

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

NOTES ON GENERALIZED BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS IN BANACH SPACES. II. INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL EXTENSION THEORY

RICHARD CLARK BROWN

NOTES ON GENERALIZED BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS IN BANACH SPACES, II INFINITE DIMENSIONAL EXTENSION THEORY

R. C. BROWN

Let X, Y be Banach spaces and $\mathcal{A}: X \rightarrow Y$, $\mathcal{B}: Y^* \rightarrow X^*$ be linear relations. Suppose \mathcal{A} is a restriction of the adjoint (or preadjoint) \mathcal{B}^* of \mathcal{B} and the codimension of $G(\mathcal{A})$ in $G(\mathcal{B}^*)$ is not necessarily finite. Under certain hypotheses we can describe in computationally useful ways extensions \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{A} which are restrictions of \mathcal{B}^* and their adjoints. The theory is applied to a number of examples and is a direct extension of a previous paper which mainly treated the finite dimensional case.

1. Introduction. This paper is a continuation of [3] which outlined an adjoint and extension theory for generalized boundary value problems (g.b.v.p) in a Banach space setting.

Specifically [3] was concerned with two fundamental problems:

The Adjoint Problem. Let A be a densely defined closed operator in a Banach space X with range in a Banach space Y . Suppose further that H is an operator on $D(A)$ with range in a locally convex topological vector space (l.c.t.v.s.) F such that $D(A) \cap N(H) \neq 0$. Form the operators $A_H: X \rightarrow Y$ and $A^H: X \rightarrow Y \times F$ given by $A_H(x) = Ax$ on $N(H)$ and

$$A^H x = \begin{pmatrix} Ax \\ Hx \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then a question of interest is the determination of A_H^* and A^{H*} and the investigation of their mutual relationship.

The Extension Problem. Suppose \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are two closed relations in $X \times Y$ such that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$. We now wish to characterize \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}^* where \mathcal{C} is an arbitrary closed relation such that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}$. An interesting version of this problem is the case where $\mathcal{A} = A_H$ and $\mathcal{B} = B_K^*$ where $B: Y^* \rightarrow X^*$, K is an operator on $D(B)$ with range in an l.c.t.v.s. G such that $D(B) \cap N(K) \neq 0$, and A is an operator restriction of the adjoint (or preadjoint) of B^* (also an operator) so that $A_H \subset \mathcal{C} \subset B_K^*$ and $B_K \subset \mathcal{C}^* \subset A_H^*$. Here we wish to relate \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}^* to the structure—presumably already known—of B_K^* and A_H^* .

In [3] solutions to both of the above problems were sought in

terms of a theory which should be both applicable to particular b.v.p. (especially those determined by differential operators and multipoint, Stieltjes, or interface boundary conditions) and capable of extension to more difficult problems involving functional differential operators, PDE, evolution operators, etc.

The focus of the present paper will be on the extension problem. Our goal is to refine and generalize two distinct theories reflecting different points of view sketched in [3]. We will also mostly deal here with the most difficult case—when H is an operator with infinite dimensional range.

The first approach which seeks to characterize \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}^* in terms of mutually adjoint boundary conditions is developed in §3. The second which uses the Fredholm alternative rather than boundary operators is presented in §4, §5 contains a nonexhaustive list of examples. The last section consists of some historical remarks.

2. Notation and preliminaries. At this point to motivate the results of the next two sections and to make the paper notationally self-contained we will review some of the main ideas and conventions in [3].

We follow Arens [1] and call a closed linear possibly multivalued mapping from a Banach space X to a Banach space Y a linear relation.¹ It is notationally convenient to distinguish between \mathcal{A} and its graph $G(\mathcal{A})$ (a closed subspace of $X \times Y$) although logically the distinction is an artificial one. We often refer to \mathcal{A} by the notation $\mathcal{A}: X \rightarrow Y$. But this will not imply either that $D(\mathcal{A}) = X$ or $R(\mathcal{A}) = Y$. (We will also often denote an operator with graph in $X \times Y$ with standard type rather than script; e.g., “ A ” instead of “ \mathcal{A} ”). Given a relation \mathcal{A} we denote the image (a set) of $\alpha \in X$ under \mathcal{A} by $\mathcal{A}(\alpha)$ and an arbitrary member of this set by $\mathcal{A}\alpha$. Clearly $\beta, \beta' \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha)$ if and only if $\beta \equiv \beta' \bmod \mathcal{A}(0)$. \mathcal{A}^* means either the preadjoint or adjoint of \mathcal{A} depending on whether or not X and Y are dual spaces. If $S \subset X$, \bar{S} or “closure” of S means weak* or topological closure (equivalently weak closure if S is convex) according to whether or not X is a dual space. We follow a similar policy with regard to terms like “complemented”, “continuous”, “annihilator”, etc. Thus, for example, a complemented set S in a dual space X is weak* complemented in the sense that there exists a weak* continuous projection P onto the (weak* closed) set S .

DEFINITION 2.1. *If $\mathcal{A}: X \rightarrow Y$ and F is a l.c.t.v.s. then a boundary operator $H: X \times Y \rightarrow F$ is a linear operator such that $D(H) \supset$*

¹ One can also simply identify \mathcal{A} with its graph $X \oplus Y$ and call \mathcal{A} a “subspace” as is done for example in [6] or [15]–[17].

$G(\mathcal{A})$, $N(H) \cap G(\mathcal{A}) \neq 0$, and $D(H^*)$ is total over F . The condition $H(y, \mathcal{A}y) = 0$ is called a boundary condition for \mathcal{A} . \mathcal{A}_H will denote the restriction of \mathcal{A} defined by $N(H) \cap G(\mathcal{A})$.

It is easy to show from this definition that $H: G(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow F$ is continuous if $G(\mathcal{A})$ is given the (relative) product topology as a subspace of $X \times Y$ and F has the weak topology induced by $D(H^*)$. Thus \mathcal{A}_H is a closed linear relation. Moreover, one can also show easily that every closed restriction of \mathcal{A} is an " \mathcal{A}_H " with respect to a space F which can be viewed either as a Banach space or as a l.c.t.v.s. under its weak topology. Surprisingly, the second choice fits some applications better (more will be said about this issue later).

In the case of an operator A the structure of A_H^* was completely determined in [3] when $R(H)$ is finite dimensional. Several characterizations of A_H^* were also given in the more difficult infinite dimensional case under several sets of hypotheses. We restate two of the most useful ones:

THEOREM 2.2. *Suppose $N(A^*)$ is complemented in Y^* and $H = M \circ A$. Assume that $\overline{D(M)}^\perp$ is complemented in Y^* and that $D(M^*)$ is total over F . Then*

$$G(A_H^*) = \{(z, A^*\bar{z}): z + \psi \in D(A^*) \text{ and } \psi \in \overline{R(M^*)}\}.$$

In other words $D(A_H^) = D(A^*) - \overline{R(M^*)}$, and $G(A_H^*) = G(A^*) - (\overline{R(M^*)} \times \{0\})$.*

COROLLARY 2.3. *Suppose A is a closed densely defined 1-1 operator, such that $N(A^*)$ is complemented. Let A^+ be a (not necessarily bounded) partial inverse satisfying $A^+A = I$. Assume further that $\overline{D(HA^+)}$ is complemented and that $D(HA^+)^*$ is total over F then A_H^* is the relation with graph*

$$\{(z, A^*(z + \psi)): z + \psi \in D(A^*) \text{ and } \psi \in \overline{R(HA^+)^*}\}.$$

We ought to remark here that the assumptions behind these two results are reasonable ones. For instance, if $D(M) = R(A)$ then $D(M)^\perp = N(A^*)$ and so it is complemented if and only if $N(A^*)$ is. Note also if A is 1-1, H can be a general boundary operator and not merely defined on $R(A)$. (The case where A is not 1-1 can be handled by the extension theory.) Furthermore if A is determined by a regular differential operator, $A^+ \equiv$ the Greens function. But even if A is singular (with essential spectrum) A^+ can be identified with an "algebraic resolvent." For example, if A is determined by

y'' viewed as an operator on $L^p[0, \infty) \rightarrow L^p[0, \infty)$ with boundary conditions $y(0) = y'(0) = 0$, A^+ is $\int_0^t (t-s)(\cdot) ds$.

At this point we indicate why F is sometimes better viewed as a l.c.t.v.s. rather than a Banach space. Suppose for example $Hy = \langle c_i y(t_i) + d_i y'(t_{i+1}) \rangle$ where $\{t_i\}$ is an infinite set of points with limit point ∞ on $[0, \infty)$. $R(H)$ may or may not be a Banach space² but $R(H) \subset R^{+, \omega}$ (my notation for the countable direct sum of $[0, \infty)$). We can make this into a l.c.t.v.s. by giving $R^{+, \omega}$ the weak topology vis a vis $R_{00}^{+, \omega}$ (sequences in $R^{+, \omega}$ with finitely many nonzero terms). If we can find $\hat{R}(HA^+)^*$ or at least the main features of its structure we have a good idea of A_H^+ . This generally is not difficult to do. This approach can be generalized to more complicated singular Stieltjes b.v.p. The results are similar to the parametric adjoints found for such problems by less general methods in [2]. (We will illustrate further this approach in § 5.)

Two approaches to the extension problem were outlined in [3]. The first one which completely solved the problem in the case $\dim F < \infty$ was a straightforward exercise in matrix theory and depended on the following generalized Green's identity.

THEOREM 2.4. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}: X \rightarrow Y$, $\mathcal{B}: Y^* \rightarrow X^*$ are relations such that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}^*$ and $\dim G(\mathcal{A}^*)/G(\mathcal{B}) = G(\mathcal{B}^*)/G(\mathcal{A}) = n < \infty$. Then there exists an $n \times n$ nonsingular matrix $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ and continuous operators $J: G(\mathcal{B}^*) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, $\tilde{J}: G(\mathcal{A}^*) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ with linearly independent coordinate functionals such that*

$$[\mathcal{B}^*y, z] - [y, \mathcal{A}^*z] = \tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^*z)^* \hat{\mathcal{B}} J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y) \quad \text{on } G(\mathcal{A}^*) \times G(\mathcal{B}^*).$$

Moreover, in a Hilbert space setting where \mathcal{A} is symmetric and $\mathcal{A}^* = \mathcal{B}^*$ then $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is skew-hermitian.

This result is easily proved using the linear dependence principle. An easy consequence is the fact that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}^*$ if and only if \mathcal{C} is determined by the boundary condition $DJ(G(\mathcal{B}^*)) = 0$ where D is a $k \times n$, $k \leq n$ matrix of full rank and that \mathcal{C}^* is given by the adjoint boundary condition

$$(2.1) \quad [ND]^* \hat{\mathcal{B}}^* \tilde{J}(y, \mathcal{A}^*y) = 0$$

where $[ND]$ is a matrix whose columns form a basis for the null space of D .

