

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

**NONLINEAR EQUATIONS OF EVOLUTION**

BRUCE DONALD CALVERT

# NONLINEAR EQUATIONS OF EVOLUTION

BRUCE D. CALVERT

We begin by considering various kinds of nonlinear operators in a Banach lattice  $X$ , i.e., a Banach space which has a compatible lattice structure. With adequate definitions we are able to develop a theory parallel to the theory of nonlinear equations of evolutions in a general Banach space, as carried out by Komura, Kato, Browder and others. Existence and uniqueness theorems about solutions of the equation of evolution  $du(t)/dt = -Au(t)$  are developed under conditions on the space  $X$  and the operator  $A$ . Given a solution  $u(t)$  to  $du(t)/dt = -Au(t)$  with initial condition  $u(0) = v$ , where  $v$  lies in the domain of  $A$ , a semi-group  $U(t)$  is defined by  $U(t)v = u(t)$ ,  $t \geq 0$ .

Conditions are found under which the semi-group is order-preserving, and under which a trajectory  $u(t)$  is itself increasing as  $t$  increases. Under these conditions, the existence of zeroes of the infinitesimal generator  $-A$  is derived, corresponding to fixed points of the semi-group  $U(t)$ . These results are stronger than those concerning the zeroes of accretive operators in a general Banach space.

Under the special condition that the space  $X$  be an algebra whose unit is an order unit, we give conditions on  $-A$  in order that it generates a semi-group, without assuming local uniform continuity of  $A$ .

Ergodic theory, which concerns the convergence of  $1/n \int_0^n U(t)v dt$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  is developed, having an intimate connection with the nonlinear semi-groups  $U(t)$  of the type considered above. Nonlinear ergodic theorems have not so far appeared in the literature.

Furthermore, the existence of a solution to  $du(t)/dt = +Au(t)$  under the condition that  $A$  preserves order is discussed. These results lead to some new open questions, as for example how to carry over the theory of fixed points and zeroes developed above.

The last two sections deal with equations of evolution outside the Banach lattice. For the case of a lattice, the concept of  $x \rightarrow 2J(x^+)$  being a selection of the subgradient of  $x \rightarrow \|x^+\|^2$ , with  $J$  a duality map, was used. With  $G$  a closed convex subset of  $x$ , we now use the fact that  $x \rightarrow 2J(x - Ux)$  is a selection of the subgradient of  $x \rightarrow (d(x, G))^2$ , where  $Ux$  denotes a nearest point to  $x$  in  $G$ . With  $G$  compact, we directly generalise some of the results of the theory of accretive operators, which correspond here to  $G = \{0\}$ .

Finally, in order to find zeroes of a given operator  $A$ , a smoothed

version of  $du(t)/dt = +Au(t)$  is considered. Smoothing refers to the fact that Banach spaces  $X_2 \subset X_1$  and linear operators  $St, t \geq 0$ , from  $X_1$  to  $X_2$  are considered, which abstract the idea of smoothing or modification by convolution. This gives results under the conditions of the Nash-Moser inverse function theorem.

**1. Nonlinear Operators in a Banach Lattice.** We recall a *Banach lattice*  $X$  is a Banach space  $X$  over the real numbers  $R$ , which is a lattice under the ordering  $\leq$ , such that for  $x, y$  and  $z$  in  $X$ ,

- (a)  $x \leq y$  implies  $x + z \leq y + z$
- (b)  $x \leq y$  implies  $ax \leq ay$  for  $a \geq 0$  in  $R$
- (c)  $|x| \leq |y|$  implies  $\|x\| \leq \|y\|$ .

A background in Banach lattices is provided by the books of Yosida [24], Schaefer [20] and Birkhoff [2]. Schaefer's notation is mostly followed, in particular  $x^+ = \sup(x, 0)$  and  $x^- = \sup(-x, 0)$ , so that  $x = x^+ - x^-$  and  $|x| = x^+ + x^-$ .

We use where possible nonlinear terminology from Browder [5]. In particular a *duality map*  $J$  is a function from  $X$  to its dual  $X^*$  such that  $(Jx, x) = \|x\|^2$  and  $\|Jx\| = \|x\|$  for  $x$  in  $X$ . With an order structure on a Banach space we may consider further properties possessed by  $J$ .

**DEFINITION.** Suppose  $X$  is a Banach lattice, and  $J$  a duality map. Then  $J$  is *positive* if

- (1)  $(Jx, y) \geq 0$  if  $x \geq 0$  and  $y \geq 0$
- (2)  $(Jx, y) = 0$  if  $x \perp y$ .

Since writing this paper as a thesis the author has found Phillips [18] used this duality mapping in the theory of linear nonexpansive semigroups.

We recall: a subset  $A$  of  $X$  is *order bounded* if it is contained in an *order interval*  $[a, b] = \{z \text{ in } X: a \leq z \leq b\}$ .  $X$  is *countably order complete* (*sigma complete* in Yosida [24]) if for every order bounded countable subset  $A$  of  $X$ ,  $\sup A$  and  $\inf A$  exist.  $X$  is *order complete* if we remove the countability requirement. Following Krasnoselski [13], if  $X$  is an ordered Banach space we say the norm is *monotonic* if  $0 \leq x \leq y$  implies  $\|x\| \leq \|y\|$ . Schaefer [20] page 215 shows that  $X$  has an equivalent *monotonic* norm iff the positive cone  $\{x \text{ in } X: x \geq 0\}$  is normal.

**PROPOSITION 1.1.** (1) Suppose  $X$  is an ordered Banach space with monotonic norm. Then there is a duality map  $J$  satisfying (1) above.

(2) Supposing  $X$  is a Banach lattice, then there is a duality map satisfying (2) as well, i.e., a positive duality map.

*Proof.* (1) Suppose  $x$  in  $K$ , the positive cone of  $X$ , and  $\|x\| = 1$ . Let  $B$  be the open ball center 0 radius 1 and let  $B - K$  be the convex open set  $\{b - k: b \text{ in } B \text{ and } k \text{ in } K\}$ .  $x$  is not in  $B - K$ , for if  $x = b - k$ , then  $b \geq x \geq 0$ . Hence,  $\|b\| \geq \|x\| = 1$ .

By the Hahn-Banach theorem there is a closed hyperplane containing  $x$  which does not intersect  $B - K$ . Hence, there is an element  $J_1x$  of  $X^*$  with  $(J_1x, x) = 1$  and  $(J_1x, f) < 1$  if  $f$  is in  $B - K$ . By continuity,  $(J_1x, x - k) \leq 1$ , hence,  $(J_1x, k) \geq 0$  for  $k$  in  $K$ . For  $b$  in  $B$ ,  $(J_1x, b) < 1$ , hence,  $\|J_1x\| \leq 1$ . Therefore,  $\|J_1x\| = 1$  since  $(J_1x, x) = 1$ . This gives a duality map on  $K \cup -K$  satisfying (1). If  $x$  is not in  $K$  or  $-K$ , we consider the open set  $B$  instead of  $B - K$  as usual to obtain a duality map  $J_1: X \rightarrow X^*$  satisfying (1). The device used above is that of the Brauer-Namioka theorem on extension of positive functionals. (See Schaefer [20], page 227.)

(2)  $X$  may not be sigma complete, but  $X^{**}$  is; indeed, it is order complete. Hence, for  $x$  in  $X^{**}$  and for  $y \geq 0$  we define

$$\begin{aligned} P_x(y) &= \sup\{\inf(n|x|, y): n \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}^+\} \\ &= \sup\{[0, y] \cap B_x\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $B_x = \{x^\perp\}^\perp$  is the band generated by  $x$ . For general  $y$  we define  $P_x(y) = P_x(y^+) - P_x(y^-)$ .  $P_x$  is a bounded linear operator of norm 1, idempotent, a lattice homomorphism, and  $P_x(y) = 0$  if  $x \perp y$ .

Now the evaluation  $e: X \rightarrow X^{**}$  defined by  $(e(x), f) = (x, f)$  for  $f$  in  $X^*$  is a lattice homomorphism and an isometry. If  $X$  were sigma complete with  $J_1$  as in (1) a duality map for  $X$ , we could define  $Jx = P_x^*J_1(x)$ .

Given  $J_1$  as in (1) a duality map for  $X^{**}$ , we define for  $x$  in  $X$ ,  $Jx = e^*P_x^*J_1ex$ .

- (a)  $(Jx, x) = (J_1ex, P_{ex}(ex)) = \|ex\|^2 = \|x\|^2$ ;
- (b)  $(Jx, y) = (J_1ex, P_{ex}(ey)) \leq \|ex\| \|ey\| = \|x\| \|y\|$ ;
- (c) if  $x, y \geq 0$ , then  $ex \geq 0$  and  $P_{ex}(ey) \geq 0$ , hence,  $(Jx, y) \geq 0$ ;
- (d) if  $x \perp y$ , then  $ex \perp ey$ , hence,  $P_{ex}(ey) = 0$ , hence,  $(Jx, y) = 0$ .

Hence,  $J$  is a positive duality map.

**COROLLARY.** *If  $X$  is a Banach lattice and  $X^*$  is strictly convex, then the duality map is positive since it is unique.*

If  $g$  is a convex real valued function on  $X$ , then the subgradient  $dg: X \rightarrow \text{subsets of } X^*$  is defined by:  $w$  is in  $dg(x)$  iff for all  $u$  in  $X$ ,

$$g(u) \geq g(x) + (w, u - x).$$

A selection of a function  $F: X \rightarrow \text{subsets of } Y$  is a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  with  $f(x)$  in  $F(x)$  for  $x$  in  $X$ . The first part of this next

result is central to further development.

**PROPOSITION 1.2.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map  $J$ . Then  $y \rightarrow 2J(y^+)$  is a selection of the subgradient of  $y \rightarrow \|y^+\|^2$ . Conversely, if  $x \rightarrow 2w(x)$  is a selection of the subgradient of  $x \rightarrow \|x^+\|^2$  and  $w(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x$  in  $X$ , then  $w(x)$  is a permissible value for  $J(x^+)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x$  and  $y$  be elements of  $X$ .

$$\begin{aligned} (J(x^+), y) &\leq (J(x^+), y^+) \text{ since } J \text{ positive and } y^+ \geq y. \\ (J(x^+), x) &= (J(x^+), x^+ - x^-) \\ &= (J(x^+), x^+) \quad \text{since } J \text{ positive and } x^+ \perp x^-. \end{aligned}$$

Now  $(\|x^+\| - \|y^+\|)^2 \geq 0$ , hence,

$$\|y^+\|^2 \geq \|x^+\|^2 + 2(J(x^+), y^+ - x^+).$$

Therefore,

$$\|y^+\|^2 \geq \|x^+\|^2 + 2(J(x^+), y - x),$$

and  $x \rightarrow 2J(x^+)$  is a selection of the subgradient of  $x \rightarrow \|x^+\|^2$ .

Conversely, suppose for  $y$  in  $X$  we have

$$(1) \quad \|y^+\|^2 \geq \|x^+\|^2 + 2(w(x), y - x).$$

Putting  $y = ax$ , a real in (1), we have

$$a \|x^+\|^2 - 2(w(x), x)a + 2(w(x), x) - \|x^+\|^2 \geq 0.$$

Hence, the discriminant is  $\leq 0$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq (w(x), x)^2 - 2 \|x^+\| (w(x), x) + \|x^+\|^4 \\ &= ((w(x), x) - \|x^+\|^2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (w(x), x) &= \|x^+\|^2. \\ ((w(x), x^+) &= (w(x), x) + (w(x), x^-) \\ &\geq (w(x), x) \quad \text{since } w(x) \geq 0 \text{ and } x^- \geq 0 \\ &= \|x^+\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now given  $e > 0$ , there is  $U(e)$  in  $X$  with  $\|U(e)\| = \|w(x)\|$  and

$$(w(x), U(e)) \geq \|w(x)\|^2 - e.$$

Putting  $y = U(e)$  in (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U(e)\|^2 + \|x^+\|^2 &\geq 2(w(x), U(e)) \\ &\geq 2\|w(x)\|^2 - 2e. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|w(x)\|^2 \leq \|x^+\|^2 + 2e.$$

Hence,

$$\|w(x)\| \leq \|x^+\|,$$

giving

$$\|w(x)\| = \|x^+\| \text{ and } (w(x), x^+) = \|x^+\|^2.$$

A *global  $\psi$  system* for a Banach space  $X$  is a function  $\psi: X \rightarrow X^*$  with  $\|\psi(x)\| \leq \|x\|$  and  $(\psi(x), x) \geq c\|x\|^2$  for  $x$  in  $X$ , where  $c > 0$  is in  $R$ . (See Browder [7], Chapter 3)

**PROPOSITION 1.3.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map  $J$ , then  $\psi(z) = \frac{1}{2}(J(z^+) - J(z^-))$  is a global  $\psi$  system for  $X$  with constant  $c = 1/4$ .*

*Proof.*  $\|z^+\| \leq \|z\|$  and  $\|z^-\| \leq \|z\|$  since  $X$  a Banach lattice, hence,  $\|\psi(z)\| \leq \|z\|$ .

$$\begin{aligned} 2(\psi(z), z) &= (J(z^+) - J(z^-), z^+ - z^-) \\ &= \|z^+\|^2 + \|z^-\|^2 \quad \text{since } J \text{ positive.} \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$2\|z^+\|\|z^-\| \leq \|z^+\|^2 + \|z^-\|^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\|^2 &\leq (\|z^+\| + \|z^-\|)^2 \\ &\leq 2(\|z^+\|^2 + \|z^-\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(\psi(z), z) \geq \frac{1}{4}\|z\|^2.$$

**DEFINITION.** Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map  $J$ .

$A: D(A) \rightarrow X$ ,  $D(A) \subset X$ , is *T-accretive* if for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $D(A)$ ,  $(Ax - Ay, J(x - y)^+) \geq 0$ , and  $A$  is *hypermaksimal T-accretive* if also

$$R(I + A) = X.$$

$U: D(U) \rightarrow X$ ,  $D(U) \subset X$ , is *T-nonexpansive* if for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $D(U)$

$$\|(Ux - Uy)^+\| \leq \|(x - y)^+\|.$$

$A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is *generalized T-accretive* if there is  $k > 0$  in  $R$  with

$$(Ax - Ay, J(x - y)^+) \geq -k\|(x - y)^+\|^2.$$

$U: D(U) \rightarrow X$  is *T-Lipschitz* if there is  $k > 0$  in  $R$  with

$$\|(Ux - Uy)^+\| \leq k \|(x - y)^+\|.$$

$A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is *locally generalized T-accretive* if for  $z$  in  $D(A)$ , there is  $k_z > 0$ , and a neighborhood  $N_z$  of  $z$  in  $X$ , with

$$(Ax - Ay, J(x - y)^+) \geq -k_z \|(x - y)^+\|^2$$

for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $N_z \cap D(A)$ .

$U: D(U) \rightarrow X$  is *locally T-Lipschitz* if for  $z$  in  $D(U)$ , there is  $k_z > 0$  and a neighborhood  $N_z$  of  $z$  in  $X$  with  $\|(Ux - Uy)^+\| \leq k_z \|(x - y)^+\|$  for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $N_z \cap D(U)$ .

Given a global  $\psi$  system  $\psi$ ,  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is  $\psi$ -accretive if

$$(Ax - Ay, \psi(x - y)) \geq 0.$$

$U: D(U) \rightarrow X$  is *monotonic* if  $x \geq y$  implies  $Ux \geq Uy$ .

$U: D(U) \rightarrow X^*$  is *T-monotone* if  $(Ux - Uy, (x - y)^+) \geq 0$ .

The definition of *T-monotone* functions was given independently by Brezis-Stampacchia [5] in a particular concrete case. *T-monotone* implies *monotone*, but, in general, *T-accretive* does not imply *accretive*. In many function spaces it does, we see later, but we obtain additional information from the *T-accretive* property.

*T-accretive* functions arise as nonlinear partial differential operators; for example, the conditions (A) of Brower [6] give *T-monotonicity* in the Hilbert space  $L^2(G)$ , hence, *T-accretivity*, for second order operators.

We now consider certain relations between these classes.

**PROPOSITION 1.4.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map, and  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is T-accretive. Then  $A$  is accretive with respect to  $\psi(z) = \frac{1}{2}(J(z^+) - J(z^-))$  of Proposition 1.3.*

*Proof.* Let  $x$  and  $y$  be in  $D(A)$ . Now  $2\psi(x - y)^+ = J(x - y)^+$  and  $2\psi(x - y)^- = J(x - y)^-$  and  $2\psi(x - y) = \psi(x - y)^+ - \psi(x - y)^-$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 2(Ax - Ay, \psi(x - y)) &= (Ax - Ay, J(x - y)^+) - (Ax - Ay, J(x - y)^-) \\ &= (Ax - Ay, J(x - y)^+) + (Ay - Ax, J(y - x)^+) \\ &\geq 0 \quad \text{since } A \text{ is } T\text{-accretive.} \end{aligned}$$

We note  $A$  is *T-accretive* iff  $(Ax - Ay, J_r(x - y)^+) \geq 0$  where  $J_r$  is a generalized duality map. Hence, if  $J_r(z) = J_r(z^+) - J_r(z^-)$  for  $z$  in  $X$ , then *T-accretive* maps are *accretive*. This occurs in  $L^p$  spaces,  $1 < p < \infty$ . Yamamuro [23] gives a result on generalized duality maps of this type.

PROPOSITION 1.5. (a) If  $U$  is a (locally)  $T$ -Lipschitz function, then  $-U$  is (locally) generalized  $T$ -accretive and also (locally) Lipschitzian.

(b) A  $T$ -accretive function is generalized  $T$ -accretive and a generalized  $T$ -accretive function is locally generalized  $T$ -accretive.

(c) A  $T$ -nonexpansive function is  $T$ -Lipschitz and a  $T$ -Lipschitz function is locally  $T$ -Lipschitz. A  $T$ -Lipschitz function is monotonic.

(d) Suppose  $D(U) \subset X$  is convex.  $U$  is locally  $T$ -Lipschitz iff there is a continuous function  $k: D(U) \times D(U) \rightarrow R$  with

$$\|(Ux - Uy)^+\| \leq k(x, y) \|(x - y)^+\|.$$

In particular,  $U$  is monotonic.

(e) Suppose  $D(A) \subset X$  is convex, and  $J(rx) = rJ(x)$  for  $r$  in  $R$  and  $x$  in  $X$ .  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is locally generalized  $T$ -accretive iff there is a continuous function

$k: D(A) \times D(A) \rightarrow R$  with  $(Ax - Ay, J(x - y)^+) \geq -k(x, y) \|(x - y)^+\|^2$ .

*Proof.* (a), (b), and (c) are straightforward; we prove (d), and the proof of (e) is similar.

We suppose  $U$  is locally  $T$ -Lipschitz, and  $x$  and  $y$  are in  $D(U)$ . We assume  $z \rightarrow k_z$  is continuous, using a partition of unity. The line segment joining  $x$  and  $y$  is compact and contained in  $D(U)$ . Hence, we divide the line segment:

$$x = x_0 \cdots y = x_n \text{ with } \|(Ux_{i-1} - Ux_i)^+\| \leq k_i \|(x_{i-1} - x_i)^+\|$$

with  $k_i$  corresponding to a set containing  $x_i$  and  $x_{i-1}$ .

Put  $k(x, y) = \sup \{k_i: 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ .

Now for  $a$  and  $b$  in a Banach lattice,  $a^+ + b^+ \geq (a + b)^+$ . Hence,  $(\sum a_i)^+ \leq \sum (a_i^+)$  for a finite sum, giving  $\|(\sum a_i)^+\| \leq \|\sum (a_i^+)\|$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(Ux - Uy)^+\| &= \|(\sum Ux_{i-1} - Ux_i)^+\| \\ &\leq \|\sum (Ux_{i-1} - Ux_i)^+\| \\ &\leq \sum \|(Ux_{i-1} - Ux_i)^+\| \\ &\leq \sum k(x, y) \|(x_{i-1} - x_i)^+\| \\ &= k(x, y) \|(x - y)^+\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then by a partition of unity, we may assume  $k$  is continuous. The reverse implication is immediate.  $U$  is monotonic for suppose  $x \leq y$ , then  $\|(x - y)^+\| = 0$ . Hence,  $\|(Ux - Uy)^+\| = 0$ , giving  $Ux \leq Uy$ .

PROPOSITION 1.6. Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map. If  $U: D(U) \rightarrow X$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive, then  $I - U$  is  $T$ -accretive.



