J. Austral. Math. Soc. (*Series A*) **65** (1998), 145–162

ON THE LEBESGUE FUNCTION OF WEIGHTED LAGRANGE INTERPOLATION. II

P. VÉRTESI

(Received 20 June 1997; revised 28 April 1998)

Communicated by J. R. J. Groves

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to continue our investigation of the Lebesgue function of weighted Lagrange interpolation by considering Erdős weights on $\mathbb{R}$ and weights on $[-1, 1]$. The main results give lower bounds for the Lebesgue function on large subsets of the relevant domains.

1991 *Mathematics subject classification* (*Amer. Math. Soc.*): 41A05, 41A10.

1. Introduction, notations and preliminary results

1.1. In [15] it was proved that the weighted Lebesgue function is 'big' on a 'large' subset of $[-a_n, a_n]$ for arbitrary fixed interpolatory matrix X considering a class of Freud-type weights on $\mathbb{R}$. The aim of the present work is to extend this result for Erdős weights on $\mathbb{R}$ and for weights defined on $[-1, 1]$.

1A. Erdős weights on $\mathbb{R}$

1.2. DEFINITION. We say that $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{R})$ (w is an Erdős weight on $\mathbb{R}$) if and only if $w(x) = e^{-Q(x)}$ where $Q\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is even and is differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$, $Q' > 0$ and $Q'' \geq 0$ in $(0, \infty)$ and the function

$$T(x){:} = 1 + x\frac{Q''(x)}{Q'(x)}, \qquad x \in (0, \infty), \tag{1.1}$$

Research supported by The Hungarian National Science Foundation Grant Ns. T 7570, T 17425, T22943 and by the CRA/La Trobe University (Bendigo–Melbourne) Distinguished Visiting Fellowship.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1446788700034923 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is increasing in $(0, \infty)$, with

(1.2) $$\lim_{x\to\infty} T(x) = \infty; \qquad T(0+) := \lim_{x\to 0+} T(x) > 1.$$

Moreover we assume that for some $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$

(1.3) $$C_1 \le T(x)\frac{Q(x)}{xQ'(x)} \le C_2 \qquad \text{if} \qquad x \ge C_3$$

(see [5, p. 201]).

The prototype of $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathscr{R})$ is the case when $Q(x) = Q_{k,\alpha}(x) = \exp_k(|x|^\alpha)$, $k \ge 1, \alpha > 1$ where $\exp_k := \exp(\exp(\dots))$ denotes the kth iterated exponential. The corresponding w will be denoted by $w_{k,\alpha}$. One can see that in that case

$$T(x) = \alpha x^\alpha \left\{\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \exp_j(x^\alpha)\right\}(1+o(1)), \qquad x \to \infty$$

(see [9, (1.8)]).

REMARK. We use the differentiability of Q on the *whole* (open) line when we apply a result of Lubinsky [7, Lemma and Theorem 1] (see the 'Proof of Lemma 3.2' and 'Statement 3.5' of the present paper). Otherwise, evenness and conditions on the interval $(0, \infty)$ would be enough.

1.3. If $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interpolatory matrix, that is

(1.4) $$-\infty < x_{nn} < x_{n-1,n} < \dots < x_{2n} < x_{1n} < \infty, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

for $f \in C(w, R)$ where $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathscr{R})$ and

$$C(w, R) := \left\{ f : f \text{ is continuous on } \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \lim_{|x|\to\infty} f(x)w(x) = 0 \right\},$$

one can investigate the *weighted Lagrange interpolation* defined by

(1.5) $$L_n(f, w, X, x) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} f(x_{kn})w(x_{kn})t_{kn}(w, X, x), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where

(1.6) $$t_k(x) = t_{kn}(w, X, x) = \frac{w(x)}{w(x_{kn})} l_{kn}(X, x), \qquad 1 \le k \le n,$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1446788700034923 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$(1.7)\qquad l_k(x) = l_{kn}(X, x) = \frac{\omega_n(X, x)}{\omega_n'(X, x_{kn})(x - x_{kn})}, \qquad 1 \le k \le n,$$

and

$$(1.8)\qquad \omega_n(x) = \omega_n(X, x) = c_n \prod_{k=1}^{n} (x - x_{kn}), \qquad n \in N.$$

The polynomials l_k of degree exactly $n-1$ (that is $l_k \in \mathscr{P}_{n-1} \setminus \mathscr{P}_{n-2}$) are the fundamental functions of the (usual) Lagrange interpolation while functions t_k are the fundamental functions of the weighted Lagrange interpolation.

The classical Lebesgue estimation now has the form

$$(1.9)\qquad |L_n(f, w, X, x) - f(x)w(x)| \le \{\lambda_n(w, X, x) + 1\} E_{n-1}(f, w)$$

where the (weighted) Lebesgue function is

$$(1.10)\qquad \lambda_n(w, X, x) := \sum_{k=1}^{n} |t_{kn}(w, X, x)|, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R},\ n \in N$$

and

$$(1.11)\qquad E_{n-1}(f, w) := \inf_{p \in \mathscr{P}_{n-1}} \|(f - p)w\|, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Here $\|\cdot\|$ is the sup norm on $\mathbb{R}$. If $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{R})$ then it is well-known that $E_{n-1}(f, w) \to 0$ if $n \to \infty$ and $f \in C(w, R)$.

Relation (1.9) and its immediate consequence

$$(1.12)\qquad \|L_n(f, w, X) - fw\| \le \{\Lambda_n(w, X) + 1\} E_{n-1}(f, w),$$

where

$$(1.13)\qquad \Lambda_n(w, X) := \|\lambda_n(w, X, x)\|$$

show that the investigation of $\lambda_n(w, X, x)$ and $\Lambda_n(w, X)$ (weighted Lebesgue constant) are fundamental. (For further motivations, see [15, §1].)

1.4. To get estimations for $\Lambda_n(w, X)$, at least for certain X, we consider the n different roots

$$(1.14)\qquad -\infty < y_{nn}(w^2) < y_{n-1,n}(w^2) < \cdots < y_{2n}(w^2) < y_{1n}(w^2) < \infty$$

of the nth orthonormal polynomial $p_n(w^2, x) \in \mathscr{P}_n \setminus \mathscr{P}_{n-1}$ with respect to $w^2 \in \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{R})$ (that is $\int_R p_n(w^2) p_m(w^2) w^2 = \delta_{nm}$). One can prove that for $Y(w^2) = \{y_{kn}(w^2)\}$ (see [1, (1.18)])

$$(1.15)\qquad \Lambda_n(w, Y(w^2)) \sim (nT_n)^{1/6}, \qquad w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{R}),$$

where $T_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. (Here, and later, $A_n \sim B_n$ means that $0 < c_1 \le A_n/B_n \le c_2$ where c_1 and c_2 do not depend on n, but may depend on other, previously fixed parameters.)

