m u_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) \cdot \left[l_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) \right]^4 \cdot f \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right],$$

where $l_{km} = l_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ is the k th Lagrange polynomial of degree $m - 1$ determined by the nodes (1.1) and where $u_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ is given by

$$(1.2) \quad u_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^3 a_{km}^{(i)} \cdot \left[x - x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right]^i$$

with

$$a_{km}^{(0)} = 1,$$

$$a_{km}^{(1)} = -4 l'_{km} \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right],$$

$$a_{km}^{(2)} = 10 \cdot \left[l'_{km} \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right] \right]^2 - 2 l''_{km} \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right],$$

and

$$a_{km}^{(3)} = 10 l'_{km} \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right] \cdot l''_{km} \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right] - 20 \left[l'_{km} \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right] \right]^3 - \frac{2}{3} l^{(3)}_{km} \left[x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right].$$

As in the case of Hermite-Fejer interpolation the question arises for which $(\alpha, \beta) \in]-1, \infty[$ we have

$$(1.3) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| f - K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)} f \right\| = 0 \quad \text{for all } f \in C(I).$$

It was shown first that (1.3) is valid in the case $\alpha = \beta = -0.5$ (cf. Kryloff and Stayermann [8], Laden [9] as well as Sharma and Tzimbalarío [12]). Then it was shown that estimations of

$$\left\| f - K_m^{(-0.5, -0.5)} f \right\| \quad \text{and of} \quad \left| f(x) - K_m^{(-0.5, -0.5)} f(x) \right|$$

(for $x \in I$) by the modulus of continuity and by the modulus of smoothness

of f can be given (cf. Stancu [13], Florica [2], Haussmann and Knoop [6], Mills [10], Prasad [11] and Gonska [3, 4]). Moreover, there exist error bounds for subspaces of $C(I)$ (cf. Gonska [3, 4] as well as Goodenough and Mills [5]). In these investigations the positivity of the operators $K_m^{(-0.5,-0.5)}$ plays a fundamental role. Now the positivity of these operators is equivalent to

$$u_{km}^{(-0.5,-0.5)}(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in I, \quad 1 \leq k \leq m.$$

In [7] it was shown that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$u_{km}^{(-0.5,-0.5)}(x) \geq \frac{1}{8} \quad \text{for all } x \in I, \quad 1 \leq k \leq m.$$

Other pairs (α, β) were considered by Laden. He has shown in [9] that (1.3) is valid for all pairs (α, β) with

$$(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}]^2 \cup [-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2,$$

and that there is a function $f \in C(I)$ such that $K_m^{(\alpha,\alpha)}f(1)$ does not converge to $f(1)$ in the case $\alpha = -0.25$.

In this paper we show that

$$K_m^{(\alpha,\beta)} : C(I) \ni f \mapsto K_m^{(\alpha,\beta)}f \in C(I)$$

is a positive operator for a wider field of pairs (α, β) , namely for all $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$, and that (1.3) holds even for all $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$. To formulate more precisely

THEOREM 1. *Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$, then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, any $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and any $x \in I$ we have*

$$u_{km}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(x) \geq -\frac{4}{3}\eta^3 + \frac{23}{12}\eta^2 - 2\eta + 1 \geq \frac{1}{64}$$

with $\eta = \max(\alpha, \beta) + 1$.

THEOREM 2. *Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$, then we have for any $f \in C(I)$,*

$$\|f - K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)} f\| \leq 2 \cdot D \cdot \begin{cases} \omega(f, \sqrt{m^{4\Theta+1}}), & \text{if } \min(\alpha, \beta) > -\frac{3}{4}, \\ \omega(f, \sqrt{m^{4\Theta+1} \cdot \log m}), & \text{if } \min(\alpha, \beta) = -\frac{3}{4}. \end{cases}$$

Here $\Theta = \max(\alpha, \beta, -0.5)$, ω denotes the usual modulus of continuity and D is a positive constant independent of f and m .

