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# ACCOMPANYING SPACES TO A LINEAR TWO-DIMENSIONAL SPACE OF CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS WITH A CONTINUOUS FIRST DERIVATIVE 

JITKA KOJECKÁ<br>(Received March 27, 1981)

Dedicated to Prof. Miroslav Laitoch on his 60th birthday
M. Laitoch defined in [2] the $n$-th accompanying equation (n-natural) to a $2^{\text {nd }}$ order linear differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}=Q(t) y \tag{Q}
\end{equation*}
$$

( $Q<0$ is a continuous function on its definition interval $i \subset E_{1}$ ) with a given basis $[\alpha, \beta]$, where $\alpha, \beta$ are given real constants, $\alpha^{2}+\beta^{2} \neq 0$. If $u, v$ are two independent integrals of $(Q)$, then the function

$$
U=\frac{\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}}{\sqrt{\alpha^{2}-\beta^{2} Q}}, \quad V=\frac{\alpha v+\beta v^{\prime}}{\sqrt{\alpha^{2}-\beta^{2} Q}}
$$

form a basis of the space of all integrals of the first accompanying equation to $(Q)$.
The present paper investigates the properties of a linear two-dimensional space of continuous functions with the basis ( $\varrho\left(\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}\right), \varrho\left(\alpha v+\beta v^{\prime}\right)$ ), where $(u, v)$ is the base of a linear two-dimensional space of continuous functions with a continuous first derivative, $\varrho>0$ is a continuous function and $\alpha, \beta\left(\alpha^{2}+\beta^{2} \neq 0\right)$ are given real constants. There are investigated zeros of functions and extremes of phases relative to this space and conditions are stated under which this space is of the $0^{\text {th }}$ class, i.e. it has no extreme points. It is referred to [3], [4] and [5] where the linear two-dimensional spaces of continuous functions are studied from the point of view of Academician O. Borůvka's theory on transformations of solutions of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ order linear differential equations and to [6], where the spaces of continuous functions with a continuous first derivative are considered. We continue to use the results of the works cited at the end of this article.
0. In all what follows we are dealing with functions from $C_{1}(i), i \subset E_{1} ; y^{\prime} \in C_{0}(i)$ will always denote the derivative of the function $y \in C_{1}(i)$.

Remark 0.1. Three cases arise for the function $y \in C_{1}(i), y \not \equiv$ constant on $i$, and its derivative (cf. definition 1.1 [3]):

1. $y, y^{\prime}$ are dependent on the interval $i$,
2. $y, y^{\prime}$ are independent on the interval $i$,
3. $y, y^{\prime}$ are neither dependent or independent on the interval $i$.

Theorem 0.1. Let $y \in C_{1}(i), y \not \equiv$ constant on $i$. The functions $y, y^{\prime}$ are dependent on the interval $i$ exactly if $y \equiv k e^{c t}$ on the interval $i, t \in i$, where $k, c$ are nonzero constants.

Proof: I. Let $y, y^{\prime}$ be functions dependent on $i$. Then there exist real numbers $a, b\left(a^{2}+b^{2} \neq 0\right)$ such that $a y+b y^{\prime} \equiv 0$ on $i$. If one of the numbers $a, b$ were equal to zero, then with respect to the assumption $y \not \equiv$ constant, the other number would also be equal to zero, which would, however, contradict the assumption $a^{2}+b^{2} \neq 0$. Thus it holds in the whole interval $i$ that $y^{\prime}=c y$, where $c=-a / b$. Next, it must hold for all $t \in i$ that $y(t) \neq 0$. Namely, if there would exist a point $t_{0} \in i$ such that $y\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, then $y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ would follow from equation $y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=$ $=c y\left(t_{0}\right)$ and in view of this fact the equality $y^{\prime}=c y$ on $i$ may be satisfied by the functions $y \equiv 0$ and $y^{\prime} \equiv 0$ only, which again conflicts with our assumption that $y \not \equiv$ constant. The function $y=k e^{c t}$, where $k \neq 0$ is a constant, is the solution of the equation

$$
y^{\prime}(t)=c y(t), \quad t \in i .
$$

II. If $y=k e^{c t}, t \in i$, where $k, c$ are nonzero constants, we obtain $y^{\prime}=k c e^{c t}$. Then there exist numbers $a, b$, for instance $a=-c, b=1$, and it holds $a y+$ $+b y^{\prime} \equiv 0$ on $i$, hence $y$ and $y^{\prime}$ are dependent on $i$.

Corollary 0.1. Let $y \in C_{1}(i), y \neq$ constant on $i$. The functions $y, y^{\prime}$ are independent on $i$ exactly if $y \not \equiv k e^{c t}, t \in j$, holds on every interval $j \subset i$, where $k, c$ are nonzero constants.

Corollary 0.2. Let $y \in C_{1}(i), y \not \equiv$ constant on $i$. The function $y, y^{\prime}$ are neither dependent or independent on $i$ exactly if there exists an interval $j \subset i, j \neq i$, where $y \equiv k e^{c t}, t \in j$, and $y \not \equiv k e^{c t}, t \in i \backslash j$, on the interval $i \backslash j$, where $k, c$ are nonzero constants.

## 1. Zeros of functions of an accompanying space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ <br> to a space $S$

Let $u, v \in C_{1}(i)$ and $(u, v)$ be a basis of a linear two-dimensional space $S$ (cf. definition 1.2 [3]) whose range of definition is the interval $i \subset E_{1}$. Let ( $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}$ ) be a basis of the linear two-dimensional space $S^{\prime}$, where $S^{\prime}$ is the set of derivatives
of all functions of the space $S$. By Theorem 1.2 [6] no function $y \in S$ is equal to a nonzero constant on any interval $j \subset i$.

Convention 1.1. We assume throughout that for every function $y \in S$ the functions $y, y^{\prime}$ are independent on interval $i$. The functions identically equal to zero will be excluded from our considerations.

Theorem 1.1. Let $S$ be a space with a basis $(u, v), \varrho(t), t \in i$, be a function continuous and positive on the interval $i, \alpha, \beta$ are given real constants, $\alpha^{2}+\beta^{2} \neq 0$. Then the set of all functions having the form $\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)$, where $t \in i$ and $y \in S$, form a two-dimensional space of continuous functions with a basis $\left(\varrho\left(\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}\right), \varrho\left(\alpha v+\beta v^{\prime}\right)\right)$ and with a definition interval $i$.

Proof: We show first that the functions $\varrho\left(\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}\right)$ and $\varrho\left(\alpha v+\beta v^{\prime}\right)$ are independent on $i$. If they were not independent on $i$, then there would exist constants $a, b\left(a^{2}+b^{2} \neq 0\right)$ and the interval $j \subset i$ such that

$$
a \varrho\left(\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}\right)+b \varrho\left(\alpha v+\beta v^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0 \quad \text { on } j,
$$

hence

$$
\alpha(a u+b v)+\beta\left(a u^{\prime}+b v^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0 \quad \text { on } j .
$$

Because of the independence of functions $u, v$ and because of the independence of each function from $S$ and its derivative, the above equality is satisfied for $a=0$, $b=0$ only, whence it follows that $\varrho\left(\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}\right)$ and $\varrho\left(\alpha v+\beta v^{\prime}\right)$ are independent on $i$.