Unfortunately if $\dim G(\mathcal{B}^*)/G(\mathcal{A}) = \infty$, the foregoing analysis

² See §6 for further discussion of this point.

breaks down because the linear dependence principle no longer holds. To cover this case an alternative approach was developed in [3]. The underlying idea is simple. When $A_H \subset \mathcal{C} \subset B_K^*$, $B_K \subset \mathcal{C}^* \subset A_H^*$. If it is assumed that $R(\mathcal{C})$ is closed, one can describe \mathcal{C} as that restriction of B_K^* whose range is orthogonal to a certain subspace of $N(A_H^*)$ and whose null space is a subspace of B_K^* . Conversely starting with known subspaces of $N(A_H^*)$ and $N(B_K^*)$ one can describe an extension \mathcal{C} . Interchanging these subspaces describes \mathcal{C}^* . Unfortunately the assumption of closed range is too strong because it rules out b.v.p. for singular differential operators with essential spectrum.

This survey of [3] brings us to the point of departure for the present paper. The next section will show that—suitably reinterpreted—the simple formulas of the finite dimensional theory (e.g., Theorem 2.4) can be extended to the infinite dimensional case. This is the most significant accomplishment of the paper. In § 4 we investigate the simple Fredholm alternative approach. This section is mostly a refinement of previous work. But, it is shown that a large portion of the theory may be salvaged if we abandon the closed range hypothesis. Fortunately, the portion that remains is just what we need to calculate extensions in concrete problems.

3. A theory of boundary operators for the infinite dimensional extension problem. As mentioned above, the purpose of this section is to show how to preserve the results of [3]—e.g., Theorem 2.4 or (2.1) above—describing finite dimensional extensions in the infinite dimensional setting. However, we state at the outset that this will be done at a price. $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$, D , etc., will no longer be matrices but rather weakly continuous operators. Also, certain restrictions must be placed on the boundary operators J , \tilde{J} as well as on the class of extensions considered.

The finite dimensional theory depended on linear algebra arguments and especially the “linear dependence principle”: If ψ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ and ϕ are linear functionals on a space X such that $N(\phi) \supset \bigcap N(\psi_i)$, then ϕ is a linear combination of the ψ_i . Our first step is to replace this principle by an obvious generalization.

LEMMA 3.1. *Suppose X , F , G , are linear spaces and $\pi: X \rightarrow F$, $\phi: X \rightarrow G$ are linear operators such that $N(\pi) \supset N(\phi)$ then there exists $\lambda: G \rightarrow F$ such that $\lambda \circ \phi = \pi$.*

Next we add a refinement to the idea of a boundary operator.

DEFINITION 3.2. *Suppose $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}^*$. We say that \mathcal{C} is*

regular if there is a boundary operator H for \mathcal{B}^* (cf. Definition 2.1) defining \mathcal{C} , i.e., $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{B}_H^*$ such that H^* has closed range in $Y^* \times X^*$. In these circumstances H is said to be a regular boundary operator.

REMARK. Recall from Definition 2.1 that H is considered a mapping from $X \times Y$ to F . So that H^* has range in $Y^* \times X^*$. But although $D(H) \supset G(\mathcal{B}^*)$ H need not be densely defined so that H^* may be multivalued.

LEMMA 3.3. Suppose $D(H) = G(B^*)$ then \mathcal{C} is regular if and only if

$$(3.1) \quad R(H^*) = G(-\mathcal{C}^*)^{-1}.$$

Proof. If (3.1) holds \mathcal{C} is regular since \mathcal{C}^* is closed. Conversely, if \mathcal{C} is regular the fact that $N(H) \equiv G(\mathcal{C})$ implies

$$(N(H))^\perp = G(-\mathcal{C}^*)^{-1} = R(H^*), \quad \square$$

We now make the following assumptions: (i) \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{C} are regular; (ii) the boundary operators J for \mathcal{A} and \tilde{J} for \mathcal{B} (i.e., $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}_J^*$, $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{J}}^*$) are onto certain fixed l.c.t.v.s. F and G ; (iii) $D(J) = G(B^*)$, $D(\tilde{J}) = G(A^*)$; \mathcal{C} —unless stated otherwise—is a regular relation which is an extension of \mathcal{A} and contained in \mathcal{B}^* .

Throughout the paper we also adopt the following conventions concerning the topologies of F and G . Unless otherwise mentioned F^* denotes $D(J^*)$ endowed with the weak* topology induced by F and F will have the weak topology induced by F^* . Thus F^* is the dual of F and $F^{**} = F$. A similar policy will be followed with regard to G . It follows (since $D(J^*)$ and $D(\tilde{J}^*)$ are total) that J , \tilde{J} or any other boundary operator may be viewed as continuous on $G(\mathcal{B}^*)$ or $G(\mathcal{A}^*)$.

LEMMA 3.4. If $G(\mathcal{C})$ is a subspace (but perhaps neither closed or regular) of $G(\mathcal{B}^*)$ then \mathcal{C} is closed if and only if $J(G(\mathcal{C}))$ is closed.

Proof. Since $J(\mathcal{C})$ is a subspace it is sufficient to show that $J(G(\mathcal{C}))$ is weakly closed. Let γ be a weak limit point of $J(G(\mathcal{C}))$. Then there exists a net $\langle y_i, \mathcal{B}^*y_i \rangle$ in $G(\mathcal{C})$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad [J(y_i, \mathcal{B}^*y_i), \phi] \longrightarrow [\gamma, \phi]$$

for all ϕ in F^* . Since J is onto $\gamma = J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y)$ for some y . Taking

adjoints we have,

$$[(\mathcal{B}^*y_i, y_i), J^*\phi] \longrightarrow [(\mathcal{B}^*y, y), J^*\phi]$$

since $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}^*$, $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{C}^* \subset \mathcal{A}^*$. Since $\mathcal{C} \supset N(J) = \mathcal{A}$,

$$-\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}^\perp \subset N(J)^\perp = \mathcal{A}^\perp = -\mathcal{A}^*.$$

Since $N(J)^\perp = R(J^*)$, (because J is regular!), it follows that $-\mathcal{C}^* \subset R(J^*)$. Hence we can select ϕ so that $J^*\phi$ is an arbitrary member (z, \mathcal{A}^*z) in $G(-\mathcal{C}^*)$. Then (3.2) can be written

$$[\mathcal{B}^*y_i, z] - [y_i, \mathcal{A}^*z] \longrightarrow [\mathcal{B}^*y, z] - [y, \mathcal{A}^*z].$$

Since all the terms on the left vanish it follows that $(y, \mathcal{B}^*y) \in G(\mathcal{C})$ so that $\gamma \in J(G(\mathcal{C}))$ and $J(G(\mathcal{C}))$ is weakly closed.

Now suppose $J(G(\mathcal{C}))$ is closed. Let $(y, \mathcal{B}^*y) \in \overline{G(\mathcal{C})}$. Then there is a sequence $\langle y_i, \mathcal{B}^*y_i \rangle$ in $G(\mathcal{C})$ converging to (y, \mathcal{B}^*y) . By the (weak) continuity of J ,

$$[J(y_i, \mathcal{B}^*y_i), \phi] \longrightarrow [J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y), \phi]$$

for all ϕ in F^* . This implies that $J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y)$ is a limit point of $J(G(\mathcal{C}))$ and hence belongs to $J(G(\mathcal{C}))$. Since $J^{-1}J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y) \equiv G(\mathcal{C}) \bmod G(\mathcal{A})$, $(y, \mathcal{B}^*y) \in G(\mathcal{C})$. \square

The next two results generalize the Greens formula—Theorem 1.2, derived in [3] for finite dimensional F . Together they will serve as the foundations of our extension theory.

THEOREM 3.5. *There exists a 1-1 continuous operator $\hat{\mathcal{B}}: G \rightarrow F^*$ such that*

$$(3.3) \quad [\mathcal{B}^*y, z] - [y, \mathcal{A}^*z] = [J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y), \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^*z)].$$

Proof. Fix an element (α, β) in $G(\mathcal{A}^*)$. Then $[\mathcal{B}^*y, \alpha] - [y, \beta]$ is a functional $\psi_{\alpha\beta}$ continuous on $G(\mathcal{B}^*)$ whose null space contains $N(J)$. Consequently by Lemma 3.1 $\kappa(\alpha, \beta) := \psi_{\alpha\beta}J^{-1}$ is well-defined and

$$(3.4) \quad [\mathcal{B}^*y, \alpha] - [y, \beta] = \kappa(\alpha, \beta) \circ J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y).$$

We now show that $\kappa(\alpha, \beta) \in F^*$. Suppose $\langle \gamma_i \rangle$ is a weakly convergent net with limit γ in F . Since J is onto, there exists a net $\langle y_i, \mathcal{B}^*y_i \rangle$ and a pair (y, \mathcal{B}^*y) such that $J(y_i, \mathcal{B}^*y_i) = \gamma_i$ and $J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y) = \gamma$. Hence by the weak convergence of $\langle \gamma_i \rangle$

$$[J(y_i, \mathcal{B}^*y_i), \phi] \longrightarrow [J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y), \phi]$$

for all ϕ in $F^* := D(J^*)$. Taking adjoints yields

$$[(y_i, \mathcal{B}^* y_i), J^* \phi] \longrightarrow [(y, \mathcal{B}^* y), J^* \phi].$$

By Lemma 3.3 $R(J^*) = G(-\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}$. Hence, choosing ϕ so that $J^* \phi = (-\beta, \alpha)$,

$$(3.5) \quad [\mathcal{B}^* y_i, \alpha] - [y_i, \beta] \longrightarrow [\mathcal{B}^* y, \alpha] - [y, \beta].$$

Putting (3.4) and (3.5) together we conclude that $\kappa(\alpha, \beta) \circ \gamma_n \rightarrow \kappa(\alpha, \beta) \circ \gamma$. Thus $\kappa(\alpha, \beta) \in F^*$. (3.4) also shows that the mapping $(\alpha, \beta) \xrightarrow{\hat{\kappa}} \kappa(\alpha, \beta)$ is linear and continuous with respect to the graph topology on $G(\mathcal{A}^*)$ and the weak* topology of F^* . Further $(\alpha, \beta) \in G(\mathcal{B})$ if and only if $\tilde{J}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. In this case $[J(y, \mathcal{B}^* y), \kappa(\alpha, \beta)] = 0$ on $G(\mathcal{B}^*)$. Since J is onto, $(\alpha, \beta) \in N(\hat{\kappa})$. By Lemma 3.1 there exists an operator $\hat{\mathcal{B}}: G \rightarrow F^*$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{B}} \circ \tilde{J} = \hat{\kappa}$ so that from (3.4)

$$(3.6) \quad [\mathcal{B}^* y, \alpha] - [y, \beta] = (\hat{\mathcal{B}} \circ \tilde{J}(\alpha, \beta)) \circ J(y, \mathcal{B}^* y).$$