To be more precise about T_n, we introduce the corresponding Mhaskar–Rahmanov–Saff (MRS) number $a_u(w)$, the positive root of the equation

$$u = \frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^1 \frac{a_u t\ Q'(a_u t)}{\sqrt{1-t^2}}dt, \qquad u > 0 \tag{1.16}$$

(see [5, (1.13)]).

As an important application we mention the relations

$$\begin{cases} \|r_n w\| = \max\limits_{|x|\le a_n(w)} |r_n(x)w(x)| \\ \|r_n w\| > |r_n(x)w(x)| \qquad \text{for } |x| > a_n(w) \end{cases} \tag{1.17}$$

valid for $r_n \in \mathscr{P}_n$ and $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{R})$.

If $w = w_{k,\alpha}$ then

$$a_n = \left\{\log_{k-1}\left(\log n - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=2}^{k+1}\log_{(j)} n + O(1)\right)\right\}^{1/\alpha} \tag{1.18}$$

where $\log_{(j)} = \log(\log(\dots))$, is the jth iterated logarithm.

Using a_n, T_n can be written as

$$T_n = T(a_n(w)). \tag{1.19}$$

Later on we use that $T_n = o(n^2)$ (see [9, p. 209, (VIII)]).

Again, if $w = w_{k,\alpha}$, then $T_n \sim \prod_{j=1}^{k}\log_{(j)} n$ (see [9, (1.13)–(1.16)]).

1.5. But we can do better as far as the order of Λ_n is concerned. Let $y_0 = y_{0n} > 0$ denote a point such that

$$|p_n(w^2, y_0)w(y_0)| = \|p_n(w^2)w\|. \tag{1.20}$$

Then if

$$V(w^2) = \{\{y_{kn}(w^2),\ 1 \le k \le n\} \cup \{y_{0n}, -y_{0n}\},\ n \in N\}$$

one can prove the following.

Let $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{R})$. Then

$$\Lambda_n(w, V(w^2)) \sim \log n \tag{1.21}$$

(see [1, (1.22)]; concerning the additional points $\{\pm y_{0n}\}$, see [12]).

1B. Exponential weights on $[-1, 1]$

1.6. Instead of $\mathbb{R}$, we can define our weight function w on the interval $(-1, 1)$. There is a substantial resemblance concerning formulas, definitions and theorems. So sometimes, especially in proofs, we only refer to the corresponding relations defined on $\mathbb{R}$. Following the exhaustive memoir of Levin and Lubinsky [4], we define the class of functions W as follows.

DEFINITION. Let $w(x) = e^{-Q(x)}$ where $Q\colon (-1, 1) \to \mathbb{R}$, is even and is twice continuously differentiable in $(-1, 1)$. Assume moreover, that $Q' \geq 0$, $Q'' \geq 0$ in $(0, 1)$ and $\lim_{x \to 1-0} Q(x) = \infty$. The function

$$T(x) := 1 + x\frac{Q''(x)}{Q'(x)}, \qquad x \in [0, 1) \tag{1.22}$$

is increasing in $[0, 1)$, moreover

$$\begin{cases} \text{(i)} & T(0+) > 1, \\ \text{(ii)} & T(x) \sim Q'(x)/Q(x), \quad x \text{ close enough to } 1, \\ \text{(iii)} & T(x)/(1 - x^2) \geq A > 2, \quad x \text{ close enough to } 1. \end{cases} \tag{1.23}$$

Then we write $w \in W$ (see [4, p. 5 and (1.34)]).

REMARKS. (1) Let $w_{0,\alpha}(x) = \exp(-(1 - x^2)^{-\alpha})$, $\alpha > 0$ and $w_{k,\alpha}(x) = \exp(-\exp_k(1 - x^2)^{-\alpha})$, $\alpha > 0$, $k \geq 1$. These strongly vanishing weights at ± 1 are from W ([4, §1]).

(2) Consider the ultraspherical Jacobi weight $w^{(\alpha)}(x) = (1 - x^2)^{\alpha}$, $\alpha > -1$. Here $Q(x) = -\alpha \log(1 - x^2)$, that is $w^{(\alpha)} \notin W$ if $-1 < \alpha < 0$ (the conditions for $Q(x)$ are not satisfied). If $\alpha \geq 0$ then $w^{(\alpha)}$ satisfies all the conditions required for W but (1.23) (ii), (iii) (by routine calculation, $T(x) = 2(1 - x^2)^{-1}$ while $Q'(x)/Q(x) = -2x\{(1 - x^2)\log(1 - x^2)\}^{-1}$, $x \in (-1, 1)$). That means, $w^{(\alpha)} \notin W$ even for non-negative values of α. However, they are very similar (at least from our point of view) to weights in W, so we can deal with them (see subsections 1.9 – 1.10).

1.7. Now the interpolatory matrix $X = \{x_{kn}\}$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is in the open (!) interval $I = (-1, 1)$; the meaning of $C(w, I)$, $L_n(f, w, X, x)$, $\lambda_n(w, X, x)$, $\Lambda_n(w, X)$, $E_{n-1}(f, w)$, $p_n(w^2, x)$ and $\{y_{kn}(w^2)\} \subset (-1, 1)$ are clear (see (1.4)–(1.14)). For example if $w \in W$, then

$$C(w, I) := \left\{ f : f \text{ is continuous on } I \text{ and } \lim_{|x| \to 1} f(x)w(x) = 0 \right\}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1446788700034923 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Again, if $w \in W$, $E_{n-1}(f, w) \to 0$ whenever $f \in C(w, I)$, that is the Lebesgue estimation (1.12) holds true (now $\|\cdot\| = \max_{-1\le x\le 1} |\cdot|$). As one can prove

$$\Lambda_n(w, Y(w^2)) \sim (nT_n)^{1/6}, \qquad w \in W \tag{1.24}$$

(see [2]) where $T_n = T(a_n)$ and $a_n = a_n(w)$, $w \in W$, is defined by (1.16). By [4, (1.16), (1.17)], $1 - a_n(w_{0\alpha}) \sim n^{-1/(\alpha+\frac{1}{2})}$ and $1 - a_n(w_{k,\alpha}) \sim (\log_k n)^{-1/\alpha}$ whence, by (1.23) (iii), $T_n \to \infty$. On the other hand, by (1.23) (i) and [4, (3.8)], $1 < T_n = o(n^2)$.

