

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

**STRONGLY UNIQUE BEST APPROXIMATES TO A FUNCTION
ON A SET, AND A FINITE SUBSET THEREOF**

MARTIN BARTELT

STRONGLY UNIQUE BEST APPROXIMATES TO A FUNCTION ON A SET, AND A FINITE SUBSET THEREOF

M. W. BARTELT

Let X be a compact Hausdorff space and let $C(X)$ denote the space of continuous real valued functions defined on X , normed by the supremum norm $\|f\| = \max_{x \in X} |f(x)|$. Let M be a finite dimensional subspace of $C(X)$. This note examines the problem of whether every best (unique best, strongly unique best) approximate to f on X is also a best (respectively: unique best, strongly unique best) approximate to f on some finite subset of X . Appropriate converse results are also considered.

The Kolmogorov criterion for best approximates shows that $\pi \in M$ is a best approximate to f on X if and only if it is a best approximate to f on a finite subset of

$$E_\pi = \{x \in X: |f(x) - \pi(x)| = \|f - \pi\|\}.$$

Example 1 shows that the corresponding result does not hold for unique best approximates. It can easily be shown that when π is a strongly unique best approximate to f in $C[a, b]$ from a Haar subspace then there is a finite subset A of $[a, b]$ such that π is a strongly unique best approximate to f on A . In Theorem 2 the latter result is extended to an arbitrary finite dimensional subspace M of $C(X)$ and in Theorem 3 a converse is proven in this general setting.

The second algorithm of Remez [11] is an important method for the computation of the best approximate to a function f in $C[a, b]$ from a finite dimensional Haar subspace. This algorithm depends on the fact that a best approximate to f on $[a, b]$ is a best approximate to f on some finite subset of $[a, b]$. (One can think of the algorithm as a search for this subset.) In fact, the proof of the convergence of the algorithm given by E. W. Cheney [3] indicates that the algorithm depends more precisely on the facts that the best approximate π to f on $[a, b]$ is strongly unique and that π is also a strongly unique best approximate to f on some finite subset of $[a, b]$.

It would also be natural to consider in $L^p[a, b]$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$ the relationship between strongly unique best approximates on $[a, b]$ and on finite subsets of $[a, b]$. However, D. E. Wulbert ([15], [16]) has shown that strong unicity does not occur (nontrivially) in any smooth space and $L^p[a, b]$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$ is smooth. In the last section a different proof of Wulbert's result is given because the

method of the proof enables one to study strong unicity in L^1 . It should be observed (see Example 3) that even though there are no finite dimensional subspaces of $L^1[a, b]$ containing a unique best approximate to every f in $L^1[a, b]$, a given f in $L^1[a, b]$ may have a strongly unique best approximate.

The result mentioned above on the relationship between the best approximates to f on X and the best approximates to f on a finite subset of X can be found in [8], [13], and [18].

The results of this note hold with obvious modifications for the complex case.

2. DEFINITIONS. An element π in M is a best approximate to f in $C(X)$ if $\|f - m\| \geq \|f - \pi\|$ for all m in M ; π is a unique best approximate if the inequality is strict for all m in M , $m \neq \pi$; and π is a strongly unique best approximate to f if there exists a real number $r > 0$ such that $\|f - m\| \geq \|f - \pi\| + r\|\pi - m\|$ for all m in M .

Let M have dimension n . The subspace M is called a Haar (Chebyshev) subspace if no nonzero function in M has more than $n - 1$ zeros in X . If X is the finite interval $[a, b]$, then M is called a weak Chebyshev subspace if no nonzero function in M has more than $n - 1$ sign changes on $[a, b]$. (For properties of Haar and weak Chebyshev systems, see e.g. [4], [5], [6], and [17].) In particular it is known that if M is a Haar subspace of $C[a, b]$ then π is a best approximate to f on a closed set X in $[a, b]$ (where X contains at least $n + 1$ points) if and only if there exists an equioscillation set for $f - \pi$, i.e., a subset A of X containing $n + 1$ points $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{n+1}$ such that $f(x_{i+1}) - \pi(x_{i+1}) = -[f(x_i) - \pi(x_i)]$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $|f(x_i) - \pi(x_i)| = \|f - \pi\|$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n + 1$.

One of the principal tools of the investigation is the following strong Kolmogorov criterion [2] characterizing strongly unique best approximates.