*Proof.* Let  $x$  and  $y$  be in  $D(U)$ . Since  $(Ux - Uy)^+ \geq Ux - Uy$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & ((x - Ux) - (y - Uy), J(x - y)^+) \\ &= \|(x - y)^+\|^2 - (Ux - Uy, J(x - y)^+) \\ &\geq \|(x - y)^+\|^2 - ((Ux - Uy)^+, J(x - y)^+) \\ &\geq \|(x - y)^+\|^2 - \|(Ux - Uy)^+\| \|(x - y)^+\| \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

**PROPOSITION 1.7.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map  $J$ . If  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is  $T$ -accretive, then for all  $d > 0$ ,  $(I + dA)^{-1}: R(I + dA) \rightarrow X$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive. If  $J$  is demicontinuous from the strong to the weak\* topology, then the converse is true.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $w$  and  $z$  in  $D(A)$ ,  $A$  is  $T$ -accretive, and  $d > 0$  is given, and  $(I + dA)w = x$  and  $(I + dA)z = y$ . Since  $A$  is  $T$ -accretive, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(w - z)^+\|^2 &\leq (x - y, J(w - z)^+) \\ &\leq ((x - y)^+, J(w - z)^+) \\ &\leq \|(x - y)^+\| \|(w - z)^+\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\|(w - z)^+\| \leq \|(x - y)^+\|$  and  $(I + dA)^{-1}$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive.

Conversely, suppose for  $d > 0$ ,  $(I + dA)w = x_d$  and  $(I + dA)z = y_d$ . Then

$$\|(w - z)^+\| \leq \|(x_d - y_d)^+\| \text{ for } d > 0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (J(x_d - y_d)^+, w - z) &\leq (J(x_d - y_d)^+, (w - z)^+) \\ &\leq \|J(x_d - y_d)^+\| \|(w - z)^+\| \\ &\leq \|(x_d - y_d)^+\|^2 \\ &= (J(x_d - y_d)^+, x_d - y_d). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(J(x_d - y_d)^+, (w - x_d) - (z - y_d)) \leq 0.$$

But  $w - x_d = -dAw$  and  $z - y_d = -dAz$ . Therefore,

$$(J(x_d - y_d)^+, Aw - Az) \geq 0.$$

Now  $x_d - y_d \rightarrow w - z$ , hence,  $(x_d - y_d)^+ \rightarrow (w - z)^+$ , hence,

$$(J(w - z)^+, Aw - Az) \geq 0,$$

and  $A$  is  $T$ -accretive.

We see that  $A$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive if and only if there exists  $d > 0$  with  $R(I + dA) = X$  if and only if for all  $d > 0$ ,

$$R(I + dA) = X.$$

**PROPOSITION 1.8.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive. Then  $R(A + dI) = X$  for  $d > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Given  $y$  in  $X$ ,  $d > 0$ , we want  $u$  with  $(A + dI)u = y$ . Suppose  $R(A + d_0I) = X$ ,  $d_0 > 0$ . We shall solve

$$(A + dI)(A + d_0I)^{-1}x = y,$$

and put  $u = (A + d_0I)^{-1}x$ . We want  $x$  with

$$x + d_0^{-1}(d - d_0)(d_0^{-1}A + I)^{-1}x = y.$$

Now  $(d_0^{-1}A + I)^{-1}$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive, hence, has Lipschitz constant  $\leq 2$ . Hence, if  $|d_0^{-1}(d - d_0)| < 1/2$ , we have a solution  $x$  by the contraction mapping principle. Repeating this process a finite number of times, we have  $A + dI$  is surjective for any  $d > 0$ .

**PROPOSITION 1.9.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map, and  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive. Then for  $d > 0$ ,  $A(I + dA)^{-1}$  is  $T$ -accretive and Lipschitzian from  $X$  to  $X$ .*

*Proof.*  $A(I + dA)^{-1} = d^{-1}(I - (I + dA)^{-1})$ . By proposition 7,  $(I + dA)^{-1}$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive. By Proposition 6,  $I - (I + dA)^{-1}$  is  $T$ -accretive. Hence,  $A(I + dA)^{-1}$  is  $T$ -accretive. Also,  $(I + dA)^{-1}$  is Lipschitzian, hence,  $I - (I + dA)^{-1}$  is also, consequently,  $A(I + dA)^{-1}$  is Lipschitzian with Lipschitz constant  $3/d$ .

**PROPOSITION 1.10.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map, and  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$ . Suppose  $A$  is*

(1)  $T$ -accretive;

or

(2) generalized  $T$ -accretive;

or

(3) locally generalized  $T$ -accretive.

For  $v$  in  $D(A)$  and  $t$  in  $R^+$  we put  $U(t)v = u(t)$ , if there is a unique continuous weakly differentiable function  $u: [0, t] \rightarrow X$ ,  $u(0) = v$ ,  $du(s)/ds = -Au(s)$  for  $s$  in  $(0, t)$  and  $s \rightarrow \|u(s)\|$  is absolutely continuous. We say  $-A$  generates the semigroup  $U(t)$ . We have  $U(t)$  is

(1)  $T$ -nonexpansive;

or

(2)  $T$ -Lipschitz;

or

(3) locally  $T$ -Lipschitz.

*Proof.* Suppose  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq d$ , and  $x$  and  $y$  are in  $D(U(d))$ . By Proposition 1.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (x(s) - y(s))^+ \|^2 - \| (x(t) - y(t))^+ \|^2 \\ & \geq 2(J(x(t) - y(t))^+, (x(s) - x(t)) - (y(s) - y(t))) . \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by  $t - s$  and letting  $s \rightarrow t^-$ , we have, by the absolute continuity of  $\| (x(s) - y(s))^+ \|^2$ , for  $t$  in  $[0, d] - N$ , where  $N$  is a set of measure zero,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \| (x(t) - y(t))^+ \|^2 \leq -2(J(x(t) - y(t))^+, Ax(t) - Ay(t)) .$$

In case (1),  $d \| (x(t) - y(t))^+ \|^2/dt \leq 0$  for  $t$  in  $[0, d] - N$ . Hence,

$$\| (x(d) - y(d))^+ \|^2 \leq \| (x - y)^+ \|^2 ,$$

and  $U(d)$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive.

In case (2),  $d \| (x(t) - y(t))^+ \|^2/dt \leq 2k \| (x(t) - y(t))^+ \|^2$ . Hence,

$$\frac{d}{dt} (e^{-2kt} \| (x(t) - y(t))^+ \|^2) \leq 0 .$$

Hence,  $\| (U(d)x - U(d)y)^+ \| \leq \| e^{kd} \| (x - y)^+ \|$ , and  $U(d)$  is  $T$ -Lipschitz. In case (3), we assume  $d$  small and  $x$  close to  $y$ , so that  $x(t)$  and  $y(t)$  are in a neighborhood  $N_z$  where  $k_z$  is constant. This puts us back in case (2). Composing with  $U(d)$  we obtain the result for general  $d$  since  $[0, d]$  is compact.

We have a converse of the proposition above.

**PROPOSITION 1.11.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map, and  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$ ; is such that  $-A$  generates the semigroup  $U(t)$  which is*

(1)  $T$ -nonexpansive;

or

(2)  $T$ -Lipschitz;

or

(3) locally  $T$ -Lipschitz.

Then  $A$  is

(1)  $T$ -accretive;

or

(2) generalized  $T$ -accretive;

or

(3) locally generalized  $T$ -accretive.

*Proof.* Given  $x$  and  $y$  in  $D(A)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(x(t) - y(t))^+\|^2 &\leq \|(x(0) - y(0))^+\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2(J(x(0) - y(0))^+, (x(t) - y(t)) - (x(0) - y(0))) . \end{aligned}$$

In case (1),  $\|(x(t) - y(t))^+\|^2 \leq \|(x(0) - y(0))^+\|^2$ . Hence,

$$0 \geq 2(J(x(0) - y(0))^+, (x(t) - x(0)) - (y(t) - y(0))) :$$

dividing by  $t$  and letting  $t \rightarrow 0^+$  we have  $A$   $T$ -accretive.

Cases (2) and (3) are similar.

**PROPOSITION 1.12.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map. Suppose  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  generates a semigroup  $U(t)$ , and  $A$  is*

(1)  $T$ -accretive;

or

(2) generalized  $T$ -accretive;

or

(3) locally generalized  $T$ -accretive.

Then

$$(1) \quad \|(Au(t))^+\| \leq \|(Au(0))^+\|;$$

or

$$(2) \quad \|(Au(t))^+\| \leq e^{kt} \|(Au(0))^+\| \quad \text{where} \quad (Ax - Ay, J(x - y)^+) \geq -k \|(x - y)^+\|^2;$$

or

$$(3) \quad \|(Au(t))^+\| \leq e^{K(t)} \|(Au(0))^+\|, \quad \text{where} \quad (Ax - Ay, J(x - y)^+) \geq -k(y) \|(x - y)^+\|^2 \text{ for } x \text{ near } y \text{ and } K(t) = \int_0^t k(u(s)) \, ds.$$

*Proof.* We prove case (3). Suppose  $A$  is locally generalized  $T$ -accretive, and  $u$  is a continuous function  $[0, d] \rightarrow X$  with  $du(t)/dt = -Au(t)$ . Then

$$\|(u(t+h) - u(t))^- \| \leq \|(u(h) - u(0))^- \| e^{K(t)} .$$

by Proposition 1.10, since  $v(t) = u(t+h)$  is a solution to

$$\frac{dv}{dt}(t) = -Av(t), \text{ with } v(0) = u(h) .$$

Dividing by  $h$  and letting  $h \rightarrow 0^+$ , we have

$$\|(Au(t))^+\| \leq \|(Au(0))^+\| e^{K(t)} .$$

Case (1) and (2) are similar, indeed particular cases.

**COROLLARY.** *Suppose  $X$  and  $A$  are as in (3) above, with*

$du(t)/dt = -Au(t)$ , and  $Au(0) \leq 0$ . Then  $Au(t) \leq 0$  as long as  $u(t)$  is defined, and  $u(t) \leq u(s)$  if  $t \leq s$ .

*Proof.* By (3) of Proposition 1.12,  $\|(Au(t)^+\| \leq 0$ . Given  $t \leq s$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} u(s) - u(t) &= \int_t^s \frac{du}{dr}(r) dr \\ &= \int_t^s -Au(r) dr \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We recall a function  $T: X \rightarrow 2^X$  is  $g$ -accretive if there is a map  $\phi: X \times X \times X \rightarrow X^*$  with  $\phi(u, v, x)$  in  $J(u - v)$  for  $x, u, v$  in  $X$ , such that for  $y$  in  $T(u)$  and  $w$  in  $T(v)$ ,  $(\phi(u, v, y - w), y - w) \geq 0$ .

**PROPOSITION 1.13.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map. Then  $X$  has an equivalent norm in which  $T$ -nonexpansive functions are nonexpansive and  $T$ -accretive functions are  $g$ -accretive.*

*Proof.* Set  $\|x\|_1 = \|x^+\| + \|x^-\|$ .  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is an equivalent norm. Suppose  $U: D(U) \rightarrow X$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive and  $x$  and  $y$  are in  $D(U)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ux - Uy\|_1 &= \|(Ux - Uy)^+\| + \|Ux - Uy\|^- \\ &\leq \|(x - y)^+\| + \|(x - y)^-\| \\ &= \|x - y\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is  $T$ -accretive. Then for  $d > 0$ ,  $(I + dA)^{-1}$  is nonexpansive, hence, nonexpansive in  $(X, \|\cdot\|_1)$ . Hence, by Theorem 9.1 of Browder [5],  $A$  is  $g$ -accretive in  $(X, \|\cdot\|_1)$ .

**COROLLARY.** *Suppose  $G$  is a closed subset of a Banach lattice and  $U: G \rightarrow G$  satisfies  $\|(Ux - Uy)^+\| \leq a \|(x - y)^+\|$  with  $a < 1$ , for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $G$ . Then  $U$  has a unique fixed point.*

*Proof.*  $\|Ux - Uy\|_1 \leq a \|x - y\|_1$  for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $G$ . The result follows from the contraction mapping principle.

We note that  $(X, \|\cdot\|_1, \leq)$  is not a Banach lattice. We have only that  $|x| \leq |y|$  implies  $\|x\|_1 \leq 2\|y\|_1$ . In general, the equivalent norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$  does not preserve properties like normal structure, strict convexity, or uniform convexity of  $X$  or  $X^*$ .

We recall that a Banach space  $X$  has property  $P$  of Bohnenblust [3] if  $a, b, c, d \geq 0$ ,  $a \perp b$ ,  $c \perp d$ ,  $\|a\| = \|c\|$  and  $\|b\| = \|d\|$  implies

$$\|a + b\| = \|c + d\|.$$

**PROPOSITION 1.14.** *Every  $T$ -nonexpansive function  $U: D(U) \rightarrow X$  is nonexpansive if and only if  $X$  has property  $P$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $X$  has property  $P$  and  $y$  and  $x$  are in  $D(U)$ .  $\|(Ux - Uy)^+\| \leq \|(x - y)^+\|$ , hence,  $\|(Ux - Uy)^+\| = a \|(x - y)^+\|$  for some  $a$  in  $[0, 1]$ . Similarly, there is  $b$  in  $[0, 1]$  with  $\|(Ux - Uy)^-\| = b \|(x - y)^-\|$ . Now  $a(x - y)^+ \perp b(x - y)^-$  and  $(Ux - Uy)^+ \perp (Ux - Uy)^-$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ux - Uy\| &= \|(Ux - Uy)^+ + (Ux - Uy)^-\| \\ &= \|a(x - y)^+ + b(x - y)^-\| \\ &\leq \|(x - y)^+ + (x - y)^-\| \\ &= \|x - y\|. \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, suppose  $X$  does not have property  $P$ . Then there are  $a, b, c, d \geq 0$  in  $X$  with  $\|c\| = \|d\|$ ,  $\|a\| = \|b\|$ ,  $a \perp c$ ,  $b \perp d$ , and  $\|a + c\| < \|b + d\|$ . Put  $U(0) = 0$ ,  $U(a - c) = b - d$ . Then a calculation shows  $U: \{0, a - c\} \rightarrow X$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive but not nonexpansive.

The following proposition shows that in the linear case (see Phillips [18] and Sato [19]) semigroups of nonexpansive positive operators are  $T$ -nonexpansive. The converse is true too, which could be extended as in Proposition 1.16 on the differentiable case, for example to show a hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive operator  $A$  is  $g$ -accretive, if the resolvents  $(I + eA)^{-1}$  are  $C^1$ .

**PROPOSITION 1.15.** *Suppose  $E$  is a lattice subspace of  $X$ , and  $U: E \rightarrow X$  is a bounded positive linear operator. Then  $U$  is  $T$ -Lipschitz.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $x$  is in  $E$ .  $Ux = (Ux^+) + (Ux^-)$  since  $U$  is linear.  $U(x^+)$  and  $U(x^-)$  are  $\geq 0$  since  $U$  is positive. Hence,  $U(x^+) \geq U(x)$ . Hence,  $U(x^+) \geq (Ux)^+$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(Ux^+)\| &\leq \|U(x^+)\| \\ &\leq \|U\| \|x^+\|. \end{aligned}$$

We found a locally  $T$ -Lipschitz function  $U$  (with convex domain) is monotonic. The following proposition shows these properties are equivalent when  $U$  is  $C^1$ .

**PROPOSITION 1.16.** *Suppose  $U: G \rightarrow X$ ,  $G$  an open subset of the Banach lattice  $X$ , is  $C^1$  and monotonic. Then  $U$  is locally  $T$ -Lipschitz.*

*Proof.* The derivative at  $x$  in  $G$ ,  $U'_x$ , is positive. For suppose  $h \geq 0$  in  $X$ , then for  $t \geq 0$ ,  $U(x + th) - U(x) \geq 0$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} U'_x(h) &= \lim t^{-1} (U(x + th) - U(x)) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Given  $y$  in  $G$ , take  $B$  a ball around  $y$  in  $G$ , and  $M$  a positive constant, with  $\|U'_x\| \leq M$  for  $x$  in  $B$ . This may be done since  $U$  is  $C^1$ . Then for  $x$  in  $B$

$$Ux - Uy = \int_0^1 U'_{tx + (1-t)y}(x - y) dt.$$

Now from the inequality for a finite sum in a Banach lattice

$$(\Sigma a_n)^+ \leq \Sigma(a_n^+),$$

we have for a curve  $a: [c, d] \rightarrow X$ , that

$$\left(\int_c^d a(t) dt\right)^+ \leq \int_c^d a(t)^+ dt.$$

Hence,

$$(Ux - Uy)^+ \leq \int_0^1 (U'_{tx + (1-t)y}(x - y))^+ dt.$$

Hence, by Proposition 1.15,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(Ux - Uy)^+\| &\leq \int_0^1 \|(U'_{tx + (1-t)y}(x - y))^+\| dt \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \|U'_{tx + (1-t)y}\| \|(x - y)^+\| dt \\ &= M \|(x - y)^+\|. \end{aligned}$$

The question arises of the structure of the fixed point set  $F(U)$  of a  $T$ -nonexpansive function  $U: D(U) \rightarrow X$ . If  $X$  has property  $P$  and is strictly convex, then  $F(U)$  is convex. The following generalizes a linear theorem of Birkhoff [2], page 391.

**PROPOSITION 1.17.** *Suppose  $U$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive  $X \rightarrow X$ , an  $AL$  space. Then  $F(U)$  is a sublattice.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $Ux = x$ ,  $Uy = y$ , and  $z = \sup(x, y)$ .  $U$  is monotonic, hence,  $Uz \geq z$ . Suppose  $Uz = z + h$ , with  $h \geq 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|Uz - z\| + \|Uz - y\| &\leq \|z - x\| + \|z - y\| \\ &= \|x - y\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\|2h + x - y\| \leq \|x - y\|.$$

Therefore,  $h = 0$  and  $Uz = z$ . Similarly,  $\inf(x, y)$  is in  $F(U)$ .

**COROLLARY.** Suppose  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive, where  $X$  is an AL space with positive duality map. Then for  $x$  in  $X$ ,  $A^{-1}(x)$  is a sublattice.

*Proof.*  $A^{-1}(x) = B^{-1}(0)$  where  $B: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is defined by  $By = Ay - x$ . Now  $B(y) = 0$  if and only if  $(I + B)^{-1}y = y$ . But  $(I + B)^{-1}$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive. Hence,  $B^{-1}(0) = F((I + B)^{-1})$  is a sublattice.

## 2. Existence of solutions to equations of evolution.

**THEOREM 2.1.** Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with  $X^*$  uniformly convex. Suppose  $A$  is demicontinuous and locally generalized  $T$ -accretive from a neighborhood  $N$  of  $v$  to  $X$ .

Then there is an interval  $[0, d]$  and a unique strongly continuous weakly  $C^1$  function

$$u: [0, d] \rightarrow X \text{ with } u(0) = v \text{ and } \frac{du}{dt}(t) = -Au(t).$$

*Proof.* We have, since  $A$  is demicontinuous, a neighborhood  $N_0$  of  $v$  and a constant  $M$  with  $\|Ax\| \leq M$  if  $x$  is in  $N_0$ . Since  $A$  is locally generalized  $T$ -accretive, there is a neighborhood  $N_1$  of  $v$  and a constant  $k$  with

$$(Ax - Ay, J(x - y)^+) \geq -k \|(x - y)^+\|^2$$

for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $N_1$ .

We may assume  $N = B_R(v) \subset N_0 \cap N_1$ . For  $e > 0$ , we solve:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad \frac{du_e}{dt}(t) &= -Au_e(t - e) & t \geq 0 \\ u_e(t) &= v & t \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

There is a  $d > 0$  such that all solutions of (a) are in  $N$  for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$  independently of  $e$ .