Let $y\left(=c_{1} u+c_{2} v\right) \in S$ be an arbitrary function, $c_{1}, c_{2}$ be real constants. Then $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)=\varrho\left(\alpha\left(c_{1} u+c_{2} v\right)+\beta\left(c_{1} u^{\prime}+c_{2} v^{\prime}\right)\right)=c_{1}\left(\varrho\left(\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}\right)\right)+$ $+c_{2}\left(\varrho\left(\alpha v+\beta v^{\prime}\right)\right)$. The set of all functions $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$ is thus a set of all linear combinations $c_{1} \varrho\left(\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}\right)+c_{2} \varrho\left(\alpha v+\beta v^{\prime}\right)$ and by definition $1.2[3]$ it is a linear two-dimensional space of continuous functions.

Corollary 1.1. The functions $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{2}+\beta y_{2}^{\prime}\right)$, where $y_{1}, y_{2} \in S$, are independent (dependent) exactly if $y_{1}, y_{2}$ are independent (dependent).

Definition 1.1. The space from Theorem 1.1 of all functions $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$, where $y \in S$, will be called an accompanying space to the space $S$ with respect to the number basis $[\alpha, \beta]$ with a weight $\varrho$ and we denote it by $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

Lemma 1.1. To every function $x \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ there exists exactly one function $y \in S$ or $y^{\prime} \in S$ such that $x=\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$.

Proof: Let $y$ and $\bar{y}$ be two functions of the space $S$ for which $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)=$ $=x=\varrho\left(\alpha \bar{y}+\beta \bar{y}^{\prime}\right)$. Then $\alpha(y-\bar{y})+\beta\left(y^{\prime}-\bar{y}^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0$ and - because of the independence of each function $y \in S$ and its derivative - the above relation is satisfied for $y \equiv \bar{y}$ only and thus also $y^{\prime} \equiv \bar{y}^{\prime}$.

Theorem 1.2. The mapping of $S$ on the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ defined by the operator $D .=\varrho\left(\alpha+\beta \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d} t}.\right)$ is an isomorphism of $S$ onto $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

Proof: By definition $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ we have $D S=P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. With respect to Lemma 1.1 the mapping $D$ is schlicht and it holds for $y_{1}, y_{2} \in S$ :
$D\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)=\varrho\left(\alpha\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)+\beta\left(y_{1}^{\prime}+y_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right)=$
$=\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right)+\varrho\left(\alpha y_{2}+\beta y_{2}^{\prime}\right)=D y_{1}+D y_{2}$,
$D\left(c y_{1}\right)=\varrho\left(\alpha c y_{1}+\beta c y_{1}^{\prime}\right)=c \varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right)=c D y_{1}$.
Remark 1.1. With reference to Lemma 1.1 [6] we can in analogy prove that the mapping of the space $S^{\prime}$ onto the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ defined by the operator $D^{\prime} .=\varrho\left(\alpha \int . \mathrm{d} t+\beta.\right)$ is an isomorphism $S^{\prime}$ onto $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

Convention 1.2. Since in the main zeros of functions of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ investigated throughout this paper, we shall assume $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$. If there namely were $\alpha=0$ or $\beta=0$, we would investigate in fact the zeros of functions of the space $S$ or $S^{\prime}$, which is the content of [5] and [6].

Convention 1.3. Let $(u, v)$ be a basis of the space $S$, then in all what follows $w$ will stand for the Wronskian of functions $u, v$, i.e.

$$
w=\left|\begin{array}{ll}
u & v \\
u^{\prime} & v^{\prime}
\end{array}\right|=u v^{\prime}-u^{\prime} v .
$$

Lemma 1.2. Let $t_{0} \in i$ and let for the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ hold $\varrho\left(t_{0}\right)\left(\alpha y\left(t_{0}\right)+\beta y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)=0$. Then there arises exactly one of the possibilities for the function $y(\in S)$ :
$1^{\circ} y\left(t_{0}\right)=0, y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$,
$2^{\circ} y\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0, y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$ and $\frac{y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y\left(t_{0}\right)}=-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$.
Proof: The assertion follows directly from the equation $\varrho\left(t_{0}\right)\left(\alpha y\left(t_{0}\right)+\beta y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)=$ $=0$ and from the condition $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$.

Definition 1.2. If $y\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and $y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ holds for the function $y \in S$ and the point $t_{0} \in i$, then we say that $t_{0}$ is the zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 1 . If $y\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$ and $\frac{y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y\left(t_{0}\right)}=-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ holds for the function $y \in S$ and the point $t_{0} \in i$, we say that $t_{0}$ is the zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 2 .

Lemma 1.3. Let $t_{0} \in i$. Then there exists a function $y \in S$ such that $t_{0}$ is the zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 1 exactly if $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$.

Proof: The assertion follows from Theorem 1.7 [6].
Theorem 1.3. Let $t_{0} \in i$ be a singular point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. Then $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$.

Proof: Any two independent functions $\varrho\left(\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}\right), \varrho\left(\alpha v+\beta v^{\prime}\right)$ of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ have at $t_{0}$ a zero value, thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \alpha u\left(t_{0}\right)+\beta u^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0 \\
& \alpha v\left(t_{0}\right)+\beta v^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

With respect of the assumption $\alpha \neq 0, \beta \neq 0$ the above system of equations has a zero determinant, i.e.

$$
0=u\left(t_{0}\right) v^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)-u^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right) v\left(t_{0}\right)=w\left(t_{0}\right)
$$

Corollary 1.2. Let $t_{0} \in i$ and $w\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$. Then $t_{0}$ is a regular point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

Theorem 1.4. Let $t_{0} \in i, w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and let $y \in S$ exist such that $t_{0}$ is a zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 2 . Then $t_{0}$ is a singular point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

Proof: From the assumption $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ now follows by 1.7 [6] that there exists a function $y_{1} \in S$ such that $y_{1}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and $y_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$. Since $y_{1}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and $y\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$ are $y_{1}, y$ independent and by Corollary 1.1 the functions $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$ and $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ are also independent. According to Theorem 1.3[3] $t_{0}$ is a singular point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

Corollary 1.3. Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 be satisfied. Then there exists a function $y_{1} \in S$ independent on $y$ such that $t_{0}$ is a zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 1 .

Theorem 1.5. Let $t_{0} \in i$ be a regular point of the spaces $S$ and $S^{\prime}$. The point $t_{0}$ is a singular point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ exactly if there exist independent functions $y_{1}, y_{2} \in S$ such that $t_{0}$ is a zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 1 and $t_{0}$ is a zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{2}+\beta y_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 2.