1.8. As in subsection 1.5, using some additional points 'close' to $a_n(w)$, for the corresponding matrix $V(w^2)$ we get (see [2])

$$\Lambda_n(w, V(w^2)) \sim \log n, \qquad w \in W. \tag{1.25}$$

1.9. In subsections 1.9–1.10 we deal with Jacobi weights and their generalizations. First we give the rather general definition (see [10]; the present paper uses only a special case of [10; Definition 1.1]).

In what follows, $L^p[a, b]$ denotes the set of functions F such that

$$\begin{cases} \|F\|_{L^p[a,b]} := \left\{\int_a^b |F(t)|^p dt\right\}^{1/p} & \text{if} \quad 0 < p < \infty, \\ \|F\|_\infty := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{a\le t\le b} |F(t)| & \text{if} \quad p = \infty \end{cases}$$

is finite. If $p \ge 1$ it is a norm; for $0 < p < 1$ its pth power defines a metric in $L^p[a, b]$.

By a *modulus of continuity* we mean a nondecreasing, continuous semiadditive function $\omega(\delta)$ on $[0, \infty)$ with $\omega(0) = 0$. If, in addition,

$$\omega(\delta) + \omega(\eta) \le 2\omega(\delta/2 + \eta/2) \qquad \text{for any } \delta, \eta \ge 0,$$

then $\omega(\delta)$ is a *concave* modulus of continuity, in which case $\delta/\omega(\delta)$ is nondecreasing for $\delta \ge 0$. We define $\omega(f, \delta)_p = \sup_{|\lambda|\le\delta} \|f(\lambda + \cdot) - f(\cdot)\|_p$, the *modulus of continuity of* f in L^p (where L^p stands for $L^p[0, 2\pi]$).

For a fixed $m \ge 0$ let

$$-1 = u_{m+1} < u_m < \cdots < u_1 < u_0 = 1$$

and with $l_r \in \mathbb{N}$ $(r = 0, 1, \ldots, m+1)$

$$w_r(\delta) := \prod_{s=1}^{l_r} \{\omega_{rs}(\delta)\}^{\alpha(r,s)},$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1446788700034923 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where $\omega_{rs}(\delta)$ are concave moduli of continuity with $\alpha(r,s) > 0$ ($s = 1, 2, \dots, l_r$; $r = 0, 1, \dots, m+1$).

Further let $H(x)$ be a *positive continuous* function on $[-1, 1]$ such that for $h(\vartheta) :=$ $H(\cos\vartheta)$

$$\omega(h,\delta)_\infty \delta^{-1} \in L^1[0,1] \quad \text{or} \quad \omega(h,\delta)_2 = 0(\sqrt{\delta}), \quad \delta \to 0.$$

DEFINITION. The function

$$w(x) = H(x) w_0(\sqrt{1-x}) w_{m+1}(\sqrt{1+x}) \prod_{r=1}^{m} w_r(|x - u_r|), \quad -1 \le x \le 1, \tag{1.26}$$

is a generalized Jacobi weight ($w \in GJ$), with singularities u_r ($0 \le r \le m+1$).

REMARK. Since $\omega_{rs}(\tau) \le \omega_{rs}(\delta)$ ($0 \le \tau \le \delta$),

$$\int_0^\delta w_r(\tau) d\tau \le \delta w_r(\delta); \tag{1.27}$$

in [10, Definition 1.10] where $\alpha(r,s)$ might be negative, this important inequality had to be assumed (see [10, (1.12)]). Actually by (1.27) and [10, (1.24)] we get

$$\int_0^\delta w_r(\tau) d\tau \sim \delta w_r(\delta), \qquad r = 0, 1, \dots, m+1. \tag{1.28}$$

1.10. If $S(w) = S := \{u_r : r = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ denotes the set containing the *inner* singularities of $w \in GJ$, a natural condition for an interpolatory $X \subset (1, 1)$ is that $X \cap S = \emptyset$.

As above, one can define matrices $V(w^2) \subset (-1, 1) \setminus S$, $w \in GJ$, with

$$\Lambda_n(w, V(w^2)) \sim \log n \tag{1.29}$$

(see [8], [11], [16]).

2. New results

2.1. It is natural to seek to prove that the order of the estimations $\Lambda(w, V(w^2)) \sim \log n$ (see (1.21), (1.25) and (1.29)) is the best amongst the interpolatory matrices. We can get much more.

THEOREM 2.1. *Let $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{R})$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ be fixed. Then for any fixed interpolatory matrix $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ there exist sets $H_n = H_n(w, \varepsilon, X)$ with $|H_n| \le \varepsilon a_n(w)$ such that*

$$(2.1) \qquad \lambda_n(w, X, x) > \frac{1}{3840}\varepsilon \log n \quad \text{if} \quad x \in [-a_n(w), a_n(w)] \setminus H_n,$$

whenever $n \ge n_1$.

REMARK. Here (and later) n_1 depends on ε and w but not on X.

2.2. Similarly on $(-1, 1)$ (see (1.25) and (1.29)), we state (with $S = \emptyset$ when $w \in W$) the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.2. *Let $w \in W \cup GJ$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ be fixed. Then for any $X \subset (-1, 1) \setminus S$ there exist sets $H_n = H_n(w, \varepsilon, X)$ with $|H_n| \le \varepsilon$ such that*

$$(2.2) \qquad \lambda_n(w, X, x) > \eta(\varepsilon, w) \log n \quad \text{if } x \in (-1, 1) \setminus H_n$$

whenever $n \ge n_1$. Especially, $\eta(\varepsilon, w) = \varepsilon/3840$ if $w \in W$ or $w = (1 - x^2)^\alpha$, $\alpha \ge 0$.

3. Proofs

3.1. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1 (subsections 3.1–3.10). First we state some properties of $p_n = p_n(w^2)$ and $p_n w$, $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathscr{R})$.

Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ be fixed and consider the interval $I_n = I_n(\varepsilon) = [-b_n, b_n] = [-a_n(1 - \varepsilon/5), a_n(1 - \varepsilon/5)]$. By definition $|[-a_n, a_n] \setminus I_n| = 2\varepsilon a_n/5$. First we deal with the interval I_n.