To derive the Greens relation (3.3) it remains to show that $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ has the stated continuity properties. Let $\langle g_i \rangle$ be a net in G converging to g . We write $g_i = \tilde{J}(\alpha_i, \mathcal{A}^* \alpha_i)$ and $g = \tilde{J}(\alpha, \mathcal{A}^* \alpha)$. Then

$$[\tilde{J}(\alpha_i, \mathcal{A}^* \alpha_i), \phi] \longrightarrow [\tilde{J}(\alpha, \mathcal{A}^* \alpha), \phi]$$

for all ϕ in G^* . Taking adjoints yields

$$(3.7) \quad [(\alpha_i, \mathcal{A}^* \alpha_i), \tilde{J}^* \phi] \longrightarrow [(\alpha, \mathcal{A}^* \alpha), \tilde{J}^* \phi].$$

Since $G(-\mathcal{B}^*)^{-1} = R(\tilde{J}^*)$ (Lemma 3.3) (3.7) can be written

$$[\mathcal{B}^* y, \alpha_i] - [y, \mathcal{A}^* \alpha_i] \longrightarrow [\mathcal{B}^* y, \alpha] - [y, \mathcal{A}^* \alpha]$$

on $G(\mathcal{B}^*)$. Thus from (3.6)

$$(\hat{\mathcal{B}} \circ g_i) \circ J(y, \mathcal{B}^* y) \longrightarrow (\hat{\mathcal{B}} \circ g) \circ J(y, \mathcal{B}^* y).$$

Since $J(y, \mathcal{B}^* y)$ is an arbitrary element of F , $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is continuous. Finally $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is 1-1 for if $\hat{\mathcal{B}} \tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^* z) = 0$ and (3.3) is true, then $(z, \mathcal{A}^* z) \in G(\mathcal{B})$, implying $\tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^* z) = 0$.

COROLLARY 3.6. *Suppose $X = Y$ is a Hilbert space (" \mathcal{H} ") and $\mathcal{B}^* = \mathcal{A}^*$ so that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}^*$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is skew-hermitian. Since the argument is no different from the proof in [3] (Lemma 4.2), we do not repeat it.*

The previous theorem has shown that given regular \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} and certain conditions on J , \tilde{J} then a Green's relation may be constructed.

However, in many applications the Green's formula is already known. The following theorem therefore is sort of a converse of Theorem 3.5 and shows that in certain circumstances given a Green's formula, \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are regular.

THEOREM 3.7. *Let W, Z be linear spaces and suppose $J: X \times Y \rightarrow W$, $\tilde{J}: Y^* \times X^* \rightarrow Z$ are linear operators with domains $G(\mathcal{B}^*)$ and $G(\mathcal{A}^*)$ respectively. Suppose further that there is a 1-1 operator $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ from $R(\tilde{J})$ onto a total space of functionals over $R(J)$ such that*

$$(3.8) \quad [\mathcal{B}^*y, z] - [y, \mathcal{A}^*z] = [J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y), \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^*z)].$$

Then J and \tilde{J} are regular boundary operators \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .

Proof. We regard $R(J)$ as a l.c.t.v.s. F under the weak topology determined by $R(\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}) := F^*$ and F^* as a l.c.t.v.s. endowed with the weak* topology determined by F . (3.8) implies that $J: G(\mathcal{B}^*) \rightarrow F$ and $\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}: G(\mathcal{A}^*) \rightarrow F^*$ are continuous. Hence \mathcal{B}_J^* and $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}}^* = \mathcal{A}_J^*$ are closed. (3.8) also shows that $\mathcal{B}_J^* \subset \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{**}$ and $\mathcal{A}^* \subset \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^{**}$. On the other hand if $(y, \mathcal{B}^*y) \in G(\mathcal{A})$

$$(3.9) \quad [J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y), \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^*z)] = 0$$

for all elements of $G(\mathcal{A}^*)$. Our assumption of totalness implies that $(y, \mathcal{B}^*y) \in G(\mathcal{B}_J^*)$. Hence $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}_J^*$ and the two relations are equal. Similarly if $(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) \in G(\mathcal{B})$ (3.9) holds for all elements of $G(\mathcal{B}^*)$ —i.e., on $R(J)$. This means (since F is automatically total over F^*) that $\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) = 0$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is 1-1, $J(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) = 0$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_J^*$. Since J is continuous, standard theory implies that J^* exists and $D(J^*) = F^*$. We now show that $R(J^*) = G((- \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1})$ (showing in particular that $R(J^*)$ is closed). To see this we rewrite (3.8) in the form

$$[G(\mathcal{B}^*), (-\mathcal{A}_\alpha^*, \alpha) - J^*\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\alpha^*)] = 0$$

for fixed $(\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\alpha^*)$ in $G(\mathcal{A}^*)$. It follows that

$$(3.10) \quad (-\mathcal{A}_\alpha^*, \alpha) - J^*\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\alpha^*) \subset G((- \mathcal{B})^{-1}),$$

so that

$$J^*\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\alpha^*) \subset G(-\mathcal{A}^{*-1})$$

showing that $R(J^*) \subset G(-\mathcal{A}^{*-1})$. However from what was proven above $(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) \in G(\mathcal{B})$ if and only if $\tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) = 0$. This and (3.8) shows that $J^*(0) = G(-\mathcal{B}^{-1})$. Therefore from (3.10)

$$(\mathcal{A}_\alpha^*, \alpha) \in J^*\hat{\mathcal{B}}(\tilde{J}(\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\alpha^*))$$

for any α . Thus $G(-\mathcal{A}^{*-1}) \subset R(J^*)$ and we conclude that $R(J^*) = G(-\mathcal{A}^{*-1})$. We now consider the operator \tilde{J} . As noted previously F is automatically a total family of functionals over $F^* := R(\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J})$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is 1-1 the pairing

$$(3.11) \quad [f, \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^*z)], \quad f \in F$$

induces a total family of functionals in $G := R(J)$. Thus the usual way G and F can be regarded as mutually dual l.c.t.v.s. with respect to the pairing (3.11). The operator $\hat{\mathcal{B}}: G \rightarrow F^*$ is automatically continuous. Its adjoint $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*: F \rightarrow F^*$ exists and is continuous. $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*$ is defined by the equation

$$f \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*} [f, \hat{\mathcal{B}}(\cdot)].$$

Also, $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*$ is trivially onto and 1-1. In terms of $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*$ we can write the Green's relation (3.8) as

$$[\mathcal{B}^*y, z] - [y, \mathcal{A}^*z] = [\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y), \tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}z)].$$

Here $R(\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*J)$ defines a total family of functionals over \tilde{J} . By reasoning paralleling that for J in the first part of the proof, we can prove that \tilde{J} is a regular boundary operator. \square

REMARK 3.8. In most practical cases $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*$ is known and we need not formally define it as has been done in the previous theorem.

To develop an extension theory paralleling the finite dimensional case, it is necessary to put a further restriction on the intermediate relation \mathcal{C} . At this point we assume that in addition to being regular $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{B}_{D,J}^*$ where $D: F \rightarrow F$ is a weakly continuous operator. Let us call such \mathcal{C} (or the boundary operator defining it) "admissible".

The connection between this assumption and the assumption of regularity is made clear by the following lemma.

LEMMA 3.9. *Suppose $D: F \rightarrow F$ is a weakly continuous operator. Then DJ is regular if and only if D^* has closed range.*

Proof. Since D is weakly continuous D^* exists and the domain of $D^* = F^*$. This implies that $(DJ)^* = J^*D^*$. For if y is in the domain of $(DJ)^*$

$$[Jx, D^*y] = [x, J^*D^*y] = [x, (DJ)^*y]$$

so that $J^*D^*y = (DJ)^*y$ and thus $J^*D^* \supset (DJ)^*$. On the other hand the reverse inclusion is trivial. Now suppose that D^* has closed range. Let λ_i be a net in $R(DJ)^*$ converging to λ . Then $\lambda_i =$

$(DJ)^*\phi_i$. Further

$$[\theta, (DJ)^*\phi_i] = [\theta, J^*D^*\phi_i] \longrightarrow [\theta, \lambda]$$

for all θ in F . Since $\lambda_i \in R(J^*)$ and J^* has closed range, (recall J is assumed regular) $\lambda = J^*\eta$. Hence

$$[J\theta, D^*\phi_i] \longrightarrow [J\theta, \eta].$$

Since J is onto and D^* has closed range, $\eta = D^*\phi$. It follows that

$$\lambda = J^*D^*\phi = (DJ)^*\phi.$$

So $(DJ)^*$ has closed range. Conversely if $(DJ)^*$ has closed range and $\lambda_i = D^*\phi_i \rightarrow \lambda$ is a net in $R(D^*)$, then

$$[J\theta, D^*\phi_i] \longrightarrow [J\theta, \lambda].$$

So that

$$[\theta, (DJ)^*\phi_i] \longrightarrow [\theta, J^*\lambda].$$

Hence

$$J^*\lambda = (DJ)^*\phi = J^*D^*\phi$$

implying since J^* is 1-1 that $\lambda = D^*\phi$. □

We can now prove our main result concerning admissible relations.

THEOREM 3.10. *Suppose \mathcal{C} is admissible. Then*

$$G(\mathcal{C}^*) = \{(z, \mathcal{A}^*z): \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) \in R(\mathcal{D}^*)\}.$$

Proof. By Green's relation $(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) \in \mathcal{C}^*$ if and only if

$$(3.12) \quad [J(\mathcal{C}), \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^*z)] = 0,$$

that is,

$$\mathcal{C}^* = \{(z, \mathcal{A}^*z): \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) \in J(\mathcal{C})^\perp\}.$$

By hypothesis $N(DJ) = \mathcal{C}$ so that $N(\mathcal{D}) = J(\mathcal{C})$ because J is surjective. Thus

$$(3.13) \quad J(\mathcal{C})^\perp = N(D)^\perp = R(D^*)$$

because \mathcal{C} is admissible and $R(D^*)$ is closed by Lemma 3.9. □

If \mathcal{C} is regular but not admissible we have the following result.

COROLLARY 3.11. $\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(\mathcal{C}^*) = \overline{R(D^*)}$.

If \mathcal{E} is not regular we can still say something about \mathcal{E}^* .

COROLLARY 3.12. *Two relations \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}^+ are mutually adjoint if and only if*

$$[J(G(\mathcal{E})), \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(G(\mathcal{E}^+))] = 0.$$

Proof. This follows from (3.12) above. □

COROLLARY 3.13. *Suppose $\overline{R(D^*)}$ is complemented and \mathcal{E} is regular. Then $G(\mathcal{E}^*)$ is characterized by the adjoint boundary condition*

$$(3.14) \quad (I - P)\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}(G(\mathcal{E}^*)) = 0$$

where P is the projection on $\overline{R(D^*)}$.