Proof: I. Let $t_{0}$ be a singular point of $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. Then by Theorem $1.3 w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and thus $y_{1} \in S$ such that $t_{0}$ is a zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 1 . If the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ had at $t_{0}$ a zero of the type 1 , then there would $y\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and this is because of the assumption on regularity of $S$ possible only then, if $y_{1}, y$ are dependent. Hence it follows for a function $y_{2} \in S$ independent on $y_{1}$ that the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{2}+\beta y_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ contains a zero of the type 2 at $t_{0}$.
II. If $t_{0}$ is a zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ of the type 1 and the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{2}+\beta y_{2}^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ of the type 2 , then the assertion follows from Theorem 1.4 and from Corollary 1.3.

Corollary 1.4. Let $t_{0} \in i$ be a singular point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. Then there arises exactly one of the possibilities:
$1^{\circ}$ there exist functions $y_{1}, y_{2} \in S$ such that $t_{0}$ is a zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 1 and the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{2}+\beta y_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 2. Then $t_{0}$ is a regular point of the spaces $S$ and $S^{\prime}$.
$2^{\circ} t_{0}$ is a zero of any function of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ of the type 1 . Then $t_{0}$ is a singular point of the spaces $S$ and $S^{\prime}$.

Theorem 1.6. Let $t_{0} \in i$ be a singular point of the space $S\left(S^{\prime}\right)$. Then it holds that either $t_{0}$ is a regular point of the spaces $S^{\prime}$ and $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta](S$ and $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta])$ or $t_{0}$ is a singular point of the spaces $S^{\prime}$ and $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ ( $S$ and $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ ).

Proof: Let $t_{0}$ be a singular point of the space $S$. Then it holds for any function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ that $\varrho\left(t_{0}\right)\left(\alpha y\left(t_{0}\right)+\beta y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)=\varrho\left(t_{0}\right) \beta y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)$ whence the assertion follows. Entirely analogous is the proof for $t_{0}$ being a singular point of $S^{\prime}$.

Theorem 1.7. Let $t_{0} \in i$ be a regular point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ and let a function $y \in S$ exist such that $t_{0}$ is a zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 2 . Then $w\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$.

Proof: Let the function $y_{1} \in S, y_{1}\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$, be independent on $y$. Then it follows from

$$
\frac{y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y\left(t_{0}\right)}=-\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{y_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y_{1}\left(t_{0}\right)} \neq-\frac{\alpha}{\beta},
$$

that $y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right) y_{1}\left(t_{0}\right)-y_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right) y\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$ and because of Lemma $1.2[6] w\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$.
Corollary 1.5. Let the assertions of Theorem 1.7 be satisfied. Then no function of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ has a zero of the type 1 at $t_{0}$.

Theorem 1.8. Let $t_{0} \in i$ be a regular point of the spaces $S$ and $S^{\prime}$. Then for any function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$, for which $\varrho\left(t_{0}\right)\left(\alpha y\left(t_{0}\right)+\beta y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)=0$ holds, $t_{0}$ is a zero of the type 1 exactly if $t_{0}$ is a regular point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ and $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$.

Proof: I. Let any function of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$, having a zero value at $t_{0}$, have a zero of the type 1 at $t_{0}$. Then by Theorem $1.7[6] w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and because of Theorem $1.5 t_{0}$ is a regular point of $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.
II. If $t_{0}$ is a regular point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ and $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, then with respect to Theorem 1.7 [6] there exists a function of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ such that $t_{0}$ is its zero of the type 1 and by Theorem 1.5 no function of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ has a zero of the type 2 at $t_{0}$.

Theorem 1.9. Let $t_{0} \in i$ be a regular point of the spaces $S$ and $S^{\prime}$. The point $t_{0}$ is a regular point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ exactly if there holds one of the assertions below:
$1^{\circ} w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and for any function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ having a zero value at $t_{0}, t_{0}$ is a zero of the type 1 .
$2^{\circ} w\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$ (said otherwise: for any function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ having a zero value at $t_{0}, t_{0}$ is a zero of the type 2 ).
Proof: The assertion is the corollary of the previous theorems.

Theorem 1.10. Let $t_{0} \in i$ be a regular point of the spaces $S, S^{\prime}, P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ and $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$. Then there exist real constants $\lambda, \mu, \lambda \neq 0, \mu \neq 0$ such that $t_{0}$ is a singular point of the accompanying space $P v[\lambda, \mu]$ to the space $S$, where $v>0$ is a function continuous on the interval $i$.

Proof: According to Theorem 1.9, for any function $y \in S$ for which $y\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$ $\frac{y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y\left(t_{0}\right)} \neq-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$. Let us write $\frac{y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y\left(t_{0}\right)}=-\frac{\lambda}{\mu}$. Then $t_{0}$ is a zero of the function $v\left(\lambda y+\mu y^{\prime}\right)$ of the type 2 and by Theorem $1.4 t_{0}$ is a singular point of the space $\operatorname{Pv}[\lambda, \mu]$.

## 2. Extreme points of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$

Lemma 2.1. Let $t_{0} \in i$ and $y \in C_{1}(i)$ be such that $y\left(t_{0}\right)=0$. Let $t_{0}$ not be a limit point of zeros either of the function $y$ nor $y^{\prime}$. Then there exists $\delta>0$ such that for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}\right) \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}<0$ and for $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right) \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y^{\prime}(t)}>0$.

Proof: With respect to the assumptions of our Lemma there exists $\delta>0$ such that $y(t) \neq 0$ holds for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}+\delta\right), t \neq t_{0}$ and likewise $y^{\prime}(t) \neq 0$. Let for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}\right)$ hold:

1. $y(t)<0$, then $y$ is increasing and thus $y^{\prime}(t)>0$,
2. $y(t)>0$, then $y$ is decreasing and thus $y^{\prime}(t)<0$,
whence it follows that $\frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}<0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}\right)$.
Let for $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ hold:
3. $y(t)<0$, then $y$ is decreasing and thus $y^{\prime}(t)<0$,
4. $y(t)>0$, then $y$ is increasing and thus $y^{\prime}(t)>0$,
whence it follows that $\frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}>0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$.
Theorem 2.1. Let $t_{0} \in i$ and $y \in C_{1}(i)$ such that $y\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and $y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$. Then it holds:

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}+} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=+\infty \quad \text { and } \quad \lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}-} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=-\infty
$$

Proof: The assertion follows with respect to Lemma 2.1 from the assumption of $y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$.

Corollary 2.1. Let $t_{1}, t_{2} \in i, t_{1}<t_{2}$, be the neighbouring zeros of the function $y \in C_{1}(i)$ and let $y^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right) \neq 0$ and $y^{\prime}\left(t_{2}\right) \neq 0$ hold. Then the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ maps the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ onto the interval $(-\infty,+\infty)$.