2. Proof of Theorem 1

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$ be given. Then for the sake of simplicity we put

$$\gamma := \alpha - \beta,$$

$$\delta := \alpha + \beta + 2,$$

and

$$M := m(m + \alpha + \beta + 1).$$

We further use the notation

$$x_k := x_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)}, \quad l_k := l_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \quad \text{and} \quad u_k := u_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)}.$$

From the differential equation for the Jacobi-polynomials (see Szegő [15]) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} (2.1) \quad u_k(x) &= 1 - 2 \cdot \frac{\gamma + \delta x_k}{1 - x_k^2} \cdot (x - x_k) + \frac{11}{6} \left(\frac{\gamma + \delta x_k}{1 - x_k^2} \right)^2 \cdot (x - x_k)^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{x - x_k}{1 - x_k^2} \right)^2 \cdot s_k(x) \cdot \left[4 \cdot (M - \delta) \left(1 - x_k^2 \right) - 8 \cdot x_k \cdot (\gamma + \delta x_k) \right] \\ &- \left[\left(\frac{\gamma + \delta x_k}{1 - x_k^2} \right)^3 + \frac{1}{3} \cdot x_k \cdot \frac{(\gamma + \delta x_k)^2}{(1 - x_k^2)^3} + \frac{1}{6} (\delta + 2) \cdot \frac{\gamma + \delta x_k}{(1 - x_k^2)^2} \right] \cdot (x - x_k)^3 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$s_k(x) = s_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) = 1 - \frac{2\gamma + (2\delta - 1) \cdot x_k}{1 - x_k^2} \cdot (x - x_k).$$

Now the assertion of Theorem 1 is an immediate consequence of the two

following lemmas.

LEMMA 1. For any $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$, any $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and any $x \in I$ we have

$$s_{km}^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) \geq \min\{-(2\alpha + \frac{1}{2}), -(2\beta + \frac{1}{2})\} \geq 0.$$

Proof. s_k being a linear function it is sufficient to consider $s_k(1)$ and $s_k(-1)$. We compute

$$s_k(1) = -(2\alpha + \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{4\beta + 3}{2} \cdot \frac{1 - x_k}{1 + x_k}$$

and

$$s_k(-1) = -(2\beta + \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{4\alpha + 3}{2} \cdot \frac{1 + x_k}{1 - x_k}. \quad \square$$

Now taking into consideration the estimation

$$4(M - \delta) \cdot \left[1 - x_k^2\right] - 8 \cdot x_k \cdot (\gamma + \delta x_k) \geq (\gamma + \delta x_k)^2$$

(cf. Laden [9, Lemma 4]) and putting for fixed $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and, for fixed $x \in I$,

$$t := \frac{\gamma + \delta x_k}{1 - x_k^2}, \quad y := x - x_k,$$

we get for any $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$,

$$u_k(x) \geq (1 - ty)^2 + \frac{5}{6}(ty)^2 + \frac{2}{3}(ty)^2 \cdot s_k(x) - \frac{1}{2}(ty)^2 \cdot \left[1 - 2ty + \frac{y \cdot x_k}{1 - x_k^2}\right] - (ty)^2 \cdot \left[ty + \frac{1}{3} \frac{y \cdot x_k}{1 - x_k^2}\right] - \frac{1}{6}(\delta + 2) \frac{t \cdot y^3}{1 - x_k^2}.$$

Thus we have for any $x \in I$ and all u_k the estimation

$$(2.2) \quad u_k(x) \geq h(x, x_k, \gamma, \delta)$$

with

$$h(x, x_k, \gamma, \delta) = -\frac{t}{6} \left(8t^2 + t \cdot \frac{x_k}{1-x_k^2} + \frac{\delta+2}{1-x_k^2} \right) y^3 + 2t^2 y^2 - 2ty + 1 .$$

Now h can be estimated from below as shown in the following lemma.

LEMMA 2. For any $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$ we have

$$\inf_{x_k \in]-1, 1[} \min_{x \in [-1, 1]} h(x, x_k, \gamma, \delta) = -\frac{4}{3}\eta^3 + \frac{23}{12}\eta^2 - 2\eta + 1$$

with $\eta = \max(\alpha, \beta) + 1$.

Proof. For any $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$ we have $\gamma \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $\delta \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$. Since $h(x, x_k, \gamma, \delta) = h(-x, -x_k, -\gamma, \delta)$ we assume $\gamma \geq 0$ in the following. At first we show that h is a monotone function of x . Let $t \neq 0$. If there is a zero of $\partial h / \partial x$ we then have

$$\Delta := -4t^2 - t \cdot \frac{x_k}{1-x_k^2} - \frac{\delta+2}{1-x_k^2} \geq 0 .$$

This implies $t \cdot x_k < 0$, hence $t > 0$ and $x_k < 0$. From this we conclude $x_k \geq -0.5$. Since $\Delta \geq 0$ implies that Δ has a zero (as a polynomial in t) we have

$$\frac{x_k^2}{(1-x_k^2)^2} - 16 \frac{\delta+2}{1-x_k^2} \geq 0 .$$

But this is impossible since $x_k \in [-0.5, 0[$. Therefore we have for $x_k \in]-1, 1[$, $\gamma \in [0, 0.5]$ and $\delta \in [0.5, 1.5]$,

$$\min_{x \in [-1, 1]} h(x, x_k, \gamma, \delta) = \min(h(-1, x_k, \gamma, \delta), h(1, x_k, \gamma, \delta)) .$$