Given  $e, f > 0$ , for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ , we set

$$q_{e,f}(t) = \|(u_e(t) - u_f(t))^+\|^2.$$

For  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq d$ , we have

$$q_{e,f}(s) \geq q_{e,f}(t) + 2(J(u_e(t) - u_f(t))^+, (u_e(s) - u_e(t)) - (u_f(s) - u_f(t))).$$

Dividing by  $t - s$  and letting  $s \rightarrow t^-$ ,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow t^-} \frac{q_{e,f}(t) - q_{e,f}(s)}{t - s} \leq 2(J(u_e(t) - u_f(t))^+, \frac{du_e}{dt}(t) - \frac{du_f}{dt}(t)).$$



By the boundedness of  $du_e/dt$ , we have  $q_{e,f}$  is absolutely continuous. Hence, there is a set  $N$  of measure 0 with

$$\frac{d}{dt} q_{e,f}(t) = \lim_{s \rightarrow t^-} \frac{q_{e,f}(t) - q_{e,f}(s)}{t - s}$$

existing for  $t$  in  $[0, d] - N$ . For such  $t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} q_{e,f}(t) &\leq 2(J(u_e(t - e) - u_f(t - f))^+ - J(u_e(t) - u_f(t))^+ , \\ Au_e(t - e) - Au_f(t - f)) &- 2(J(u_e(t - e) - u_f(t - f))^+ , Au_e(t - e) \\ &- Au_f(t - f)) . \end{aligned}$$

For  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ ,

$$\|(u_e(t - e) - u_f(t - f))^+\| \leq 2R$$

and

$$\|(u_e(t) - u_f(t))^+\| \leq 2R .$$

Since  $X^*$  is uniformly convex,  $J$  is uniformly continuous on  $B_{2R}(0)$ , hence, there is a function  $r: R^+ \rightarrow R^+$  with  $r(k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow 0$  such that if  $\|x\| \leq 2R$ ,  $\|y\| \leq 2R$ , then  $\|Jx - Jy\| \leq r(\|x - y\|)$ . Now  $\|u_e(t) - u_e(t - e)\| \leq eM$  and  $\|u_a(t) - u_a(t - d)\| \leq dM$  for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ . Therefore,

$$\|(u_e(t - e) - u_f(t - f)) - (u_e(t) - u_f(t))\| \leq (e + f)M .$$

Now if  $a, b$  are in a Banach lattice,

$$|a^+ - b^+| \leq |a - b|, \text{ hence, } \|a^+ - b^+\| \leq \|a - b\| .$$

Therefore,

$$\|J(u_e(t - e) - u_f(t - f))^+ - J(u_e(t) - u_f(t))^+\| \leq r((e + f)M) .$$

Therefore for  $t$  in  $[0, d] - N$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} q_{e,f}(t) \leq 4Mr((e + f)M) + 2k \|(u_e(t - e) - u_f(t - f))^+\|^2 .$$

Now

$$\|(u_e(t - e) - u_f(t - f))^+\| \leq (e + f)M + \|(u_e(t) - u_f(t))^+\| .$$

Hence,

$$\|(u_e(t - e) - u_f(t - f))^+\|^2 \leq 2(e + f)^2 M^2 + 2q_{e,f}(t) .$$

Hence,

$$\frac{d}{dt} q_{e,f}(t) - 4kq_{e,f}(t) \leq 2(e + f)^2 M^2 + 4Mr((e + f)M) .$$

Given  $g > 0$  there is  $h > 0$  such that for  $e, f \leq h$  the  $RHS \leq g$ . For  $e, f \leq h$ ,  $t$  in  $[0, d] - N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (e^{-4kt} q_{e,f}(t)) &= e^{-4kt} \left( \frac{d}{dt} q_{e,f}(t) - 4k q_{e,f}(t) \right) \\ &\leq g. \end{aligned}$$

Now  $q_{e,f}(0) = 0$ , hence,  $e^{-4kt} q_{e,f}(t) \leq gd$  for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ . Hence  $q_{e,f}(t) \leq gde^{4kd}$  for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ . Hence,  $(u_e(t) - u_f(t))^+$  converges to zero uniformly on  $[0, d]$  as  $e, f \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore,

$$(u_e(t) - u_f(t))^- = (u_f(t) - u_e(t))^+$$

converges to zero uniformly on  $[0, d]$ . Therefore,  $u_e(t) - u_f(t)$  converges to zero uniformly on  $[0, d]$ . Since  $(u_e)$  is a Cauchy net of continuous functions  $[0, d] \rightarrow B_R(v)$ , it converges to a continuous function  $u: [0, d] \rightarrow B_R(v)$ . Hence,  $u_e(t - e)$  also converges to  $u(t)$  uniformly on  $[0, d]$ , and since  $A$  is demicontinuous,  $Au_e(t - e)$  converges weakly to  $Au(t)$ .

Suppose  $f$  is in  $X^*$ , then for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$

$$(u_e(t), f) = (v, f) - \int_0^t (Au_e(s - e), f) ds.$$

Now  $|Au_e(s - e), f| \leq M \|f\|$ , hence, the integral converges to  $\int_0^t (Au(s), f) ds$ .  $(u_e(t), f)$  converges to  $(u(t), f)$ . Hence,

$$(u(t), f) = (v, f) - \int_0^t (Au(s), f) ds.$$

Hence,  $u$  is weakly differentiable with derivative  $du(t)/dt = -Au(t)$ , and since  $A$  is demicontinuous,  $u$  is weakly  $C^1$ . Uniqueness follows from Proposition 1.10.

**THEOREM 2.2.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with  $X^*$  uniformly convex. Suppose  $A_0: X \rightarrow X$  is locally generalized  $T$ -accretive and demicontinuous. Suppose  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive. Suppose  $v$  is in  $D(A)$ . Then there is an interval  $[0, h]$  and a unique strongly continuous weakly  $C^1$  function  $u: [0, h] \rightarrow X$  with  $u(0) = v$  and  $du(t)/dt = -A_1 u(t)$ , where  $A_1 = A_0 + A$ .*

*Proof.* We have, for  $d > 0$ ,

$$A(I + dA)^{-1} = d^{-1}(I - (I + dA)^{-1})$$

is  $T$ -accretive and Lipschitzian, with domain  $R(I + dA) = X$ . Hence,  $A_{1,d} = A_0 + A(I + dA)^{-1}$  is demicontinuous and locally generalized  $T$ -accretive:  $X \rightarrow X$ .

By Theorem 2.1, there is a unique solution  $u_d$  of

$$(a) \quad \frac{d}{dt} u_d(t) = -A_{1,d} u_d$$

$$u_d(0) = v$$

on some interval  $[0, h]$ .

By Proposition 1.12, we have a bound on the derivative of  $u_d(t)$  depending only on the locally generalized  $T$ -accretive part of  $A_{1,d}$  and on  $t$ . Hence, we have solutions of (a) for an interval  $[0, h]$  independent of  $d$ , with  $\|du_d(t)/dt\| \leq M$  for  $t$  in  $[0, h]$  for some constant  $M$ . Taking  $h$  small, we may assume there are positive constants  $k, M_0, R$ , with all solutions  $u_d(t)$  in  $B_R(v)$  for  $t$  in  $[0, h]$ , with  $\|A_0x\| \leq M_0$  and

$$(A_0x - A_0y, J(x - y)^+) \geq -k \|(x - y)^+\|^2$$

for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $B_R(v)$ .

Let

$$v_d(t) = (I + dA)^{-1}u_d(t) .$$

Then

$$-Av_d(t) = \frac{d}{dt} u_d(t) + A_0u_d(t) .$$

Hence,

$$\|Av_d(t)\| \leq M + M_0$$

for  $t$  in  $[0, h]$ . Now

$$u_d(t) - v_d(t) = dAv_d(t) ,$$

giving

$$\|u_d(t) - v_d(t)\| \leq d(M + M_0) .$$

Now

$$\|(u_d(t) - u_e(t))\| \leq 2R ,$$

hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(v_d(t) - v_e(t))\| &\leq \|v_d(t) - u_d(t)\| + \|v_d(t) - u_e(t)\| + 2R \\ &\leq 2R + (e + d)(M + M_0) \\ &\leq 4R, \text{ if } e, d \leq (M + M_0)^{-1}R . \end{aligned}$$

Since  $X^*$  is uniformly convex, there is a function  $r: R^+ \rightarrow R^+$  with  $r(k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow 0$  such that for  $\|y\|, \|x\| \leq 4R$ ,  $\|Jx - Jy\| \leq r(k)$  if  $\|x - y\| \leq k$ . Given  $d, e \leq (M + M_0)^{-1}R$ ,

$$\|v_d(t) - v_e(t) - u_d(t) + u_e(t)\| \leq (e + d)(M + M_0) .$$

Hence,

$$\|(v_d(t) - v_e(t))^+ - (u_d(t) + u_e(t))^+\| \leq (e + d)(M + M_0) .$$

Hence,

$$\|J(v_d(t) - v_e(t))^+ - J(u_d(t) - u_e(t))^+\| \leq r((e + d)(M + M_0)) .$$

We set  $q_{d,e}(t) = \|(u_d(t) - u_e(t))^+\|^2$ . Now  $q_{d,e}$  is absolutely continuous

on  $[0, h]$ , hence, there is a set  $N$  with measure 0 such that for  $t$  in  $[0, h] - N$ ,  $dq_{d,e}(t)/dt$  exists, and as in Theorem 2.1, for such  $t$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}q_{d,e}(t) &\leq 2(J(u_d(t) - u_e(t))^+, \frac{du_d}{dt}(t) - \frac{du_e}{dt}(t)) \\ &= -2(J(u_d(t) - u_e(t))^+, A_0u_d(t) - A_0u_e(t)) \\ &\quad - 2(J(v_d(t) - v_e(t))^+, Av_d(t) - Av_e(t)) \\ &\quad + 2(J(v_d(t) - v_e(t))^+ - J(u_d(t) - u_e(t))^+, Av_d(t) - Av_e(t)) \\ &\leq 2k \|(u_d(t) - u_e(t))^+\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \|J(v_d(t) - v_e(t))^+ - J(u_d(t) - u_e(t))^+\| \cdot \|Av_d(t) - Av_e(t)\| \\ &\leq 4(M + M_0)r((e + d)(M + M_0)) + 2kq_{d,e}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for  $t$  in  $[0, h] - N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(e^{-2kt}q_{d,e}(t)) &= e^{-2kt}\left(\frac{d}{dt}q_{d,e}(t) - 2kq_{d,e}(t)\right) \\ &\leq e^{-2kt}4(M + M_0)r((e + d)(M + M_0)). \end{aligned}$$

Given  $g > 0$  there is an  $f > 0$  with  $f \leq (M + M_0)^{-1}R$  such that for  $d, e \leq f$ , the  $RHS \leq g$ .

Since  $q_{d,e}(0) = 0$ ,

$$e^{-2kt}q_{d,e}(t) \leq gd$$

for  $t$  in  $[0, h]$ , hence,

$$q_{d,e}(t) \leq gde^{2kd}.$$

Hence,  $(u_d(t) - u_e(t))^+$  converges to zero uniformly on  $[0, h]$  as  $d, e \rightarrow 0$ . As in Theorem 2.1,  $u_d$  converges to a continuous  $u$ . Since

$$\|u_d(t) - v_d(t)\| \leq d(M + M_0),$$

$v_d(t)$  also converges to  $u(t)$  uniformly on  $[0, h]$ .

We claim  $u(t)$  lies in  $D(A_1)$  for  $t$  in  $[0, h]$  and  $t \rightarrow A_1u(t)$  is weakly continuous.

Since  $u_d(t) \rightarrow u(t)$  and  $A_0$  is demicontinuous,  $A_0u_d(t) \rightarrow A_0u(t)$ .  $A$  is hypermaximal  $\psi$ -accretive, where  $\psi$  is the  $\psi$  system of Proposition 1.3.  $v_d(t) \rightarrow u(t)$ , and  $Av_d(t)$  is bounded, hence, has a weak cluster point  $w$ .

Given  $v$  in  $D(A)$ ,

$$(Av_d(t) - Av, \psi(v_d(t) - v)) \geq 0.$$

Hence,

$$(w - Av, \psi(u(t) - v)) \geq 0.$$

Since  $A$  is maximal  $\psi$ -accretive,  $u(t)$  is in  $D(A)$  and  $Au(t) = w$ . If  $s \rightarrow t$ , then  $Au(s)$  has a weak cluster point  $w_0$ , and  $u(s) \rightarrow u(t)$ .

Given  $v$  in  $D(A)$ ,

$$(Au(s) - Av, \psi(u(s) - v)) \geq 0.$$

Hence,

$$(w_0 - Av, \psi(u(t) - v)) \geq 0,$$

hence,  $w_0 = Au(t)$ , hence,  $Au(s) \rightarrow Au(t)$ . Hence,  $u(t)$  is in  $D(A_1)$  and  $A_1u(s) \rightarrow A_1u(t)$  as  $s \rightarrow t$ .

As in Theorem 2.1, we have for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ ,  $f$  in  $X^*$ ,

$$(f, u(t)) = (f, v) - \int_0^t (f, Au(s)) ds.$$

Hence,  $u$  is continuous, weakly  $C^1$ , and unique by Proposition 1.10.

**THEOREM 2.3.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map. Let  $N$  be a neighborhood of  $v$  in  $X$ . Let  $A: N \rightarrow X$  be locally uniformly continuous and locally generalized  $T$ -accretive. Then there is a unique strongly  $C^1$  function  $u: [0, h] \rightarrow N$  for some  $h > 0$  with  $u(0) = v$  and  $du(t)/dt = -Au(t)$ .*

*Proof.* For some neighborhood  $M$  of  $v$  and positive constant  $k$ ,  $A + kI$  is  $T$ -accretive  $M \rightarrow X$ . By Proposition 1.13,  $A + kI$  is  $g$ -accretive in  $(x, \|\cdot\|_1)$ . Hence, for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $M$ ,

$$(Ax - Ay, \phi(x, y, Ax - Ay)) \geq -k \|x - y\|_1^2.$$

The result follows from Theorem 9.7 of Browder [5].

We note that we could extend Theorem 2.2 to include a second hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive operator  $A_2$  such that  $\|A_2x\| \leq k \|Ax\|$  with  $k < 1$ . We could also have considered the case of the generator  $A$  being multivalued, and considered the temporally inhomogeneous problem,  $du(t)/dt = -T_t u(t)$ .

**THEOREM 2.4.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with  $X^*$  uniformly convex. Suppose  $A_0: X \rightarrow X$  is demicontinuous and  $T$ -accretive, and  $A_1: D(A_1) \rightarrow X$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive. Then  $A_0 + A_1$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive.*

*Proof.* Given  $w$  in  $X$ , we have  $x \rightarrow A_0x + x - w$  is demicontinuous and  $T$ -accretive:  $X \rightarrow X$ , hence, by Theorem 2.2,  $A_0 + I - w + A_1$  generates a semigroup  $U(t)$ .

Given  $x$  and  $y$  in  $D(A_1)$ , for  $t$  in  $[0, h] - N$  as in Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|(x(t) - y(t))^+\|^2 &\leq 2(J(x(t) - y(t))^+, \frac{dx}{dt}(t) - \frac{dy}{dt}(t)) \\ &\leq -2 \|(x(t) - y(t))^+\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Putting  $x(t) = y(t + h)$  and letting  $h \rightarrow 0^+$ , we obtain

$$\left\| \left( \frac{dy}{dt}(t) \right)^+ \right\| \leq e^{-t} \left\| \left( \frac{dy}{dt}(0) \right)^+ \right\|,$$

and similarly,

$$\left\| \left( \frac{dy}{dt}(t) \right)^- \right\| \leq e^{-t} \left\| \left( \frac{dy}{dt}(0) \right)^- \right\|.$$

Hence, if there is a solution  $y(t)$  to  $dy(t)/dt = -(A_0 + I + A_1 - w)y(t)$  on an interval  $[0, k)$ , then by the bound on the derivative  $y(t)$  converges as  $t \rightarrow k^-$ , hence, there is a solution on an interval  $[0, k+h]$  for some  $h > 0$ , hence, on all of  $R^+$ .

As  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $y(t)$  is Cauchy, hence,  $y(t)$  converges to  $z$  for some  $z$  in  $X$ . Since  $A_1 y(t)$  is bounded and  $A_1$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive,  $z$  is in  $D(A_1)$  and  $A_1 y(t)$  converges weakly to  $Az$ . Hence,  $z$  is in  $D(U(t))$  for  $t \geq 0$ .

Now for  $t \geq 0$ ,  $U(t)$  is continuous, hence,

$$\begin{aligned} U(t)z &= U(t) \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} U(s)y \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} U(t+s)y \\ &= z. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 z + z + A_1 z - w &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{U(t)z - z}{t} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $R((A_0 + A_1) + I)$  contains  $w$ , hence,

$$R((A_0 + A_1) + I) = X.$$

**COROLLARY.** *Suppose  $X$  a Banach lattice with positive duality map. Suppose  $A: X \rightarrow X$  is locally uniformly continuous and  $T$ -accretive. Then  $A$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.3,  $-(A + I)$  generates a semigroup, and the proof proceeds as in Theorem 2.4.

### 3. Surjectivity of $T$ -accretive operators.

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $X$  be a Banach lattice with  $X^*$  uniformly convex. Let  $A_1: D(A_1) \rightarrow X$  be hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive. Let  $A_2: X \rightarrow X$  be demicontinuous and locally generalized  $T$ -accretive. Let  $A = A_1 + A_2$ .*

*Suppose either*



$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|(z(t) - w(t))^+\|^2 &\leq 2(J(z(t) - w(t))^+, \frac{dz}{dt}(t) - \frac{dw}{dt}(t)) \\ &\leq 2k \|(z(t) - w(t))^+\|^2 + 2(J(z(t) - w(t))^+, b - d) \end{aligned}$$

(where  $k$  is the local constant associated with  $A$  and  $h$ )

$$\leq 2k \|(z(t) - w(t))^+\|^2 \quad \text{since } b \leq d.$$

Hence,  $z(t) \leq w(t)$  in the interval  $[0, h]$ , hence, for all  $t$  in  $R^+$ . Therefor,  $z \leq w$ . Now we have solutions to

$$\frac{dr}{dt}(t) = -Ar(t) + c \quad r(0) = z$$

and

$$\frac{ds}{dt}(t) = -As(t) + e \quad s(0) = w.$$

$r(t)$  decreases to  $r$  with  $Ar = c$  and  $s(t)$  decreases to  $s$  with  $As = e$ . We have except on a set of measure 0,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|(r(t) - s(t))^+\|^2 &\leq 2k \|(r(t) - s(t))^+\|^2 + 2(J(r(t) - s(t))^+, c - e) \\ &\leq 2k \|(r(t) - s(t))^+\|^2 \quad \text{since } c \leq e. \end{aligned}$$

Now  $\|(r(0) - s(0))^+\| = 0$ , giving  $r(t) \leq s(t)$  for all  $t$  in  $R^+$ ; hence,  $r \leq s$ .

The function taking  $c$  to  $r$  by this construction takes  $e \geq c$  to  $s \geq r$  and hence, is monotonic.

**COROLLARY 2.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, if we have  $x$  and  $y$  such that  $Ax \leq x \leq y \leq Ay$ , then there is a fixed point of  $A$  in  $[x, y]$ .*

*Proof.* Starting from  $x$  as in Corollary I, we have a monotonic selection  $B$  of  $A^{-1}$ .  $BA(x) = x$ , and we claim  $BAy$  is in  $[x, y]$ .  $BAy = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t)$ , where  $x(0) = x$  and  $dx(t)/dt = -Ax(t) + Ay$ . Hence,  $x \leq BAy$ .

Except on a set of measure 0,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|(x(t) - y)^+\|^2 &\leq 2(J(x(t) - y)^+, \frac{dx}{dt}(t)) \\ &= -2(J(x(t) - y)^+, Ax(t) - Ay) \\ &\leq 2k(x(t)) \|(x(t) - y)^+\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $x(t) \leq y$  for all  $t$  in  $R^+$ . Hence,  $BAy \leq y$ .

Then  $[Ax, Ay]$  is invariant under  $B$ , and is a complete lattice since  $X$  is reflexive.



The Tarski fixed point theorem says: Let  $L$  be a complete lattice. Then a monotonic function  $L \rightarrow L$  has a fixed point.

Hence, there is  $z$  in  $[Ax, Ay]$  with  $Bz = z$ , hence,  $Az = z$ . Since  $B[Ax, Ay] \subset [x, y]$  by construction,  $z$  is in  $[x, y]$ .

**THEOREM 3.2.** *Suppose  $X$  a reflexive Banach lattice with positive duality map. Suppose  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive with  $A^{-1}$  locally bounded. Then*

- (a)  $R(A) = X$ ;
- (b)  $A^{-1}$  is monotonic if it is single-valued and demicontinuous.

*Proof.* (a) We consider  $B = A(I + A)^{-1}: X \rightarrow X$ .  $B$  is  $T$ -accretive and Lipschitzian, and  $B^{-1}$  is locally bounded. We show  $R(B) = X$ .

Now Theorem 5.3 of Browder [5] gives: Suppose  $X$  a Banach space with a  $\psi$  system,  $A$  a hypermaximal  $\psi$ -accretive function  $D(A) \rightarrow X$ , and  $A^{-1}$  locally bounded, then  $clR(A) = X$ .