Theorem 2.2. Let $t_{0} \in i$ and $y \in C_{1}(i)$ such that $y\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and $y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$. Let $t_{0}$ not be a limit point of zeros either of the function $y$ nor $y^{\prime}$ and let $t_{0}$ not be a limit
point of extremes of the function $y^{\prime}$. Then

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}+} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=+\infty \quad \text { and } \quad \lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}-} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=-\infty
$$

Proof: With respect to the assumptions of the Theorem there exists $\delta>0$ such that $y(t) \neq 0, y^{\prime}(t) \neq 0$ holds for $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ and the functions $y(t)$ and $y^{\prime}(t)$ are strictly monotone in the interval $\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$. Let us restrict ourselves to the case that $y(t)>0, y^{\prime}(t)>0$ for $\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ and let us investigate $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}+} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}$. The functions $y(t), y^{\prime}(t)$ are thus increasing on the interval $\left\langle t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right\rangle$ and the function $y$ is strictly convex. Let $h$ be a number, $0<h<\delta$, then by the mean value theorem there exists $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
y\left(t_{0}+h\right)-y\left(t_{0}\right)=y^{\prime}(t) h . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because of $y^{\prime}$ being increasing on the interval $\left\langle t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right\rangle$, the point $t$ from (2.1) is uniquely determined and it is obviously the function $h$. Let $t=T(h)$ for $h \in$ $\in(0, \delta)$ and $T(0)=t_{0}$. Then for $h \in(0, \delta)$ we have

$$
T(h)=\left(y^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{y\left(t_{0}+h\right)-y\left(t_{0}\right)}{h}\right)
$$

and

$$
\lim _{h \rightarrow 0+} T(h)=\left(y^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\left(\operatorname{iim}_{h \rightarrow 0+} \frac{y\left(t_{0}+h\right)-y\left(t_{0}\right)}{h}\right)=\left(y^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\left(y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)=t_{0} .
$$

The function $T(h)$ is thus continuous on the interval $\langle 0, \delta)$. For any $h \in(0, \delta)$ we have

$$
\frac{y\left(t_{0}+h\right)}{y(T(h))}>1
$$

and thus

$$
\frac{y\left(t_{0}+h\right)}{y(T(h)) h}>\frac{1}{h} .
$$

Since $\lim _{h \rightarrow 0+} \frac{1}{h}=+\infty$ we have $\lim _{h \rightarrow 0+} \frac{y\left(t_{0}+h\right)}{y(T(h)) h}=+\infty$. In applying (2.1) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
+\infty=\lim _{h \rightarrow 0+} \frac{y\left(t_{0}+h\right)-y\left(t_{0}\right)}{y(T(h)) h}=\lim _{h \rightarrow 0+} \frac{y^{\prime}(T(h)) h}{y(T(h)) h}=\lim _{h \rightarrow 0+} \frac{y^{\prime}(T(h))}{y(T(h))} . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us now show that the function $T(h)$ is schlicht - increasing on the interval $\langle 0, \delta)$. If it namely were for $h_{1}<h_{2} T\left(h_{1}\right) \geqq T\left(h_{2}\right)$, i.e. $t_{1} \geqq t_{2}$, where $t_{1}=T\left(h_{1}\right)$, $t_{2}=T\left(h_{2}\right) \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ and since $y^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right) \geqq y^{\prime}\left(t_{2}\right)$, then it would be:

$$
\frac{y\left(t_{0}+h_{1}\right)}{h_{1}} \geqq \frac{y\left(t_{0}+h_{2}\right)}{h_{2}},
$$

which is impossible with respect to $y$ being strictly convex on the interval $\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$. Thus there exists an inverse function $T^{-1}(t)$ and we have

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}} T^{-1}(t)=T^{-1}\left(t_{0}\right)=0
$$

Inserting $h=T^{-1}(t)$ into (2.2) we get

$$
+\infty=\lim _{h \rightarrow 0^{+}} \frac{y^{\prime}(T(h))}{y(T(h))}=\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}+} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)},
$$

which was to be proved.
In case of $y(t)<0$ and $y^{\prime}(t)<0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ let us denote $z(t)=-y(t)$ and $z^{\prime}(t)=-y^{\prime}(t)$ then for all $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right) \frac{z^{\prime}(t)}{z(t)}=\frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}$ which are the conditions of the previous case.

The assertion $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}-} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=-\infty$ is to be proved in analogy to $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}+} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=$ $=+\infty$.

Corollary 2.2. Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 or Theorem 2.2 be satisfied. Then

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}} \frac{y(t)}{y^{\prime}(t)}=0
$$

holds.
Theorem 2.3. Let $t_{1}, t_{2} \in i, t_{1}<t_{2}$, be the neighbouring zeros of the function $y \in C_{1}(i)$. Let next the sequence of zeros of the function $y^{\prime}$ from the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ not have any limit point $t_{1}$ or $t_{2}$ and in case of $y^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)=0$ or $y^{\prime}\left(t_{2}\right)=0$, let $t_{1}$ or $t_{2}$ not be a limit point of extremes of the function $y^{\prime}$ from the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$. Then the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ maps the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ onto the interval $(-\infty,+\infty)$.

Proof: The assertion follows from Theorems 2.1 and 2.2.
Convention 2.1. We shall concern ourselves in what follows with regular spaces of a certain type on $i$ only. It means two independent functions of the space $S$ or $S^{\prime}$ or $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ have no zeros in commun and no function of the space $S$ or $S^{\prime}$ or $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ has not any limit point of zeros inside the definition interval $i$. For short we shall call the zero $t_{0} \in i$ of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ of type 1 or type 2 the zero of type 1 or type 2 . We shall exclude from our considerations the zeros of type 1 which are the limit points of extremes of the function from the space $S^{\prime}$ having at these points a zero value, i.e. we assume that for any $t_{0} \in i$ there exist the limits $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}+} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}$ and $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}-} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}$, where $y \in S$.

Lemma 2.2. Let $t_{1}, t_{2} \in i, t_{1}<t_{2}$, be the neighbouring zeros of the function
$\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. Then the function $y$ has in the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ one zero at most.

Proof: Let us assume there exist at least two zeros of the function $y$ in the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$. Let us denote by $t_{3}, t_{4} \in\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right), t_{3}<t_{4}$, the neighbouring zeros of the function $y$. Then by Theorem 2.3 the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ assumes the value $-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ on the interval $\left(t_{3}, t_{4}\right)$ and by Lemma 1.2 there exist in $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ a zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$, contrary to our assumption.

Theorem 2.4. Let $t_{1}, t_{2} \in i, t_{1}<t_{2}$, be the neighbouring zeros of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. Let the function $y$ have in the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ exactly one zero, then $t_{1}$ and $t_{2}$ are the zeros of type 2 .

Proof: Let us denote by $t_{0} \in\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ the zero of the function $y$. If the point $t_{1}$ were the zero of type 1 , then by Theorem $2.2 \lim _{t \rightarrow t_{1}+} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=+\infty$ and since by Theorem $2.1 \lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}-} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=-\infty$, the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ would assume the value $-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ on the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{0}\right)$ and by Lemma 1.2 the zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$ would be in the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{0}\right)$. This, however, contradicts our assumption. The proof for the point $t_{2}$ proceeds similarly.