THEOREM. *Let M be finite dimensional. There exists a real number $r > 0$ such that*

$$\|f - m\| \geq \|f - \pi\| + r\|\pi - m\| \quad \forall m \in M$$

if and only if

$$\max_{x \in E_\pi} [f(x) - \pi(x)]m(x) > 0 \quad \forall m \in M, \quad m \neq 0.$$

In proofs we assume without loss of generality that the best approximate to f is 0.

3. Results. The relationship between a strongly unique best approximate to a given f on $[a, b]$ and on a finite subset A of $[a, b]$ is especially simple when M is a Haar subspace. Recall that when M is a Haar subspace of $C[a, b]$ every f in $C(X)$, where X is a compact subset of $[a, b]$, has a strongly unique best approximate from M [9]. Hence by the strong Kolmogorov criterion we have the following result:

THEOREM 1. *Let π be a best approximate from the Haar subspace M of $C[a, b]$ to a given f in $C[a, b]$. Then for every equioscillation set $A \subseteq E_\pi$,*

$$\max_{x \in A} [f(x) - \pi(x)]m(x) > 0 \quad \forall m \in M, m \not\equiv 0.$$

If we only assume that π is a strongly unique best approximate from a weak Chebyshev subspace, then the conclusion of the previous theorem does not hold. For example, in $C[0, 4\pi]$ let $f(x) = \sin x$ and let M be the linear span of

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 3\pi/2 - x & 0 \leq x \leq 3\pi/2 \\ 0 & 3\pi/2 \leq x \leq 5\pi/2 \\ 5\pi/2 - x & 5\pi/2 \leq x \leq 4\pi. \end{cases}$$

Then 0 is strongly unique to f since $\max_{x \in E_0} f(x)m(x) > 0, \forall m \in M, m \not\equiv 0$, but $\max_{x \in A} f(x)(-g(x)) = 0$ where $A = \{5\pi/2, 7\pi/2\}$ is an equioscillation set for $f - 0$.

However, we now show that when π is a strongly unique best approximate from an arbitrary subspace M in $C(X)$, it follows that there does exist some finite subset A of E_π such that π is a strongly unique best approximate to f on A .

THEOREM 2. *Let π be a strongly unique best approximate from a subspace M of $C(X)$ to an element f in $C(X)$. Then there exists a finite subset A of E_π with $\leq 2n$ points such that*

$$\max_{x \in A} [f(x) - \pi(x)]m(x) > 0 \quad \forall m \in M, m/A \not\equiv 0.$$

Proof. Let M be the span of $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$. Let $\hat{E}_0 = \{(f(x)g_1(x), \dots, f(x)g_n(x)): x \in E_0\}$. Then it follows ([2], Theorem 6) that 0 is in the interior of the convex hull of \hat{E}_0 . Hence (see e.g. Theorem 3.13 in [14]) 0 is in the interior of the convex hull of \hat{A} , where \hat{A} is a finite subset of \hat{E}_0 consisting of $\leq 2n$ points. It follows ([2], Theorem 6) that 0 is a strongly unique best approximate to f on A . By the strong Kolmogorov criterion $\max_{x \in A} f(x)m(x) > 0$ for all m in M with $m/A \not\equiv 0$.

It is not known in general whether it is possible to find a finite set A satisfying the conditions of the previous theorem such that if m is in M and $m/A = 0$, then $m \equiv 0$. However, if E_π is finite then by setting $A = E_\pi$ one can add to the conclusion of Theorem 2 that $m/E_\pi = 0$ implies $m \equiv 0$. This follows from the strong Kolmogorov criterion. Also if E_π is not finite but it is known that any nonzero function in M has at most $N - 1$ zeros for some integer N (for example $N = n$ when M is a Haar set), then one can just add to the set A of the previous theorem enough points of E_π so that A has N or more points.

It would be of interest to determine whether the $2n$ of the theorem is in general best possible.

If π is a unique best approximate to f on X , then it does not follow that π is a unique best approximate to f on E_π . This can be seen in the next example which will also be used later.