COROLLARY 3.14. *If \mathcal{E} is admissible and $R(D^*)$ is complemented, then \mathcal{E}^* is admissible.*

Proof. Looking at the boundary condition (3.14) characterizing \mathcal{E}^* we must prove that $T := ((I - P)\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J})^*$ has closed range. Now

$$((I - P)\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J})^* = \tilde{J}^*\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*(I - P)^*.$$

It is also easily shown that $I - P^*$ is a (weakly continuous) projection on $N(D)$.

Let $\lambda_i := T\phi_i$ be a net $\rightarrow \lambda$ in $R(T)$ since $\lambda_i \in R(\tilde{J}^*)$ and $R(\tilde{J}^*)$ is closed (J being admissible) $\lambda = \tilde{J}_\eta^*$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*$ is onto, $\eta = \hat{\mathcal{B}}^*\psi$. Thus

$$[T\phi_i, \theta] \longrightarrow [\tilde{J}^*\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*\psi, \theta]$$

or

$$(-(I - P^*)\phi_i, \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}\theta) \longrightarrow [\psi, \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}\theta]$$

for all θ in F^* . Since $\hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}$ runs over F^* and $N(D)$ is (weakly) closed, $\psi = (I - P^*)\phi$. Going backwards these facts imply that $\lambda = T\psi$ so that T has closed range. □

Self-adjoint and symmetric extensions. Suppose $X = Y = \mathcal{H}$, $F = G = H$ where \mathcal{H} and H are Hilbert spaces and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$. In this case \mathcal{A} is symmetric and $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is skew-Hermitian. We wish to characterize self-adjoint and symmetric extensions \mathcal{E} of \mathcal{A} .

Suppose \mathcal{E} is admissible and regular then:

THEOREM 3.15. *Let P be the orthogonal projection onto $N(\mathcal{D})$. Then \mathcal{C} is antisymmetric, i.e., $\mathcal{C} \supset \mathcal{C}^*$ if and only if $N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}) \subset N(D)$ and \mathcal{C} is self-adjoint if and only if $N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = N(D)$.*

Proof. We have $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{A}^*)_{DJ}$ and, by Corollary 3.13, $\mathcal{C}^* = (\mathcal{A}^*)_{P\hat{\mathcal{B}}J}$, so that $\mathcal{C} = N(DJ)$ and $\mathcal{C}^* = N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}J)$. Since J is surjective it follows that $J(\mathcal{C}) = N(D)$ and $J(\mathcal{C}^*) = N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}})$. Let $\mathcal{C} \supset \mathcal{C}^*$. Then $J(\mathcal{C}) \supset J(\mathcal{C}^*)$ and so $N(D) \supset N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}})$. Conversely, let $N(D) \supset N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}})$. Then $N(DJ) \supset N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}J)$ so that $\mathcal{C} \supset \mathcal{C}^*$. The second assertion follows from the foregoing lines after replacing the inclusion signs by equality signs. \square

COROLLARY 3.16. *Suppose P is an orthogonal projection with the property that $P\hat{\mathcal{B}}P = 0$. Then the intermediate admissible relation \mathcal{C} determined by DJ where $D = P\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is antisymmetric and is self-adjoint if and only if $N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = R(P)$.*

Proof. Let Q be the orthogonal projection onto $N(D)$. Then $P\hat{\mathcal{B}}P = 0$ implies that $N(Q\hat{\mathcal{B}}) \subset N(D)$ so that by Theorem 3.15 \mathcal{C} is antisymmetric. To see that $N(Q\hat{\mathcal{B}}) \subset N(D)$, let $x \in N(Q\hat{\mathcal{B}})$. Then $Q\hat{\mathcal{B}}x = 0$ so that $\hat{\mathcal{B}}x \in N(D)^\perp = R(D^*)$ since \mathcal{C} is admissible (see Lemma 3.9). Hence

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*x = -\hat{\mathcal{B}}x = -D^*y = -\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*Py \quad \text{for some } y.$$

Here we used the fact that $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is skew-hermitian. Since $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*$ is 1-1 we have that $x = -Py$ so that $P\hat{\mathcal{B}}x = -D\hat{\mathcal{B}}Py = 0$ showing that $N(Q\hat{\mathcal{B}}) \subset N(D)$. The second assertion of the corollary follows from the second assertion of Theorem 3.15 once we have proved that $N(Q\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = N(D)$ if and only if $N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = R(P)$. Assume the first equality. If $x \in N(P)$ then $x \in N(Q)$ and hence

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}x \in N(D)^\perp = R(D^*) = R(\hat{\mathcal{B}}D).$$

It follows that $\hat{\mathcal{B}}x = \hat{\mathcal{B}}Py$ for some y . Since $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is 1-1 we have $x \in Py \in R(D)$. Hence $N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}) \subset R(P)$. Clearly $P\hat{\mathcal{B}}P = 0$ implies $R(P) \supset N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}})$ so that $N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = R(P)$. Now assume $N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = R(P)$. If $x \in N(Q\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = N(D)$, then

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}x \in N(D)^\perp = N(\hat{\mathcal{B}})^\perp = R(P)^\perp = N(P)$$

so that $x \in N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = N(D)$. Hence $N(Q\hat{\mathcal{B}}) \subset N(D)$. The converse inclusion can be proved in a similar way.

COROLLARY 3.17. *Let S be a closed subspace of H . Then if*

$\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}^*$ is determined by the condition $[J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y), s] = 0 \quad s \in S$. \mathcal{C} is self-adjoint if and only if $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*$ maps S^\perp onto S .

Proof. Let D be the orthogonal projection onto S . Then $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{A}^*)_{D\mathcal{S}}$. Since D is continuous and $R(D^*) = R(D) = S$ is closed, \mathcal{C} is admissible. Now by Theorem 3.15 \mathcal{C} is self-adjoint if and only if $N((I - D)\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = N(D)$. Taking orthogonal complements we see that \mathcal{C} is self-adjoint if and only if $R(\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*(I - D)) = R(D)$. Here we use the fact that $R(\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*(I - D))$ is closed because of Corollaries (3.14), (3.13) and Lemma 3.9. The last equality is equivalent to $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*S^\perp$.

Note that since $\hat{\mathcal{B}}^*$ is 1-1 and onto a necessary condition that \mathcal{C} be self-adjoint is that $\dim S^\perp = \dim S$.

COROLLARY 3.18. *Let S be a (weak*) complemented subspace of F^* . Then if \mathcal{C} is the restriction of \mathcal{B}^* determined by the condition $[J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y), s] = 0 \quad s \in S$. \mathcal{C}^* is the restriction of \mathcal{A}^* determined by the condition $[s', \hat{\mathcal{B}}J(z, \mathcal{A}^*z)], s' \in S^\perp$.*

Proof. The condition determining \mathcal{C} can be written $P^*J(y, \mathcal{B}^*y) = 0$ where P is the projection on S . By Theorem 3.10 $(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) \in G(\mathcal{C}^*)$ if and only if $\hat{\mathcal{B}}J(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) \in R(P)$. Equivalently

$$(I - P)\hat{\mathcal{B}}J(z, \mathcal{A}^*z) = 0,$$

or

$$[v(I - P^*), \hat{\mathcal{B}}J(z, \mathcal{A}^*z)], \quad v \in F,$$

or

$$[s', \hat{\mathcal{B}}J(z, \mathcal{A}^*z)], \quad s' \in S^\perp.$$

4. Extension theory via Fredholm alternatives. In the previous section we have attempted to characterize extensions \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}^* in terms of their boundary operators. In this section we pursue a different strategy by describing \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}^* “parametrically”—by relating \mathcal{C} to a “known” extension \mathcal{C} and then describing \mathcal{C} in terms of certain subspaces S_\circ, S_\circ^* .

We assume throughout the setting of Theorem 2.2. Recall that $A: X \rightarrow Y$ and $B: Y^* \rightarrow X^*$ are closed operators such that $A \subset B^*$ and $N(A^*), N(B^*)$ are complemented subspaces of X . H and K are boundary operators (cf. Definition 2.1) for A and B respectively such that $H = M \circ A$ and $K = N \circ B$. The operators M and N have ranges in the t.v.s.s. F and G . $\overline{D(M)}^\perp$ and $\overline{D(N)}^\perp$ are complemented in Y^* and $D(M^*), D(N^*)$ are total over F and G . Under these hypotheses

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} G(A_H^*) &= G(A^*) - \overline{(R(M^*)} \times \{0\}) \\ G(B_K^*) &= G(B^*) - (R(N^*) \times \{0\}). \end{aligned}$$

We will often use the notation $(z, A^*\bar{z})$ or $(z, C\bar{z})$ if $C \subset A^*$ where \bar{z} means $z + \psi$ for an appropriately chosen element in $\overline{R(M^*)}$ to refer to an element in $G(A_H^*)$ or in the graph of a certain restriction of A_H^* . Similarly $(y, B^*\bar{y})$ will denote an element of $G(B_K^*)$.

Next suppose C is closed extension A contained in B^* . Let S_c and S_c^* be closed subspaces of $\overline{R(N^*)}$ and $\overline{R(M^*)}$. Define C' as the restriction of C whose range is orthogonal to S_c^* and let \mathcal{C} be the linear relation in $X \times Y$ with graph $G(\mathcal{C}) = G(C') - (S_c \times \{0\})$. We shall say that \mathcal{C} is determined by S_c , S_c^* , and \mathcal{C} . From (4.1) $C \subset B_K^*$. Clearly $A_H \subset A \subset C$. Also $R(A_H)$ is orthogonal to $N(A_H^*)$ and therefore also to S_c^* . Hence $A_H \subset C'$. Since $C' \subset C$ we conclude that $A_H \subset C \subset B_K^*$.

At this point we introduce a new assumption: that every closed subspace of $N(A^*)$ or $N(B^*)$ is complemented.³ This will certainly be true if $N(A^*)$ and $N(B^*)$ is finite dimensional or the setting is in a Hilbert space.

C' is easily shown to be closed (see Lemma 4.13 [3]). $N(C') = N(C)$ and is a closed subspace of $N(B^*)$. Since it is complemented

$$S_c = S_c \cap N(C') \oplus S_c \cap N(C')^\circ.$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned} G(C) &= G(C') + ((S_c \cap N(C') \oplus S_c \cap N(C')^\circ) \times \{0\}) \\ &= G(C') + ((S_c \cap N(C')^\circ) \times \{0\}). \end{aligned}$$

The intersection of $G(C')$ and $N((C')^\circ) \times \{0\}$ is clearly trivial. If Q is a projection of X onto $N(C')^\circ$ we define a projection \tilde{Q} from $X \times Y$ to $N(C')^\circ \times \{0\}$ by $\tilde{Q}(x, y) := (Qx, 0)$. It follows that $(S_c \cap N(C')) \times \{0\} \subset R(\tilde{Q})$ and $G(C') \subset N(\tilde{Q})$. Since both $(S_c \cap N(C')) \times \{0\}$ and $G(C')$ are closed and contained in complementary subspaces $G(C)$ must be closed.