Since  $B$  is  $\psi$ -accretive with respect to the  $\psi$  system of Proposition 1.3, we have only to show  $R(B)$  is closed. By translation we have only to show that if there is a sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $X$  with  $Bx_n \rightarrow 0$ , then 0 is in  $R(B)$ .

Now  $Bx_n$  converges to 0 relatively uniformly (see Yosida [24], page 370). In particular, there is a subsequence  $(x_m)$  and  $z \geq 0$  with  $|Bx_m| \leq m^{-1}z$ .

Suppose  $B^{-1}(B_{3r}(0))$  is bounded. If  $m$  large, then  $\|m^{-1}z\| \leq r$ . Put  $D(x) = B(x) - m^{-1}z$  for  $x$  in  $X$ . Then  $D(x_m) \leq 0$ , hence, if  $x(0) = x_m$  and  $dx(t)/dt = -Dx(t)$ , then  $Dx(t) \leq 0$ , and  $x(t)$  is increasing. Also,

$$\|(Dx(t))\| \leq \|Dx_m\| \leq \|B(x_m)\| + \|m^{-1}z\| \leq 2r.$$

Hence,

$$\|Bx(t)\| \leq \|Dx(t)\| + \|m^{-1}z\| \leq 3r.$$

Hence,  $x(t)$  is bounded, and by Dini's Theorem, as in Theorem 3.1, we have  $x(t)$  defined on  $R^+$  and  $x(t)$  converging strongly to  $w$ . Again, as in Theorem 3.1,  $U(t)w = w$  and, hence,  $D(w) = 0$ , giving  $Bw = m^{-1}z$  and  $w \geq x_m$ .

Similarly, putting  $C(x) = B(x) + m^{-1}z$ , we obtain  $v$  with  $Bv = -m^{-1}z$  and  $v \leq x_m$ . Then if

$$v(0) = v, \frac{dv}{dt}(t) = -Bv(t)$$

$$w(0) = w, \frac{dw}{dt}(t) = -Bw(t),$$

we have  $v(t)$  increasing,  $w(t)$  decreasing, and  $v(t) \leq w(t)$ . Hence,  $v(t)$  is bounded, hence, converges strongly to  $x$ , with  $B(x) = 0$ .

(b) For  $d > 0$ ,  $(I + d^{-1}A)^{-1}$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive. Hence,

$$(A + dI)^{-1} = d^{-1}(I + d^{-1}A)^{-1}$$

is  $T$ -Lipschitz, hence, monotonic. Given  $y$  in  $X$ , let  $(A + d_n I)x_n = y$  for a sequence  $d_n \rightarrow 0^+$ . By Lemma 3.3,  $x_n$  may be assumed bounded. Hence,  $d_n x_n \rightarrow 0$ , hence,  $Ax_n \rightarrow y$ , hence,  $x_n \rightarrow A^{-1}y$ . Suppose  $w \leq y$ , and  $(A + d_n I)z_n = w$ . Since  $(A + d_n I)^{-1}$  is monotonic,  $z_n \leq x_n$ . Since the positive cone is weakly closed, and  $z_n \rightarrow A^{-1}w$ ,  $A^{-1}w \leq A^{-1}y$ .

We recall a Banach lattice  $X$  with positive cone  $k$  is uniformly monotone if for  $e > 0$ , there is  $d > 0$  such that if  $f$  and  $g$  are in  $K$ ,  $\|f\| = 1$  and  $\|f + g\| \leq 1 + d$ , then  $\|g\| \leq e$ . A theorem of Birkhoff [2], page 371, says that a bounded subset of a uniformly monotone Banach lattice directed under  $\leq$  is convergent. If  $X$  has this property it is fully regular (Krasnoselski [13]).

**COROLLARY.** *Theorem 3.2 holds if  $X$  is fully regular.*

**LEMMA 3.3.** *If  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$ ,  $D(A) \subset X$ , a Banach space with  $\psi$  system, is hypermaximal  $\psi$ -accretive and  $A^{-1}$  is locally bounded, then given  $w$  in  $cl(R(A))$ , there is a neighborhood  $N$  of  $w$ , a bounded set  $B$ , and  $d_0 > 0$  with  $(A + dI)^{-1}N \subset B$  for  $d \leq d_0$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not, then there are sequences  $(z_n)$ ,  $(d_n)$  with  $d_n \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\|z_n\| \rightarrow \infty$  and  $(A + d_n I)z_n \rightarrow w$ . Suppose

$$A^{-1}(B_{3r}(w)) \subset B_h(0) \subset B_k(0)$$

with  $h < k$ . Take  $s$  in  $B_h(0)$  with  $A(s)$  in  $B_r(w)$ . Take  $d_0$  with  $d_0 k \leq r$ . If  $n$  large,  $z_n$  is outside  $B_k(0)$ , and  $(A + d_n I)z_n$  is in  $B_r(w)$  and  $d_n \leq d_0$ . Then  $(A + d_n I)s$  is in  $B_{2r}(w)$ . But  $(A + d_n I)^{-1}B_{2r}(w)$  is connected, hence, it contains  $s_1$  with  $\|s_1\| = k$ . Then

$$A(s_1) = (A + d_n I)(s_1) - d_n s_1$$

is in  $B_{3r}(w)$ , contradicting  $A^{-1}(B_{3r}(w)) \subset B_h(0)$ .

**THEOREM 3.4.** *Suppose  $X$  an order complete lattice, and  $A$  an order bounded subset of  $X$  such that  $B \subset A$  implies  $\sup B$  and  $\inf B$  are in  $A$ . Suppose  $\{U_t: t \text{ in } T\}$  is a commuting directed set of monotonic functions, with  $U_t: D(U_t) \rightarrow X$ . Suppose that for  $a$  in  $A$ ,  $D(U_t)$  eventually contains  $a$ , in which case we may say  $a$  as in  $D(U_t)$  for small  $t$ . Then there is  $c$  in  $A$  with  $U_t c = c$  for small  $t$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M = \{x \text{ in } A: U_t x \geq x \text{ for small } t\}$ .  $M$  is nonempty

since  $\inf A$  is in  $M$ . Let  $c = \sup M$ . Then  $c$  is in  $A$ . Given  $x$  in  $M$ , for small  $t$  both  $x$  and  $c$  are in  $D(U_t)$ , hence,  $U_t c \geq U_t x \geq x$ . Hence,  $c$  is in  $M$ .

We claim  $U_t c$  is in  $M$  for small  $t$ . Given  $s$  small in  $T$ ,  $U_s c \geq c$ , hence, for small  $t$ ,  $U_t U_s c \geq U_t c$ . Therefore,  $U_s(U_t c) \geq U_t c$ , giving  $U_t c$  in  $M$ . Therefore,  $U_t c \leq c$  for small  $t$  since  $c = \sup M$ . Therefore,  $U_t c = c$  for small  $t$ .

This generalization of the Tarski fixed point theorem also holds for  $U_t: A \rightarrow 2^A$ , with  $U_t$  monotonic and  $U_t(x)$  closed under sup for  $x$  in  $A$ . We say  $U: X \rightarrow 2^X$  is monotonic if for  $x \leq y$ , we have:

(a) for  $w$  in  $U(x)$ , there is  $z$  in  $U(y)$  with  $w \leq z$ ;

and

(b) for  $z$  in  $U(y)$ , there is  $w$  in  $U(x)$  with  $w \leq z$ .

**PROPOSITION 3.5.** *Suppose  $X$  is an order complete Banach lattice with positive duality map. Suppose  $A: X \rightarrow X$  is locally uniformly continuous and locally generalized  $T$ -accretive. Then for  $a \leq b$  in  $X$ :  $[A(a), A(b)] \subset A[a, b]$ .*

*Proof.* We assume  $Aa \leq Ab$ , since otherwise  $[A(a), A(b)]$  is empty, and suppose  $y$  satisfies  $A(a) \leq y \leq A(b)$ . Consider  $A_y(x) = Ax - y$  for  $x$  in  $X$ .  $A_y$  is locally generalized  $T$ -accretive and locally uniformly continuous, hence,  $-A_y$  generates a semigroup  $U(t)$ .  $A_y(a) \leq 0$ , hence,  $A_y U(t)a \leq 0$  and  $U(t)a$  is increasing.  $A_y(b) \geq 0$ , hence,  $A_y U(t)b \geq 0$  and  $U(t)b$  is decreasing. By monotonicity of  $U(t)$ , if  $x$  is in  $[a, b]$ , then for small  $t \geq 0$ , we have

$$b \geq U(t)b \geq U(t)x \geq U(t)a \geq a.$$

Since  $\{U(t)\}$  is a commuting family of monotonic functions, and  $[a, b]$  is an order bounded set closed under inf and sup on subsets, and for small  $t$  any given  $x$  is in  $D(U(t))$ , and if  $x$  is in  $[a, b]$ ,  $U(t)x$  is in  $[a, b]$  for  $t$  small, we have by Theorem 3.4 an element  $c$  of  $[a, b]$  with  $U(t)c = c$  for small  $t$ . Therefore,  $A_y(c) = 0$ , giving  $A(c) = y$ .

In §4 we will consider operators on the space  $C(M)$  of continuous real valued functions on a compact  $T_2$  space  $M$ . Such a space is order complete if and only if  $M$  is extremally disconnected, i.e., the closure of an open subset is open. A particular example of this case is the dual of an (AL) space, also studied in §4. If  $X$  is an order complete Banach lattice whose positive cone has nonempty interior, then it is isomorphic as a Banach lattice to  $C(M)$  where  $M$  is extremally disconnected.

**THEOREM 3.6.** *Suppose  $X$  is an order complete Banach lattice with positive duality map whose cone  $K$  has nonempty interior. Suppose  $B: D(B) \rightarrow X$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive and  $B^{-1}$  is locally bounded. Then  $B$  is surjective.*

*Proof.* We have  $A = B(I + B)^{-1}$  is  $T$ -accretive and Lipschitzian,  $X \rightarrow X$ .  $A^{-1}$  is locally bounded. By the Corollary to Theorem 2.4,  $A$  is hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive. To show  $R(B) = X$ , it is enough to show  $R(A) = X$ , and by Proposition 3.5, it is enough to show that for  $y$  in  $X$  there are  $a, b$  in  $X$ , with  $a \leq b$  and  $A(a) \leq y \leq A(b)$ .

We take  $r > 0$  in  $R, w$  and  $v$  in  $X$ , with  $B_r(w)$  in  $y + K$  and  $B_r(v)$  in  $y - K$ . By Lemma 3.3, we have, decreasing  $r$  is necessary, positive constants  $d_0$  and  $k$  such that  $(A + dI)^{-1}B_r(w) \subset B_k(0)$  and

$$(A + dI)^{-1}B_r(v) \subset B_k(0) .$$

Take  $d \leq \min \{d_0, rk^{-1}\}$  and take  $b = (A + dI)^{-1}w$ , and  $a = (A + dI)^{-1}v$ . Then  $a \leq b$  since  $(A + dI)^{-1}$  is monotonic.

$\|db\| \leq r$ , and  $\|da\| \leq r$ , hence,  $Aa$  is in  $B_r(v)$  and  $Ab$  is in  $B_r(w)$ , hence,  $Aa \leq y \leq Ab$ .

We complete this section with some results on fixed points of  $T$ -nonexpansive functions.

**PROPOSITION 3.7.** *Let  $G$  be a closed bounded convex subset of a reflexive Banach lattice  $X$ . Let  $N_e(G) = \{x \text{ in } X: d(x, G) \leq e\}$ . Suppose  $U: N_e(G) \rightarrow G$  is locally  $T$ -Lipschitz. Then  $(I - U)N_e(G)$  is closed.*

*Proof.* By translation, as in Theorem 3.2, it is enough to suppose  $x_n$  is a sequence in  $N_e(G)$  with  $|(I - U)x_n| \leq n^{-1}z$  for some  $z \geq 0$  in  $X$ . Since  $X$  is reflexive, we may impose an equivalent norm in which  $X^*$  is strictly convex. Take  $n$  large so that  $\|n^{-1}z\| < e/8$ . Now  $A = I - U - n^{-1}z$  is locally generalized  $T$ -accretive, and locally Lipschitzian, and  $-A$  generates a semigroup  $\{U(t): t \text{ in } R^+\}$ . Suppose  $x(t)$  is in  $N_e(G)$  but  $d(x(t), G) \geq e/2$ . Let  $Vx(t)$  be a nearest point to  $x(t)$  on  $G$ . Then we have, except on a set of measure 0, by Lemma 3.8,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|x(t) - Vx(t)\|^2 &\leq 2(J(x(t) - Vx(t), \frac{dx}{dt}(t))) \\ &= 2(J(x(t) - Vx(t), Ux(t) - x(t) + n^{-1}z)) \\ &\leq 2(J(x(t) - Vx(t), n^{-1}z) - 2\|x(t) - Vx(t)\|^2) \\ &\leq 2e^2/8 - 2e^2/4 \\ &= -e^2/4 . \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $N_e(G)$  is invariant under  $\{U(t): t \text{ in } R^+\}$ .

Since  $Ax_n \leq 0$ ,  $U(t)x_n$  is increasing as  $t$  increases, and, hence, converges to  $x$  in  $N_e(G)$  with  $x - Ux = z/n$ . Similarly, we obtain  $y$  with  $y - Uy = -z/n$  and  $y \leq x_n \leq x$ . By Proposition 3.5, 0 is in  $(I - U)[y, x]$ . By construction,  $(I - U)z = 0$  where  $z = \lim z(t)$ ,  $z(0) = y$ , and  $dz(t)/dt = (U - I)z(t)$ . Hence,  $z$  is in  $N_e(G)$ .

**LEMMA 3.8.** *Suppose  $G$  is a closed convex subset of a Banach space  $X$  with  $X^*$  strictly convex. Let  $Ux$  be a nearest point to  $x$  on  $G$ . Then  $2J(I - U)$  is a selection of the subgradient of  $x \rightarrow (d(x, G))^2$ .*

*Proof.* (a) We claim  $(J(x - Ux), z - Ux) \leq 0$  for  $x$  in  $X$  and  $z$  in  $G$ . Let  $z(t) = Ux + t(z - Ux)$  for  $t$  in  $[0, 1]$ . Then  $z(t)$  is in  $G$ , hence,

$$\|x - z(t)\|^2 \geq \|x - Ux\|^2.$$

Now

$$\|x - Ux\|^2 \geq \|z - z(t)\|^2 + 2(J(x - z(t)), z(t) - Ux)$$

since  $J$  is the duality map. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq 2(J(x - z(t)), z(t) - Ux) \\ &= 2t(J(x - z(t)), z - Ux). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $(J(x - z(t)), z - Ux) \leq 0$ , and letting  $t \rightarrow 0^+$ , we have  $z(t) \rightarrow Ux$ , and since  $J$  is demicontinuous, we have the result.

(b) Given  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$ ,  $(\|x - Ux\| - \|x - Uy\|)^2 \geq 0$ . Hence,

$$\|y - Uy\|^2 + \|x - Ux\|^2 - 2(J(x - Ux), y - Uy) \geq 0.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|y - Uy\|^2 &\geq \|x - Ux\|^2 + 2(J(x - Ux), y - Uy - x + Ux) \\ &\geq \|x - Ux\|^2 + 2(J(x - Ux), y - x) \end{aligned}$$

by (a), setting  $z = Uy$ .

**PROPOSITION 3.9.** *Let  $G$  be a closed bounded convex subset of a reflexive Banach lattice  $X$ . Suppose there is  $\epsilon > 0$  with  $U: N_\epsilon(G) \rightarrow G$   $T$ -nonexpansive. Then  $U$  has a fixed point.*

*Proof.* Fix  $y$  in  $G$ ; for  $p$  in  $(0, 1)$ , we set  $U_p x = pUx + (I - p)y$ .  $U_p$  takes  $N_\epsilon(G)$  to itself, and  $\|(U_p x - U_p z)^+\| = p\|(Ux - Uz)^+\|$  for  $x$  and  $z$  in  $N_\epsilon(G)$ . By the Corollary to Proposition 1.13,  $U_p$  has a fixed point,  $x_p$ . Letting  $p \rightarrow 1$ , we have  $x_p - Ux_p \rightarrow 0$ , since  $G$  is bounded. By Proposition 3.7,  $(I - U)N_\epsilon(G)$  is closed, hence, contains 0.

**COROLLARY.** Suppose there is a  $T$ -nonexpansive retraction  $R: N_e(G) \rightarrow G$  where  $G$  is a closed bounded convex subset of a reflexive Banach lattice. Suppose  $U: G \rightarrow G$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive. Then  $U$  has a fixed point.

*Proof.*  $UR: N_e(G) \rightarrow G$  is  $T$ -nonexpansive, giving  $x$  in  $G$  with  $URx = x$ . But  $Rx = x$ , hence,  $Ux = x$ .

**4. Equations of evolution in  $C(M)$ .** In the following we suppose  $X = C(M)$ , the space of real valued continuous functions on a compact  $T^2$  space  $M$ .

**DEFINITION.**  $T$ , a relation on  $X$ , is  $S$ -accretive if  $xTu$  and  $yTv$  implies  $(u - v)(x - y) \geq 0$ . Operators of this type were considered by Kacurovskii [9]. We see  $T$  is  $S$ -accretive if and only if  $T^{-1}$  is  $S$ -accretive. We will, for simplicity, restrict the discussion to single valued operators.

**DEFINITION.**  $T: D(T) \rightarrow X$ ,  $D(T) \subset X$ , is *hypermaximal  $S$ -accretive*, if  $S$ -accretive, i.e.,  $(Tx - Ty)(x - y) \geq 0$  for  $x, y$  in  $D(T)$ , and  $R(I + A) = X$ .  $U: D(U) \rightarrow X$ ,  $D(U) \subset X$ , is  *$S$ -nonexpansive* if  $|Ux - Uy| \leq |x - y|$  for  $x, y$  in  $D(U)$ .

**PROPOSITION 4.1.** If  $U$  is  $S$ -nonexpansive, then  $I - U$  is  $S$ -accretive.

*Proof.* Given  $x, y$  in  $D(U)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} ((x - Ux) - (y - Uy))(x - y) &\geq |x - y|^2 - |Ux - Uy| |x - y| \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

**PROPOSITION 4.2.**  $T$  is  $S$ -accretive if and only if  $(I + eT)^{-1}$  is  $S$ -nonexpansive for  $e > 0$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $T$  is  $S$ -accretive, and  $e > 0$ . Suppose  $(I + eT)w = x$ ,  $(I + eT)v = y$ . Then  $(x - y)(w - v) \geq (w - v)^2$ . Hence,  $|x - y| \geq |w - v|$ , and  $(I + eT)^{-1}$  is  $S$ -nonexpansive.

Suppose  $T$  is not  $S$ -accretive, then there is  $w$  and  $v$  in  $X$  and  $s$  in  $M$  with  $w(s) > v(s)$  and  $Tw(s) < Tv(s)$ . Then there is an  $e > 0$  with

$$w(s) + eTw(s) = v(s) + eTv(s).$$

Hence,  $v(s) = w(s)$ , a contradiction.

**PROPOSITION 4.3.** If  $T: D(T) \rightarrow X$  generates a semigroup  $U(t)$ ,

then  $T$  is  $S$ -accretive if and only if  $U(t)$  is  $S$ -nonexpansive for  $t$  in  $R^+$ .

*Proof.* If

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}U(t)x &= -TU(t)x, \\ \frac{d}{dt}U(t)y &= -TU(t)y,\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\frac{d}{dt}(u(t)x - U(t)y)^2 = -2(U(t)x - U(t)y)(TU(t)x - TU(t)y).$$

The l.h.s.  $\leq 0$  if and only if  $U(t)$  is  $S$ -nonexpansive.

The r.h.s.  $\leq 0$  if and only if  $T$  is  $S$ -accretive.

