

On the functional equation of autodistributivity.

By M. HOSSZU in Miskolc.

A function of two variables $M(x, y)$ is called autodistributive (on the right side) if

$$(1) \quad M[M(x, y), z] = M[M(x, z), M(y, z)].$$

The functional equation (1) resp. a similar equation was first examined by C. RYLL-NARDZEWSKI [3].¹⁾ He proved that all strictly monotonic, continuous and symmetric²⁾ solutions of (1) are quasiarithmetic means i. e. they have the form

$$(2) \quad M(x, y) = f^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{2} f(x) + \frac{1}{2} f(y) \right],$$

where $f(t)$ is an arbitrary strictly monotonic, continuous function and $f^{-1}(t)$ is its inverse function.

On the other hand B. KNASTER [2] has proved that all strictly monotonic, continuous, autodistributive and symmetric functions are bisymmetric³⁾ and hence they all have the form (2).

J. ACZÉL⁴⁾ examined first the functional equation (1) without supposing symmetry. He proved that all strictly monotonic and twice differentiable solutions of (1) are quasilinear means i. e. they have the form

$$(3) \quad M(x, y) = f^{-1}[pf(x) + qf(y)], \quad (p + q = 1).$$

The object of the present paper is to show that if autodistributivity *on both sides* is required, then it is sufficient to suppose the differentiability *in first order* for the validity of (3).

We prove the

¹⁾ The numbers in brackets refer to the Bibliography at the end of this paper.

²⁾ $M(x, y)$ is called symmetric if $M(x, y) = M(y, x)$. C. RYLL-NARDZEWSKI has involved the symmetry of $M(x, y)$ in the functional equation

$$M[x, M(y, z)] = M[M(x, y), M(z, x)]$$

which implies also the functional equation (1). See [3].

³⁾ A function $M(x, y)$ is called bisymmetric if

$$M[M(x, y), M(u, v)] = M[M(x, u), M(y, v)].$$

The functional equation of bisymmetry was solved by J. ACZÉL supposing strict monotony and continuity. See [1] and [2].

⁴⁾ Oral communication. ACZÉL conjectured also that the condition of differentiability in second order might be omitted.

Theorem. *If the function $M(x, y)$ strictly monotonic in both variables and (once) derivable, satisfies the functional equations*

$$(1a) \quad M[M(x, y), z] = M[M(x, z), M(y, z)],$$

$$(1b) \quad M[z, M(x, y)] = M[M(z, x), M(z, y)]$$

then and only then $M(x, y)$ has the form

$$(3) \quad M(x, y) = f^{-1}[p f(x) + q f(y)], \quad (p + q = 1)$$

where $f(t)$ is an arbitrary strictly monotonic and differentiable function, the inverse function of which is $f^{-1}(t)$ and p is a constant.

Proof. We shall make use of two lemmas.

Lemma I. If the strictly monotonic and derivable function $M(x, y)$ satisfies e. g. the functional equation (1a) then

$$(4) \quad M(t, t) = t$$

and

$$M_1(t, t) = p, \quad M_2(t, t) = q$$

are constants with

$$p + q = 1$$

where the indices $_1$ resp. $_2$ denote the partial differential quotients of $M(x, y)$ with respect to the first resp. second variable.

*Proof of Lemma I.*⁵⁾ First we remark that $M(x, y)$ is reflexive

$$(4) \quad M(t, t) = t$$

as putting $x = y = z$ in (1a) we have

$$M[M(x, x), x] = M[M(x, x), M(x, x)]$$

which by the monotony of $M(x, y)$ implies (4).

If we take now the derivative of (1a) with respect to x then we get

$$M_1[M(x, y), z] M_1(x, y) = M_1[M(x, z), M(y, z)] M_1(x, z).$$

Let us put here $y = x$ then by (4)

$$M_1(x, z) M_1(x, x) = M_1[M(x, z), M(x, z)] M_1(x, z),$$

consequently

$$(5) \quad M_1(x, x) = M_1[M(x, z), M(x, z)] = p \text{ (constant).}$$

Further by differentiating (4) we have

$$(6) \quad M_1(t, t) + M_2(t, t) = 1.$$

(4), (5) and (6) contain the assertion of Lemma I.

Lemma II. If the strictly monotonic and continuous function $M(x, y)$ satisfies the functional equations (1a) and (1b) then the functions

$$t_1 = M(x, u),$$

$$t_2 = M(x, v),$$

$$t_3 = M(y, u),$$

$$t_4 = M(y, v).$$

⁵⁾ This Lemma I is due to J. ACZÉL⁴⁾.

— all considered as functions of the four variables x, y, u, v — are not independent.