Next we compare $h(-1, x_k, \gamma, \delta)$ with $h(1, x_k, \gamma, \delta)$. We put $\tau := (\gamma + \delta x_k) / (1 - x_k)$ and compute

$$h(-1, x_k, \gamma, \delta) = \frac{4}{3}\tau^3 + \left(2 + \frac{1}{6} \frac{x_k}{1-x_k}\right) \cdot \tau^2 + \left(2 + \frac{1}{6} \frac{(\delta+2)(1+x_k)}{1-x_k}\right) \cdot \tau + 1 =: u(\tau).$$

If $x_k \leq 0$ it is easily seen that $(\partial/\partial\tau)u(\tau)$ has no zero and hence $(\partial/\partial\tau)u(\tau) > 0$. In this case we get

$$h(1, -x_k, \gamma, \delta) = u\left(\tau - \frac{2\gamma}{1-x_k}\right) \leq u(\tau) = h(-1, x_k, \gamma, \delta).$$

If $x_k \geq 0$ we have $\tau \geq 0$ and therefore $h(-1, x_k, \gamma, \delta) \geq 1$. Since we will see later on that

$$\inf_{x_k \in]-1, 1[} h(1, x_k, \gamma, \delta) < 1,$$

there follows for any $\gamma \in [0, 0.5]$, $\delta \in [0.5, 1.5]$,

$$\inf_{x_k \in]-1, 1[} \min_{x \in [-1, 1]} h(x, x_k, \gamma, \delta) = \inf_{x_k \in]-1, 1[} h(1, x_k, \gamma, \delta).$$

We now consider the function $h_1 :]-1, 1[\ni z \mapsto h(1, z, \gamma, \delta)$ for fixed γ and δ ,

$$h_1(x_k) = 1 - \frac{\gamma + \delta x_k}{1 + x_k} \left(2 + \frac{1}{6} \frac{(\delta + 2)(1 - x_k)}{1 + x_k}\right) + 2 \left(\frac{\gamma + \delta x_k}{1 + x_k}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{\gamma + \delta x_k}{1 + x_k}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{x_k}{1 + x_k} - \frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{\gamma + \delta x_k}{1 + x_k}\right)^3.$$

Obviously h_1 has a continuous extension to a function on $]-1, 1[$.

Evidently, for $x_k \leq -(\gamma/\delta)$ we have $h_1(x_k) \geq 1$. We now show that

$$\inf_{x_k \in]-1, 1[} h_1(x_k) = h_1(1).$$

Since we will see that $h_1(1) < 1$, it is sufficient to show that there is no x_k with $-(\gamma/\delta) < x_k < 1$ and $h_1(x_k) < h_1(1)$. It is evident that for the derivative h'_1 we have $h'_1(-(\gamma/\delta)) < 0$. On the other hand it

follows that

$$h_1'(x_k) = \frac{1}{(1+x_k)^4} \left(A \cdot x_k^2 + B \cdot x_k + C \right)$$

with

$$A = -\frac{47}{6}\alpha^2 - 23\alpha - 8\beta^3 - \frac{98}{3}\beta^2 - 43\beta - 8\alpha^2\beta - 16\alpha\beta^2 - 40\alpha\beta - 18,$$

$$B = -\frac{47}{3}\alpha^2 - 14\alpha + 16\beta^3 + 49\beta^2 + 42\beta - 16\alpha^2\beta - 16\alpha\beta + \frac{32}{3},$$

$$C = -\frac{47}{6}\alpha^2 + 9\alpha - 8\beta^3 - \frac{101}{6}\beta^2 - 15\beta - 8\alpha^2\beta + 16\alpha\beta^2 + 24\alpha\beta - \frac{16}{3}.$$

Now $\text{sign } h_1'(1) = \text{sign}(A+B+C)$ and

$$A + B + C \leq -\frac{22}{3}\alpha^2 - 4\alpha - \frac{2}{3} < 0.$$

If we now assume that there is an $x_k \in]-(\gamma/\delta), 1[$ with $h_1(x_k) < h_1(1)$,

it follows that h_1' has two different zeros in the interval $](\gamma/\delta), 1[$

and therefore $B^2 > 4AC$ and $A < 0$. Now

$$C = \alpha^2 \left(-\frac{47}{6} - 8\beta \right) + 16\alpha \left(\beta + \frac{3}{4} \right)^2 - 8\beta^3 - \frac{101}{6}\beta^2 - 15\beta - \frac{16}{3} < 0.$$

We consider two cases.