EXAMPLE 1. Let M be the subspace of $C[0, 3\pi]$ spanned by $g_1(x) = 1$ and

$$g_2(x) = \begin{cases} \pi - x & 0 \leq x \leq \pi \\ 0 & \pi \leq x \leq 5\pi/2 \\ 5\pi/2 - x & 5\pi/2 \leq x \leq 3\pi \end{cases}$$

Let $f(x) = \sin x$. Then M is a weak Chebyshev system, but it is not a Haar set on $[0, 3\pi]$. Because $f(x)$ has a horizontal tangent at $x = 5\pi/2$, the function $-g_2(x)$ is not as good an approximate to $f(x)$ as 0 is. Clearly then, 0 is a unique best approximate to f on $[0, 3\pi]$. Now $E_0 = \{\pi/2, 3\pi/2, 5\pi/2\}$. Since M has dimension 2, E_0 is an equioscillation set for $f - 0$ on $[0, 3\pi]$. Now 0 is not a unique best approximate on $E_0 = A$ since $g_2(x)$ is also a best approximate. Also observe that 0 is not a strongly unique best approximate to f on $[0, 3\pi]$ since $\max_{x \in E_0} f(x)[-g_2(x)] = 0$.

In fact even more holds. Let

$$g_3(x) = \begin{cases} x - \pi/2 & 0 \leq x \leq \pi/2 \\ 0 & \pi/2 \leq x \leq \pi \\ x - \pi & \pi \leq x \leq 3\pi/2 \\ 2(7\pi/4 - x) & 3\pi/2 \leq x \leq 7\pi/4 \\ x - 7\pi/4 & 7\pi/4 \leq x \leq 3\pi \end{cases}$$

Then let M be the subspace of $C[0, 3\pi]$ spanned by $g_2(x)$ and $g_3(x)$, and let $f(x) = \sin x$. Then by consideration of the values of any $m \in M$ at points $\pi/2, 3\pi/2$, and $5\pi/2$, it is easy to verify that zero is a unique best approximate to f on $[0, 3\pi]$ and $E_0 = \{\pi/2, 3\pi/2, 5\pi/2\}$.

Moreover on each subset A of E_0 , there is a function $g \in M$ such that $g/A \not\equiv 0$ and g is a best approximate to f on A . Thus zero is not a unique best approximate to f on any finite subset A of E_0 .

The next proposition summarizes the results for an arbitrary subspace M of $C(X)$. For the result on best approximates see [8], [13], and [18].

PROPOSITION. *If π is a best (strongly unique best) approximate to f on X , then there exists a finite subset A of X with less than or equal to $n + 1$ (resp. $2n$) points such that π is a best (strongly unique best) approximate on A .*

REMARK. The Kolmogorov and strong Kolmogorov criteria and Example 1 also yield the relationship between the best approximate to f on X and on all of E_π . As expected, π is a best (strongly unique best) approximate to f on X if and only if it has the same property on E_π . This does not hold for a unique best approximate.

4. **Converse results.** The Kolmogorov criterion shows part (i) of the next theorem.

THEOREM 3. (i) *If π is a best approximate to f on a finite subset of E_π , then π is a best approximate to f on X .*

(ii) *If π is a unique (strongly unique) best approximate to f on a finite subset A of E_π , then π is a unique (strongly unique) best approximate to f on X , except possibly for those m in M with $m/A \equiv 0$.*

In fact more than this holds. The following result says that if π is a unique best approximate to f on a finite subset A of X , then π is also a strongly unique best approximate to f on A .

THEOREM 4. *Let π be a unique best approximate to f on a finite subset A of X . Assume $f(x) - \pi(x) \not\equiv 0$ on A . Then*

$$\max_{x \in A} [f(x) - \pi(x)]m(x) > 0 \quad \forall m \not\equiv 0 \text{ on } A.$$

Proof. (We show that if $\max_{x \in A} f(x)q(x) \leq 0$ for some $q \in M$, then there exists a real number $\lambda > 0$ such that $-\lambda q$ is a best approximate to f on A .) Let $A' = \{x \in A: f(x)q(x) < 0\}$. Let $\lambda > 0$ be such that both the following hold:

$$(1) \quad \lambda \max_{x \in A} |q(x)| < \|f\|,$$

$$(2) \quad \lambda q^2(x) + 2f(x)q(x) < 0 \text{ for all } x \text{ in } A'.$$

Notice that $H(\lambda) = \max_{x \in A'} \lambda q^2(x) + f(x)q(x)$ is a continuous function of λ with $H(0) < 0$. Since $A' \subseteq A$ is finite such a λ can be chosen.

Now if $x \in A'$, then letting $\|f\|_A = \max_{x \in A} |f(x)|$ we have

$$(f(x) + \lambda q(x))^2 = (f(x))^2 + \lambda(\lambda q^2(x) + 2f(x)q(x)) < (f(x))^2 \leq \|f\|_A^2.$$

If $x \in A - A'$ and $q(x) = 0$, then $|f(x) + \lambda q(x)| = |f(x)| \leq \|f\|_A$; whereas, if $q(x) \neq 0$, then $f(x) = 0$ and

$$|f(x) + \lambda q(x)| = \lambda |q(x)| < \|f\|_A.$$

Thus $|f(x) + \lambda q(x)| \leq \|f\|_A$ for any x in A .