**PROPOSITION 4.4.** *If  $dx(t)/dt = -Tx(t)$  and  $T$  is  $S$ -accretive, then  $|Tx(t)|$  is decreasing.*

*Proof.*

$$|x(t+h) - x(t)| \leq |x(s+h) - x(s)|$$

for  $s \leq t$ , since  $U(t)$  is  $S$ -nonexpansive. Dividing by  $h$  and letting  $h \rightarrow 0^+$ ,

$$|Tx(t)| \leq |Tx(s)|.$$

**PROPOSITION 4.5.** *If  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is  $S$ -accretive and continuous from line segments to the topology of pointwise convergence, then  $T$  is continuous and monotonic.*

*Proof.* Given  $u_0$  in  $X$ ,  $(u_0 + n^{-1}u)$  converges to  $u_0$  where  $u$  is the unit of  $X$ . Hence,  $T(u_0 + n^{-1}u)$  converges pointwise to  $T(u_0)$ . If  $m > n$ , then

$$(T(u_0 + m^{-1}u) - T(u_0 + n^{-1}u))(m^{-1} - n^{-1})u \geq 0,$$

hence,  $T(u_0 + n^{-1}u)$  is decreasing. Therefore, by Dini's theorem,  $T(u_0 + n^{-1}u)$  converges strongly to  $T(u_0)$ . Similarly,  $T(u_0 - n^{-1}u)$  converges to  $T(u_0)$ . Given  $n$ , if  $(u_k)$  converges to  $u_0$ , then eventually

$$u_0 - (2n)^{-1}u \leq u_k \leq u_0 + (2n)^{-1}u,$$

giving

$$T(u_0 - n^{-1}u) \leq T(u_k) \leq T(u_0 + n^{-1}u).$$

Hence,  $T(u_k)$  converges to  $T(u_0)$  strongly, and  $T$  is continuous. If

$x \leq y$ , then  $y + n^{-1}u - x \geq n^{-1}u$ , hence,  $T(y + n^{-1}u) \geq T(x)$ . Therefore,  $T(y) \geq T(x)$  and  $T$  is monotonic.

**PROPOSITION 4.6.** *If  $T: D(T) \rightarrow X$  is hypermaximal  $S$ -accretive, then  $T$  is maximal  $S$ -accretive.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $(w - Tv)(u - v) \geq 0$  for  $v$  in  $D(T)$ . We want to show that  $u$  is in  $D(T)$  and  $w = T(u)$ .

Given  $a$  in  $X$ , and  $t > 0$ , choose  $v_t$  with

$$(I + T)v_t = u + w + ta.$$

Then

$$(u + w - v_t - Tv_t)(u - v_t) \geq 0.$$

Hence,

$$(-ta)(u - v_t) \geq 0.$$

Hence,

$$a(u - v_t) \leq 0.$$

Since  $(I + T)^{-1}$  is  $S$ -nonexpansive, and

$$v_t = (I + T)^{-1}(u + w + ta),$$

we have

$$v_t \rightarrow (I + T)^{-1}(u + w) \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore,

$$a(u - (I + T)^{-1}(u + w)) \leq 0.$$

Hence,

$$u - (I + T)^{-1}(u + w) = 0,$$

giving  $u$  in  $D(I + T) = D(T)$ , and  $T(u) = w$ .

**PROPOSITION 4.7.** *If  $T$  is  $S$ -accretive, then  $T$  is accretive and  $T$ -accretive.*

*Proof.* If  $x$  in  $X$ , the  $Jx$  is the set of bounded real Baire measures  $m$  on  $M$  with support in  $|x|^{-1}(\|x\|)$ , with total variation  $\|x\|$ , positive where  $x$  is positive and negative where  $x$  is negative.

If  $x, y$  are in  $D(T)$ , and  $m$  is in  $J(x - y)$ , then  $(Tx - Ty)(x - y) \geq 0$  implies  $Tx - Ty$  is positive on the support of the positive part of  $m$  and negative on the support of the negative part. Hence,

$$(Tx - Ty, m) \geq 0.$$

If  $n$  is in  $J(x - y)^+$ , then  $Tx - Ty$  is positive on support of  $n$ . Hence,  $(Tx - Ty, n) \geq 0$ .



**THEOREM 4.8.** *If  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is continuous from line segments to pointwise convergence, and  $S$ -accretive, then  $-T$  generates a strongly  $C^1$  semigroup on  $X \times R^+$ .*

*Proof.* Given  $u_0$  in  $X$ , there is for  $e > 0$  a solution of

$$(a) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{du_e}{dt}(t) &= -Tu_e(t-e) & t \geq 0 \\ u_e(t) &= u_0 & t \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

since by Proposition 4.5,  $T$  is continuous.

There is an  $r > 0$  and  $M > 0$  in  $R$  with  $\|T(x)\| \leq M$  if  $x$  is in  $B_r(u_0)$ . Then there is an interval  $[0, h]$  of  $R$  such that all solutions of (a) are in  $B_r(u_0)$  for  $t \leq h$ .

Suppose  $e, d > 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(u_e(t) - u_d(t))^2 &= -2(u_e(t) - u_d(t))(Tu_e(t-e) - Tu_d(t-d)) \\ &\leq 2((u_e(t-e) - (u_e(t) - u_d(t-d) - u_d(t)))(Tu_e(t-e) - Tu_d(t-d)) \end{aligned}$$

since  $T$  is  $S$ -accretive.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_e(t-e) - u_e(t)\| &\leq eM, \\ \|u_d(t-d) - u_d(t)\| &\leq dM, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|Tu_e(t-e) - Tu_d(t-d)\| \leq 2M,$$

we have the r.h.s.  $\leq 4M^2(d+e)u$  where  $u$  is the unit of  $X$ .

Now  $(u_e(0) - u_d(0))^2 = 0$ .

Hence,

$$0 \leq (u_e(t) - u_d(t))^2 \leq h4M^2(d+e)u$$

for  $t$  in  $[0, h]$ .

Hence,  $u_e$  is a Cauchy net of continuous functions  $[0, h] \rightarrow X$ , hence, convergent to a continuous function  $u: [0, h] \rightarrow X$ . Also,  $u_e(s-e)$  converges to  $u(s)$  uniformly on  $[0, h]$ . Hence,  $Tu_e(s-e)$  converges to  $Tu(s)$  on  $[0, h]$ .

Now for  $e > 0$ , and for  $t \leq h$ , by (a),

$$u_e(t) = u_0 - \int_0^t Tu_e(s-e)ds.$$

Hence,

$$u(t) = u_0 - \int_0^t Tu(s)ds,$$

giving  $u(t)$  a  $C^1$  function:  $[0, h] \rightarrow X$ .

Suppose  $u(t)$  is defined on  $[0, k)$ . By Proposition 4.4,  $|Tu(t)| \leq |Tu_0|$ , hence, if  $t_n \rightarrow k^-$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t_n) - u(t_m)\| &\leq \int_{t_m}^{t_n} \|Tu(t)\| dt \\ &\leq (t_n - t_m) \|Tu_0\|, \end{aligned}$$

giving  $u(t_n)$  a Cauchy sequence, hence, convergent to  $u(k)$ .

By the first part of the proof there is a solution on an interval  $[k, k + h]$ , with initial point  $u(k)$ , hence, there is a solution on  $R^+$ .

**COROLLARY.** *If  $T$  is continuous and  $S$ -accretive:  $X \rightarrow X$ , then  $T$  is hypermaximal  $S$ -accretive.*

*Proof.* Since  $T + I$  is continuous and  $S$ -accretive,  $-(T + I)$  generates a  $C^1$  semigroup  $U(t)$  for  $t$  in  $R^+$ . Take  $y$  and  $x$  in  $X$ , then

$$\frac{d}{dt}(U(t)x - U(t)y)^2 \leq -2(U(t)x - U(t)y)^2.$$

Therefore,

$$|U(t)x - U(t)y| \leq e^{-t} |x - y|.$$

Letting  $y = U(h)x$  and letting  $h \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$|TU(t)x| \leq e^{-t} |Tx|.$$

Therefore,

$$|U(t)x - U(s)x| \leq |e^{-s} - e^{-t}| |Tx|,$$

hence,  $U(t)x$  is a Cauchy net, hence, convergent to an element  $z$  of  $X$ , as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $U(t)z = z$  for  $t$  in  $R^+$  by continuity. Hence,  $(T + I)z = 0$ . By translation we have  $R(T + I) = X$ .

**THEOREM 4.9.** *If  $T$  is continuous,  $S$ -accretive, and proper  $X \rightarrow X$ , then  $T$  is surjective.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.7,  $T$  is accretive, and by the Corollary above,  $T$  is hypermaximal accretive. Since  $T$  is proper,  $T^{-1}$  is locally bounded and  $T$  takes closed balls to closed sets.

Hence, by Theorem 5.3 of Browder [7],  $R(T) = X$ .

**THEOREM 4.10.** *If  $X$  is the dual of an (AL) space,  $T_0: X \rightarrow X$  is continuous and  $S$ -accretive,  $T_1: D(T_1) \rightarrow X$  is hypermaximal  $S$ -accretive,  $T = T_0 + T_1$ , then  $-T$  generates a weak\*  $C^1$  semigroup on  $D(T_1) \times R^+$ .*

*Proof.* Given  $u_0$  in  $D(T_1)$ , we have, by Theorem 4.8, for  $e > 0$

a solution for  $t$  in  $R^+$  of

$$(a) \quad \frac{du_e}{dt}(t) = -T_e u_e(t) \\ u_e(t) = u_0 ,$$

where

$$T_e = T_0 + T_1(I + eT_1)^{-1} = T_0 + e^{-1}(I - eT_1)^{-1} .$$

We let  $v_e(t) = (I + eT_1)^{-1}u_e(t)$ .

Now since  $T_e$  is  $S$ -accretive,

$$\left| \frac{du_e}{dt}(t) \right| \leq \left| \frac{du_e}{dt}(0) \right| \leq | -T_0 u_0 | + | T_1 u_0 | .$$

There is  $M > 0$  and  $r > 0$  in  $R$  such that if  $x$  is in  $B_r(u_0)$ , then  $\|T_0(x)\| \leq M$ . There is an  $h > 0$  such that if  $t \leq h$ , then the solution of (a) is in  $B_r(u_0)$  for  $t$  in  $[0, h]$ , independently of  $e$ .

Hence, if  $t$  is in  $[0, h]$ ,  $e > 0$ , then

$$|T_1 v_e(t)| \leq \left| \frac{d}{dt} u_e(t) \right| + M \leq |T_0 u_0| + |T_1 u_0| + M = M_1 .$$

Now  $v_e(t) - u_e(t) = eT_1 v_e(t)$ . Hence,  $|v_e(t) - u_e(t)| \leq eM_1$  for  $t$  in  $[0, h]$ . Given  $e, d > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(u_e(t) - u_d(t))^2 &\leq -2(u_e(t) - u_d(t))(T_1 v_e(t) - T_1 v_d(t)) \\ &\leq 2((v_e(t) - v_d(t) - u_e(t) + u_d(t))(T_1 v_e(t) - T_1 v_d(t)) \\ &\leq 4M_1^2(e + d) . \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(u_e(t) - u_d(t))^2 \leq h4M_1^2(e + d)u$$

for  $t$  in  $[0, h]$ .

Hence,  $u_e(t)$  converges to  $u(t)$  uniformly on  $[0, h]$ , where  $u$  is continuous. Hence,  $v_e(t)$  converges uniformly to  $u(t)$  on  $[0, h]$ . From (a) we have for  $t$  in  $[0, h]$ ,

$$u_e(t) = u_0 - \int_0^t T_e u_e(s) ds . \\ T_e u_e(s) = T_0 u_e(s) + T_1 v_e(s) .$$

We have  $T_0 u_e(s)$  converging to  $T_0 u(s)$ .  $T_1 v_e(s)$  is bounded, hence, there is a weak\* cluster point  $w$ . For  $v$  in  $D(T_1)$ ,  $(T_1 v_e(s) - T_1 v)(v_e(s) - v) \geq 0$ . Hence,  $(w - T_1 v)(u(s) - v) \geq 0$  since the positive cone is weak\* closed. Since  $T_1$  is maximal  $S$ -accretive,  $u(s)$  is in  $D(T_1)$  and  $w = T_1 u(s)$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(t) &= u_0 - \int_0^t T_0 u(s) ds - \int_0^t T_1 u(s) ds \\
 &= u_0 - \int_0^t T u(s) ds.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $u(t)$  is weak\*  $C^1$  on the interval  $[0, h]$ .

As in Theorem 4.8, there is a solution  $u(t)$  on all of  $R^+$ .

**COROLLARY.** *If  $X$ ,  $T_0$ , and  $T_1$  are as in Theorem 4.10, then  $T_0 + T_1$  is hypermaximal  $S$ -accretive.*

The proof is the same as the Colollary to Theorem 4.8.

We note that in this section we used the fact that the Banach lattice  $X$  is an algebra whose unit is an order unit  $u$ . Stone's algebra theorem says that  $X$  is isomorphic with the Banach lattice  $C(M)$  of continuous real valued functions on  $M$ , where  $M$  is the set of multiplicative positive linear forms  $f$  satisfying  $f(u) = 1$ .

## 5. Ergodic theory.

**THEOREM 5.1.** *Suppose  $X$  is a uniformly convex Banach lattice with positive cone  $K$ . Suppose  $U: K \rightarrow K$  is nonlinear, with  $W: K \rightarrow K$  linear, and  $Ux \leq Wx$  for  $x$  in  $K$ . Suppose  $\|W\| \leq 1$ . Then for  $x$  in  $K$ ,  $S_n x = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n U^i x$  is convergent to  $x_0$  in  $K$  with  $Ux_0 \leq x_0$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $G$  is the convex hull of  $\{U^i x: i \text{ in } Z^+\}$ . Let  $m = \inf \{\|h\|: h \text{ in } G\}$ . Take  $e > 0$ . Then there exists  $g$  in  $G$  with  $\|g\| \leq m + e$ , with  $g = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i U^i x$ ,  $\sum a_i = 1$ ,  $a_i \geq 0$ . For  $n$  in  $Z^+$  let  $T_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n W^i$ . Then  $\|T_n g\| \leq m + e$  since  $\|W\| \leq 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 W^h g &= \sum_{i=1}^k a_i W^h U^i x \\
 &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k U^{i+h} x.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_n g &\geq n^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^k a_i U^{i+h} x \\
 &= n^{-1} \sum_{h=i}^n U^h x - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k b_i U^i x + n^{-1} \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+k} c_i U^i x
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $b_i$  and  $c_i$  are in  $[0, 1]$ .

Hence,

$$S_n x \leq T_n g + n^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^k U^i x + \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+k} U^i x \right).$$

Hence,

$$\|S_n x\| \leq m + 2e \quad \text{if} \quad kn^{-1} \|x\| \leq e/2.$$

But  $S_n x$  is in  $G$ , giving  $\|S_n x\| \geq m$ .

By the uniform convexity of  $X$ ,  $S_n x$  converges, and to the point  $x_0$  of  $\text{cl}(G)$  with minimum norm. Now  $G + K$  is invariant under  $W$ , and, hence,  $\text{cl}(G + K)$  is too. Therefore,  $Wx_0 = x_0$ . Therefore  $Ux_0 \leq x_0$ .

**COROLLARY.** *Suppose  $X$  is a uniformly convex Banach lattice, and  $U: X \rightarrow X$  is linear and positive, with  $\|U\| \leq 1$ . Then for  $x$  in  $X$ ,  $S_n x$  is convergent.*

*Proof.* If  $x$  is in  $K$ , the result follows from the theorem on putting  $U = W$ . For general  $x$ ,  $S_n x = S_n(x^+) - S_n(x^-)$ .

**THEOREM 5.2.** *Suppose  $X$  is a uniformly convex Banach lattice with positive cone  $K$ . Suppose  $\{U(t): t \text{ in } R^+\}$  is a one parameter semigroup of nonlinear operators  $U(t): K \rightarrow K$ . Suppose  $\{W(t): t \text{ in } R^+\}$  is a one parameter semigroup of positive nonexpansive linear operators. Suppose  $U(t)x \leq W(t)x$  for  $x$  in  $K$  and  $t$  in  $R^+$ . Then for  $x$  in  $K$ ,*

$$S_t x = t^{-1} \int_0^t U(s)x$$

*is convergent to  $x_0$  in  $K$  with  $U(t)x_0 \leq x_0$  for  $t$  in  $R^+$ .*

The proof is the same as in the case of the discrete semigroup of Theorem 5.1.

**THEOREM 5.3.** *Suppose  $X$  is a Banach lattice with  $X$  and  $X^*$  uniformly convex. Suppose  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  is the sum of a hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive and a demicontinuous generalized  $T$ -accretive function, and  $A(0) = 0$ . Suppose  $B: D(B) \rightarrow X$  is linear and hypermaximal  $T$ -accretive. Suppose  $D(A) \subset D(B)$  and  $K \subset \text{cl}(D(A))$ , and for  $x$  in  $K \cap D(A)$  we have  $Ax \geq Bx$ . Let  $U(t)$  be the semigroup generated by  $-A$ . Then for  $x$  in  $K$ ,*

$$S_t x = t^{-1} \int_0^t U(t)x$$

*converges to  $x_0$  in  $K$ , with  $Ax_0 \geq 0$  if  $x_0$  is in  $D(A)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $W(t)$  be the semigroup generated by  $-B$ . Then  $W(t)$  is linear and  $T$ -nonexpansive, hence,  $\|W(t)x\| \leq \|x\|$  for  $x$  in  $K$ . Suppose  $x$  is in  $D(A) \cap K$ . Let  $x(t) = U(t)x$  and  $y(t) = W(t)x$ . Then, except on a set of measure 0,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|(x(t) - y(t))^+\|^2 &\leq 2 \left( J((x(t) - y(t))^+), \frac{d}{dt}x(t) - \frac{d}{dt}y(t) \right) \\ &= -2(J((x(t) - y(t))^+, Ax(t) - Bx(t)) \\ &\quad - 2(J((x(t) - y(t))^+, Bx(t) - By(t))) \end{aligned}$$

since  $x(t)$  is in  $D(A)$  and, hence, in  $D(B)$ .

Since  $Ax(t) \geq Bx(t)$  and  $B$  is  $T$ -accretive the r.h.s. is  $\leq 0$ . Therefore,  $x(t) \leq y(t)$  for  $t$  in  $R^+$ . Extending  $U(t)$  and  $W(t)$  to  $K$  by uniform continuity, we have  $U(t)x \leq W(t)x$  for every  $x$  in  $K$  and  $t$  in  $R^+$ . By Theorem 5.2,  $S_t x$  converges to  $x_0$  in  $K$  with  $U(t)x_0 \leq x_0$  for  $t$  in  $R^+$ . If  $x_0$  is in  $D(A)$ , we have in the weak topology

$$-Ax_0 = \lim t^{-1}(U(t)x_0 - x_0),$$

giving  $Ax_0 \geq 0$ .

**COROLLARY.** *The result holds if  $K \subset \text{cl}(D(B))$  and  $D(B) \subset D(A)$ . In this case,  $x_0$  is in  $D(A)$ .*

*Proof.* With notation as above,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|(x(t) - y(t))^+\|^2 &= -2(J(x(t) - y(t))^+, Ax(t) - By(t)) \\ &= -2(J(x(t) - y(t))^+, Ax(t) - Ay(t)) \\ &\quad - 2(J(x(t) - y(t))^+, Ay(t) - By(t)) \end{aligned}$$

since  $y(t)$  is in  $D(B)$  and, hence, in  $D(A)$ ,

$$\leq 2k \|(x(t) - y(t))^+\|^2$$

since  $A$  is generalized  $T$ -accretive.

Since  $x(0) = y(0) = x$ , we have  $x(t) \leq y(t)$  for  $t$  in  $R^+$ . As above,  $S_t x$  converges to  $x_0$ , where  $x_0$  is in  $F(W(t))$  for  $t \geq 0$ . Now  $x_0$  is in  $D(B)$  since  $\lim t^{-1}(W(t)x_0 - x_0)$  exists. Therefore,  $x_0$  is in  $D(A)$ , giving  $A(x_0) \geq 0$ .

**THEOREM 5.4.** *Let  $W$  be a positive linear operator in  $L^2(S, B, m)$  with  $\|W\| \leq 1$ . Suppose  $W$  extends to a positive linear operator  $W_1$  in  $L^1(S, B, m)$  with  $\|W_1\| < 1$ . Suppose  $m(S) < \infty$ , and  $W(1) = 1$ . Let  $K$  be the positive cone in  $L^2(S, B, m)$ . Let  $U: K \rightarrow K$  satisfy  $Ux \leq Wx$  for all  $x$ . Then for  $x$  in  $K$ ,  $S_n x = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n U^i x$  converges to  $x_0$  in  $K$  and  $\sup(S_n x, x_0)$  converges to  $x_0$   $m$  a.e.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 5.1,  $S_n x$  and  $T_n x$  converge to  $x_0$  in  $K$ .  $T_n x$  converges to  $x_0$   $m$  a.e., by the individual ergodic theorem (Yoshida [22], page 388). For all  $n$  we have

$$x_0 \leq \sup(S_n x, x_0) \leq \sup(T_n x, x_0) .$$

Hence,  $\sup(S_n x, x_0)$  converges to  $x_0$  *m a.e.*

**PROPOSITION 5.5.** *Given the conditions of Theorem 5.1, let  $S_0: K \rightarrow K$  be defined by  $S_0 x = x_0$ . Suppose  $U$  is continuous and monotonic. Then*

$$S_0 Ux = S_0 x \geq US_0 x \geq S_0^2 x = S_0^n x \quad (n \geq 2),$$

and  $R(S_0^2) = F(U)$ .