Proof of Lemma II. We prove Lemma II indirectly by supposing the independence of the functions t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4 . Then $M(x, y)$ is bisymmetric

$$M[M(t_1, t_2), M(t_3, t_4)] = M[M(t_1, t_3), M(t_2, t_4)]$$

since by (1a) and (1b)

$$\begin{aligned} M[M(x, y), M(u, v)] &= M\{M[x, M(u, v)], M[y, M(u, v)]\} = \\ &= M\{M[M(x, u), M(x, v)], M[M(y, u), M(y, v)]\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M[M(x, y), M(u, v)] &= M\{M[M(x, y), u], M[M(x, y), v]\} = \\ &= M\{M[M(x, u), M(y, u)], M[M(x, v), M(y, v)]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence⁶⁾ $M(x, y)$ is a quasilinear function

$$M(x, y) = f^{-1}[af(x) + bf(y) + c].$$

But then

$$f(t_1) = af(x) + bf(u) + c,$$

$$f(t_2) = af(x) + bf(v) + c,$$

$$f(t_3) = af(y) + bf(u) + c,$$

$$f(t_4) = af(y) + bf(v) + c,$$

$$f(t_1) + f(t_4) = f(t_2) + f(t_3) = a[f(x) + f(y)] + b[f(u) + f(v)] + 2c$$

in contradiction with the supposed independence of t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4 .

Now we can turn our attention to the

Proof of the Theorem. We proved in Lemma II. that the functions $M(x, u), M(x, v), M(y, u), M(y, v)$ are not independent hence their functional determinant must vanish:

$$\begin{vmatrix} M_1(x, u), & 0, & M_2(x, u), & 0 \\ M_1(x, v), & 0, & 0, & M_2(x, v) \\ 0, & M_1(y, u), & M_2(y, u), & 0 \\ 0, & M_1(y, v), & 0, & M_2(y, v) \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

or what is the same

$$\begin{aligned} M_1(x, u) M_2(x, v) M_2(y, u) M_1(y, v) &= \\ &= M_2(x, u) M_1(x, v) M_1(y, u) M_2(y, v). \end{aligned}$$

If we put $u = y$ then taking Lemma I into account we get

$$\frac{M_1(x, y)}{M_2(x, y)} = \frac{p}{q} \frac{M_1(x, v)}{M_2(x, v)} \frac{M_2(y, v)}{M_1(y, v)}.$$

⁶⁾ See [1]. Moreover here (4) implies $c = 0$ and $a + b = 1$.

Let us keep $v = v_0$ constant and define the function $f(t)$ by the equation

$$f'(t) = \frac{M_1(t, v_0)}{M_2(t, v_0)}$$

so we arrive to

$$\frac{M_1(x, y)}{M_2(x, y)} = \frac{p f'(x)}{q f'(y)}.$$

This can be written in the form

$$\begin{vmatrix} M_1(x, y) & M_2(x, y) \\ p f'(x) & q f'(y) \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

which shows the dependence of the functions $M(x, y)$ and $pf(x) + qf(y)$ i. e. there exists a function $\varphi(t)$ such that

$$\varphi[M(x, y)] = pf(x) + qf(y), \quad (p + q = 1).$$

Putting $y = x$ and taking (4) into account this gives

$$\varphi(x) = (p + q) f(x) = f(x).$$

Hence the solution is

$$M(x, y) = f^{-1}[pf(x) + qf(y)], \quad (p + q = 1)$$

Finally we verify that this solution really satisfies the functional equation (1a) and (1b):

$$\begin{aligned} M[M(x, y), z] &= f^{-1}\{p[pf(x) + qf(y)] + qf(z)\}, \\ M[M(x, z), M(y, z)] &= f^{-1}\{p[pf(x) + qf(z)] + q[pf(y) + qf(z)]\} = \\ &= f^{-1}\{p[pf(x) + qf(y)] + (p + q)qf(z)\} \end{aligned}$$

so (1a) is satisfied and similarly also (1b). This completes the proof of our Theorem.

Remark. Looking back to our proof we see that we have proved our assertion (3) in both cases: if the system of functions in Lemma II is not independent and if it is independent. But in the latter case the formula (3) thus proved offers on the other hand a contradiction with the supposed independence.

Bibliography.

- [1] J. ACZÉL, On mean values, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **54** (1948), 392—400.
- [2] B. KNASTER, Sur une équivalence pour les fonctions, *Colloquium Mathematicum*, **2** (1949), 1—4.
- [3] C. RYLL-NARDZEWSKI, Sur les moyennes, *Studia Mathematica*, **11** (1949), 31—37.

(Received January 22, 1953.)