COROLLARY. *If π is a unique best approximate to f on a finite subset A of E and $m/A = 0$ implies $m \equiv 0$, then π is a strongly unique best approximate to f on X .*

It follows that if $\|f - m\|_A \geq \|f - \pi\|_A + r\|\pi - m\|_A$ and $m/A = 0$ implies $m \equiv 0$, then $\|f - m\|_X \geq \|f - \pi\|_X + r'\|\pi - m\|_X$. It would be of interest to determine the relationship between r and r' here and also in the situation under discussion in Theorem 2.

REMARK. When M is a weak Chebyshev set in $C[a, b]$ one expects to obtain better results than for a general subspace M , but this does not occur here. Indeed, if π is a unique best approximate to f on $[a, b]$, A is a set of equioscillation points and $m/A = 0$ implies $m \equiv 0$, then it need not follow that π is a strongly unique best approximate to f on $[a, b]$ as seen in Example 1. Of course if one also assumes that π is a unique best approximate to f on A , then the above theorem guarantees that π is a strongly unique best approximate to f on $[a, b]$. It should be observed that the proof given in [4] of the de La Vallée Poussin theorem when M is a Haar set also proves the result when M is only a weak Chebyshev set.

5. **Strong unicity in L^p , $1 \leq p < \infty$.** Let W be a normed linear space with dual space W^* . Let M denote a subspace (not necessarily finite dimensional) of W . As shown in [2], the existence of a subspace M of W which gives strongly unique best approximates to elements of W depends on the character of W^* . To be more specific, let $\langle M, f \rangle$ denote the subspace of W spanned by M and f and let $\langle M, f \rangle^*$ be the dual space of $\langle M, f \rangle$. Also let

$$\mathcal{L}_\pi = \{L \in \langle M, f \rangle^*: L(f - \pi) = \|f - \pi\| \text{ and } \|L\| = 1\},$$

and

$$K_\pi = \{z \in \langle M, f \rangle: Lz \leq \|f - \pi\| \forall L \in \mathcal{L}_\pi\}.$$

Then ([2]) π is a strongly unique best approximate to f if and only if $K_\pi \cap M$ is bounded. If π is a best approximate to f , then ([2]) Haar's result ([4]) in an abstract setting implies that there is at least one element $L_\pi \in \mathcal{L}_\pi$ defined by $L_\pi(m + af) = a\|f - \pi\|$. Any element m in M is trivially its own strongly unique best approximate.

THEOREM 5. (Wulbert). *Let W be a smooth normed linear space. If M is a proper subspace of W and $f \in W - M$, then the best approximate to f from M is not strongly unique.*

Proof. Since W is smooth, \mathcal{L}_0 contains a unique linear functional which is L_0 . Thus, $M \subseteq K_0$ and $M \cap K_0$ is not bounded. Hence 0 is not a strongly unique best approximate.

Let μ be a σ -finite positive measure on a σ -algebra Σ of subsets of a set T . As usual let $L^p(T, \Sigma, \mu)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, (briefly L^p) denote the space of functions f on T such that $\|f\|_p = \left(\int |f|^p d\mu\right)^{1/p} < \infty$. Let $1/p + 1/q = 1$. Then L^p is smooth for $1 < p < \infty$. Of course, any finite dimensional subspace of L^p , $1 < p < \infty$ does contain a unique best approximate to every element in L^p . It follows that if M is a subspace of L^p , $1 < p < \infty$, then there is no $f \in L^p - M$ with a strongly unique best approximate.

The concept of an interpolating subspace was introduced in [1], where it was shown that if M is an interpolating subspace then M always contains a strongly unique best approximate to every element $f \in W$. Theorem 6 shows that [1] if W is a smooth normed linear space, then W contains no interpolating subspace. However, there are subspaces which are not interpolating, but from which every element has a strongly unique best approximate.

EXAMPLE 2. In l' let M be the subspace spanned by $(1, 0, 0, \dots)$ and $(0, 1, 0, \dots)$. Then [1] M is not an interpolating subspace. Given $f \in l'$, let π in M be given by $(f(1), f(2), 0, \dots)$. Then for $m \in M$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - m\| &= |f(1) - m(1)| + |f(2) - m(2)| + \sum_{i \geq 2} |f(i) - m(i)| \\ &\geq \sum_{i \geq 2} |f(i)| + r\{|\pi(1) - m(1)| + |\pi(2) - m(2)|\} \end{aligned}$$

where one can choose $r = 1$ to be the strong unicity constant.