Corollary 2.3. Let $t_{1}, t_{2} \in i, t_{1} \neq t_{2}$, be the neighbouring conjugate points of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. Then $t_{1}$ and $t_{2}$ are not the zeros of type 1 simultaneously.

Remark 2.1. In the following Lemma 2.3, Theorem 2.5 and in its Corollary 2.4 the assumption $S \subset C_{1}(i)$ is not necessary and $S \subset C_{0}(i)$ suffices. This assertion is true for any two-dimensional regular space of continuous functions of a certain type on its definition interval.

Lemma 2.3. Let $(u, v)$ be a basis of the space $S$. Let $t_{1}, t_{2} \in i, t_{1}<t_{2}$, be the neighbouring zeros of the function $u$. Let $v \neq 0$ in the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ or let $v$ have at least two zeros in the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$. Then at least one extreme point of the space $S$ lies in the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$.

Proof: The assertion follows from Theorem 5 [5].
Theorem 2.5. The point $t_{0} \in i$ is an extreme point of the space $S$ exactly if the function $y \in S$, for which $y\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, does not change the sign at $t_{0}$.

Proof: According to Lemma 1 [5] every point $t_{0} \in i$ is the zero of a function from the space $S$. Hence, let $y\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ hold for $y \in S$. With respect to the regularity of the space $S y_{1}\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$ holds for any function $y_{1} \in S$, independent on $y$.
I. Let $t_{0}$ be an extreme point of the space $S$. Then by Theorem $3.2[3] \lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}} \frac{y_{1}(t)}{y(t)}=$ $=+\infty$ or $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}} \frac{y_{1}(t)}{y(t)}=-\infty$. Since $y_{1}\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$, there exists a neighbourhood of the
point $t_{0}$ at which $y_{1}$ is positive or negative so that, for the above limits to be valid, $y$ cannot change its sign at $t_{0}$.
II. Let the function $y \in S$ not change the sign at its zero $t_{0}$. Taking the function $y_{1} \in S$ independent on $y$, we obtain $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}} \frac{y_{1}(t)}{y(t)}$ being equal to $+\infty$ or $-\infty$ and by Theorem 3.2 [3] $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $S$.

Corollary 2.4. The point $t_{0} \in i$ is an ordinary point of the space $S$ exactly if the function $y \in S$, for which $y\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, does not change its sign at $t_{0}$.

Theorem 2.6. Let there exist a neighbourhood $U\left(t_{0}\right)$ of the point $t_{0} \in i$ such that $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and $w(t) \neq 0$ holds for all $t \in U\left(t_{0}\right), t \neq t_{0}$. Then
a) if $w$ changes its sign at $t_{0}$, then $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $S$.
b) if $w$ does not change its sign at $t_{0}$, then $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $S^{\prime}$.

Proof: By Theorem 1.10 [6] the first phase $A(t), t \in i$, of the basis $(u, v)$ from the space $S$ has the continuous first derivative

$$
A^{\prime}(t)=\frac{-w(t)}{u^{2}(t)+v^{2}(t)} .
$$

For $A(t)$ to have an extreme at $t_{0}$ it is necessary that $w$ changes its sign at $t_{0}$. Further, by Lemma 1.4 [6] the point $t_{0}$, where $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, is either an extreme point of the space $S$ or an extreme point of the space $S^{\prime}$ - thus if $w$ does not change its sign at $t_{0}$, then $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $S^{\prime}$.

Theorem 2.7. Let $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, where $t_{0} \in i$. The point $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ exactly if $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $S^{\prime}$.

Proof: Assuming that $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ then, by Lemma 1.3, there exists the function $y \in S$ such that $y\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and $y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$.
I. Let $t_{0}$ be an extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. Then it follows, by Lemma 2.5, that for the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$ there exists $\delta_{1}>0$ such that for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta_{1}, t_{0}+\delta_{1}\right)$, $t \neq t_{0}$, we have $\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)>0$ or $\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)<0$. It suffices to assume next $\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)>0$, thus $\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)>0$. By Lemma 2.1 there exists $\delta_{2}>0$ such that for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta_{2}, t_{0}\right)$ either $y^{\prime}(t)<0$ and $y(t)>0$ or $y^{\prime}(t)>0$ and $y(t)<0$ and for $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta_{2}\right)$ there is either $y^{\prime}(t)>0$ and $y(t)>0$ or $y^{\prime}(t)<0$ and $y(t)<0$. Let us take $\delta=\min \left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)$.

1. Let $\beta>0$. Then it follows from $\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}>0$ that $y^{\prime}>-\frac{\alpha}{\beta} y$. Since $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}-} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=-\infty$, the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ cannot be lower limited on the interval ( $t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}$ ), it must hold there $y<0$ and consequently $y^{\prime}>0$. Next it holds $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}+} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=+\infty$, thus the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ cannot be upper limited on the interval ( $t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta$ ) and it must hold there $y>0$ and consequently $y^{\prime}>0$. Herefrom we
see that the function $y$ changes the sign in its zero $t_{0}$ and thus $t_{0}$ is by Corollary 2.4 an ordinary point of the space $S$ and the function $y^{\prime}$ does not change the sign in its zero $t_{0}$ and thus $t_{0}$ is by Theorem 2.5 the extreme point of the space $S^{\prime}$.
2. Let $\beta<0$. Then it follows from $\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}>0$ that $y^{\prime}<-\frac{\alpha}{\beta} y$ and in analogy with part 1 . we get $y(t)>0, y^{\prime}(t)<0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}\right)$ and $y(t)<0$, $y^{\prime}(t)<0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$. With respect to Corollary 2.4 and to Theorem 2.5 $t_{0}$ is again an ordinary point of the space $S$ and an extreme point of the space $S^{\prime}$.
II. Let $t_{0}$ be an extreme point of the space $S^{\prime}$. Then by Theorem 2.5 there exists for the function $y^{\prime}$ that $\delta_{1}>0$ such that $y^{\prime}(t)>0$ or $y^{\prime}(t)<0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta_{1}, t_{0}+\delta_{1}\right)$, $t \neq t_{0}$. Next it suffices to assume that $y^{\prime}(t)>0$. With respect to Lemma 2.1 there exists $\delta_{2}>0$ such that $y(t)<0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta_{2}, t_{0}\right)$ and $y(t)>0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta_{2}\right)$. Let us take $\delta=\min \left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)$.
3. Let $\beta>0$. Since $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}-} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=-\infty$, there exists $\delta_{3}>0$ such that the inequality $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}<-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ is satisfied on the interval $\left(t_{0}-\delta_{3}, t_{0}\right) \subset\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}\right)$ whence it follows that $\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}<0$ on the interval $\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}\right)$ and consequently the function $\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)<0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}\right)$. Since $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{0}+} \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}=+\infty$, there exists $\delta_{4}>0$ such that the inequality $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}>-\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \begin{gathered}t \rightarrow t_{0}+ \\ \text { is satisfied }\end{gathered}$ on the interval $\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta_{4}\right) \subset\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ whence it follows that $\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}<0$ on the interval $\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$, hence the function $\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)<0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}\right.$, $\left.t_{0}+\delta\right)$. Since $\varrho\left(t_{0}\right)\left(\alpha y\left(t_{0}\right)+\beta y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)=0$, we get by Theorem 2.5 that $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.
4. Let $\beta<0$. Then proceeding analogous as in part 1. we get $\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)>0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}\right)$ and $\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)>0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$. The function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ does not change the sign at its zero $t_{0}$ so that by Theorem 2.5 $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

Corollary 2.5. Let $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0, t_{0} \in i$, and $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $S^{\prime}$. Then $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of any accompanying space $P v[\lambda, \mu]$ to the space $S$, where $\lambda, \mu \neq 0$ are arbitrary numbers and $v>0$ is a function continuous on the interval $i$.