By (1.14), $p_n(x) = p_n(w^2, x) = \gamma_n(w^2) \prod_{k=1}^{n} (x - y_{kn}(w^2))$. Using the notation $y_{kn} = y_{kn}(w^2)$, we have

STATEMENT 3.1. Let $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{R})$. Then uniformly in k and $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(3.1) \qquad \tilde{c}_1 \frac{a_n}{n} \le y_{kn} - y_{k+1,n} \le c_1 \frac{a_n}{n}, \qquad y_{k,n}, y_{k+1,n} \in I_n,$$

$$(3.2) \qquad |p_n'(y_{kn}) w(y_{kn})| \sim \frac{n}{a_n^{3/2}}, \qquad y_{kn} \in I_n.$$

Moreover, uniformly in k, x and $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(3.3) \qquad |p_n(x) w(x)| \le c|x - y_{kn}| \frac{n}{a_n^{3/2}}; \qquad x, y_{kn} \in I_n.$$

Finally,

$$(3.4) \qquad |p_n(x) w(x)| \le c\, a_n^{-1/2} (n T_n)^{1/6}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

See [5, (1.24) and the remark after the formula] for (3.1); [5, last formula on p. 285] for (3.2); [5, (10.28)] for (3.3), and [5, (1.26)] for (3.4). We used that $\psi_n(x) \sim \varphi_n(x) \sim 1$ whenever $x \in I_n$. ($\psi_n(x)$ and $\varphi_n(x)$ are defined by [5; (1.19) and (10.11), (10.12)], respectively.)

Now let $y_j = y_{jn} = y_{j(n,x),n}$ be defined by

$$|x - y_{jn}| = \min_{1\le k\le n} |x - y_{kn}|. \tag{3.5}$$

LEMMA 3.2. *We have, uniformly in $x \in I_n$,*

$$|p_n(x)w(x)| \sim |p_n'(y_{jn})w(y_{jn})|\,|x - y_{jn}| \sim \frac{n}{a_n^{3/2}}|x - y_{jn}|. \tag{3.6}$$

REMARKS. (1) The constants in formula (3.1)–(3.3) and (3.6) do depend on ε.
(2) By definition, (3.5) and (3.6) mean that $|(t_{jn}(Y(w^2), x)| \sim 1$ whenever $x \in I_n$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.2. Using [1, (2.16)],

$$\|t_{kn}(Y(w^2))\| \le c, \qquad 1 \le k \le n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.7}$$

Consider the polynomial $\tau_{kn}(x) = l_{kn}(Y(w^2), x)w^{-1}(y_k) \in \mathscr{P}_{n-1}$. By definition, $t_{kn}(x) = \tau_k(y_k)w(y_k) = 1$; further, using (3.7) we get $|\tau_k(x)w(x)| \le c$ for any k, n and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, applying a Markov–Bernstein inequality in [6, (1.26)],

$$\begin{aligned} |t_k(x)| = |\tau_k(x)w(x)| &= |\tau_k(y_k)w(y_k) + (\tau_k(\xi)w(\xi))'(x - y_k)| \\ &\ge |1 - c\,\eta\, n\, a_n^{-1} \cdot a_n n^{-1}| \ge 1/2 \quad \text{if} \quad |x - y_k| \le \eta a_n/n \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

(ξ between x and y_k, x, $y_k \in I_n$), whenever we choose $\eta > 0$, fixed, properly small.

Notice that $\eta > 0$ does not depend on k and n.

Now, relations (3.7) and (3.8) give (3.6) at least for x satisfying relations $|x - y_j| \le \eta\, a_n/n$, $x \in I_n$.

We can finish the proof of the lemma as follows. For a fixed l, denote by z the unique maximum point in (y_l, y_{l-1}) of $|p_n(x)w(x)|$, $2 \le l \le n$ (for uniqueness consult Lubinsky [7, Lemma]). Using (3.3) if $x \in (y_l, y_{l-1}) \subset I_n$ and $k = l$, gives that $|p_n(z)w(z)| \le c\, a_n n^{-1} n\, a_n^{-3/2} \sim a_n^{-1/2}$. On the other hand if $z_1 = y_l + \eta\, a_n/n$, $z_2 = y_{l-1} - \eta\, a_n/n$, we get relations $|p_n(z_i)w(z_i)| \sim a_n n^{-1} n\, a_n^{-3/2} = a_n^{-1/2}$ (see (3.6)), whence $y_{l-1} - z \sim z - y_l \sim a_n/n$ is obvious. Then, we can choose $\eta > 0$ so that $z - z_1 \sim z_2 - z \sim a_n/n$. Now, if $x \in (z_1, z_2)$, by the monotonicity of $p_n w$ (see [7, Lemma]), $a_n^{-1/2} \sim |p_n(z)w(z)| \ge |p_n(x)w(x)| > \min(|p_n(z_1)w(z_1)|, |p_n(z_2)w(z_2)|) \sim a_n^{-1/2}$ which, using that now $|x - y_j| \sim a_n/n$, gives relation (3.6).

3.2. Next, we prove Theorem 2.1 for $x \in I_n = I_n(\varepsilon)$. Fix n and let $K_n = \{k : x_{kn} \in I_n\}$. First suppose that $|K_n| := N = N_n > 0$ and denote the corresponding nodes $\{x_{kn}\} \subset I_n$ by $z_{1n}, z_{2n}, \ldots, z_{Nn}$. We order them as

$$z_{N+1,n} := -b_n \leq z_{Nn} < z_{N-1,n} < \cdots < z_{2n} < z_{1n} \leq z_{0n} := b_n. \tag{3.9}$$

We introduce some other notations and definitions. Let

$$\begin{cases} J_k = J_{kn}(Z) := [z_{k+1,n}, z_{kn}], \quad (J_k) := (J_{kn}(Z)) = (z_{k+1,n}, z_{kn}), \\ J_k(q_k) = J_{kn}(q(J_{kn})) := [z_{k+1} + q_k|J_k|, z_k - q_k|J_k|], \\ \overline{J_k} = \overline{J_k(q_k)} := J_k \setminus J_k(q_k) \text{ with } 0 < q_k \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 0 \leq k \leq N. \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

The interval J_k is called *short* if and only if $|J_k| \leq a_n\delta_n$, where $\delta_n = n^{-1/6}$, say; the others are called *long*. (Actually, arbitrary $\delta_n = n^{-\alpha}$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, works.)

3.3. For the long intervals we prove (see [15, Lemma 3.3] and the references there).

LEMMA 3.3. *Let* $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{R})$, $J_k \subset I_n$, $a_n\delta_n < |J_k|$, $c_0/(n\delta_n) < q_k < \frac{1}{4}$ *and define* $\varrho = \varrho(k,n) := [(q_k/2)|J_k|(n/c_1a_n)]$. *Then for a proper* $h_{kn} \subset J_k$ *we have*

$$\lambda_n(w, X, x) > c_2 \frac{3^{\varrho(k,n)}}{n^{7/6}T_n^{1/6}\delta_n} \qquad \text{if } x \in J_{kn} \setminus h_{kn}. \tag{3.11}$$

Here $|h_{kn}| \leq 4q_k|J_k|$, $0 \leq k \leq N$, $n \geq n_0$; *the constants* n_0 *and* c_0 *are properly chosen.*