The space L^1 contains a finite dimensional subspace M which contains a strongly unique best approximate to every element $f \in L^1 - M$ if and only if (T, Σ, μ) contains an atom ([1], [10]). To obtain further information about strong unicity in L^1 , let $f \in L^1$, $\|f\| = 1$ and $f \notin M$. Assume without loss of generality that 0 is a best approximate to f and let $\mathcal{L}_0 = \{L \in \langle M, f \rangle^*: Lf = 1 = \|L\|\}$. For a

given $L \in \mathcal{L}_0$, there exists by the Riesz Representation Theorem a function $h \in L^\infty$ such that

$$Lg = \int_T h g d\mu \quad \forall g \in L^1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|L\| = \|h\|_\infty.$$

Thus for a given $L \in \mathcal{L}_0$ we have

$$(1) \quad 1 = \int_T h f d\mu \leq \int_T |h| |f| d\mu \leq \|h\|_\infty \|f\|_1 = 1.$$

The condition for equality in Hölders inequality implies that $|h| |f| = \|h\|_\infty |f| = |f|$ a.e. Also (1) shows that $hf = |h| |f|$ a.e. Thus \mathcal{L}_0 can be identified with

$$\{h \in L^\infty : |f|(|h| - 1) = 0 \text{ a.e. and } (hf)(1 - \operatorname{sgn} h \operatorname{sgn} f) = 0 \text{ a.e.}\}.$$

This characterization of \mathcal{L}_0 can be used to study strong unicity in L^1 . For example if $\mu\{x: f(x) = 0\} = 0$, then $|h| = 1$ a.e., $\operatorname{sgn} h \operatorname{sgn} f = 1$ a.e. and therefore h is uniquely determined a.e. Since \mathcal{L}_0 contains a unique element it follows as before that 0 is not a strongly unique best approximate to f . We have shown the following:

THEOREM 6. *Let f in $L^1(T, \Sigma, \mu)$ have a strongly unique best approximate π from a subspace M . Then $\mu\{x: f(x) - \pi(x) = 0\} > 0$.*

It should be pointed out that it is possible for an element $f \in L^1$ to have a strongly unique best approximate from a subspace M even when (T, Σ, μ) does not have an atom. It is not known whether a result like Theorem 2 exists for $L^1[a, b]$.

EXAMPLE 3. Let M be the constant functions, a subspace of $L^1[-2, 2]$. Let

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} x + 1 & -2 \leq x \leq -1 \\ 0 & -1 \leq x \leq 1 \\ x - 1 & 1 \leq x \leq 2. \end{cases}$$

Then one can verify that

$$\|f - c\|_1 = \begin{cases} (|c| + 1)^2 & 1 \geq |c| \geq 0 \\ 4|c| & |c| > 1. \end{cases}$$

Thus 0 is a best approximate to f and also

$$\|f - c\|_1 \geq \|f\|_1 + 1/2 \|c\|_1.$$

REFERENCES

1. D. A. Ault, F. R. Deutsch, P. D. Morris, and J. E. Olson, *Interpolating subspaces in approximation theory*, J. Approx. Theory, **3** (1970), 164-182.
2. M. W. Bartelt and H. W. McLaughlin, *Characterizations of strong unicity in approximation theory*, J. Approx. Theory, **9** (1973), 255-266.
3. E. W. Cheney, *Introduction to Approximation Theory*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1966.
4. A. Haar, *Die Minkowschische Geometrie und die Annäherung an stetige Funktionen*, Math. Annalen, **78** (1918), 294-311.
5. R. C. Jones and L. A. Karlovitz, *Equioscillation under nonuniqueness in the approximation of continuous functions*, J. Approx. Theory, **3** (1970), 138-145.
6. S. Karlin and W. J. Studden, *Tschebycheff Systems: With Application in Analysis and Statistics*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966.
7. A. N. Kolmogorov, *A remark on the polynomials of P. L. Chebyshev deviating the least from a given function*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk., **3** (1948), 216-221 (Russian).
8. G. G. Lorentz, *Approximation of Functions*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1966.
9. D. J. Newman and H. S. Shapiro, *Some theorems on Chebyshev approximation*, Duke Math. J., **30** (1963), 673-681.
10. R. R. Phelps, *Uniqueness of Hahn-Banach extensions and unique best approximation*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **95** (1960), 238-255.
11. E. Ya. Remez, *General computational methods of Tchebycheff approximation*, Kiev (Russian), (1957), AECT No. 4491.
12. T. J. Rivlin and E. W. Cheney, *A comparison of uniform approximations on an interval and a finite subset thereof*, J. SIAM Number Anal., **3** No. 2 (1966), 311-320.
13. T. J. Rivlin and H. S. Shapiro, *A unified approach to certain problems of approximation and minimization*, J. SIAM, (9) 670-699.
14. C. P. Valentine, *Convex Sets*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1964.
15. D. E. Wulbert, *Uniqueness and differential characterization of approximation from manifolds of functions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **77** (1971), 88-91.
16. ———, *Uniqueness and differential characterization of approximation from manifolds of functions*, Amer. J. Math., **93** (1971), 350-366.
17. J. W. Young, *General theory of approximation by functions involving a given number of arbitrary parameters*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **8** (1907), 331-344.
18. S. I. Zuhovickii, *On approximation of real functions in the sense of P. L. Chebyshev*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk., **11** (1956), 125-159 (Russian), AMS Translation, Series 2, **19** 221-252.