Theorem 2.8. Let $t_{0} \in i$ and $w\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$. Then $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ if and only if it holds for the function $y \in S$, for which $\varrho\left(t_{0}\right)\left(\alpha y\left(t_{0}\right)+\right.$ $\left.+\beta y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)=0$, that $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ has an extreme at $t_{0}$.
Proof: I. Let $t_{0}$ be an extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. Then it holds for the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ having the zero value at $t_{0}$ that $y\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$ and
$y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$, hence it exists $\delta_{1}>0$ such that $y(t) \neq 0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta_{1}, t_{0}+\delta_{1}\right)$ and it holds further $\delta_{2}>0$ such that $\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)>0$ or $\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)<0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta_{2}, t_{0}+\delta_{2}\right), t \neq t_{0}$. Let us take $\delta=\min \left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)$ and we can next assume that $\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)>0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}+\delta\right), t \neq t_{0}$.

1. Let $\beta>0$. From the relation $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)>0$ on the interval $\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}\right) \cup$ $\cup\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ we get: if $y>0$ on the interval $\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}+\delta\right)$, then it holds $\frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}>-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}\right) \cup\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ and since $\frac{y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y\left(t_{0}\right)}=-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ holds, $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ has its minimum at $t_{0}$; if $y<0$ holds on the interval $\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}+\delta\right)$, then the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ has its maximum at $t_{0}$.
2. Let $\beta<0$. The proof proceeds analogous to that of part 1 . and we get that $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ has at $t_{0}$ for $y>0$ on $\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ its maximum and for $y<0$ its minimum.
II. Let the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$, where $\varrho\left(t_{0}\right)\left(\alpha y\left(t_{0}\right)+\beta y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)=0$, have its extrem at the point $t_{0}$; it suffices to assume that it has the maximum. Thus, there exists $\delta>0$ such that $y(t) \neq 0$ and $\frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}<-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}+\delta\right), t \neq t_{0}$, where by Lemma $1.2 \frac{y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y\left(t_{0}\right)}=-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$.
3. Let $\beta>0$. If $y>0(y<0)$ on the interval $\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ then $\varrho(t) \times$ $\times\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)<0\left(\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)>0\right)$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}+\delta\right), t \neq t_{0}$, and thus the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right)$ does not change the sign at its zero $t_{0}$. By Theorem $2.5 t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.
4. Let $\beta<0$. If $y>0(y<0)$ on the interval $\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}+\delta\right)$ is for $t \in$ $\in\left(t_{0}-\delta, t_{0}+\delta\right), t \neq t_{0}, \varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)>0\left(\varrho(t)\left(\alpha y(t)+\beta y^{\prime}(t)\right)<0\right)$ and thus by Theorem $2.5 t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

Theorem 2.9. Let $t_{0} \in i$ and $w\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$. Let a function $y \in S, y\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$, exist such that the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ has the extreme at $t_{0}$. Then there exist real constants $\lambda$, $\mu \neq 0$ such that $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the accompanying space $P v[\lambda, \mu]$ to the space $S$, where $v>0$ is a function continuous on $i$.

Proof: Since $y\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$ the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ has its finite value at $t_{0}$. Let us denote it $-\frac{\lambda}{\mu}$, where $\mu \neq 0$. By Theorem $2.8 t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $P v[\lambda, \mu]$.

Theorem 2.10. Let $t_{1}{ }^{*}, t_{2} \in i, t_{1}<t_{2}$, be the neighbouring zeros of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ and for all $t \in\left\langle t_{1}, t_{2}\right\rangle$ let $y(t) \neq 0$ and $w(t) \neq 0$. Then there lies at least one extreme point $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ in the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$.

Proof: Assuming $y \neq 0$ on the interval $\left\langle t_{1}, t_{2}\right\rangle$ it follows that $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ is continuous on $\left\langle t_{1}, t_{2}\right\rangle$, hence also limited on $\left\langle t_{1}, t_{2}\right\rangle$. Assuming $w \neq 0$ on the interval $\left\langle t_{1}, t_{2}\right\rangle$ it follows that every point on $\left\langle t_{1}, t_{2}\right\rangle$ is a zero of type 2 and for every function $y_{1} \in S$ independent on $y \frac{y_{1}^{\prime}(t)}{y_{1}(t)} \neq \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}$ for all $t \in\left\langle t_{1}, t_{2}\right\rangle$ where $y_{1}(t) \neq 0$. Let $t_{0} \in\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ be a zero of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{2}+\beta y_{2}^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. If $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{2}+\beta y_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ does not change its sign at $t_{0}$, then, by Theorem 2.5, $t_{0}$ is an extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ and there is nothing more do prove. Thus let the function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{2}+\beta y_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ change its sign at $t_{0}$. Then, because of the fact that for every $t \in\left\langle t_{1}, t_{2}\right\rangle \frac{y_{2}^{\prime}(t)}{y_{2}(t)} \neq$ $\neq \frac{y^{\prime}(t)}{y(t)}$, there must exist at least one point $T \neq t_{0}, T \in\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$, such that $\varrho(T)\left(\alpha y_{2}(T)+\beta y_{2}^{\prime}(T)\right)=0$. By Lemma 2.3 at least one extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ exists in the interval $\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$.

Theorem 2.11. Let $t_{0}, t_{1} \in i, t_{0}<t_{1}\left(t_{0}>t_{1}\right)$, be neighbouring conjugate points of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ and let $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and $w(t) \neq 0$ for $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right\rangle\left(t \in\left\langle t_{1}, t_{0}\right)\right)$. Let $\frac{y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y\left(t_{0}\right)}<-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\left(\frac{y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y\left(t_{0}\right)}>-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)$ hold for the function $y \in S$, where $y\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$. Then at least one extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ lies in the interval $\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right)$ $\left(\left(t_{1}, t_{0}\right)\right)$.