PROOF. Let us consider those roots y_{in} of $p_n(x)$ which are in $J_k(q_k)$. By (3.1), their number is not less than

$$\left[(1 - 2q_k)|J_k|\frac{n}{c_1a_n}\right] > c(1 - 2q_k)n\delta_n.$$

Let us define the set $h_k = h_{kn}$ by

$$h_k = \overline{J_k(q_k)} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{\Delta_i \subset J_k(q_k)} \overline{\Delta_i(q_k)} \right\},$$

where $\Delta_i = \Delta_i(Y) = [y_i, y_{i+1}]$ and (Δ_i), $\Delta_i(q_k)$, $\overline{\Delta_i}$ are defined according to (3.10). (We use the same $q_k = q(J_k)$ for every Δ_i.) By construction,

$$|h_k| < 4q_k|J_k|.$$

To prove (3.11), let $y \in J_k \setminus h_k = J_k(q_k) \setminus h_k$ and consider the interval

$$M(y) = \left[y - \frac{q_k}{4}|J_k|, y + \frac{q_k}{4}|J_k|\right] \subset J_k\left(\frac{3q_k}{4}\right),$$

containing at least

$$\left[\frac{q_k}{2}|J_k|\frac{n}{c_1 a_n}\right] = \varrho > c\ q_k n\delta_n \geq 1 \tag{3.12}$$

roots of $p_n(x)$ if $c_0 > 0$ is properly chosen.

Consider the polynomial $r(x) = \prod_{y_i \notin M(y)}(x - y_i)$. Since

$$p_n(u) = \gamma_n r(u) \prod_{y_i \in M(y)} (u - y_i),$$

we have

$$w(x)r(x) = \frac{w(x)p_n(x)}{w(y)p_n(y)} w(y)r(y) \prod_{y_i \in M(y)} \frac{y - y_i}{x - y_i}.$$

Here, if $x \notin (J_k)$, by construction

$$\left|\frac{y - y_i}{x - y_i}\right| \leq \frac{1}{3};$$

$$|w(x)p_n(x)| \leq c\ a_n^{-1/2}(nT_n)^{1/6}$$

(see (3.4)). Finally if $y_i = y_j(y)$ is the nearest root of p_n to y, by construction,

$$|w(y)p_n(y)| \geq c|p_n'(y_j)w(y_j)(y - y_j)| \sim na_n^{-3/2}q_k\frac{a_n}{n} = q_k a_n^{-1/2}$$

(see (3.6)). So, as $c_0 q_k^{-1} < n\,\delta_n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |w(x)r(x)| &\leq c|w(y)r(y)|\,\frac{a_n^{-1/2}(nT_n)^{1/6}}{q_k a_n^{-1/2}}3^{-\varrho} \\ &\leq c|w(y)r(y)|\,\frac{n\,\delta_n(nT_n)^{1/6}}{3^{\varrho}}, \qquad x \notin (J_k). \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

On the other hand, since $\varrho \geq 1$, $r(x) \in \mathscr{P}_{n-1}$ whence, using Lagrange interpolation,

$$w(y)r(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w(x_i)r(x_i)\frac{w(y)}{w(x_i)}l_i(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w(x_i)r(x_i)t_i(y). \tag{3.14}$$

Using $x_i \notin (J_k)$, (3.13) and (3.14) yield

$$|w(y)r(y)| \leq c|w(y)r(y)|\,\frac{n^{7/6}T_n^{1/6}\delta_n}{3^{\varrho}}\lambda_n(w, y),$$

whence as $w(y)r(y) \neq 0$, we get (3.11) with a constant $c_2 > 0$, actually for every $0 < \delta_n \leq 1/2$ (say).

3.4. Let us apply Lemma 3.3 for every long interval J_k with $q_k = 1/\log n$, say. By (3.12), we get the relation $\varrho(k,n) > n\delta_n/\log^2 n \gg n^{2/3}$, whence by (3.11) and $1 < T_n = o(n^2)$

$$\lambda_n(w,x) \gg n, \qquad x \in D_{1n} \setminus H_{1n}, \tag{3.15}$$

where $D_{1n} = \bigcup_k \{J_k : J_k \text{ is long}\}$ and $H_{1n} = \bigcup_k \{h_k : J_k \text{ is long}\}$. By construction

$$|H_{1n}| \le \sum |h_k| \le 4 \sum q_k |J_k| \le \frac{4}{\log n} a_n, \tag{3.16}$$

where the summations are over $k : J_k \subset D_{1n} \subset I_n$. That is (2.1) holds for the long intervals in I_n, apart from a set of measure $\le 4a_n/\log n$. If $|K_n| = 0$, the same argument works for the whole interval $J_{kn} = I_n$.

3.5. Next, we consider the short intervals (subsections 3.5–3.9). Let φ_n denote the number of short intervals J_{kn}, $1 \le k \le N-1$. If $\varphi_n \le n^\gamma$, then their total measure $\le n^\gamma a_n \delta_n = o(a_n)$, whenever $0 < \gamma < 1/6$, which we suppose from now on. So adding them to the exceptional set H_n, we get, using (3.16) and (3.11),

$$|H_n| \le |H_{1n}| + o(a_n) + 2a_n\delta_n + 2(a_n - b_n) < \varepsilon a_n$$

that is we would get the theorem (the third term, $2a_n\delta_n$, estimates the measure of the (possibly) short interval(s) J_{Nn} and (or) J_{0n}; the fourth one measures the set $[-a_n, a_n] \setminus I_n$).

3.6. So from now on we can suppose $\varphi_n > n^\gamma$. First we introduce some further notations. With $\Omega_n(x) = \omega_n(x) w(x)$, let $u_k = u_k(q_k)$ be defined by

$$|\Omega_n(u_k)| := \min_{x \in J_k(q_k)} |\Omega_n(x)|, \qquad 1 \le k \le N-1,$$

($|\Omega_n(u_k)| > 0$, as $q_k > 0$). Further let

$$|J_i, J_k| := \max(|z_{i+1} - z_k|, |z_{k+1} - z_i|), \quad 1 \le i, k \le N-1,$$
$$\varrho(J_i, J_k) := \min(|z_{i+1} - z_k|, |z_{k+1} - z_i|), \quad 1 \le i, k \le N-1.$$

We prove (see [15, Lemma 3.4 and its references]) the following lemma.

LEMMA 3.4. *Let $1 \le k, r \le N-1$. Then if $w \in \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{R})$,*

$$|t_k(x)| + |t_{k+1}(x)| > \frac{1}{4} \frac{|\Omega_n(u_r)|}{|\Omega_n(u_k)|} \frac{|\overline{J}_k|}{|J_r, J_k|}, \quad n \ge 2, \tag{3.17}$$

whenever $x \in J_r(q_r)$, $\varrho(J_r, J_k) \ge a_n\delta_n$ and $|J_r| \le a_n\delta_n$. Here t_k and t_{k+1} are the fundamental functions corresponding to z_k and z_{k+1}, respectively.