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} S_n Ux &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=2}^{n+1} U^i x \\ &= S_n x + n^{-1} (U^{n+1} x - Ux) . \end{aligned}$$

The second term converges to 0; therefore,  $S_n Ux$  converges to  $S_0 x$ . We showed in Theorem 5.1 that  $S_0 x \geq US_0 x$ . Hence,  $U^n S_0 x$  is a decreasing sequence, since  $U$  is monotonic.  $U^n S_0 x$  is convergent since  $X$  is uniformly convex, and to a fixed point  $z$  of  $U$  since  $U$  is continuous. Therefore,  $S_n S_0 x$  converges to  $z$ , giving  $S_0^2 x = z$ , and  $S_0^2 x \leq US_0 x$ . Since  $z$  is in  $F(U)$ ,  $S_n z = z$ . Hence,  $S_0 z = z$ , giving  $S_0^n x = S_0^2 x$  for  $n \geq 2$ . This also gives  $R(S_0^2) = F(U)$ .

**6. Monotonic generators.** In the theory of equations of evolution the property of being locally  $T$ -Lipschitz was the weakest condition stronger than monotonicity. If  $A: X \rightarrow X$  is locally  $T$ -Lipschitz, there is a local solution  $u$  for  $u_0$  in  $X$  to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad u(0) &= u_0 \\ \frac{d}{dt} u(t) &= Au(t) . \end{aligned}$$

Supposing  $A$  is merely monotonic, we would like a solution of (a).

**DEFINITION.** Let  $X$  be a topological lattice.  $A: X \rightarrow X$  is locally order bounded if for  $v$  in  $X$  there is a neighborhood  $N$  of  $v$  with  $A(N)$  order bounded.

**THEOREM 6.1.** *Suppose  $X$  is an order complete Banach lattice. Let  $A: X \rightarrow X$  be monotonic, continuous, and locally order bounded. Then for  $u_0$  in  $X$  there is a strongly  $C^1$  solution  $u$  to (a) on some interval  $[0, h]$ .*

*Proof.* For  $d > 0$  the space of equivalence classes of integrable

functions  $f: [0, d] \rightarrow X$  is an order complete Banach lattice,  $L^1([0, d], X)$ . For  $f$  integrable  $[0, d] \rightarrow X$ ,  $Af$  is integrable  $[0, d] \rightarrow X$ , giving an operator  $B: L^1([0, d], X) \rightarrow L^1([0, d], X)$ . If  $f(s) \geq g(s)$  a.e., then  $Af(s) \geq Ag(s)$  a.e. Therefore,  $B$  is monotonic. Suppose  $f$  is integrable  $[0, d] \rightarrow X$ , then  $t \rightarrow u_0 + \int_0^t f(s)ds$  is integrable  $[0, d] \rightarrow X$ , thus giving an operator  $C: L^1([0, d], X) \rightarrow L^1([0, d], X)$ . If  $f(s) \geq g(s)$  a.e., then

$$u_0 + \int_0^t f(s)ds \geq u_0 + \int_0^t g(s)ds$$

for all  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ . Therefore,  $C$  is monotonic.

There is a fixed point of  $CB$  by the Tarski fixed point theorem if there is an order interval  $[a, b]$  invariant under  $CB$ . We want  $a_1$  in  $X$  and  $d > 0$  with

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &\leq u_0 + \int_0^t A(a_1)ds \\ &= u_0 + tA(a_1) \end{aligned}$$

for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ .

If  $A(X)$  is order bounded, there is  $g \geq 0$  with  $A(x)$  in  $[-g, g]$  for  $x$  in  $X$ . Take  $a_1 = u_0 - g$ , and  $d = 1$ . Then if  $a$  is the equivalence class of  $t \rightarrow a_1$ , we have  $CBa \geq a$ . Taking  $b$ , the class of  $t \rightarrow u_0 + g$ , we have  $CBb \leq b$ . Therefore, there exists  $u: [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  with

$$u(t) = \int_0^t Au(s)ds.$$

In the general case, we have, for  $h \geq 0$ ,  $u_h: [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  with

$$u_h(t) = \int_0^t \sup(-h, \inf(h, Au_h(s)))ds.$$

Since  $A$  is locally order bounded, there exist  $r > 0$  and  $g \geq 0$  with  $A(B_r(u_0)) \subset [-g, g]$ . Now  $\|u_g(t) - u_0\| \leq t\|g\|$ . Take  $d \leq r/\|g\|$ . Then  $u_g(t)$  is in  $B_r(u_0)$  for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ . Hence,  $Au_g(t)$  is in  $[-g, g]$ . Therefore, for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$  we have

$$u_g(t) = \int_0^t Au_g(s)ds.$$

Then  $u = u_g$  is differentiable with  $du(t)/dt = Au(t)$ , and  $u(0) = u_0$ .

**COROLLARY 1.** *Suppose  $X$  is an order complete Banach lattice with order unit. Let  $A: X \rightarrow X$  be monotonic and continuous. Then for  $u_0$  in  $X$  there is a strongly  $C^1$  solution to (a) on some interval  $[0, d]$ .*

*Proof.*  $A$  is locally order bounded since continuous.



**THEOREM 6.2.** *Suppose  $X$  is an order complete Banach lattice with positive cone  $K$ , such that bounded subsets of  $X$  directed under  $\leq$  are convergent. Suppose  $A: X \rightarrow X$  is monotonic, continuous, and there is a neighborhood  $N$  of  $u_0$  with  $A(N) \subset K$ . Then there is a strongly  $C^1$  solution (a) on some interval  $[0, d]$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $M$  and  $r$  such that  $\|Ax\| \leq M$  for  $x$  in  $B_r(u_0)$ . Then take  $d \leq r/M$ . For  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ , take  $u_1(t) = u_0$ , and define inductively

$$u_{n+1}(t) = u_0 + \int_0^t Au_n(s) ds.$$

Then  $(u_n)$  is an increasing bounded sequence in  $L^1([0, d], X)$ , hence, convergent to an element  $u$  of  $L^1([0, d], X)$ . For  $s$  in  $[0, d]$ ,  $u_n(s)$  is an increasing sequence convergent to  $u(s)$ , and  $Au_n(s)$  is an increasing sequence convergent to  $Au(s)$ . Hence,

$$u(t) = u_0 + \int_0^t Au(s) ds$$

for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ , giving the result.

We could use the same technique to study the temporally inhomogeneous problem, and, indeed, the functional equation  $du(t)/dt = f(P_t u, t)$ , where  $P_t u$  is the function  $[-t, 0] \rightarrow X$  defined by  $P_t u(s) = u(t + s)$ . Also, the theory could be stated in terms of a locally convex vector lattice.

**7.  $G$ -accretive functions.** If  $G$  is a closed convex subset of a reflexive Banach space  $X$ , there is a multivalued map  $x \rightarrow Ux$  taking  $x$  to points of  $G$  which are nearest to  $x$ . If  $X$  is strictly convex, then  $U$  is singlevalued. Suppose  $X$  is a reflexive Banach lattice and  $G = -K$ , the negative cone. Then  $Ux$  contains  $-x^-$ ,  $(I - U)x$  contains  $x^+$ , and  $x \rightarrow 2J(x^+)$  being a selection of the subgradient of  $x \rightarrow \|x^+\|^2$  is a particular case of the following result.

**PROPOSITION 7.1.** *Let  $G$  be a closed convex subset of a Banach space with strictly convex dual. Then  $2J(I - U)$  is a subset of the subgradient of  $x \rightarrow (d(x, G))^2$ .*

This was proved as Lemma 3.8.

**DEFINITION.** Let  $G$  be a subset of a Banach space  $X$  with duality map  $J$ , and  $U$  be a function taking points in  $X$  to closest points in  $G$ . We say  $V: D(V) \rightarrow X$ ,  $D(V) \subset X$ , is  $G$ -nonexpansive if

$$d(Vx - Vy, G) \leq d(x - y, G)$$

for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $D(V)$ . We say  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$ ,  $D(A) \subset X$ , is  $G$ -accretive if for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $D(A)$ ,  $(J(I - U)(x - y), Ax - Ay) \geq 0$ .

If  $G = \{0\}$ , then  $I - U = I$ , and we are back in the nonexpansive and accretive case. If  $G = -K$ , then we are back in the  $T$ -nonexpansive and  $T$ -accretive case. When  $G$  is a compact convex circled subset of  $X$ , we can directly generalize some results on accretive operators.

**PROPOSITION 7.2.** *Let  $G$  be a closed convex subset of a Banach space  $X$  with strictly convex dual. Suppose  $u$  and  $v$  are strongly continuous and weakly differentiable  $R \rightarrow X$ , with  $du(s)/ds = -Tu(s)$  and  $dv(s)/ds = -Tv(s)$ . Then*

$$(J(I - U)(u(t) - v(t)), Tu(t) - Tv(t)) \geq 0$$

*if and only if  $d(u(t) - v(t), G)$  is decreasing.*

*Proof.* Let  $q(t) = \|(I - U)(u(t) - v(t))\|^2$ . By Proposition 7.1,

$$q(t) - q(s) \leq 2(J(I - U)(u(t) - v(t), u(t) - v(t) - u(s) + v(s)) .$$

Dividing by  $t - s$  and letting  $s \rightarrow t^-$ , we obtain

$$\varlimsup_{s \rightarrow t^-} \left\{ \frac{q(t) - q(s)}{t - s} \right\} \leq -2(J(I - U)(u(t) - v(t), Tu(t) - Tv(t)) .$$

Since the l.h.s. is  $\leq 0$  if and only if  $d(u(t) - v(t), G)$  is decreasing, one implication follows.

The technique of Proposition 1.11 gives the converse.

**THEOREM 7.3.** *Suppose  $X$  is a Banach space with  $X^*$  strictly convex, and  $G$  compact convex circled subset of  $X$ . Suppose  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is  $G$ -accretive and locally uniformly continuous. Then  $-T$  generates a strongly  $C^1$  solution to  $dx(t)/dt = -Tx(t)$ ,  $x(0) = x_0$ .*

*Proof.* (a) Given  $x_0$  in  $X$  and  $e > 0$ , we have a solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} x_e(t) &= -Tx_e(t - e) & t \geq 0 \\ x_e(0) &= x_0 . \end{aligned}$$

Now there exist positive constants  $r$  and  $M$  such that  $\|T(B_r(x_0))\| \leq M$ . Then there is  $d > 0$  such that all solutions  $x_e(t)$  are in  $B_r(x_0)$  for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ . For  $e$  and  $f > 0$  and  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ , we set

$$q_{e,f}(t) = \|(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t))\|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow t-} \left\{ \frac{q_{e,f}(t) - q_{e,f}(s)}{t - s} \right\} &\leq 2 \left( J(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t)), \frac{d}{dt} x_e(t) - \frac{d}{dt} x_f(t) \right) \\ &= -2(J(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t), Tx_e(t - e) - Tx_f(t - f))) . \end{aligned}$$

(b) By the local uniform continuity of  $T$  we may assume  $r$  is small enough that  $T$  is uniformly continuous on  $B_r(x_0)$ . Then there is a function  $s: R^+ \rightarrow R^+$  with  $s(k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow 0$ , such that  $\|Tx - Ty\| \leq s(k)$  if  $x$  and  $y$  are in  $B_r(x_0)$  and  $\|x - y\| \leq k$ . Now

$$\|x_e(t - e) - x_e(t)\| \leq eM, \quad \|x_f(t - f) - x_f(t)\| \leq fM,$$

and  $\|x_e(t) - x_f(t)\| \leq 2r$ . It follows that

$$\|Tx_e(t - e) - Tx_e(t) - Tx_f(t - f) + Tx_f(t)\| \leq s(eM) + s(fM) .$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &-2(J(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t)), Tx_e(t - e) - Tx_f(t - f)) \\ &= -2(J(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t), Tx_e(t) - Tx_f(t)) \\ &\quad + 2(J(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t), Tx_e(t) - Tx_f(t) - Tx_e(t - e) \\ &\quad + Tx_f(t - f)) \leq \|2J(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t))\| \|Tx_e(t) - Tx_f(t) \\ &\quad - Tx_e(t - e) + Tx_f(t - f)\| \leq 4r(s(eM) + s(fM)) . \end{aligned}$$

Now given  $g > 0$ , there is  $h > 0$  such that if  $e, f \leq h$ , then

$$4r(s(eM) + s(fM)) \leq g .$$

Hence, for  $e, f \leq h$ , we have

$$\overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow t-} \left\{ \frac{q_{e,f}(t) - q_{e,f}(s)}{t - s} \right\} \leq g .$$

Since  $q_{e,f}(0) = 0$ , we have  $q_{e,f}(t) \leq gt \leq gd$  for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ . Hence,  $(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t)) \rightarrow 0$  uniformly on  $[0, d]$  as  $e, f \rightarrow 0$ .

(c) We claim  $F = \{U(x_e - x_f), e, f \leq 1\}$  is relatively compact in  $C([0, d], X)$ .  $\{x_e\}$  is an equicontinuous family since

$$\|x_e(t) - x_e(s)\| \leq M|t - s| .$$

Hence,  $\{x_e - x_f: e, f \leq 1\}$  is equicontinuous.  $U$  is Lipschitzian, hence,  $F$  is equicontinuous. Since  $F[0, d]$  is relatively compact in  $X$ ,  $F$  is relatively compact by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem.

Take a sequence  $e(n) \rightarrow 0$  in  $R$ . Writing  $x_{e(n)} = x_n$ , there is for  $n$  fixed a subsequence  $U(x_n - x_{m'})$  of  $U(x_n - x_m)$  convergent to  $z_n$  in  $\text{cl}(F)$  as  $m' \rightarrow \infty$ . There is a subsequence  $z_{n'} \rightarrow z$  in  $\text{cl}(F)$  as  $n' \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $(I - U)(x_{n'} - x_{m'}) \rightarrow 0$ , we can find, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , a sequence  $x_{n'}(i) = x(i)$  such that  $\|(x(i + 1) - x(i)) - z\| \leq \epsilon 2^{-i}$ . Therefore,

$$\|x(i) - x(1) - iz\| \leq \epsilon .$$

But  $\|x(i) - x(1)\| \leq 2r$  for all  $i$ , so that  $z = 0$ . Hence,  $x(i)$  is a Cauchy sequence, hence, converges to a continuous function  $x: [0, d] \rightarrow B_r(x_0)$ .

(d) For each  $i$  we have

$$x(i)(t) = x_0 - \int_0^t Tx(i)(s - e(n'(i)))ds.$$

Now  $x(i)(s - e(n'(i))) \rightarrow x(s)$  uniformly on  $[0, d]$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence,  $Tx(i)(s - e(n'(i))) \rightarrow Tx(s)$ , and we have

$$x(t) = x_0 - \int_0^t Tx(s)ds$$

for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ . Hence,  $x$  is  $C^1$ , and  $dx(t)/dt = -Tx(t)$ .

We have uniqueness to within the compact set  $G$ . That is, if  $x(t)$  and  $y(t)$  are solutions, then  $x(t) - y(t)$  is an element of  $G$ , since  $(I - U)(x(t) - y(t)) = 0$ .

**COROLLARY (Peano).** *Suppose  $f: R^n \rightarrow R^n$  is continuous and  $x_0$  is an element of  $R^n$ . Then there is a solution to  $dx(t)/dt = f(x(t))$ ,  $x(0) = x_0$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $G$  a large set so that the notion of  $G$ -accretivity is void for points near  $x_0$ . The local uniform continuity of  $f$  follows from the local compactness of  $R^n$ .

**THEOREM 7.4.** *Suppose  $X$  is a Banach space with  $X^*$  uniformly convex, and  $G$  a compact convex circled subset of  $X$ . Suppose  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is  $G$ -accretive and demicontinuous. Then  $-T$  generates a weakly  $C^1$  solution to  $dx(t)/dt = -Tx(t)$ ,  $x(0) = x_0$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is the same as in Theorem 7.3 except in (d) where the integral is taken in the weak topology, and in (b) where the uniform continuity of  $J$  is used, as is shown below.

(b)

$$\overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow t^-} \left\{ \frac{q_{e,f}(t) - q_{e,f}(s)}{t - s} \right\} \leq -2(J(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t), Tx_e(t - e) - Tx_f(t - f)))$$

as in Theorem 7.3. Since  $T$  is  $G$ -accretive, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{r.h.s.} &\leq 2(J(I - U)(x_e(t - e) - x_f(t - f)) \\ &\quad - J(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t)), Tx_e(t - e) - Tx_f(t - f)) \\ &\leq 4M \|J(I - U)(x_e(t - e) - x_f(t - f)) - J(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t))\| \\ &\leq 4M s(2(e + f)M) \end{aligned}$$

where  $s: R^+ \rightarrow R^+$  satisfies  $s(k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\|Jx - Jy\| \leq s(k)$

if  $\|x - y\| \leq k$ , for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $B_{kr}(0)$ .

Given  $g > 0$ , we take  $h > 0$  such that if  $e, f \leq h$ , then  $4Ms(2(e + f)M) < g$ . Since  $q_{e,f}(0) = 0$ ,  $q_{e,f}(t) \leq tg \leq dg$  for  $t$  in  $[0, d]$ . Therefore,  $(I - U)(x_e(t) - x_f(t)) \rightarrow 0$  uniformly on  $[0, d]$  as  $e, f \rightarrow 0$ .

**PROPOSITION 7.5.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 7.3 or 7.4, the solution  $x(t)$  is defined for all  $t$  in  $R^+$ .*

*Proof.* It is enough to suppose there is a solution  $x(t)$  on  $[0, k)$ , and show  $x(t)$  is convergent as  $t \rightarrow k^-$ . Take  $h$  in  $(0, k)$ . Then  $\{x(t): 0 \leq t < h\}$  is relatively compact. We recall that given a bounded subset  $A$  of a complete metric space  $X$ , the ball measure of noncompactness of  $A$ , written  $C(A)$ , is  $\inf\{a > 0: A \text{ can be covered by a finite number of balls of radius } \leq a\}$ .  $C(A) = 0$  if and only if  $\text{cl}(A)$  is compact. The concept is developed in Nussbaum [17] and Ambrosetti [1]. We recall  $f: X \rightarrow X$  is a  $C$ - $k$ -set contraction if  $C(f(A)) \leq k(C(A))$  for all bounded subsets  $A$  of  $X$ .

Given  $a > 0$ , we may, since  $C\{x(t): 0 \leq t < h\} = 0$ , take  $t_1 \cdots t_n$  in  $[0, h)$  such that  $\{x(t): 0 \leq t < h\} \subset \cup \{B_a(x_i): 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  where  $x_i = x(t_i)$ . Suppose  $y$  in  $\{x(t): 0 \leq t < h\}$  is in  $B_a(x_i)$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|(I - U)(x_i(t) - y(t))\|^2 \\ \leq -2(J(I - U)(x(t) - y(t)), Tx_i(t) - Ty(t)) \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

$y(t)$  is in  $B_a(x_i(t) + G)$  for  $t \leq k - h$ , where  $x_i(t)$  is any solution to  $du(t)/dt = -Tu(t)$  with  $u(0) = x_i$ . Hence,

$$\{x(t): k - h \leq t < k\} \subset \cup \{B_a(x_i(t) + G): 0 \leq t \leq k - h, 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

Hence,  $C\{x(t): k - h \leq t < k\} \leq a$ . Since  $a$  was arbitrary,

$$C\{x(t): k - h \leq t < k\} = 0.$$

Hence,  $x(t)$  converges as  $t \rightarrow k^-$ .

The semigroup  $U(t)$  generated by  $-T$  is taken as  $U(t)x = \text{all } x(t) \text{ such that } x(0) = x \text{ and } dx(s)/ds = -Tx(s)$ . The property

$$U(s)U(t) = U(t + s)$$

holds, but homological properties of  $U(t)$  are unclear; for example, the existence of a continuous selection.