These remarks prove the first part of the following result.

THEOREM 4.1. *Suppose every closed subspace of $N(A^*)$ or $N(B^*)$ is complemented and let C be an extension of A contained in B^* . Then for every pair of closed subspaces $S_c \subset \overline{R(N^*)}$ and $S_c^* \subset \overline{R(M^*)}$, there exists a closed extension \mathcal{C} of A_H contained in B_K^* determined by C , S_c and S_c^* . Moreover, its adjoint \mathcal{C}^* is determined by C^* , S_c^* and S_c ; i.e., $S_{c^*} = S_c^*$ and $S_{c^*}^* = S_c$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to show that \mathcal{C}^* is determined by C^* , S_c^* and S_c . By repeating the argument for the first part of the theorem we can show that there is an extension \mathcal{C}^+ of B_K contained in A_H^* determined by C^* , S_c^* and S_c . Suppose $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Since

³ This assumption needs to be introduced to correct an error in the discussion of Theorem 4.13 in [3]. The argument we give here works with minor changes there.

$\mathcal{C}^* \subset A_H^* \beta \in A^* \bar{\alpha}$. Further

$$(4.2) \quad [\mathcal{C}y, \alpha] - [y, \mathcal{C}^* \alpha] = 0 = [C\bar{y}, \bar{\alpha}] - [\bar{y}, A^* \bar{\alpha}] - [C\bar{y}, \psi_\alpha] - [\eta_y, A^* \bar{\alpha}]$$

for all $y \in D(\mathcal{C})$, where $\psi_\alpha \in \overline{R(M^*)}$ and $\eta_y \in \overline{R(N^*)}$. Now

$$\psi_\alpha \in N(\mathcal{C}^*) = R(\mathcal{C})^\perp = R(C)^\perp$$

and

$$\eta_y \in N(\mathcal{C}) = R(\mathcal{C}^*)^\perp = R(A^* \bar{z})^\perp, \quad z \in D(\mathcal{C}^*)$$

showing that $\psi_\alpha \in S_c^*$, $\eta_y \in S_c$. The last two terms of (4.2) vanish, so that $(\bar{\alpha}, A^* \bar{\alpha}) \in G(C^*)$. We conclude that $\mathcal{C}^* \subset \mathcal{C}^+$. The reverse inclusion follows, since

$$[\mathcal{C}y, z] - [y, \mathcal{C}^+ z] = [C\bar{y}, \bar{z}] - [\bar{y}, C^* \bar{z}] - [C\bar{y}, \psi_z] + [\eta_y, C^* \bar{z}] = 0.$$

It is natural to attempt to determine the class of extensions between A_H and B_K^* determined by a C between A and B^* and a pair of subspaces S_c and S_c^* . In particular when does this class equal all extensions between A_H and B_K^* ? We have not settled these questions in general but there are interesting partial results (already sketched in [3]) for extensions with closed range or in a Hilbert space setting when A is symmetric.

LEMMA 4.2. *Suppose C is an extension of A_H contained in B^* with closed range. Then there is a closed subspace S_c^* of $\overline{R(M^*)}$ and an extension \tilde{C} between A and B^* such that C is determined by \tilde{C} , $\{0\}$, and S_c^* .*

Proof. Define \tilde{C} such that

$$G(\tilde{C}) = \{(y, B^*y): y \in D(B_c^*) \oplus N(C), B^*y \perp (R(C)^\perp \cap N(A^*))\}$$

where B_c^* is the restriction of B^* to $D(B^*) \cap N(B^*)^\circ$. Now \tilde{C} is closed (cf. Lemma 4.12 [3]). Also $C \subset \tilde{C}$. Set $S_c^* := R(C)^\perp \cap N(A^*)^\circ$. Let

$$G(C^+) = \{(y, \tilde{C}y): \tilde{C}y \perp S_c^*\}.$$

Suppose $(\alpha, \beta) \in G(C)$. Since $R(C) \subset S_c^{*\perp}$ and $C \subset \tilde{C}$, $(\alpha, \beta) \in G(C^+)$ and $C \subset C^+$. On the other hand if $(\alpha, \beta) \in G(C^+)$

$$\beta \perp (S_c^* + (R(C^\perp) \cap N(A^*))) = R(C^\perp),$$

so that $\beta \in R(C)$ (since C has closed range). If $(\alpha', \beta) \in G(C)$ we find by subtraction that $\alpha - \alpha' \in N(\tilde{C}) = N(C)$ so that $\alpha \in D(C)$ proving that $C^+ \subset C$. \square

LEMMA 4.3. *Suppose that \mathcal{E} is an extension of A_H contained in B_K^* with closed range. Then there is an extension C of A_H contained in B^* and a closed space $S_c \subset \overline{R(N^*)}$ such that \mathcal{E} is determined by C , S_c , and $\{0\}$.*

Proof. The argument is similar to that of Lemma 4.2. Define C by

$$G(C) := \{(\bar{y}, B^*\bar{y}) : y \in D(\mathcal{E})\}.$$

That is, $G(C) = (y + \psi, B^*(y + \psi))$ when y runs over $D(\mathcal{E})$ and ψ is an element in $\overline{R(N^*)}$ such that $y + \psi \in D(B^*)$. One checks that C is an operator restriction of B^* but perhaps not closed. Set $S_c := N(\mathcal{E}) \cap \overline{R(N^*)}$. Define C^+ by

$$(4.3) \quad G(C^+) := \{(z, B^*z) : z \in D(B_c^*) \oplus N(C), B^*z \perp N(\mathcal{E}^*)\}.$$

Since $N(C) \subset N(B^*)$ is assumed to be closed, it is easy to show (Lemma 4.12, [3]) that C^+ is closed. Also

$$D(C) = D(C) \cap N(B^*)^\circ \oplus D(C) \cap N(B^*) \subset D(B_c^*) + N(C).$$

And $R(C) \perp N(C^*)$ since $R(C) = R(\mathcal{E})$. It follows that $C \subset C^+$. Since $R(\mathcal{E})$ is closed by the Fredholm alternative, we have

$$R(C) = R(C^+) = N(C^*)^\perp.$$

So $R(C^+) = R(C)$. Suppose $(\alpha, \beta) \in G(C^+)$ then $\beta = C\alpha'$ for some $\alpha' \in D(C)$. Hence

$$(\alpha' - \alpha, 0) \in N(C^+).$$

By (4.3) $N(C^+) = N(C)$. Hence $(\alpha, \beta) \in G(C)$, so that $C^+ \subset C$ and the two operators are equal. (This also shows the incidental fact not obvious from the definition that C is closed.) Since $D(A_H) \subset D(B_c^*)$, $N(\mathcal{E}^*) \subset N(A_H^*)$ and $R(A_H) \perp N(\mathcal{E}^*)$ so that $A_H \subset C^+$. By definition \mathcal{E} is determined by C , S_c , $\{0\}$. \square

THEOREM 4.4. *Suppose \mathcal{E} is an extension of A_H contained in B_K^* with closed range. Then there is an extension $A \subset C \subset B^*$ and closed subspaces $S_c \subset \overline{R(N^*)}$, $S_c^* \subset \overline{R(M^*)}$ such that \mathcal{E} is determined by C , S_c and S_c^* .*

Proof. By Lemma 4.2 there exists $A_H \subset C' \subset B^*$ with closed range and closed $S_c \subset \overline{R(N^*)}$ determining \mathcal{E} . By Lemma 4.4 there exists $A \subset C \subset B^*$ and closed $S_c^* \subset \overline{R(M^*)}$ determining \mathcal{E}' . \square

COROLLARY 4.5. *Suppose $R(B^*)$ is closed. Then every extension*

$A_H \subset \mathcal{E} \subset B_K^*$ with complemented nullspace is characterized according to Theorem 4.4.

Proof. If $R(\mathcal{E}) = R(B^*)$ we can apply Theorem 4.4. If $R(\mathcal{E}) \subset R(B^*)$ we observe that \mathcal{E}_e (the restriction of \mathcal{E} to $D(\mathcal{E}) \cap N(\mathcal{E})^\circ$) is 1-1, closed, and has a bounded inverse. It is well-known that these conditions imply that \mathcal{E}_e has closed range (cf. Goldberg [10], Lemma IV. 1.1). \square

In the Hilbert space setting these special hypotheses are no longer needed. We close this section by quoting some results concerning self-adjoint extensions of a symmetric A proved in [3].

THEOREM 4.6. *Let A be a symmetric operator defined on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Then if A has a self-adjoint extension C , for each closed subspace S of $R(M^*)$ there exists a self-adjoint extension \mathcal{E}_s of A_H such that*

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{E}_s) &= \{y \in D(C) - S : A^* \bar{y} \perp S\} \\ G(\mathcal{E}_s) &= \{(y, A^* \bar{y}) : y \in D(\mathcal{E}_s)\} . \end{aligned}$$

THEOREM 4.7. *Let A be a symmetric operator defined on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Suppose \mathcal{E} is a self-adjoint extension of A_H . Then A has a self-adjoint extension C . Moreover if $S := R(\mathcal{E})$, \mathcal{E} is the self-adjoint extension \mathcal{E}_s determined by C and S given by Theorem 4.4.*

THEOREM 4.8. *Suppose A is a symmetric operator on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with equal deficiency indices. Let $R(H)$ be a Hilbert space and let the hypotheses of Corollary 2.3 be satisfied. Further let S be a closed subspace of $R(H)$. Then A_H has a self-adjoint extension determined by the boundary conditions*

$$[HA^+(A^* \bar{z}), \phi] = 0, \quad \phi \in S, \quad \bar{z} \in C$$

where C is a self-adjoint extension of A .