Proof: Let $t_{0}, t_{1} \in i, t_{0}<t_{1}$, are the neighbouring zeros of the function $\varrho\left(\alpha x+\beta x^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. Then $t_{0}$ is a zero of type $1, t_{1}$ is a zero of type 2 , and by Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 2.2, we get $x \neq 0$ on the interval $\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right\rangle$. By Lemma 1 [5] there exists to every point $T_{1} \in\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right) \subset i$ a function $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right) \in P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ such that $\varrho\left(T_{1}\right)\left(\alpha y_{1}\left(T_{1}\right)+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\left(T_{1}\right)\right)=0$. If $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ does not change its sign at $T_{1}$, then by Theorem $2.5 T_{1}$ is an extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$. Let $\varrho\left(\alpha y_{1}+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ change its sign at $T_{1}$. Then, with respect to the $\frac{y_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y_{1}\left(t_{0}\right)}<-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ and $w \neq 0$ on $\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right\rangle$, there exists at least one point $T_{2} \in\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right), T_{2} \neq T_{1}$, such that $\varrho\left(T_{2}\right)\left(\alpha y_{1}\left(T_{2}\right)+\beta y_{1}^{\prime}\left(T_{2}\right)\right)=0$. By Lemma 2.3 at least one extreme point of the space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ lies in the interval $\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right)$.

Completely analogous proceeds the proof for $t_{0}>t_{1}$ and $\frac{y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)}{y\left(t_{0}\right)}>-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$.
Corollary 2.6. Let $t_{0} \in i$ and $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$. Let next $w(t) \neq 0$ for all $t \in i, t \neq t_{0}$. Then there exist the constants $\lambda, \mu \neq 0$ such that at least one extreme point of the accompanying space $P v[\lambda, \mu]$ to the space $S$ lies in the interval $i$, being different from $t_{0}$, where $v>0$ is a function continuous on $i$.

Convention 2.2. The two-dimensional space of contmuous functions whose definition interval does not contain any extreme point will be called a space of the $0^{t h}$ class on its definition domain.

Theorem 2.12. Let $w \neq 0$ on the interval $i=(a, b)$. The space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ is the space of the $0^{t h}$ class on the interval $(a, b)$ if and only if every function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$, where $y \in S$, takes on the value $-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ exactly once between the neighbouring zeros of the function $y$ and, so far the smallest zero $t_{1} \in(a, b)$ or the greatest zero $t_{2} \in(a, b)$ of the function $y$ exists, then $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ takes on the value $-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ once at most in the interval $\left(a, t_{1}\right)$ or $\left(t_{2}, b\right)$.

Proof: With respect to Lemma 1.2 and to Corollary 2.1, the assertion follows from Theorems 3, 4, 5 [5].

Theorem 2.13. Let $w \neq 0$ on the interval $i$. Every space $P v[\lambda, \mu]$, where $\lambda, \mu$ ( $\lambda^{2}+\mu^{2} \neq 0$ ) are arbitrary constants and $v>0$ is a function continuous on $i$, is a space of the $0^{\text {th }}$ class on $i$ if and only if every function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}, y \in S$, is monotone on every interval $j \subset i$ where it is defined.

Proof: The assertion follows from Theorem 2.9.
Remark 2.2. If the function $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ is monotone in $j \subset i$, then in view of Corollary 2.1, it is obviously decreasing.

Remark 2.3. Evidently, the set of all integrals of the 2 nd order differential equation of the Jacobi type

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}=Q(t) y \tag{Q}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $Q(t), t \in i$, is a continuous function on the interval $i$, forms a two-dimensional space of continuous functions with a definition interval $i$ (in the sense of definition 1.2 [3]). By Theorem 1.16 [6] the set of derivatives of all integrals of $(Q)$ forms a two-dimensional space with a definition interval $i$ if and only if $Q \not \equiv 0$ on every interval $j \subset i$.

Lemma 2.4. Let $Q$ be continuous on $i$ and $Q \not \equiv 0$ on every interval $j \subset i$. Then there exists a solution $u$ of $(Q)$ for which $u, u^{\prime}$ are dependent on $i$ exactly if $Q \equiv k$ on $i$, where $k>0$ is a constant.

Proof: I. Let $u, u^{\prime}$ be dependent on $i$. Then by Theorem $0.1 u=c_{1} e^{c t}, t \in i$, where $c_{1}, c$ are nonzero constants. Let for the solution $v$ of $(Q)$ hold that $u, v$ are independent on $i$. Then we obtain for $v$ from the equation for differentiation of the Wronskian of the functions $u, v$ the equation

$$
v^{\prime \prime}=c^{2} v
$$

whence it follows that $Q \equiv c^{2}$ on $i$.
II. The function $e^{\eta / \overline{k t}}, t \in i$, is the solution of the differential equation

$$
y^{\prime \prime}=k y
$$

on the interval $i$, where $k>0$ is a constant. The assertion follows directly from this with respect to Theorem 0.1.

Theorem 2.14. Let $Q$ be continuous on $i$ and $Q \not \equiv 0$ on every interval $j \subset i$. It holds for every solution $y$ of $(Q)$ that $y, y^{\prime}$ are independent on $i$ exactly if $Q \not \equiv k$ on every interval $j \subset i$, where $k>0$ is a constant.

Proof: The assertion follows from Lemma 2.4 with respect to Corollary 0.1.
Remark 2.4. M. Laitoch defined in [2] the first accompanying equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}=Q_{1} y \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

corresponding to a basis $[\alpha, \beta]$ of the equation $(Q)$, where $Q<0$ is a continuous function on $i$, and $\alpha, \beta$ are arbitrary constants satisfying the condition $\alpha^{2}+\beta^{2} \neq 0$, the carrier being of the form

$$
Q_{1}=Q+\frac{\alpha \beta Q^{\prime}}{\alpha^{2}-\beta^{2} Q}+\sqrt{\alpha^{2}-\beta^{2} Q}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^{2}-\beta^{2} Q}}\right)^{\prime \prime} .
$$

By appealing to Theorem 4.1 [2] it holds that if $u$ is a solution of $(Q)$, then the solution

$$
u_{1}=\frac{\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}}{\sqrt{\alpha^{2}-\beta^{2} Q}}
$$

is a solution of $\left(Q_{1}\right)$.
Theorem 2.15. The set of all integrals of the first accompanying equation ( $Q_{1}$ ) corresponding to the $[\alpha, \beta]$ of $(Q)$ forms a two-dimensional accompanying space $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ to the space $S$ of the integrals of the equation $(Q)$, where

$$
\varrho=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^{2}-\beta^{2} Q}} .
$$

Proof: Because of the assumption $Q<0$ on $i$, it holds (by Theorem 2.14) for every solution of $(Q)$ that $y, y^{\prime}$ are independent on $i$. Obviously $\alpha^{2}-\beta^{2} Q>0$ and consequently $\varrho$ is continuous and positive on $i$. Let $u, v$ be two independent solution of ( $Q$ ). Then, with respect to Theorem 4.1 [2]

$$
u_{1}=\varrho\left(\alpha u+\beta u^{\prime}\right), \quad v_{1}=\varrho\left(\alpha v+\beta v^{\prime}\right)
$$

are two independent solution of $\left(Q_{1}\right)$ whence (with respect to Theorem 1.1) the assertion follows.
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## Souhrn