**PROPOSITION 7.6.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 7.3 or 7.4,  $(dI + T)$  generates a semigroup  $\{U(t): t \text{ in } R^+\}$  with  $U(t)$  a  $C - e^{-dt}$ -set*

contraction, for  $d, t \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* We note  $I$  is  $G$ -accretive, since

$$\begin{aligned} (J(I - U)x, x) &= (J(I - U)x, (I - U)x) + (J(I - U)x, Ux - 0) \\ &\geq \|(I - U)x\|^2 \quad \text{since } 0 \text{ is in } G. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $(dI + T)$  generates a semigroup  $U(t)$ . Given  $t \geq 0$ , suppose  $A \subset \cup \{B_b(x_i): 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ . Given  $a$  in  $A$ , suppose  $a$  is in  $B_b(x_i)$ .

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|(I - U)(a(t) - x_i(t))\|^2 \leq -2d \|(I - U)(a(t) - x_i(t))\|^2.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I - U)(a(t) - x_i(t))\| &\leq e^{-dt} \|(I - U)(a - x_i)\| \\ &\leq e^{-dt} \|a - x_i\| \leq be^{-dt}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $a(t)$  is in  $B_k(x_i(t) + G)$  where  $k = e^{-dt}b$ . Hence,

$$U(t)A \subset \cup \{B_k(x_i(t) + G): 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

Hence,  $U(t)$  is a  $C - e^{-dt}$ -set contraction, since  $C(U(t)A) \leq e^{-dt}C(A)$ .

**PROPOSITION 7.7.** *Under the conditions of Proposition 7.6, with  $d > 0$ , there is a compact convex set closed under  $U(1)$ .*

*Proof.* We have, if  $dx(t)/dt = -(dT + I)x(t)$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|(I - U)x(t)\|^2 &\leq 2(J(I - U)x(t), \frac{dx}{dt}(t)) \\ &= -2(J(I - U)x(t), dx(t) + Tx(t)) \\ &\leq -2d \|(I - U)x(t)\|^2 - 2(J(I - U)x(t), Tx(t)) \\ &\leq -2d \|(I - U)x(t)\|^2 + 2 \|(I - U)x(t)\| \|T(0)\| \\ &\leq 0 \quad \text{if } \|(I - U)x(t)\| \geq d^{-1} \|T(0)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\{x \text{ in } X: \|x\| \leq 2d^{-1} \|T(0)\| + \text{diameter } (G)\}$   $K_1$  is closed under  $\{U(t): t \text{ in } R^+\}$ . Take  $x$  in  $K_1$  and let  $H = \{U(t)x: t \text{ in } R^+\}$ . If  $C(H) > 0$ ,  $C(H) = C(U(1)H) \leq e^{-d}C(H)$  since

$$H = U(1)H \cup \{U(s)x: 0 \leq s \leq 1\}.$$

Hence,  $C(H) = 0$ , and  $H$  is relatively compact. Let  $L = \{K: K \text{ a closed convex subset of } K_1, U(1)K \subset K \text{ and } \text{cl}(H) \cap K \text{ is nonempty}\}$ . Since  $\text{cl}(H)$  is compact, if  $\{K_a\}$  is a chain in  $L$ , then  $\cap (K_a \cap \text{cl}(H))$  is nonempty, hence,  $\cap K_a$  is in  $L$ . Therefore, by Zorn's lemma, there is a minimal element  $K_0$  of  $L$ . Let  $K_2$  be the convex closure of  $U(1)K_0$ .  $K_2$  is in  $L$ . If  $C(K_0) > 0$ , then

$$C(K_2) = C(U(l)K_0) < C(K_0) ,$$

contradicting the minimality of  $K_0$ . Hence,  $C(K_0) = 0$ , and  $K_0$  is compact.

**PROPOSITION 7.8.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 7.3 or 7.4,  $R(T + dI) = X$  for  $d > 0$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 7.7 the fixed point set of  $U(1)$ :  $K_1 \rightarrow K_1$ ,  $F(U(1))$ , is nonempty.  $F(U(1))$  is compact since  $U(1)$  is a  $C - e^{-d}$ -set contraction by Proposition 7.6

The same proof shows that for  $n$  in  $Z^+$  the set  $F(U(2^{-n}))$  is nonempty and compact. Moreover,  $F(U(2^{-n})) \subset F(U(2^{-m}))$  for  $n > m$ . It follows that there is an element  $u_0$  of  $K_1$  having the property that for all  $n$  in  $Z^+$ ,  $U(2^{-n})u_0 = u_0$ . Therefore,  $(dI + T)u_0 = 0$ . By translation of  $T$  we have  $R(dI + T) = X$ .

**THEOREM 7.9.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 7.3 or 7.4,  $T^{-1}$  locally bounded implies  $R(T)$  is dense in  $X$ , and  $T$  proper implies  $R(T) = X$ .*

*Proof.* We consider the operators  $S: x \rightarrow T(x + G)$  and  $S_e: x \rightarrow (eI + T)(x + G)$ . To show  $R(T)$  is dense in  $X$ , we use  $R(T) = R(S)$  and show  $R(S)$  is dense. By Proposition 7.8,  $R(S_e) = R(eI + T) = X$ . For  $y$  in  $X$ ,

$$S_e^{-1}(y) = (eI + T)^{-1}y + G .$$

We show  $S_e$  is semi-invertible, that is,

- (a) for  $y$  in  $X$ ,  $S_e^{-1}(y)$  is connected, and
- (b)  $S_e^{-1}$  is u.s.c.

Suppose  $a$  and  $b$  are in  $S_e^{-1}(y)$ . Then there exist  $u$  and  $v$  with  $a - u$  in  $G$  and  $b - v$  in  $G$ , such that  $(eI + T)u = y$  and  $(eI + T)v = y$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (eu + Tu - ev + Tv, J(I - U)(u - v)) \\ &\geq e \|(I - U)(u - v)\|^2 . \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $u - v$  is in  $G$ . Now  $(u + G) \cup (v + G)$  is connected, and is contained in  $S_e^{-1}(y)$ , and contains  $a$  and  $b$ . Hence,  $S_e^{-1}(y)$  is connected. To show  $S_e^{-1}$  is u.s.c., it is enough to show  $y \rightarrow (eI + T)^{-1}y$  is u.s.c. We want to show that if  $N$  is a neighborhood of  $(eI + T)^{-1}y$ , and

$(eI + T)z_n$  converges to  $y$ , then  $x_n$  is eventually in  $N$ . Take  $z$  in  $(eI + T)^{-1}y$ . Then  $(I - U)(z_n - z)$  converges to 0. Hence, a subsequence,  $z_{n'}$ , is convergent to some element  $w$  of  $X$ . Then  $(eI + T)z_{n'}$  converges weakly to  $(eI + T)w$ . Hence,  $w$  is in  $(eI + T)^{-1}y$ . Hence,  $z_{n'}$  is eventually in  $N$ . Hence,  $z_n$  is eventually in  $N$ .

Now  $S_e$  converges to  $S$  uniformly on bounded sets, i.e., if  $B \subset X$  is bounded, then for  $a > 0$  there is  $e_0 > 0$  such that for  $x$  in  $B$  and  $e \leq e_0$ ,

$$S_e(x) \subset B_a S(x)$$

and

$$S(x) \subset B_a S_e(x) .$$

Now Theorem 5.1 of Browder [7] says: Let  $X$  be a topological space with a bounding system of subsets  $\{B_n\}$ ,  $Y$  a connected, locally connected uniform space. Let  $S$  be a mapping of  $X \rightarrow 2^Y$ , and suppose there exists a directed set  $\{S_e: e \text{ in } E\}$  converging uniformly to  $S$  on each  $B_n$ . Suppose for each  $y_0$  in  $Y$ , there is a neighborhood  $N$  of  $y_0$  with  $S^{-1}(N)$  bounded with respect to the given bounding system. Then

(a)  $R(S)$  is dense in  $Y$ , and

(b) if  $S(B_n)$  is closed for each  $n$ , then  $R(S) = Y$ .

We consider the bounding system  $\{B_n(0): n \text{ in } Z^+\}$  on  $X$ . To apply the theorem above, we want  $S^{-1}$  locally bounded, but

$$S^{-1}(N) = T^{-1}(N) + G ,$$

which is bounded if  $T^{-1}(N)$  is. By (a),  $R(S) = R(T)$  is dense in  $X$ . If  $T$  is proper,  $T(X)$  is closed, and, therefore,  $R(T) = X$ .

**8. Solutions by smoothing.** We recall that to show the existence of a zero of  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X$  such that  $R(A + I) = X$  and

$$(Ax - Ay, J(x - y)) \geq c \|x - y\|^2, c > 0 ,$$

we take an arbitrary  $v$  in  $X$  and solve  $u(0) = v$ ,  $du(t)/dt = -Au(t)$ , and find  $u(t)$  is convergent to  $x$  in  $X$  with  $Ax = 0$ .

The same approach is used in this section to give zeros of  $A$  under the conditions of the Nash-Moser inverse function theorem. For this, see Nash [16] and Moser [14, 15]. The results are simpler and stronger than those given by the smoothed Newton's method, and are obtained by adapting the following basic result.



**THEOREM 8.1.** *Let  $X$  be a Banach space and  $f: B \rightarrow X$  a  $C^1$  function, where  $B = \{x \text{ in } X: \|x\| < 1\}$ . Suppose  $L: B \rightarrow \{T \text{ in } L(X, X): \|T\| \leq M\}$  is locally Lipschitzian, and  $Lx$  is a right inverse of  $f'_x$  in  $L(X, X)$  for  $x$  in  $B$ . Suppose  $\|f(0)\| < M^{-1}$ . Then 0 is in  $f(B)$ .*

*Proof.* Consider

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{du}{dt}(t) &= -Lu(t)fu(t) \\ u(0) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

There is a strong solution  $u(t)$  as long as  $\|u(t)\| < 1$ , since for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $B$

$$\|L(x)f(x) - L(y)f(y)\| \leq \|L(x)(f(x) - f(y))\| + \|L(x) - L(y)\| \|f(y)\|.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}fu(t) &= f'_{u(t)} \frac{du}{dt}(t) \\ &= -f'_{u(t)}Lu(t)fu(t) \\ &= -fu(t).\end{aligned}$$

The function  $t \rightarrow \|fu(t)\|^2$  is absolutely continuous; hence,  $d\|fu(t)\|^2/dt$  exists except on a set of measure 0, and for any duality map  $J$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|fu(t)\|^2 &\leq 2(Jfu(t), \frac{d}{dt}fu(t)) \\ &= -2(Jfu(t), fu(t)) \\ &= -2\|fu(t)\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|fu(t)\|^2 \leq \|fu(0)\|^2 e^{-2t} \quad \text{for } t \geq 0.$$

Hence,

$$\left\| \frac{du}{dt}(t) \right\| \leq M \|f(0)\| e^{-t}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u(t)\| &\leq \int_0^t \left\| \frac{du}{ds}(s) \right\| ds \\ &\leq M \|f(0)\| (1 - e^{-t}) \\ &\leq M \|f(0)\|.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $u(t)$  is in  $B$  and defined for all  $t$  in  $R^+$ . Since

$$\|u(t) - u(s)\| \leq M \|f(0)\| (e^{-t} - e^{-s}), u(t)$$

is Cauchy, hence, there is  $x$  in  $B$  with  $u(t) \rightarrow x$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $fu(t) \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $fx = 0$  by continuity.

Before giving the main theorems we study smoothing operators. For an exposition of classical smoothing operators, see Schwartz [21]. For comparison, we give the Nash-Moser theorem as stated by Schwartz.

Let  $K$  be a compact  $n$ -dimensional manifold and  $C^r$  the space of  $r$  times continuously differentiable functions  $u: K \rightarrow R$  with norm

$$|u|_r = \max_{|a| \leq r} \max_{x \in K} |D^a u(x)|.$$

Let  $f$  be a function  $D(f) \rightarrow C^{m-a}$  where  $D(f) = \{x \text{ in } C^m: |x|_m \leq 1\}$ . Suppose there is a constant  $M$  such that:

- (1)  $f$  has two continuous Frechet derivatives, both bounded by  $M$ ;
- (2) there exists a map  $L$  with domain  $D(f)$  and range  $L(C^m, C^{m-a})$ , with:
  - (a)  $|L(u)h|_{m-a} \leq M|h|_m \quad u \text{ in } D(f), h \text{ in } C^m$
  - (b)  $f'_u L(u)h = h \quad u \text{ in } D(f), h \text{ in } C^{m+a}$
  - (c)  $|L(u)f(u)|_{m+9a} \leq M(1 + |u|_{m+10a})$ ;
- (3)  $|f(0)|_{m+9a} \leq 2^{-40} M^{-202}$ .

Then  $f(D(f))$  contains the origin.

**DEFINITION.** Suppose we have two Banach spaces  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  such that the inclusion  $i: X_2 \rightarrow X_1$  is bounded and  $i(X_2)$  is dense in  $X_1$ . A smoothing for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is a family  $\{S(t): t \geq t_0\} \subset L(X_1, X_2)$  with constants  $M$  and  $t_0$  and a function  $h: R^+ \rightarrow R^+$  such that

- (a)  $\|S(t)\| \leq M$  in  $L(X_1, X_1)$  and  $L(X_2, X_2)$  for all  $t$ ;
- (b)  $\|S(t)x\|_2 \leq Mh(t)\|x\|_1$  for  $x$  in  $X_1$ ;
- (c)  $\|S(t)x - x\|_1 \leq Mt^{-1}\|x\|_2$  for  $x$  in  $X_2$ .

**PROPOSITION 8.2.** Suppose  $X_2 = D(A)$  where  $A$  is an unbounded closed linear operator in  $X_1$ , and for  $x$  in  $X_2$ ,  $\|x\|_2 = \|x\|_1 + \|Ax\|_1$  or an equivalent norm. Suppose there are constants  $b$ ,  $t_0$ , and  $M$  such that  $(I - t^{-1}(A - bI))^{-1}$  is in  $L(X_1, X_1)$  with norm  $\leq M$  for all  $t \geq t_0$ . Then we have a smoothing for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ .

*Proof.* The conditions on  $A$  imply that  $A$  generates a semigroup  $\{U(t): t \text{ in } R^+\}$  with  $\|U(t)\| \leq Me^{bt}$ ,  $U(t)U(s) = U(t+s)$ ,  $U(0) = I$ , and  $U(t)x$  converges strongly to  $x$  as  $t \rightarrow 0^+$ .

There are a couple of ways of looking at smoothing.

(1) We parody the simplest smoothing by convolution where  $x$  is a locally integrable function  $R \rightarrow R$ , and  $U(t)x(s) = x(s+t)$ . Let  $f$  be a  $C^\infty$  function  $R \rightarrow R^+$  with compact support in  $\{s \text{ in } R: s > 0\}$ , such that  $\int f(s)ds = 1$ . For  $u$  in  $R^+$ , set  $f_u(t) = u^{-1}f(ut)$  and put  $S(u)x = \int_{R^+} f_u(t)U(t)x dt$  for  $x$  in  $X$ . It is straightforward to show  $\{S(u): u > 0\}$  is a smoothing for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ .

(2) We use the same construction, but with  $f(s) = e^{-s}$  for  $s \geq 0$ . In this case,  $S(u) = (I - u^{-1}(A - bI))^{-1}$ , a simpler expression. We check that this gives a smoothing. Let  $x$  be an element of  $X_1$ .

$$S(u)x + u^{-1}(A - bI)S(u)x = x.$$

Hence,  $S(u)$  is a bounded linear operator  $X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ .

(a) By definition,  $\|S(u)\| \leq M$  in  $L(X_1, X_1)$ . Let  $x$  be in  $X_2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(u)x\|_2 &= \|S(u)x\|_1 + \|AS(u)x\|_1 \\ &\leq M\|x\|_1 + M\|Ax\|_1 \\ &= M\|x\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\|S(u)\| \leq M$  in  $L(X_2, X_2)$ .

(b) Let  $x$  be in  $X_1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(u)x\|_2 &= \|S(u)x\|_1 + \|(A - bI)S(u)x\|_1 + \|bS(u)x\|_1 \\ &\leq (1 + b)M\|x\|_1 + \|u(I - S(u))x\|_1 \\ &\leq ((1 + b)M + u(1 + M))\|x\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

(c) Let  $x$  be in  $X_2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(u)x - x\|_1 &= u^{-1}\|(A - bI)S(u)x\|_1 \\ &\leq Mu^{-1}\|(A - bI)x\|_1 \\ &\leq Mu^{-1}(1 + b)\|x\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

We note that as in case (1),  $S(u)x$  is differentiable in  $u$  for fixed  $x$  in  $X_1$ ;  $dS(u)x/du = -A(S(u))^{2t^{-2}}x$ .

**PROPOSITION 8.3.** *Let  $X_1$  have a Schauder basis. Then we have a smoothing for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , if the inclusion  $i$  is compact.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\{x_n: n \geq 1\}$  is a normal Schauder basis for  $X_1$ . As in Schaefer [20], page 115, the inverse mapping theorem tells us that there exists  $C$  such that for all  $M$  and all  $x = \sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n x_n$  in  $X_1$ ,

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^M a_n x_n \right\|_1 \leq C\|x\|_1.$$

Since  $X_2$  is dense in  $X_1$ , there exists for each  $n \geq 1$  an element  $y_n$  of  $X_2$  with  $\|y_n - x_n\|_1 \leq (C2^{n+1})^{-1}$ , and  $\|y_n\|_1 = 1$ . Define  $B: X_1 \rightarrow X_1$  by  $B(\sum a_n x_n) = \sum a_n y_n$ .  $B$  is an isomorphism of  $X_1$  since for  $x = \sum a_n x_n$

$$\begin{aligned} \|Bx - x\|_1 &= \|\sum a_n(y_n - x_n)\|_1 \\ &\leq C \|x\|_1 \sum \|y_n - x_n\|_1 \\ &\leq 2^{-1} \|x\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\{y_n: n \geq 1\}$  is a normal Schauder basis for  $X_1$ . Rearranging, we may assume  $k_n = \|y_n\|_2$  is an increasing sequence. For  $x = \sum a_n y_n$  in  $X_1$  and  $u$  in  $R^+$ , we put  $T(u)x = \sum_{k_n \leq u} a_n y_n$ .  $T(u)$  is a bounded linear operator  $X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ .

(a) There exists  $M$  such that  $\|T(u)x\|_1 \leq M\|x\|_1$  for  $x$  in  $X_1$  and  $u > 0$ , and  $\|T(u)x\|_2 \leq M\|x\|_2$  for  $x$  in  $X_2$  and  $u > 0$ , by the inverse mapping theorem.

(b) Let  $x = \sum a_i y_i$  be in  $X_1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(u)x\|_2 &= \left\| \sum_{k_i \leq u} a_i y_i \right\|_2 \\ &\leq u \left\| \sum_{k_i \leq u} a_i k_i^{-1} y_i \right\|_2 \\ &\leq u \sum_{k_i \leq u} |a_i| \\ &\leq uM\|x\|_1 \text{ (number of } k_i\text{'s } \leq u). \end{aligned}$$

For  $e > 0$  there exists  $N$  such that for all  $n \geq N$ ,  $k_n^{-1} \leq e$ , since  $\{k_n^{-1}y_n: n \geq 1\}$  is bounded in  $X_2$  and, hence, compact in  $X_1$ . Therefore, there is a continuous function  $g: R^+ \rightarrow R^+$  with

$$g(u) \geq (\text{the number of } k_i\text{'s } \leq u).$$

Hence,

$$\|T(u)x\|_2 \leq M u g(u) \|x\|_1.$$

(c) Let  $x = \sum a_n k_n^{-1} y_n$  be in  $X_2$ . The unit ball in  $X_2$  is compact in  $X_1$ . Hence, for  $u > 0$  there exists  $N$  such that

$$\left\| \sum_{n \geq N} a_n (\|x\|_2 k_n)^{-1} y_n \right\|_1 \leq u^{-1}.$$

We take  $N(u)$  with this property. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(N(u))x - x\|_1 &= \left\| \sum_{k_n \leq N(u)} a_n k_n^{-1} y_n \right\|_1 \\ &\leq u^{-1} \|x\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

For  $u > 0$  we put  $S(u) = T(N(u))$ .

By (a)  $\|S(u)\| \leq M$  in  $L(X_1, X_1)$  and  $L(X_2, X_2)$ .

By (b)  $\|S(u)x\|_2 \leq MN(u)g(N(u))\|x\|_1$  for  $x$  in  $X_1$ .

By (c)  $\|S(u)x - x\|_1 \leq u^{-1}\|x\|_2$  for  $x$  in  $X_2$ .