PROOF. The proof of this lemma is similar to the one in [15]. We include it for sake of completeness. First we verify relation

$$|t_s(x)| = \left|\frac{\Omega(x)}{\Omega'(z_s)(x-z_s)}\right| = \frac{|\Omega(x)|}{|\Omega(u_r)|}\left|\frac{u_r - z_s}{x - z_s}\right| |t_s(u_r)|$$
$$\geq \frac{1}{2}|t_s(u_r)| \quad \text{if } s = k,\ k+1 \text{ and } x \in J_r(q_r). \tag{3.18}$$

Indeed,

$$\frac{|u_r - z_s|}{|x - z_s|} \geq \frac{\{|u_r - z_s| + a_n\delta_n\} - a_n\delta_n}{|u_r - z_s| + a_n\delta_n} \geq 1 - \frac{a_n\delta_n}{2a_n\delta_n} = \frac{1}{2},$$

which gives (3.18). So we can write if $r < k$, say,

$$|t_k(x)| + |t_{k+1}(x)| \geq \frac{1}{2}\{|t_k(u_r)| + |t_{k+1}(u_r)|\}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}\left|\frac{\Omega(u_r)}{\Omega(u_k)}\right| \left\{|t_k(u_k)|\frac{z_k - u_k}{u_r - z_k} + |t_{k+1}(u_k)|\frac{u_k - z_{k+1}}{u_r - z_{k+1}}\right\}$$
$$\geq \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\Omega(u_r)|}{|\Omega(u_k)|}\frac{q_k|J_k|}{|J_r, J_k|}\{|t_k(u_k)| + |t_{k+1}(u_k)|\}, \quad x \in J_r(q_r). \tag{3.19}$$

To obtain (3.17), we use [7, Theorem 1] which is stated as follows.

STATEMENT 3.5. Let $(a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $w = e^{-Q}: (a, b) \to (0, \infty)$. Assume that Q' exists and is non-decreasing in (a, b). Then for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$

$$|t_{kn}(w, X, x)| + |t_{k+1,n}(w, X, x)| \geq 1 \qquad \text{if } x \in [x_{k+1,n}, x_{kn}] \tag{3.20}$$

for arbitrary interpolatory $X \subset (a, b)$.

Applying (3.20) we obtain (3.17), considering that $2q_k|J_k| = |\overline{J}_k|$.

REMARKS. (1) Actually, if $x \in [x_{k+1}, x_k]$, then $t_s(x) \geq 0$ $(s = k, k+1)$.
(2) Relation (3.20) is a generalization of an old theorem of Erdős and Turán which says that for an arbitrary interpolatory X,

$$l_{kn}(X, x) + l_{k+1,n}(X, x) \geq 1 \quad \text{if} \quad x \in [x_{k+1,n}, x_{kn}],\ 1 \leq k \leq n-1$$

(see [3; Lemma 4, p. 529]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1446788700034923 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.7. The following statement gives a result of Vértesi [14, Lemma 3.3] in a slightly different form.

STATEMENT 3.6. Let $F_k = [A_k, B_k]$, $1 \le k \le t$, $t \ge 2$ be any t intervals in $[-A, A]$ with $|F_k \cap F_j| = 0$ $(k \ne j)$, $|F_k| \le A\delta$ $(1 \le k,\ j \le t)$, $\sum_{k=1}^{t} |\overline{F}_k| = A\mu$. Let $\xi \ge \delta$. If with a fixed integer $R \ge 4$ we have $\mu \ge 2^R \xi$, then there exists the index s $(1 \le s \le t)$ such that

$$S:=\sum_{\substack{k=1\\ \varrho(F_s,F_k)\ge A\xi}}^{t} \frac{|\overline{F}_k|}{|F_s, F_k|} \ge \frac{R\mu}{8} - \frac{3}{2}. \tag{3.21}$$

F_s will be called the accumulation interval of $\{F_k\}_{k=1}^{t}$.

Here the definitions of $\overline{F}_k = \overline{F_k(q_k)}$, $|F_s, F_k|$ and $\varrho(F_s, F_k)$ correspond to the previous ones; μ, δ and ξ are fixed positive real numbers.

3.8. Now we define q_k for the short intervals. Let $D_{2n} := \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1}\{J_k : |J_k| \le a_n\delta_n\}$ and $K_{2n} := \{k : |J_k| \le a_n\delta_n,\ 1 \le k \le N-1\}$, $|K_{2n}| = \varphi_n$. If m_k denotes the middle point of J_k, let

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{kn} &:= \max\{y : z_{k+1} \le y \le m_k \text{ and (2.1) does not hold for } y\},\\
\gamma_{kn} &:= \min\{y : m_k \le y \le z_k \text{ and (2.1) does not hold for } y\},\\
d_{kn} &:= \max(\beta_k - z_{k+1}, z_k - \gamma_k),
\end{aligned}$$

finally

$$q_{kn} = q(J_{kn}) = d_{kn}/|J_{kn}|, \qquad k \in K_{2n}. \tag{3.22}$$

Using $\lambda_n(w, x_k) = 1$, we obtain that $q_k > 0$. Further by definition, (2.1) holds true whenever x is from the interior of $J_k(q_k)$, $k \in K_{2n}$. For the remaining 'bad' sets $\overline{J}_k$ we prove relation

$$\sum_{k\in K_{2n}} |\overline{J}_k| := a_n\mu_n \le \frac{a_n\varepsilon}{2} \qquad \text{if} \qquad n \ge n_1. \tag{3.23}$$

Clearly, we can suppose that $n \in \{n_i\} = N_1$ for which $\mu_n > \varepsilon/2$. Now we can apply Statement 3.6 with the cast $\{F_r\} = \{J_{kn}\}_{k\in K_{2n}} = D_{2n}$, $A = a_n$, $\xi = \delta = \delta_n$, $\mu = \mu_n$, $R = [\log_2 n^{1/7}]$ and $n \in N_1$.