CASE 1. $B > 0$. We show that in this case the middle-point $-(B/2A)$ of the zeros of h_1' satisfies $-(B/2A) > 1$, that is, a contradiction.

Indeed, from $-(B/2A) \leq 1$ there follows $4AC \geq -2BC$ and $B \geq -2C$. Now

$$B + 2C = \alpha^2 \left(-\frac{94}{3} - 32\beta \right) + \alpha \left(4 + 32\beta + 32\beta^2 \right) + \frac{46}{3}\beta^2 + 12\beta.$$

It is $B + 2C \geq 0$ only if

$$\begin{aligned} D(\beta) &:= \left(4 + 32\beta + 32\beta^2 \right)^2 + 4 \left(\frac{94}{3} + 32\beta \right) \left(\frac{46}{3}\beta^2 + 12\beta \right) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

But using Descartes' rule we see that D has exactly one zero β_0 with

$\beta_0 \geq -\frac{3}{4}$ and from $D(-\frac{3}{4}) < 0$ we conclude that $D(\beta) < 0$ if

$\beta \in [-0.75, -0.25]$. Thus $B + 2C < 0$ and therefore $-(B/2A) > 1$.

CASE 2. $B < 0$. We will show that in this case we have $-(B/2A) \leq -1$. From the assumption $-1 < -(B/2A)$ we conclude similar as

above $B < 2C$. Now we have

$$2C - B = 32\alpha(\beta+1)^2 - r(\beta)$$

where r with

$$r(\beta) = 32\beta^3 + \frac{248}{3}\beta^2 + 72\beta + \frac{64}{3}$$

is an increasing function of β . From this we see that $2C - B < 0$; hence we get $-(B/2A) \leq -1$.

From Case 1 and Case 2 we conclude that h'_1 cannot have two distinct zeros in $]-(\gamma/\delta), 1[$. Therefore

$$\inf_{x_k \in]-1, 1]} h_1(x_k) = h_1(1) .$$

The result is

$$\inf_{x_k \in]-1, 1[} \min_{x \in [-1, 1]} h(x, x_k, \gamma, \delta) = -\frac{4}{3}\eta^3 + \frac{23}{12}\eta^2 - 2\eta + 1 .$$

Now the right side of this equation is a strictly decreasing function of η . Therefore

$$\frac{1}{64} \leq h_1(1) \leq \frac{115}{192} ,$$

which completes the proof. \square

From Lemma 2 we get in view of formula (2.2) the assertion of Theorem 1.

In the case of $\alpha = \beta = -\frac{1}{2}$ we have - as an improvement of the result in [7] - the estimation

$$u_{km}^{(-0.5, -0.5)}(x) \geq \frac{5}{16}$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, any $k = 1, \dots, m$ and any $x \in I$.

3. Proof of Theorem 2

For $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$ the mappings $K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ form a sequence of positive linear operators from $C(I)$ into $C(I)$. If e is a constant function we have $K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)}e = e$; therefore the theorem of Bohman-Korovkin

(cf. DeVore [1]) yields for any $x \in I$,

$$(3.1) \quad \left| f(x) - K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)} f(x) \right| \leq 2\omega(f, |\epsilon_m(x)|)$$

with

$$\epsilon_m^2(x) = \left(K_m^{(\alpha, \beta)} g_x \right)(x)$$

and

$$g_x(t) = (x-t)^2.$$

The function ϵ_m^2 can be estimated from above. We have

LEMMA 3. For Jacobi abscissas, with $(\alpha, \beta) \in [-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}]^2$, there exists a positive constant $D = D_{\alpha, \beta}$ independent of m such that we have for any $x \in I$,

$$\epsilon_m^2(x) \leq D \cdot \begin{cases} m^{4\theta+1} & , \text{ if } \min(\alpha, \beta) > -\frac{3}{4} \\ m^{4\theta+1} \log m & , \text{ if } \min(\alpha, \beta) = -\frac{3}{4} \end{cases}$$

with $\theta = \max(\alpha, \beta, -\frac{1}{2})$.

Proof. We get from (2.1) with $P_m = P_m^{(\alpha, \beta)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_m^2(x) &= \sum_{k=1}^m u_k(x) \cdot (x-x_k)^2 \cdot l_k^4(x) \\ &\leq D_1 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{P_m^2(x)}{(1-x_k^2)(P'_m(x_k))^2} l_k^2(x) \\ &\quad + D_2 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{m^2 P_m^4(x)}{(1-x_k^2)^2 \cdot (P'_m(x_k))^4} + D_3 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{P_m^4(x)}{(1-x_k^2)^3 (P'_m(x_k))^4}, \end{aligned}$$

where D_1, D_2, D_3 are positive constants depending only on (α, β) .