5. Examples. In this section we present a few examples to illustrate some of the main idea in the previous sections.

1. Differential operators with Stieltjes boundary conditions on compact intervals. Let $ly = y^{(n)} + a_1 y^{(n-1)} + \dots + a_n y$ be an n th order regular differential operator on $[a, b]$ ($a_i = C^{n-1}[a, b]$, all i). We let ly generate a 1-1 closed operator in $L^p[a, b]$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned} D &:= \{y \in L^p[a, b] \cap AC^{n-1}[a, b] : y^{(j)}(a) = y^{(j)}(b) = 0, \\ &\quad j = 0, \dots, n-1, ly \in L^p[a, b]\} \end{aligned}$$

where $AC^{n-1}[a, b]$ is the space of functions on $[a, b]$ having a $n - 1$ st absolutely continuous derivative, and defining A by ly on D . We restrict A by the system of boundary conditions

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \int_a^b dw_{ij} y^{(n-i)} = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

where the $\{dw_{ij}\}$ are a family of Stieltjes measures each of finite variation on (a, b) . It will be understood that the boundary conditions are independent so that $F = R^m = F^*$. Also dw_{ij} , $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$, and for all i are singular with respect to Lebesgue measure. This assumption is made to keep the computations simple; in most cases it is not unduly restrictive. Since dw_{ij} has an absolutely continuous part dw_{ij}^c it satisfies

$$\int_a^b dw_{ij}^c y^{(n-j)} = \int_a^b \frac{dw_{ij}^c}{dt} y^{(n-j-1)} dt.$$

By assuming dw_{ij}^c/dt is also of bounded variation, etc., repeated integration by parts results in singular measures. Finally, we suppose that $dw_{nj}/dt \in L^2[a, b]$. Using the standard Euclidian pairing, we set $d\bar{w}_i = (dw_{ii} \dots dw_{im})^t$ and write

$$[Hy, \phi] = \phi^t \sum_{i=1}^n \int_a^b d\bar{w}_i y^{(n-i)}.$$

By the method of variation of parameters we can produce a Green's kernel $g(t, s)$ determining A^+ , i.e.,

$$A^+Ay = \int_a^t g(t, s)lyds$$

where $g(t, s)$ has the following properties (cf. [6], Ch. 7):

- (i) $D_i^{(j)}g(t, s)$ is continuous on $[a, b] \times [a, b]$, $j = 0, \dots, n - 2$;
- (ii) $g(t, s) = 0$, $t < s$;
- (iii) $D_i^jg(t, t^-) = 0$, $j = 0, \dots, n - 2$;
- (iv) $D_i^{(n-1)}g(t, t^-) = 1$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} [Hy, \phi] &= [HA^+Ay, \phi] \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \int_a^b dw_{ij} D_i^{(n-i)} \int_a^t g(t, s)lyds \phi_j \\ &= \phi^t \sum_i \int_a^b d\bar{w}_i D_i^{(n-i)} \int_a^t g(t, s)lyds. \end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} (5.1) \quad \sum_i \phi^t \left\{ \bar{w}_i[a, b] D_i^{(n-i)} \int_a^t g(t, s)lyds \right. \\ \left. - \int_a^b \left(\bar{w}_i[a, t] D_i^{(n-i+1)} \int_a^t g(t, s)lyds \right) dt \right\} \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \phi^t \left\{ \bar{w}_i[a, b] \int_a^b D_i^{(n-i)} g(t, s) \Big|_{t=b} ly ds \right. \\ \left. + \int_a^b \left(\bar{w}_i[a, t] \int_a^t D_i^{(n-i+1)} g(t, s) ly ds \right) + w_i[a, t] ly dt \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, interchanging the order of integration and rearrangement gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b ly \left\{ \phi^t \left(\sum_i (\bar{w}_i[a, b] D_i^{(n-i)} g(t, s) \Big|_{t=b}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \int_a^b (\bar{w}_i[a, t] D_i^{(n-i+1)} g(t, s) dt) + w_i[a, s] \right\} dt. \end{aligned}$$

The expression in brackets is $(HA^+)^* \phi$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (5.2) \quad D(A_H^+) &= D(A^*) - R(HA^+)^* \\ G(A_H^+) &= (z, l_n^+ \bar{z}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{z} = z + (HA^+)^* \phi$ and Corollary 2.2 says that $A_H^* = A_H^+$. The following description of A_H^* has been given in several previous papers (e.g., [1], [2]). Introduce the "partial adjoint" expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{l}_0^+ z &:= z \\ \tilde{l}_1^+ z &:= -(l_0^+ z + \phi^t \bar{w}_1[0, t])' + a_1 z \\ &\vdots \\ \tilde{l}_{j+1}^+ z &:= -(l_j^+ z + \phi^t \bar{w}_{j+1}[a, t])' + a_{j+1} z \\ &\vdots \\ \tilde{l}_n^+ z &:= -(l_{n-1}^+ z + \phi^t \bar{w}_n[a, t])' + a_n z. \end{aligned}$$

Let D^+ be the subspace of functions $z \in L^q[a, b]$ such that $\tilde{l}_j^+ z$ exists in $L^q[a, b]$ for appropriate ϕ in R^m and that $\tilde{l}_j^+ z + \phi^t \bar{w}_{j+1}[a, t]$, $j = 0, \dots, n-1$. Note that $D^+ \supset D(A^*) = D(l_n^+)$ and that $\tilde{l}_n^+ z = -l_n^+ z + \phi^t(d\bar{w}_n/dt)$. Now set

$$G(L^+) := \{(z, \tilde{l}_n^+ z) : z \in D^+\}.$$

THEOREM. $A_H^* = L^+$.

We now show that $L^+ = A_H^+$ so that these two characterizations of A_H^* are the same. We require a lemma.

LEMMA 5.1. $(HA^+)^* \phi - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j I^j \phi^t w_{j+1}[a, s] \in D(A^*)$ where I^j stands for the j fold integration operator

$$\int_a^{t_j} \int_a^{t_{j-1}} \dots \int_a^{t_0} (\cdot) dt_0, \dots, dt_{j-1}.$$

Proof. From (5.1) and (5.2) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} D^{(j)}(HA^+)^* &\equiv (-1)^j \phi^t w_{j+1}[a, s] D_i^{(n-j+1+j-1)} g(t, s)|_{t=s^+} \\ &\equiv (-1)^j \phi^t w_{j+1}[a, s] \pmod{AC[a, b]}, \\ &j = 0, \dots, n-1. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption $dw_n/ds \in L^q[a, b]$ and thus $D^{(n)}(HA^+)^* \phi \in L^q[a, b]$. The smoothness assumptions of the coefficients of l_n^+ imply that $D(A^*) = \{z \in AC^{n-1}[a, b]: z^{(n)} \in L^q[a, b]\}$. The lemma follows.

Now suppose $z \in D(A_H^+)$. A calculation (similar to the above) shows that

$$z - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j I^j \phi^t w_{j+1}[a, s] \in D(A^*).$$

By Lemma 5.1 it follows that $z \in D^+$ so that $D(A_H^+) \subset D^+$. Further, it is easy to verify using the singularity of the measures dw_1, \dots, dw_{n-1} that

$$l_n^+ \bar{z} = l_n^+ z + \phi^t \frac{d\bar{w}_n}{dt} = \tilde{l}_n^+ z$$

so that $A_H^+ \subset L^+$. On the other hand the following Green's formula involving L^+ can be proven by repeated integration by parts (cf. [2]).

$$\int_a^b (z l y - \tilde{l}_n^+ z y) dt = \phi^t H y.$$

2. *An operator with multipoint conditions on $[0, \infty)$.* Let $A: L^p[0, \infty) \rightarrow L^p[0, \infty)$ be given by $y^{(n)}$ on

$$\begin{aligned} D &:= \{y \in L^p[0, \infty) \cap AC^{n-1}[0, \infty): y^{(j)}(0) = 0, \\ &j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1, y^{(n)} \in L^p[0, \infty)\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is known that A is a 1-1 closed operator. Let $T = \{t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_j < \dots\}$ be an ordered set of points in $(0, \infty)$ and restrict A by the boundary conditions

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\eta_i} \alpha_{ij} y(t_{i+j}) = 0.$$

Let R^ω be the countable Cartesian product of R . We view elements of R^ω as infinite column vectors. Let $R_{\omega\omega}^\omega$ be the subspace of elements of R^ω with finitely many nonzero components. We set $F = R^\omega$ and $F^* = R_{\omega\omega}^\omega$, giving F and F^* respectively the weak and weak* topologies induced by the pairing

$$[f, g] = g^t f = \sum f_i g_i, f \in F, g \in F^*.$$

Then

$$Hy = \left\langle \sum_{j=0}^{\eta_i} \alpha_{ij} y(t_{i+j}) \right\rangle \in R^\omega.$$

Also

$$A^+z = \int_0^t \frac{(t-s)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} z ds$$

for $z \in R(A)$. Note that A^+ is not a bounded operator. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} [HA^+z, \phi] &= \phi^t \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{ij} \int_0^{t_{i+j}} \frac{(t_{i+j}-s)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} z ds \\ &= \int_0^\infty z \left\{ \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{ij} \frac{(t_{i+j}-s)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} + \phi_i \right\} ds, \\ &\quad i = 0, 1, \dots; \quad 0 \leq j \leq \eta_i. \\ x_+ &:= \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= [z, (HA^+)^*\phi]. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\eta \in \overline{R(HA^+)^*}$. Since $R(HA^+)^*$ restricted to some compact interval \mathcal{I} is a finite dimensional space and $\eta|_{\mathcal{I}} \in \overline{R(HA^+)^*}|_{\mathcal{I}}$,

$$\eta|_{\mathcal{I}} = \lambda(s)_{\mathcal{I}} \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{ij} \frac{(t_{i+j}-s)}{(n-1)!} + \tilde{\phi}_i.$$

Hence η has the same structure as an element in $R(HA^+)^*$ except that $\langle \tilde{\phi}_i \rangle \in R^\omega$ instead of R^ω_{oo} , i.e., the admissible parameters corresponding to $\overline{R(HA^+)^*}$ comprise some subspace of R^ω . What subspace this is an interesting question. We are able to answer it in some circumstances as will be shown in Example 3 below.

At any rate, Corollary 2.2 implies that

$$G(A_H^*) = \{(u, A^* \bar{u})\}$$

where A^* is given by $(-1)^n z^{(n)}$ on

$$\begin{aligned} D^* &= \{z \in L^q[0, \infty] \cap AC^{n-1}[0, \infty): \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_i (-1)^i z^{(n-i)} y^{(i)}(t) = 0, \\ &\quad y \in D(A); z^{(n)} \in L^q[0, \infty)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $u^{(j)} \in D(A_H^*)$, $i = 0, \dots, n-2$, is continuous, but that

$$z^{(n-1)}(t_i^+) - z^{(n-1)}(t_i^-) = - \sum_{j=0}^{\eta_i} \alpha_{ij} \phi_i.$$

3. Operators on R with interface conditions. Let $T = \{t_{i-1} < t_i < t_{i+1}\}$ be a biinfinite set of points in R . Set $\mathcal{I}_i = [t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $|\mathcal{I}_i| = t_{i+1} - t_i$, and

$$D_p^* := \{y \in L^p(R) \cap AC^{n-1}[A_i] \text{ all } i: y^{(n)} \in L^p(R)\}.$$

Define $B^*: L^p(R) \rightarrow L^p(R)$ by $y^{(n)}$ on D_p^* and $A^*: L^q(R) \rightarrow L^q(R)$ by $(-1)^n z^{(n)}$ on D_q , $1/p + 1/q = 1$. It can be shown that A is given by $y^{(n)}$ on

$$D_p \subset D_p^* := \{y \in L^p(R) \cap AC^{n-1}(R): y^{(j)}(t_i) = j = 0, \dots, n-1, \\ y^{(n)} \in L^p(R)\}.$$

Similarly B is given by $(-1)z^{(n)}$ on D_q .