**PROPOSITION 8.4.** *Suppose  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are separable Hilbert spaces. Then there exists a smoothing with  $M = 1$  and  $h(t) = t$ , if  $i$  is compact.*

*Proof.* Let  $x$  be in  $X_2$  and  $y$  be in  $X_1$ .

$$(x, y)_1 \leq \|x\|_1 \|y\|_1 \leq \|i\| \|x\|_2 \|y\|_1.$$

Hence, there is an element  $C(y)$  of  $X_2$  with  $(x, y)_1 = (x, Cy)_2$ . It is straightforward to show  $C$  is in  $L(X_1, X_2)$ .  $C$  is positive definite in  $X_1$  since  $X_2$  is dense in  $X_1$ , and self adjoint. Hence,  $C: X_1 \rightarrow X_1$  has a positive definite self adjoint square root  $A$ . There is a complete orthonormal basis  $\{e_i: i \geq 1\}$  of  $X_1$  such that  $Ae_i = h_i e_i$  and the sequence  $h_i$  decreases to 0.

We have  $\|Ax\|_2 = \|x\|_1$  for  $x$  in  $X_1$ , and  $\{h_i e_i: i \geq 1\}$  is a complete orthonormal basis for  $X_2$ . For  $x = \sum a_i e_i$  in  $X_1$ , we put

$$S(u)x = \sum_{h_i u \geq 1} a_i e_i.$$

$S(u)$  is a bounded linear operator  $X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  for  $u$  in  $R^+$ .

(a)  $S(u)$  is a projection with norm 1 in both  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ .

(b) Let  $x = \sum a_i e_i$  be in  $X_1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(u)x\|_2 &\leq \left\| \sum_{u h_i \geq 1} u a_i h_i e_i \right\|_2 \\ &= u \left\| \sum_{u h_i \geq 1} a_i e_i \right\|_1 \\ &\leq u \|x\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

(c) Let  $x = \sum a_i h_i e_i$  be in  $X_2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(u)x - x\|_1 &= \left\| \sum_{u h_i \geq 1} a_i h_i e_i \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{u h_i \geq 1} u^{-1} a_i e_i \right\|_1 \\ &= u^{-1} \left\| \sum_{u h_i \geq 1} a_i h_i e_i \right\|_2 \\ &\leq u^{-1} \|x\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

**THEOREM 8.5.** *Let  $X_2$  be a separable Hilbert space with the Hilbert space  $X_3$  compactly included in  $X_2$  and dense in  $X_2$ , and  $X_1$  the dual of  $X_3$  under the pairing  $(\cdot, \cdot)_2$ . Suppose  $f: X_2 \rightarrow X_1$  is  $C^1$ , with  $f(0) = 0$  and the graph of  $f$  closed in  $X_1 \rightarrow X_1$ . Suppose there exists a locally Lipschitzian function  $L$ :*

$$B_1 \rightarrow \{T \text{ in } L(X_2, X_1) \cap L(X_3, X_2): \|T\|_{L(X_2, X_1)} \leq R\}$$

where  $B_1 = \{x \text{ in } X_2: \|x\|_1 \leq 1\}$  such that for  $x$  in  $B_1$  and  $v$  in  $X_3$ ,

$f'_x L(x)v = v$ . If  $\|y\|_3 \leq (2R)^{-1}$ , then there is  $x$  in  $X_1$  with  $f(x) = y$ .

*Proof.* There exists a complete orthonormal basis  $\{e_i\}$  of  $X_1$  and a sequence  $h_i$  decreasing to 0 such that  $\{h_i^{-1}e_i\}$  and  $\{h_i^{-2}e_i\}$  are complete orthonormal bases of  $X_2$  and  $X_3$ . Let  $S_t = S(e^{t/2})$  where this is the smoothing of Proposition 8.4.  $S_t$  is the projection on the subspace spanned by  $\{e_i: h_i \geq e^{-t/2}\}$ . Consider a continuous solution, differentiable on  $(t_n, t_{n+1})$ , where  $t_n = \sup(\log h_n^{-2}, 0)$ , to

$$(a) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{du}{dt}(t) &= -Lu(t)S_t(fu(t) - y) \\ u(0) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

As long as  $u(t)$  is in  $B_1$ , a solution exists in  $X_2$  by the locally Lipschitzian nature of the r.h.s. of (a).

Writing  $g(x) = f(x) - y$  for  $x$  in  $X_2$ , we have from (a) for  $t$  in  $(t_n, t_{n+1})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}gu(t) &= f'_{u(t)} \frac{du}{dt}(t) \\ &= -f'_{u(t)}Lu(t)S_tgu(t) \\ &= -S_tgu(t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{d}{dt}S_tgu(t) = -S_tgu(t).$$

Hence,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|S_tgu(t)\|_1^2 = -2 \|S_tgu(t)\|_1^2.$$

$S_tgu(t)$  is not continuous in  $t$ , so that we cannot proceed immediately as in Theorem 8.1. However, we do have

$$\|S_tgu(t)\|_1^2 = e^{-2(t-t_n)} \|S_{t_n}gu(t_n)\|_1^2.$$

Letting  $y = \sum y_i e_i$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_tgu(t)\|_1^2 &= \sum_{h_i \geq e^{-t/2}} e^{-2(t-t_i)} y_i^2 \\ &= e^{-2t} \sum_{h_i \geq e^{-t/2}} h_i^{-4} y_i^2 \\ &= e^{-2t} \|y\|_3^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\|S_tgu(t)\|_1 = e^{-t} \|y\|_3.$$

From (a),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{du}{dt}(t) \right\|_1 &\leq R \|S_t gu(t)\|_2 \\
&= R \|S_t(S_t gu(t))\|_2 \\
&\leq Re^{t/2} \|S_t gu(t)\|_1.
\end{aligned}$$

by property (b) of a smoothing

$$\leq Re^{-t/2} \|y\|_3.$$

Hence,  $\|u(t)\|_1 \leq 2R \|y\|_3$  as long as  $u(t)$  is defined, hence,  $u(t)$  is in  $B_1$ , hence,  $u(t)$  is defined for all  $t$  in  $R^+$ .

Since  $u(t)$  is Cauchy in  $X_1$  by the bound on the derivative, there is  $x$  in  $X_1$  with  $u(t) \rightarrow x$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

From  $dgu(t)/dt = -S_t gu(t)$  and the continuity in  $t$  of  $gu(t)$ ,

$$gu(t) = -y - \int_0^t S_s gu(s) ds.$$

Hence,

$$S_t gu(t) = -S_t y - \int_0^t S_s gu(s) ds.$$

Hence,

$$S_t gu(t) - gu(t) = y - S_t y.$$

Now  $y - S_t y \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  in  $X_1$  by property (c) of a smoothing. Also,  $S_t gu(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  in  $X_1$ . Hence,  $gu(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  in  $X_1$ . Since the graph of  $g$  is closed in  $X_1 \times X_1$ ,  $g(x) = 0$ , and  $f(x) = y$ .

**THEOREM 8.6** *Suppose  $X$  is the nuclear Frechet space obtained as  $\cap \{H_n: 1 \leq n\}$  where  $H_i$  are Hilbert spaces and there exists  $C: H_1 \rightarrow H_1$  such that for all  $n$ ,  $C$  is an isometry  $H_n \rightarrow H_{n+1}$  and self adjoint and compact  $H_n \rightarrow H_n$ . Suppose  $f: X \rightarrow X$  is differentiable from  $\|\cdot\|_n$  to  $\|\cdot\|_{n-1}$  for all large  $n$ . Suppose there exists  $L: X \rightarrow L(X, X)$  and constants  $M$  and  $R$  with  $f'_x L(x) = I$  for  $x$  in  $X$ .*

$$\|L(x)v\|_n \leq R \|v\|_{n+1} \text{ for } v \text{ in } X \text{ and all large } n.$$

*$\|(L(x) - L(y))v\|_n \leq M \|x - y\|_n \|v\|_{n+1}$  for  $x, y$ , and  $v$  in  $X$  and all large  $n$ . Then  $f$  is surjective.*

*Proof.* As in Proposition 8.4 we take  $S_t$  the projection onto the subspace spanned by eigenvectors of  $C$  with eigenvalues  $\geq e^{-t/2}$ . By translation we have only to show that 0 is in  $R(f)$ . We consider a curve  $u$  in  $X$  with  $u(0) = 0$  and on the intervals where  $S_t$  is constant,  $du(t)/dt = -Lu(t)S_t f u(t)$ . Such a curve exists by the Lipschitzian nature of the r.h.s. in each  $\|\cdot\|_n$  for  $n$  large. As in Theorem 8.5,

$$\left\| \frac{du}{dt}(t) \right\|_n \leq R e^{-t/2} \|f(0)\|_{n+2},$$

hence,  $u(t)$  converges in  $H_n$  for large  $n$ . Hence,  $u(t)$  converges in  $X$  to an element  $x$  of  $X$ . By continuity,  $f(x) = 0$ .

The existence of such an  $L(x)$  for  $x$  in  $X$  seems necessary since we cannot get  $f'_x$  surjective by requiring it to be near  $I$ . In fact, if  $X$  is a nuclear space, it has the approximation property and, hence, there is a sequence of finite dimensional elements of  $L(X, X)$  convergent to  $I$  in any  $S$  topology making  $L(X, X)$  a topological vector space (see Schaefer [18], page 79). The relation between the  $H_n$  seems necessary to get one smoothing for all the  $H_n$ , which does not in general exist. If  $f$  was differentiable  $\| \cdot \|_{n+k}$  to  $\| \cdot \|_n$  for some  $k$ , the surjectivity of  $f$  follows from the theorem by considering

$$X = \cap \{H_{nk} : n \geq 1\}.$$

**THEOREM 8.7.** *Suppose  $X_0$  is a Banach space and  $A: D(A) \rightarrow X_0$  is a closed densely defined linear operator such that  $(I - t^{-1}(A - bI))^{-1}$  is in  $L(X_0, X_0)$  for  $t \geq t_0$  with norm  $\leq M$ . Suppose  $X_1 = D(A)$  and  $X_2 = D(A^2)$  with  $\|x\|_1 = \|x\|_0 + \|Ax\|_0$  and  $\|x\|_2 = \|x\|_1 + \|Ax\|_1$ . Suppose  $f: X_1 \rightarrow X_0$  is  $C^1$ , with the graph of  $f$  closed in  $X_0 \times X_0$ . Let  $L$  be locally Lipschitzian  $B_1 \rightarrow \{T \text{ in } L(X_2, X_1) \text{ and } L(X_1, X_0): \|T\|_{L(X_1, X_0)} \leq R\}$  where*

$$B_1 = \{x \text{ in } X_1: \|x\|_0 \leq 8RM^2(1 + M(1 + M)(1 + b))\}.$$

*If  $\|f(0)\|_2 \leq e^{-1/(4M^2)}$ , then there is  $x$  in  $X_0$  with  $f(x) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 8.3, we have a smoothing for  $X_0$  and  $X_1$  and  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  also, since  $(I - t^{-1}(A - bI))^{-1}$  is in  $L(X_1, X_1)$  for  $t \geq t_0$  with norm  $\leq M$ , where  $A$  here is the restriction of  $A$  to  $(A + b)^{-1}X_1$ . Set  $S_t = S(e^{(M^2+2)t})$  and take  $d \leq 1$  with  $d \leq (4M^4e)^{-1}$ . Consider a solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad \frac{du}{dt}(t) &= -Lu(t)S_t^2fu(t-d) & t \geq t_0 \\ u(t) &= 0 & t \leq t_0. \end{aligned}$$

A strong solution exists in  $X_1$  by the locally Lipschitzian nature of the r.h.s. as long as  $u(t)$  is in  $B_1$ . Take  $K = 2(1 + M(1 + M)(1 + b))$  and assume, given  $t$ , that for  $s \leq t - d$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(V)} \quad \|fu(s)\|_2 &\leq e^{M^2s}, & \text{and} \\ \text{(U)} \quad \|fu(s)\|_1 &\leq Ke^{-s/2}. \end{aligned}$$



$dfu(t)/dt = -S_t^2 fu(t - d)$ , hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|fu(t)\|_2 &\leq \|f(0)\|_2 + M^2 \int_0^t \|fu(s - d)\|_2 ds \\ &\leq \|fu(0)\|_2 + M^2 \int_0^t e^{M^2(s-d)} ds \end{aligned}$$

by assumption (V). But

$$\|f(0)\|_2 \leq e^{-1/(4M^2)} \leq e^{-M^2 d}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|fu(t)\|_2 &\leq e^{-M^2 d} + e^{-M^2 d}(e^{M^2 t} - 1) \\ &\leq e^{M^2 t}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (V) holds for all  $t$  such that  $u(t)$  is defined.

$$\frac{d}{dt}fu(t) = -fu(t) + (I - S_t^2)fu(t) + S_t^2 \int_{t-d}^t \frac{d}{ds}fu(s)ds.$$

Since  $t \rightarrow \|fu(t)\|_1^2$  is absolutely continuous, it is differentiable except on a set of measure zero, and for any duality map  $J$  for  $X_1$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|fu(t)\|_1^2 \leq 2\left(Jfu(t), \frac{d}{dt}fu(t)\right)_1.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|fu(t)\|_1^2 + 2(Jfu(t), fu(t))_1 &\leq 2(Jfu(t), (I - S_t^2)fu(t)) \\ &\quad + 2\left(Jfu(t), S_t^2 \int_{t-d}^t \frac{d}{ds}fu(s)ds\right). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by  $\|fu(t)\|_1$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|fu(t)\|_1 + \|fu(t)\|_1 \leq \|(I - S_t^2)fu(t)\|_1 + \left\| S_t^2 \int_{t-d}^t \frac{d}{ds}fu(s)ds \right\|_1.$$

Multiplying by  $e^t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(e^t \|fu(t)\|_1) &\leq e^t \|(I - S_t)(I + S_t)fu(t)\|_1 \\ &\quad + e^t S_t^2 \int_{t-d}^t -S_s^2 fu(s - d)ds \Big|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I - S_t)(I + S_t)fu(t)\|_1 &\leq M(1 + b)e^{-(M^2+2)t} \|(I + S_t)fu(t)\|_2 \\ &\leq M(1 + b)(1 + M)e^{-(M^2+2)t} \|fu(t)\|_2 \\ &\leq M(1 + b)(1 + M)e^{-2t} \quad \text{by (V).} \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| S_t^2 \int_{t=d}^t -S_s^2 fu(s-d) ds \right\|_1 &\leq M^4 \int_{t-d}^t \|fu(s-d)\|_1 ds \\ &\leq KM^4 d e^{-(t-2d)/2} \quad \text{by (U).} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{d}{dt}(e^t \|fu(t)\|_1) \leq M(1+M)(1+b)e^{-t} + KM^4 d e^d d^{t/2}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} e^t \|fu(t)\|_1 &\leq \|f(0)\|_1 + M(1+M)(1+b) + 2KM^4 d e^d e^{t/2} \\ &\leq 2^{-1}K + 2^{-1}K e^{t/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\|fu(t)\|_1 \leq K e^{-t/2}$ . Hence, (U) holds for all  $t$  such that  $u(t)$  is defined.

From (a),

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{du}{dt}(t) \right\|_0 &\leq R \|S_t^2 fu(t-d)\|_1 \\ &\leq RM^2 \|fu(t-d)\|_1 \\ &\leq RM^2 K e^{d/2} e^{-t/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\|u(t)\|_0 \leq 2RM^2 K e^{d/2}$  as long as  $u(t)$  is defined. Hence,  $u(t)$  is defined for all  $t$  in  $R^{+t}$ , and is Cauchy in  $X_0$ , hence, converges to an element  $x$  of  $X_0$ . Also,  $fu(t)$  converges in  $X_0$  to 0. Since the graph of  $f$  is closed,  $f(x) = 0$ .

## REFERENCES

1. A. Ambrosetti, *Un teorema di esistenza per la equazioni differenziali sugli spazi di Banach*, Rend. Sem. Math. Univ. Padova, **39** (1967), 349-361.
2. G. Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications, Vol. XXV, (1967).
3. F. Bohnenblust, *Axiomatic characterization of  $L^p$  spaces*, Duke J. Math., **6** (1940), 627-640.
4. R. Bonic, *Some properties of Hilbert scales*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **18** (1967), 1000-1003.
5. H. Brezis and G. Stampachia, *Sur la regularite de le solution d'inequations elliptiques*, Bull. Soc. Math. de France, **96** (1968), 153-180.
6. F. Browder, *Existence theorems for nonlinear partial differential equations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 1968 Summer Institute in Global Analysis (to appear).
7. ———, *Nonlinear operators and nonlinear equations of evolution in Banach spaces*, Proc. Symposium on Nonlinear Functional Analysis, (1968) (to appear).
8. ———, *The fixed point theory of multi-valued mappings in topological vector spaces*, Math. Annalen, **177** (1968), 283-301.
9. R. Kacurovskii, *Three theorems on nonlinear equations involving monotone operators*, Soviet Math. Dokl., **9** (1968), 1322-1325.
10. S. Karlin, *Positive operators*, J. Math. and Mech., **8** (1959), 907-937.
11. T. Kato, *Nonlinear semigroups and evolution equations*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, **19** (1967), 508-520.
12. Y. Komura, *Nonlinear semi-groups in Hilbert space*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, **19** (1967), 493-507.

13. M. Krasnoselskii, *Positive Solutions of Operator Equations*, Groningen, P. Noordhoff, 1964.
14. J. Moser, *A new technique for the construction of solutions of nonlinear differential equations*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., **47**, No. 11 (1961), 1824-1831.
15. ———, *A rapidly converging iteration method and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Ann. Scuola Normale Pisa, **20** (1966), 263-315, 499-535.
16. J. Nash, *The imbedding problem for Riemannian manifolds*, Ann. Math., **63** (1956), 20-63.
17. R. Nussbaum, *The fixed point index and fixed point theorems for  $k$ -set contractions*, Thesis, University of Chicago, 1969.
18. R. S. Phillips, *Semi-groups of positive contraction operators*, Czech. Math. J., **87** (1962), 294-313.
19. K. Sato, *On the generators of nonnegative contraction semigroups in Banach lattices*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, **20** (1968), 423-436.
20. H. Schaefer, *Topological Vector Spaces*, Macmillan, New York, 1966.
21. J. Schwartz, *Nonlinear functional analysis*, New York University notes, 1963-1964.
22. ———, *On Nash's implicit function theorem*, Comm. Pure. Appl. Math., **XIII** (1960), 509-530.
23. S. Yamamuro, *On Beurling-Livingstone's theory on the Banach space with duality mapping*, Yokohama Math. Jour., **11** (1963), 1-4.
24. K. Yoshida, *Functional Analysis*, Academic Press, New York, 1965.

Received February 11, 1970.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

## EDITORS

H. SAMELSON  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305

J. DUGUNDJI  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, California 90007

C. R. HOBBY  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98105

RICHARD ARENS  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California 90024

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

## SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA  
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY  
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
OSAKA UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO  
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
\* \* \*  
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY  
CHEVRON RESEARCH CORPORATION  
NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER

---

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

---

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. The editorial "we" must not be used in the synopsis, and items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in duplicate if possible, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Rev. Index to Vol. 39. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, Richard Arens, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints are provided free for each article; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

---

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published monthly. Effective with Volume 16 the price per volume (3 numbers) is \$8.00; single issues, \$3.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: \$4.00 per volume; single issues \$1.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), 270, 3-chome Totsuka-cho, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Edward Arthur Bertram, <i>Permutations as products of conjugate infinite cycles</i> .....	275
David Blair, <i>Almost contact manifolds with Killing structure tensors</i> .....	285
Bruce Donald Calvert, <i>Nonlinear equations of evolution</i> .....	293
Bohumil Cenkľ and Giuliano Sorani, <i>Cohomology groups associated with the <math>\partial\bar{\partial}</math> operator</i> .....	351
Martin Aaron Golubitsky and Bruce Lee Rothschild, <i>Primitive subalgebras of exceptional Lie algebras</i> .....	371
Thomas J. Jech, <i>Two remarks on elementary embeddings of the universe</i> ...	395
Harold H. Johnson, <i>Conditions for isomorphism in partial differential equations</i> .....	401
Solomon Leader, <i>Measures on semilattices</i> .....	407
Donald Steven Passman, <i>Group rings satisfying a polynomial identity. II</i> .....	425
Ralph Tyrrell Rockafellar, <i>Integrals which are convex functionals. II</i> .....	439
Stanisław Sławomir Świerczkowski, <i>Cohomology of group germs and Lie algebras</i> .....	471
John Griggs Thompson, <i>Nonsolvable finite groups all of whose local subgroups are solvable. III</i> .....	483
Alan Curtiss Tucker, <i>Matrix characterizations of circular-arc graphs</i> .....	535