Because of the uniform boundedness of

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{(1-x_k^2) \cdot (P'_m(x_k))^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^m l_k^2(x)$$

(cf. for example, Szász [14]) we get in view of Szegő [15, Chapter 7.32, Chapter 8.9],

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_m^2(x) \leq D_4 \cdot m^{2 \cdot \max(\alpha, \beta, -0.5)} \\ + D_5 \cdot m^{4 \cdot \max(\alpha, \beta, -0.5)} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{m^6}{k^4} \left(\frac{k^{4\alpha+6}}{m^{4\alpha+8}} + \frac{k^{4\beta+6}}{m^{4\beta+8}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

(cf. also Laden [9, proof of Lemma 2]).

Since

$$m^{-4\varphi} m^{-2} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^m k^{4\varphi+2} \leq D_6 \cdot \begin{cases} m, & \text{if } \varphi > -\frac{3}{4}, \\ m \log m, & \text{if } \varphi = -\frac{3}{4}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$2\varphi \leq 4\varphi+1 \leq 0 \quad \text{if } -\frac{1}{2} \leq \varphi \leq -\frac{3}{4},$$

the proof is complete. \square

Combining the estimation of Lemma 3 and formula (3.1) yields the proof of Theorem 2. In the special case $\alpha = \beta = -0.5$ we derive from Theorem 2 the relation

$$\|f - K_m^{(-0.5, -0.5)} f\| \leq 2D\omega(f, \sqrt{m^{-1}})$$

(cf. Stancu [13]).

References

- [1] Ronald A. DeVore, *The approximation of continuous functions by positive linear operators* (Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 293. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1972).
- [2] Olariu Florica, "Asupra ordinului de aproximatie prin polinoame de interpolare de tip Hermite-Fejér cu noduri cvadruple" [On the order of approximation by interpolating polynomials of Hermite-Fejér type with quadruple nodes], *An. Univ. Timisoara Ser. Sti. Mat.-Fiz.* 3 (1965), 227-234.

- [3] Heinz Herbert Gonska, "Quantitative Aussagen zur Approximation durch positive lineare Operatoren" (Dissertation, Universität Duisburg, 1979).
- [4] Heinz H. Gonska, "A note on pointwise approximation by Hermite-Fejér type interpolation polynomials", *Functions, series operators* (Proc. Conf. Budapest, Hungary, 1980. North-Holland, Groningen, to appear).
- [5] S.J. Goodenough and T.M. Mills, "The asymptotic behaviour of certain interpolation polynomials", *J. Approx. Theory* 28 (1980), 309-316.
- [6] Werner Haussmann und Hans-Bernd Knoop, "Konvergenzordnung einer Folge positiver linearer Operatoren", *Rev. Anal. Numér. Théor. Approx.* 4 (1975), 123-130.
- [7] H.-B. Knoop, "Eine Folge positiver Interpolationsoperatoren", *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* 27 (1976), 263-265.
- [8] N.M. Kryloff and E. Stayermann, "Sur quelques formules d'interpolation convergentes pour toute fonction continue", *Bull. Acad. de l'Ukraine* 1 (1923), 13-16.
- [9] H.N. Laden, "An application of the classical orthogonal polynomials to the theory of interpolation", *Duke Math. J.* 8 (1941), 591-610.
- [10] T.M. Mills, "On interpolation polynomials of the Hermite-Fejér type", *Colloq. Math.* 35 (1976), 159-163.
- [11] J. Prasad, "On the rate of convergence of interpolation polynomials of Hermite-Fejér type", *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* 19 (1978), 29-37.
- [12] A. Sharma and J. Tzimbarario, "Quasi-Hermite-Fejér type interpolation of higher order", *J. Approx. Theory* 13 (1975), 431-442.
- [13] D.D. Stancu, "Asupra unei demonstratii a teoremei lui Weierstrass" [On a proof of the theorem of Weierstrass], *Bul. Inst. Politehn. Iasi (N.S.)* 5 (9) (1959), 47-50.

- [14] Paul Szász, "On a sum concerning the zeros of the Jacobi polynomials with application to the theory of generalized quasi-step parabolas", *Monatsh. Math.* **68** (1964), 167-174.
- [15] Gábor Szegő, *Orthogonal polynomials* (American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, **23**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1975).

Fachbereich II - Mathematik
der Universität Duisburg
Lotharstr. 65
D-4100 Duisburg
West Germany.