Let \mathcal{S} be the space of biinfinite sequences $\langle \dots \phi_{i-1} < \phi_i < \phi_{i+1} \dots \rangle$ and $E: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ be the shift operator defined by $E\langle \phi_i \rangle = \langle \phi_{i+1} \rangle$. Introduce the notation for elements in \mathcal{S} :

$$y_-^j = \langle y^{(j)}(t_i^-) \rangle$$

$$y_+^j = \langle y^{(j)}(t_i^+) \rangle$$

and define $J: D_p^* \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ and $\tilde{J}: D_q^* \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ by

$$Jy = \begin{pmatrix} y_+ \\ Ey_- \\ \vdots \\ y_+^{n-1} \\ Ey_-^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \tilde{J}z = \begin{pmatrix} z_+ \\ Ez_- \\ \vdots \\ z_+^{n-1} \\ Ez_-^{n-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We also construct a pairing in $\sum_{\oplus}^{2n} \mathcal{S} \times \sum_{\oplus}^{2n} \mathcal{S}$ by

$$[\alpha, \beta] := \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{ji} \beta_{ji}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq 2n, \quad -\infty \leq i \leq \infty$$

where

$$\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \alpha_{1i} \rangle \\ \vdots \\ \langle \alpha_{2ni} \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad \beta = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \beta_{1i} \rangle \\ \vdots \\ \langle \beta_{2ni} \rangle \end{pmatrix}$$

for those α, β such that the pairing exists. Then since

$$[y^{(n)}, z] - [y, (-1)^n z^{(n)}] = \sum_i (-1)^{n-1} (y^{(l-1)} z^{(n-1)}|_{t_{i+1}^-} - y^{(l-1)} z^{(n-1)}|_{t_{i+1}^+}).$$

We arrive at the Green's formula

$$(5.3) \quad [B^*y, z] - [y, A^*z] = [Jy, \hat{\mathcal{B}}\tilde{J}z]$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is the $2n \times 2n$ matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} & & & & (-1)^{n-1}H \\ & \circ & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ (-1)^{n-j}H & & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ H & & & & \circ \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$$

and the pairing on the right in (5.3) is interpreted according to (5.2).

Since $H^* = -H$, $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is skew symmetric. Further if n is even, $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is unitary since

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{B}}\hat{\mathcal{B}}^* &= \begin{pmatrix} & & & & (-1)^{n-1}H \\ & \circ & & \cdot & \cdot \\ & (-1)^{n-j}H & & & \\ & \cdot & \cdot & & \circ \\ H & & & & \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} & & & & (-1)^{n-1}H^* \\ & \circ & & \cdot & \cdot \\ & (-1)^{n-j}H^* & & & \\ & \cdot & \cdot & & \circ \\ H^* & & & & \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} & & & & \\ & & & & (-1)^{n-1}HH^* \\ & & & & \circ \\ & & & \cdot & \\ & & \circ & & (-1)^{n-1}HH^* \end{pmatrix} \\ &= I_{2n}. \end{aligned}$$

We are interested in using the theory of §5 to describe intermediate extensions C between A and B^* and their adjoints. (This problem has also been considered by Lee [15], in the case $n = p = q = 2$.) We begin by proving that J and \tilde{J} are regular boundary operators. This will be done by showing that—provided $|A_i|$ is uniformly bounded— J and \tilde{J} are onto certain Banach spaces. The closed range theorem then implies that $R(J^*)$ and $R(\tilde{J}^*)$ are closed.

First we require a technical lemma.

LEMMA 5.2. *Let $P_{ij}(t)$, $Q_{ij}(t)$ be polynomials of degree $2n - 1$ on Δ_i interpolating the data.*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ij}^{(k)}(t_i) &= \delta_{kj}\phi_{ij}, & P_{ij}^{(k)}(t_{i+1}) &= 0, \\ Q_{ij}^{(k)}(t_i) &= 0, & Q_{ij}^{(k)}(t_{i+1}) &= \delta_{kj}\phi_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

$$k = 0, \dots, n - 1.$$

Then on Δ_i

$$(5.4) \quad |Q_{ij}(t)|, |P_{ij}(t)| \leq |\phi_{ij}| |A_i|^j C_1$$

$$(5.5) \quad |Q_{ij}^{(n)}(t)|, |P_{ij}^{(n)}(t)| \leq |\phi_{ij}| |A_i|^{j-n} C_2$$

where the constants C_1 , C_2 depend only on n and j .

Proof. We will prove (5.4) and (5.5) for $Q_{ij}(t)$ and $Q_{ij}^{(n)}(t)$ only,

since

$$P_{ij}(s) := (-1)^j Q_{ij}(t_{i+1} + t_i - s)$$

is the unique polynomial interpolating the data for P_{ij} and on $\Delta_i |P_{ij}| = |Q_{ij}|$.

By the Newton formula for osculatory interpolation (cf. [6] p. 233).

$$Q_{ij}(t) = \sum_{l=0}^{2n-1} Q_{ij}[\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_l] \prod_{\rho=0}^{l-1} (t - \tilde{t}_\rho)$$

where

$$\tilde{t}_l = \begin{cases} t_i & \text{if } l < n \\ t_{i+1} & \text{if } l \geq n \end{cases}.$$

The boundary conditions on Q_{ij} imply that $Q_{ij}[\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_l] = 0$, $l = 0, \dots, n-1$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} (5.6) \quad Q_{ij}(t) &= \sum_{l=n}^{2n-1} Q_{ij}[\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_l] \prod_{\rho=0}^{l-1} (t - \tilde{t}_\rho) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n Q_{ij}[\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{n-1}, \tilde{t}_n, \dots, \tilde{t}_{n-1+k}] \prod_{\rho=0}^{n+k-2} (t - \tilde{t}_\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$g_{ij}(x) := Q_{ij}[\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{n-1}, x].$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g_{ij}^{(k-1)}(\tilde{t}_n)}{(k-1)!} &= Q_{ij}[\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{n-1}, \underset{|\leftarrow k \text{ times} \rightarrow|}{t_{i+1}}, \dots, t_{i+1}] \\ &= Q_{ij}[\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{n-1}, \tilde{t}_n, \dots, \tilde{t}_{n-1+k}] \\ &= \frac{g_{ij}^{(k-1)}(t_{i+1})}{(k-1)!} \end{aligned}$$

(see [6] p. 230 Ex. 4.6-8).

The boundary conditions on Q_{ij} and the definition of the divided difference imply:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ij}(x) &= \frac{Q_{ij}[\tilde{t}_1, \dots, \tilde{t}_{n-1}, x] - Q_{ij}[\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{n-1}]}{x - t_i} \\ &= \frac{Q_{ij}[t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}, x]}{x - t_i} \\ &\dots \\ &= \frac{Q_{ij}(x)}{(x - t)^n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{g_{ij}^{(k-1)}(\tilde{t}_n)}{(k-1)!} &= \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{r} Q_{ij}^{k-1-r}(x) D^{(r)}(x - t_i)^{-n} \big|_{x=t_{i+1}} \\
&= \binom{k-1}{k-1-j} Q_{ij} D^{(k-1-j)}(x - t_i)^{-1} \big|_{x=t_{i+1}} \\
&= \binom{k-1}{k-1-j} - n(-n-1) \cdots \\
&\quad (-n - (k-1-j) + 1) |A_i|^{-n-k+1+j}.
\end{aligned}$$

So that from (5.7)

$$|Q_{ij}(t)| \leq |\phi_{ij}| |A_i|^j \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{k-1}{k-1-j} (n)(n+1) \cdots (n + (k-1-j) - 1)$$

proving (5.4).

Also

$$\begin{aligned}
|Q_{ij}^{(n)}(t)| &\leq |\phi_{ij}| \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{k-1}{k-1-j} (n)(n+1) \cdots (n + (k-1-j) - 1) \\
&\quad \times |A|^{-n-k+1+j} \max_t D_i^{(n)} \prod_{\rho=0}^{n+k-2} (t - \tilde{t}_\rho) \\
&\leq |\phi_{ij}| |A_i|^{j-n} C_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_2 = \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{k-1}{k-1-j} (n)(n+1) \cdots (n + (k-1-j) - 1) 2^n n! k!.$$

Here we are using the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
D_i^{(n)} \prod_{\rho=0}^{n+k-2} (t - t_\rho) &= D_i^{(n)} (t - t_i)^n (t - t_{i+1})^{k-1} \\
&= \sum_{r=0}^n \binom{n}{r} D_i^{(n-r)} (t - t_i)^n D_i^n (t - t_{i+1})^{k-1} \\
&\leq 2^n n! k! |A_i|^{k-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

PROPOSITION 5.3. *Suppose $0 < N \leq |A_i| \leq M < \infty$ all i . Then $J(D(B^*))$ and $\tilde{J}(D(A^*))$ are continuous operators onto $\sum_{\oplus}^{2n} l_p$, $\sum_{\oplus}^{2n} l_q$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $1/q + 1/p = 1$.*

Proof. Let z be a function in $L^q(A_i)$ such that $z^{(n-1)}$ is absolutely continuous $z^{(n)} \in L^q(A_i)$ and satisfying the boundary conditions

$$(5.8) \quad z^{(k)}(t_i^+) = \delta_{kj} z^{(k)}(t_{i+1}^-) = 0, \quad k = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

Then if $y \in D(B^*)$

$$[y^{(n)}, z]_{A_i} = [y, (-1)^n z^{(n)}]_{A_i} = (-1)^{j-1} y^{(n-j)}(t_i^+).$$

So that

$$|y^{(n-j)}(t_i^+)| \leq (\|y\|_{p, A_i} + \|y^{(n)}\|_{p, A_i})C_i$$

where

$$C_i = \|z\|_{q, A_i} + \|z^{(n)}\|_{q, A_i}.$$

If the t_i are equally spaced, C_i does not depend on i —the same function z translated works for all intervals. Hence

$$(5.9) \quad \sum |y^{(n-j)}(t_i^+)|^p \leq (\|y\|_p^p + \|y^{(n)}\|_p^p)C$$

and so $\langle y^{(n-j)}(t_i^+) \rangle \in l^p$.