We get the accumulation interval and we denote it by $M_1 = M_{1n}$ (1st step). Dropping M_{1n} we apply Statement 3.6 again, for the intervals $\{F_r\} = D_{2n} \setminus M_{1n}$

with $\mu = \mu_n - |\overline{M}_{1n}|/a_n \geq \mu_n - \delta_n > \mu_n/2$ and with the same A, ξ, δ, R and N_1. We get the accumulation interval M_{2n} (2nd step). At the ith step ($3 \leq i \leq \psi_n$) we drop $M_{1n}, M_{2n}, \ldots, M_{i-1,n}$ and apply Statement 3.6 again for the intervals $\{F_r\} = D_{2n} \setminus \bigcup_{t=1}^{i-1} M_{tn}$ with $\mu = \mu_n - \sum_{t=1}^{i-1} |\overline{M}_{tn}|/a_n$ and with the same A, ξ, δ, R and N_1. Here ψ_n denotes the first index for which

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\psi_n-1} |\overline{M}_t| \leq \frac{a_n\mu_n}{2} \quad \text{but} \quad \sum_{t=1}^{\psi_n} |\overline{M}_t| > \frac{a_n\mu_n}{2}, \qquad n \in N_1. \tag{3.24}$$

Denoting by $M_{\psi_n+1,n}, M_{\psi_n+2,n}, \ldots, M_{\varphi_n,n}$ the remaining (that is not accumulation) intervals of D_{2n}, from relation (3.21) we get, if n_1 is big enough,

$$\sum_{k=r}^{\varphi_n}{}' \frac{|\overline{M}_k|}{|M_r, M_k|} \geq \frac{\mu_n \log n}{2\cdot 7\cdot 8} - \frac{3}{2} > \frac{\mu_n \log n}{120}, \qquad 1 \leq r \leq \psi_n, \qquad n \in N. \tag{3.25}$$

Here and later the dash on the summation indicates that we omit those indices k for which $\varrho(M_r, M_k) < a_n\delta_n$.

3.9. By (3.22), we can choose the 'bad' points $v_{in} \in M_{in}(q_{in}/2)$ such that (2.1) does not hold for v_{in} ($1 \leq i \leq \varphi_n, n \in N_1, q_{in} = q_{in}(M_{in})$).

If for a fixed $n \in N_1$ there exists an index t ($1 \leq t \leq \varphi_n$) such that

$$\lambda_n(w, v_{tn}) \geq 2c\,\mu_n \log n \tag{3.26}$$

(where $c > 0$ will be determined later), then, using (2.1), we get relation $c\,\varepsilon \log n \geq \lambda_n(w, v_{tn})$, whence by (3.26), $2\mu_n \leq \varepsilon$. That means, we obtained (3.23). *We shall verify* (3.26) *for every fixed* $n \in N_1$ with a proper $t = t(n)$. Indeed, otherwise for a certain $m \in N_1$

(3.27)

$$\lambda_m(w, v_{rm}) < 2c\,\mu_n \log m, \quad v_{rm} \in M_{rm}(q_{rm}/2), \quad \text{for every } r, \quad 1 \leq r \leq \varphi_m.$$

Then, by (3.27) and (3.23)

$$\sum_{r=1}^{\varphi_m} |\overline{M}_{rm}| \lambda_m(w, v_{rm}) < 2c\,a_m\mu_m^2 \log m. \tag{3.28}$$

On the other hand, applying (3.17) with $q_{kn}(M_{kn})/2$ we can write (with the same $|\overline{M}_i|$, as above)

$$|\overline{M}_r| \sum_{k=1}^{n} |t_k(v_{rn})| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\overline{M}_r| \sum_{k\in K_{2n}}{}' \{|t_k(v_{rn})| + |t_{k+1}(v_{rn})|\}$$

$$> \frac{1}{16}|\overline{M}_r| \sum_{k=1}^{\varphi_n}{}' \frac{|\Omega(\overline{u}_r)|}{|\Omega(\overline{u}_k)|} \frac{|\overline{M}_k|}{|M_r, M_k|}, \quad 1 \leq r \leq \varphi_n,$$

for *arbitrary* $n \in N_1$ (here $|\Omega(\overline{u}_i)| = \min_{x\in M_i(q_i/2)} |\Omega(x)|$). Then, using relation $a+a^{-1} \geq 2$, (3.24) and (3.25), we get for $n \in N_1$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{r=1}^{\varphi_n} |\overline{M}_r| \lambda_n(w, v_{rn}) &> \frac{1}{16} \sum_{r=1}^{\varphi_n} \sum_{k=1}^{\varphi_n}{}' \frac{|\Omega(\overline{u}_r)|}{|\Omega(\overline{u}_k)|} \frac{|\overline{M}_r||\overline{M}_k|}{|M_r, M_k|} \\ &= \frac{1}{16} \sum_{r=1}^{\varphi_n} \sum_{k=r}^{\varphi_n}{}' \left\{ \frac{|\Omega(\overline{u}_r)|}{|\Omega(\overline{u}_k)|} + \frac{|\Omega(\overline{u}_k)|}{|\Omega(\overline{u}_r)|} \right\} \frac{|\overline{M}_r||\overline{M}_k|}{|M_r, M_k|} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{8} \sum_{r=1}^{\psi_n} |\overline{M}_r| \sum_{k=r}^{\varphi_n}{}' \frac{|\overline{M}_k|}{|M_r, M_k|} > \frac{a_n \mu_n^2 \log n}{8 \cdot 2 \cdot 120} \\ &= 2c\, a_n \mu_n^2 \log n \qquad \text{if } c = 1/3840.\end{aligned}$$

But this contradicts (3.28), that is (3.26) must hold for any $n \in N_1$ with a proper $t = t(n)$. So (3.23) has been proved.

3.10. Finally, we estimate H_n. If J_{0n} is short, it should belong to H_n; the same holds for J_{Nn}. So by (3.16) and (3.23) (see subsection 3.5)

$$|H_n| \leq 4\frac{a_n}{\log n} + \frac{a_n \varepsilon}{2} + 2a_n\delta_n + 2(a_n - b_n) \leq \varepsilon a_n$$

which gives the theorem if $n \geq n_1(\varepsilon)$.

3.11. Proof of Theorem 2.2. The proof is analogous to the previous one after establishing the corresponding formula, so we only sketch it (subsections 3.11–3.14).

3.12. First let $w \in W$. The fact is that we have the same relations as before (for example, again $y_{kn}(w^2) - y_{k+1,n}(w^2) \sim a_n/n$, $y_{kn} \in I_n$), but of course, now I_n, $y_{kn}(w^2)$, $a_n(w)$, and so on, are defined for $w \in W$.

To be more precise, let $I_n = [-b_n, b_n]$ where, with $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $b_n = a_n(1 - \varepsilon/5)$. As we know $a_n \to 1$ (see [4, p. 30, (ii)], say).

Relations corresponding to Statement 3.1 are [4, (1.35); p. 130, last row; (12.7) and (1.39)] respectively. Notice that we used relations $a_n \sim 1$, $|y_{kn}| \leq b_n = a_n(1 - \varepsilon/5)$, $\delta_n := (nT_n)^{-2/3} = o(1)$ (see [4, (1.23)]), $\Psi_n(x) \sim \Phi_n(x) \sim 1$, if $x \in I_n$ ([4, (11.11) and (11.10)]).