Received July 13, 1973 and in revised form September 21, 1973. This research was partially supported by N. S. F. Grant GU-2605.

RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

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

R. A. BEAUMONT
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

D. GILBARG AND J. MILGRAM
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

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
NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER

Martin Bartelt, <i>Strongly unique best approximates to a function on a set, and a finite subset thereof</i>	1
S. J. Bernau, <i>Theorems of Korovkin type for L_p-spaces</i>	11
S. J. Bernau and Howard E. Lacey, <i>The range of a contractive projection on an L_p-space</i>	21
Marilyn Breen, <i>Decomposition theorems for 3-convex subsets of the plane</i>	43
Ronald Elroy Bruck, Jr., <i>A common fixed point theorem for a commuting family of nonexpansive mappings</i>	59
Aiden A. Bruen and J. C. Fisher, <i>Blocking sets and complete k-arcs</i>	73
R. Creighton Buck, <i>Approximation properties of vector valued functions</i>	85
Mary Rodriguez Embry and Marvin Rosenblum, <i>Spectra, tensor products, and linear operator equations</i>	95
Edward William Formanek, <i>Maximal quotient rings of group rings</i>	109
Barry J. Gardner, <i>Some aspects of T-nilpotence</i>	117
Juan A. Gatica and William A. Kirk, <i>A fixed point theorem for k-set-contractions defined in a cone</i>	131
Kenneth R. Goodearl, <i>Localization and splitting in hereditary noetherian prime rings</i>	137
James Victor Herod, <i>Generators for evolution systems with quasi continuous trajectories</i>	153
C. V. Hinkle, <i>The extended centralizer of an S-set</i>	163
I. Martin (Irving) Isaacs, <i>Lifting Brauer characters of p-solvable groups</i>	171
Bruce R. Johnson, <i>Generalized Lerch zeta function</i>	189
Erwin Kleinfeld, <i>A generalization of $(-1, 1)$ rings</i>	195
Horst Leptin, <i>On symmetry of some Banach algebras</i>	203
Paul Weldon Lewis, <i>Strongly bounded operators</i>	207
Arthur Larry Lieberman, <i>Spectral distribution of the sum of self-adjoint operators</i>	211
I. J. Maddox and Michael A. L. Willey, <i>Continuous operators on paranormed spaces and matrix transformations</i>	217
James Dolan Reid, <i>On rings on groups</i>	229
Richard Miles Schori and James Edward West, <i>Hyperspaces of graphs are Hilbert cubes</i>	239
William H. Specht, <i>A factorization theorem for p-constrained groups</i>	253
Robert L. Thele, <i>Iterative techniques for approximation of fixed points of certain nonlinear mappings in Banach spaces</i>	259
Tim Eden Traynor, <i>An elementary proof of the lifting theorem</i>	267
Charles Irvin Vinsonhaler and William Jennings Wickless, <i>Completely decomposable groups which admit only nilpotent multiplications</i>	273
Raymond O'Neil Wells, Jr., <i>Comparison of de Rham and Dolbeault cohomology for proper surjective mappings</i>	281
David Lee Wright, <i>The non-minimality of induced central representations</i>	301
Bertram Yood, <i>Commutativity properties in Banach $*$-algebras</i>	307