# PRƯVODNÍ PROSTORY K LINEÁRNÍMU DVOJROZMĔRNÉMU PROSTORU SPOJITÝCH FUNKCÍ SE SPOJITOU PRVNÍ DERIVACÍ 

JITKA KOJECKÁ

Necht $S \subset C_{1}(i)$ je dvojrozměrný prostor spojitých funkcí a necht pro každou funkci $y \in S$ platí, že funkce $y$ a $y^{\prime}$, kde $y^{\prime}$ je derivace funkce $y$, jsou nezávislé na intervalu $i$. Pak množina všech funkcí tvaru $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right), y \in S$, kde $\varrho>0$ je spojitá funkce na intervalu $i$ a $\alpha, \beta$ jsou dané reálné konstanty ( $\alpha^{2}+\beta^{2} \neq 0$ ) tvoří dvojrozměrný prostor spojitých funkcí s definičním intervalem $i$. Nazýváme ho průvodní prostor k prostoru $S$ vzhledem k číselné bázi $[\alpha, \beta] \mathrm{s}$ váhou $\varrho$ a značíme ho $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

V části 1 jsou zkoumány nulové body funkcí prostoru $P_{\varrho}[\alpha, \beta]$ a singulárnost a regulárnost prostoru $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

V části 2 je préedpokládáno, že prostory $S, S^{\prime}$ (množina derivací všech funkcí prostoru $S$ ) a $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ jsou regulární prostory určitého typu na intervalu $i$ (viz [3]). Jsou vyšetřovány extrémní body prostoru $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ (tj. body intervalu $i$, ve kterých má fáze prostoru $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ extrém). Necht $w$ je wronskián funkcí báze $(u, v)$ prostoru $S$, pak dostáváme tyto výsledky:

Věta 2.7. Nechť $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, kde $t_{0} \in i$. Bod $t_{0}$ je extrémní bod prostoru $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ právě tehdy, když je $t_{0}$ extrémní bod prostoru $S^{\prime}$.

Věta 2.8. Bud' $t_{0} \in i$ a $w\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$. Bod $t_{0}$ je extrémní bod prostoru $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$
právě tehdy, když pro funkci $y \in S$, pro kterou je $\varrho\left(t_{0}\right)\left(\alpha y\left(t_{0}\right)+\beta y^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)=0$, platí, že funkce $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ má $\mathrm{v} t_{0}$ extrém.

Dále je uvedeno, za jakých předpokladů nemá prostor $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ extrémní body, tj. $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ je nulté třídy na intervalu $i$ (věta 2.12) a za jakých předpokladů je každý průvodní prostor $P v[\lambda, \mu] \mathrm{k}$ prostoru $S$ nulté třídy na intervalu $i$ (věta 2.13).

V závěru práce je ukázána souvislost průvodního prostoru $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ a prostoru všech integrálů první průvodní rovnice $y^{\prime \prime}=Q_{1} y$ při bázi $[\alpha, \beta] \mathrm{k}$ diferenciální rovnici $y^{\prime \prime}=Q y$, kde $Q<0$ je funkce spojitá na intervalu $i$ (viz [2]). Platí následující:

Věta 2.15. Množina všech integrálů první průvodní rovnice $\left(Q_{1}\right)$ při bázi $[\alpha, \beta]$ k rovnici $(Q)$ tvoří dvojrozměrný průvodní prostor $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ k prostoru $S$ integrálů rovnice ( $Q$ ), kde

$$
\varrho=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^{2}-\beta^{2} Q}}
$$

Реэюме

# СОПРОВОЖДАЮЩИЕ ПРОСТРАНСТВА К ЛИНЕЙНОМУ ДВУХРАЗМЕРНОМУ ПРОСТРАНСТВУ НЕПРЕРЫВНЫХ ФУНКЦИЙ С НЕПРЕРЫВНОЙ ПРОИЗВОДНОЙ ПЕРВОГО ПОРЯДКА 

## ЙИТКА КОЙЕЦКА

Пусть $S \subset C_{1}(i)$ есть двухразмерное пространство непрерывных функций и пусть для каждой функции $y \in S$ имеет место, что $y$ и $y^{\prime}$ независимы на интервале $i$. Тогда множество функции вида $\varrho\left(\alpha y+\beta y^{\prime}\right), y \in S$, где $\varrho>0$ есть непрерывная функция на интервале $i$ и $\alpha, \beta$ данные вещественные постоянные, образует двухразмерное пространство непрерывных функций, определенных на интервале $i$. Это пространство называем сопровождающим к пространству $S$ по отношении к базису $[\alpha, \beta]$ с весом $\varrho$ и обозначаем $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

В первой части исследуются нулевые точки функций пространства $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ и сингулярность и регулярность пространства $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$.

Во второй части предполагается, что пространства $S, S^{\prime}$ (множество производных функций пространства $S$ ) и $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ регулярные пространства определенного типа на интервале $i$ (см. [3]). Исследуются экстремальные точки

пространства $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ т.е. точки интервала $i$, в которых имеет фаза пространства $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ экстрем. Пусть $w$ есть определитель Вронского функций базиса $(u, v)$ пространства $S$, тогда получаем следующие теоремы:

Теорема 2.7. Пусть $w\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, где $t_{0} \in i$. Точка $t_{0}$ экстремальная точка пространства $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ тогда и только тогда, когда $t_{0}$ является экстремальной точкой пространства $S^{\prime}$.

Теорема 2.8. Пусть $t_{0} \in i$ и $w\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$. Точка $t_{0}$ есть экстремальная точка пространства $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ тогда и только тогда, когда для функции $y \in S$, удовлетворяющей равенству $\varrho\left(t_{0}\right)\left(\alpha y\left(t_{0}\right)+\beta y\left(t_{0}\right)\right)=0$ имеет место, что $\frac{y^{\prime}}{y}$ достигает в точке $t_{0}$ экстремальное значение.

Далее привддятся условия, при которых пространство $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ не имеет экстремальные точки, т.е. $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ нулевого класса на интервале $i$ (теорема 2.12).

В заключение работы показана зависимость сопровождающего пространства $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ и пространства всех интегралов первого сопровождающего уравнения $y^{\prime \prime}=Q_{1} y$ с базисом $[\alpha, \beta]$ уравнения $y^{\prime \prime}=Q y$, где $Q<0$ является непрерывной функцией на интервале $i$ (см. [2]).

Имеет место следующее:
Теорема 2.5. Множество всех интегралов первого сопровождающего уравнения $\left(Q_{1}\right)$ с базисом $[\alpha, \beta]$ к уравнению $(Q)$ образует двухразмерное пространство $P \varrho[\alpha, \beta]$ к пространству $S$ интегралов уравнения $(Q)$, где

$$
\varrho=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^{2}-\beta^{2} Q}}
$$