The relation corresponding to (3.6) can be proved as in the proof of Lemma 3.2: the relation corresponding to (3.7) is [4, (12.5)]; the corresponding Markov–Bernstein inequality is now [4, (12.16)].

Moreover, the definition of the class W (see subsection 1.6) ensures that [7, Lemma] and [7, Theorem 1] hold true, whence, among others, Statement 3.5 can be applied.

Other details, which are based on the previously mentioned relations, can be left to the reader.

3.13. Let $w \in GJ$ be defined by formula (1.26), further let

$$I_n := [-1,1] \setminus \bigcup_{r=0}^{m+1} \left(u_r - \frac{\varepsilon}{10(m+1)}, u_r + \frac{\varepsilon}{10(m+1)} \right)$$

(actually, I_n does not depend on n, but for convenience, we keep this notation). Replacing a_n by 1, the formulae corresponding to (3.1), (3.2) and (3.6) come from [10; Theorems 3.2 and 3.3].

Indeed, (3.1) is immediate from [10, (3.4)]. To get (3.2), first let us remark that in I_n, $w(n,x) \sim w(x) \sim 1$, where $w(n,x) = w_0(\sqrt{1-x} + 1/n) w_{m+1}(\sqrt{1+x} + 1/n) \prod_{r=1}^{m} w_r(|x-u_r| + 1/n)$. Now [10, (3.5)] yields formula (3.2), because for $\varphi(x) = \sin\vartheta$ $(x = \cos\vartheta)$, $\varphi(x) \sim 1$ if $x \in I_n$.

To get (3.6) (which is an improvement of (3.3)), we use [10, (3.6)] and the fact $w(x) \sim w(n,x) \sim 1$, $x \in I_n$, again.

Finally we verify

$$\|p_n(w^2)w\| \leq c\sqrt{n} \tag{3.30}$$

(which corresponds to (3.4) if we replace T_n by n^2). We use relation

$$\|Q_n(x)w(n,x)\| \sim \|Q_n(x)w(x)\| \tag{3.31}$$

valid for any $Q_n \in \mathscr{P}_n$ supposing that the weight w satisfies the inequality

$$w(x) \leq \frac{c}{|I|} \int_I w(x)\,dx, \tag{3.32}$$

for all intervals $I \subset [-1,1]$ and $x \in I$ where $c > 0$ is independent of I and x (see [9, (5.1) and (6.26)]).

However, if $w \in GJ$, then relation (1.28) involves (3.32), that means (3.31) holds true whenever $w \in GJ$. Then, if $y_j = y_{jn}(w^2)$ is the closest root to x of $p_n(w^2,x)$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} |p_n(w^2,x)w(n,x)| &\sim |p_n(w^2,x)w(n,y_j)| \\ &\sim |p_n'(w^2,y_j)w(n,y_j)||x-y_j| \\ &\leq c\frac{n}{(\sin\vartheta_j)^{3/2}} \frac{\sin\vartheta_j}{n} \leq c\sqrt{n}, \quad |x| \leq 1, \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

(see [10; (3.4)–(3.6)] moreover, relations $w(n,x) \sim w(n,y_j)$ and $|x-y_j| \leq \sin\vartheta_j/n$), whence by (3.31) we get (3.30).

3.14. The above mentioned relations yield the analogue of Lemma 3.3 (again replacing T_n by n^2). However to get the relation corresponding to (3.20) we cannot use Statement 3.5 because we do not have the conditions for Q'; we choose another

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1446788700034923 Published online by Cambridge University Press

way. By definition, $w(x) \sim 1$ whenever $x \in I_n$; so by the Erdős–Turán relation (see subsection 3.6, Remark 2) we can write

$$(3.34)\quad t_k(x) + t_{k+1}(x) = \frac{w(x)}{w(x_k)} l_k(x) + \frac{w(x)}{w(x_{k+1})} l_{k+1}(x) \geq c\,\{l_k(x) + l_{k+1}(x)\} \geq c,$$

if $x \in J_k \subset I_n$; here c *does* depend on ε and w. Other details in proving (2.2) when $w \in GJ$ are analogous to the previous ones, so they are left to the reader.

References

[1] S. Damelin, 'The Lebesgue function and Lebesgue constant of Lagrange interpolation for Erdős weights', *J. Approx. Theory* (to appear).

[2] S. Damelin, 'Lebesgue bounds for exponential weights on $[-1, 1]$', *Acta Math. Hungar.* (to appear).

[3] P. Erdős and P. Turán, 'On interpolation. III', *Ann. of Math.* **41** (1940), 510–553.

[4] A. L. Levin and D. S. Lubinsky, *Christoffel functions and orthogonal polynomials for exponential weights on* $[-1, 1]$, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 535, Vol. 111 (1994).

[5] A. L. Levin and D. S. Lubinsky and T. Z. Mtembu, 'Christoffel functions and orthogonal polynomials for Erdős weights on $(-\infty, \infty)$', *Rend. Mat. Appl. (7)* **14** (1994), 199–289.

[6] D. S. Lubinsky, 'L_∞ Markov and Bernstein inequalities for Erdős weights', *J. Approx. Theory* **60** (1990), 188–230.

[7] D. S. Lubinsky, 'An extension of the Erdős–Turán inequality for the sum of successive fundamental polynomials', *Ann. of Numer. Math.* **2** (1995), 305–309.

[8] G. Mastroianni and M. G. Russo, 'Weighted Lagrange interpolation for Jacobi weights', *Technical Report.*

[9] G. Mastroianni and V. Totik; 'Weighted polynomial inequalities with doubling and A_∞ weights', *J. Approx. Theory* (to appear).

[10] G. Mastroianni and P. Vértesi, 'Some applications of generalized Jacobi weights', *Acta Math. Hungar.* **77**, (1997), 323–357.

[11] J. Szabados, 'Weighted Lagrange interpolation polynomials', *J. Inequal. Appl.* **1** (1997), 99–123.

[12] J. Szabados,' Weighted Lagrange and Hermite–Fejér interpolation on the real line', *Technical Report.*

[13] J. Szabados and P. Vértesi, *Interpolation of functions* (World Scientific, Singapore, New Jersey, London, Hong Kong, 1990).

[14] PVértesi,' New estimation for the Lebesgue function of Lagrange interpolation', *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **40** (1982), 21-27.

[15] P. Vértesi,' On the Lebesgue function of weighted Lagrange interpolation. I', *Constr. Approx.* (to appear).

[16] P. Vértesi,' Weighted Lagrange interpolation for generalized Jacobi weights', *Technical Report* (to appear).

Mathematical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Budapest P.O.B. 127
Hungary, 1364
e-mail: reter@math_inst.hu

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1446788700034923 Published online by Cambridge University Press