In any event we can choose for z_i the polynomial $P_{ij}(t)$ of degree $2n-1$ interpolating the data (5.8). By Lemma 5.2

$$\begin{aligned} |P_{ij}(t)| &\leq |A_i|^j C_1 \\ |P_{ij}^{(n)}(t)| &\leq |A_i|^{j-n} C_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|P_{ij}(t)\|_{q, A_i} &\leq C_1 |A_i| \frac{j q + 1}{q} \\ \|P_{ij}^{(n)}(t)\|_{q, A_i} &\leq C_2 |A_i| \frac{(j-n)q + 1}{q}. \end{aligned}$$

Our hypothesis that the $|A_i|$ are uniformly bounded above and below implies that

$$\|P_{ij}(t)\|_{q, A_i} + \|P_{ij}^{(n)}(t)\|_{q, A_i} \equiv \|z\|_{q, A_i} + \|z^{(n)}\|_{q, A_i} \leq C, \quad \text{all } i$$

so that (5.9) is true. Varying j shows that J maps into $\sum_{\oplus}^{2n} l_p$. The argument for \tilde{J} is the same changing p to q . We now show that $\tilde{J}(D(B^*))$ and $\tilde{J}(D(A^*))$ are onto, again giving the argument only for J . Let

$$\begin{pmatrix} \langle \phi_{i0} \rangle \\ \vdots \\ \langle \phi_{i2n-1} \rangle \end{pmatrix} \in \sum_{\oplus}^{2n} l_p.$$

It is sufficient to find $2n$ functions y_{ji} satisfying the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} y_{ji}^{(k)}(t_i^+) &= \delta_{kj} \phi_{ij} \\ y_{ji}^{(k)}(t_i^-) &= 0, \quad k = 0, \dots, n-1, \quad \text{for } j \leq n-1 \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} y_{ji}^{(k)}(t_i^+) &= 0 \\ y_{ji}^{(k)}(t_i^-) &= \delta_{kj} \phi_{ij}, \quad k = 0, \dots, n-1, \quad \text{for } n \leq j \leq 2n-j, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$y_j := \sum_i \lambda(t)_{ji} y_{ji} \in D(B^*) .$$

Then a function y satisfying the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} y^{(j)}(t_i^+) &= \phi_{ij} , & 0 \leq j \leq n-1 \\ y^{(j)}(t_i^-) &= \phi_{ij} , & n \leq j \leq 2n-1 \end{aligned}$$

in $D(B^*)$ can be obtained by superposition. We define the y_{ij} as

$$y_{ij} = \begin{cases} P_{ij}(t) & \text{if } 0 \leq j \leq n-1 \\ Q_{ij}(t) & \text{if } n \leq j \leq 2n-1 . \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5.2 now implies that $y_j \in D(B^*)$. That J and \tilde{J} are continuous with respect to the norm topologies on $X \times Y$ or $Y^* \times X^*$ and the weak or weak* topologies on their ranges is obvious. For $1 \leq p < \infty$, $1 \leq q < \infty$ the boundary operators are continuous with respect to the norm topologies on their ranges (Ch. [10] V. 3.15).

We are now in a position to determine extensions and their adjoints between A and B^* . For example suppose C is given by y'' and the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} y(t_i^+) &= 2y'(t_i^-) \\ 2y(t_i^-) &= y'(t_i^+) . \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -2E^{-1} \\ 0 & 2E^{-1} & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} .$$

The adjoint boundary condition

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}Jz = R(D^*)$$

may be written

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z_+ \\ Ez_- \\ z'_+ \\ Ez'_- \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2E^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -2E^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \langle \phi_{1i} \rangle \\ \langle \phi_{2i} \rangle \\ \langle \phi_{3i} \rangle \\ \langle \phi_{4i} \rangle \end{pmatrix}$$

which implies the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} z(t_{i+2}^-) &= -2z'(t_i^+) \\ -z'(t_{i+2}^-) &= 2z(t_i^+) . \end{aligned}$$

4. *A family of self-adjoint extensions.* We use the same setting as Example 3 with $p = q = 2$ and n an even integer so that $A^* = B^*$, $A = B$ and $J = \tilde{J}$. Let S_1, \dots, S_n be closed subspaces of l^2 and P_1, \dots, P_n be orthogonal projections onto these subspaces. Define a projection P in $\sum_{\oplus}^{2n} l^2$ by

$$\begin{pmatrix} P_1 & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & \ddots & & & \\ & & & P_n & & \\ & & & & Q_1 & \\ & & & & & \ddots \\ & & & & & & Q_n \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$Q_i = \begin{cases} I - P_{n-1} & \text{if } i \text{ is odd} \\ I - P_{n+2-i} & \text{if } i \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Then $P\hat{\mathcal{B}}P = 0$ and

$$N(P\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = \begin{pmatrix} R(P_1) \\ \vdots \\ R(P_n) \\ R(Q_i) \\ \vdots \\ R(Q_n) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows from Corollary 3.16 that the operator C determined by the boundary condition $P\hat{\mathcal{B}}Jy$ is self-adjoint. For example if $k = 4$ and $P_1 = I$, $P_2 = I$, $P_3 = 0$, $P_4 = 0$ then $Q_1 = I$, $Q_2 = I$, $Q_3 = 0$, $Q_4 = 0$ and the (self-adjoint) boundary conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} E\langle z_-^{(iii)} \rangle &= 0 \\ \langle z_+^{(iii)} \rangle &= 0 \\ E\langle z'_- \rangle &= 0 \\ \langle z'_+ \rangle &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

with arbitrary jumps at the other points of T in the other derivatives, i.e., the operator is determined by

$$\begin{aligned} y^{(iv)} \\ y'(t_i) &= 0 \\ y^{(iii)}(t_i) &= 0 \\ y(t_i^+) - y(t_i^-) &= \phi_{1i} \\ y''(t_i^+) - y''(t_i^-) &= \phi_{2i}. \end{aligned}$$

It would be worthwhile to determine the structure of all projections P inducing self-adjoint extensions for the minimal operator determined by $y^{(n)}$ with boundary conditions $(t_i) = 0$, $j = 0, \dots, n - 1$, all i .

6. Conclusion. We close the paper with a few historical remarks concerning generalized b.v.p. and brief mention of some unsolved problems.

We should point out first of all that concrete b.v.p. posed by differential equations and nonstandard boundary conditions (often arising from specific physical problems) have been of interest to the mathematical community for many years. Perennial problems have been the determination of adjoints, extensions, Green's functions and eigenfunction expansions for increasing general systems. Good examples of recent work on these questions include papers of Krall [12], [14], Kemp and Lee [11], this writer [1], [2], and the book of Schwabik, Tvrdý, and Vejvoda [18]. Additional historical information can be found in the surveys of Krall [13], and Whyburn [19].

An increasing tendency to abstraction has been evident in the last decade characterized by the introduction of functional analysis and spectral theory. This process culminated in the paper [4], of E. A. Coddington and A. Dijknsma. Their achievement was to introduce an abstract setting divorced from particular problems. In [4] for example, A is a closed subspace of $X \times Y$ and $A_H = A \cap {}^*B$ where *B is the preadjoint of a finite dimensional subspace B in $Y^* \times X^*$. Such a representation is always possible if H is continuous on $G(A)$ and F is finite dimensional. This "subspace" interpretation of A_H leads to a simple construction of $(A \cap {}^*B)^*$ and also to a more complicated solution of the extension problem (including self-adjoint extensions of symmetric b.v.p.). The results (particularly with respect to the determination of adjoints) are equivalent to those of [3] in the case where H has finite dimensional range. For some applications of this approach see [8]. An eigenfunction expansion theory associated with the problems in [4] can be found in [5]. The theory has also been extensively further developed by Lee [15], [16], and [17].

While the finite dimensional theory is fairly clear, the same cannot be said for the infinite dimensional case. In order to get usable results special hypotheses seem necessary. There is a certain freedom of choice here. Different assumptions can and do lead to different theories, and no theory yet seems able to characterize in a *computationally useful* fashion every extension C between A and B^* . For example the efforts of Lee to treat the infinite dimensional case assume that F is l^2 . This will be true for example when B^* and A are defined in a separable Hilbert space or when $G(B^*)/G(A) \cong l^2$. By means of the theory of Hilbert Besselian bases and a Green's

formula similar to our own, Lee is able to solve both the adjoint and extension problem. Similarly both the theories presented in this paper, although useful computationally, hold for restricted classes of problems. In § 3, for example, we must first show that $R(J^*)$ is closed and that $H = DJ$. While the second condition seems natural the first is hard to verify unless $R(J)$ happens to be a Banach space so that the closed range theorem applies. But to check that $R(J)$ is a Banach space and to describe that space can be difficult for even simple J (cf. § 5 Example 3—especially Proposition 5). When J is more complicated—for example defined by a Stieltjes measures—the question is unsolved.

For these reasons the theory presented in § 4 may be more convenient to use. It can be applied directly to many natural extensions. However, it will not describe all extensions unless all have closed range.

At this writing relation between these two theories is unclear. In particular we call attention to the two apparently unrelated descriptions of self-adjoint extensions given by Theorem 3.15 and Theorem 4.8. Obviously further work needs to be done on these issues. It should also be interesting to apply these ideas to difficult examples such as b.v.p. involving partial differential of functional differential operators.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. I wish to thank the referee for many excellent suggestions for the improvement of this paper. In particular he is responsible for the present versions of the proofs of Theorem 3.5 and Corollaries 3.16–3.17.

Added in proof. We also refer the reader to the paper of C. Bennewitz, *Spectral theory for pairs of differential operators*, Ark. Mat., 15 (1977), which includes an extension of the classical deficiency index theory for symmetric operators to the setting of linear relations.

REFERENCES

1. R. C. Brown, *The operator theory of generalized boundary value problems*, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Mathematics Research Center, TSR #1446, Canad. J. Math., **28** (1976), 486–512.
2. ———, *Differential operators with abstract boundary conditions*, Canad. J. Math., **30** (1978), 262–288.
3. ———, *Notes on generalized boundary value problems in Banach spaces I, Adjoint and extension theory*, Pacific J. Math., **85** (1979), 295–316.
4. E. A. Coddington and A. Dijkstra, *Adjoint subspaces in Banach spaces, with applications to ordinary differential subspaces*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., (IV), **118** (1978), 1–118.
5. ———, *Self-adjoint subspaces and eigenfunction expansions for ordinary differen-*

tial subspaces, *J. Differential Equations*, **20** (1976), 473-526.

6. E. A. Coddington and N. Levinson, *Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1955.
7. S. D. Conte and C. deBoor, *Elementary Numerical Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, 2nd edition, New York, 1972.
8. A. Dijkstra, *The generalized Greens function for regular ordinary differential subspaces in $L^2[a, b] \times L^2[a, b]$* , Lecture Notes of the Scheveningen Conference on Differential Equations of 1977.
9. N. Dunford and J. T. Schwartz, *Linear Operators*, Part I, Interscience, New York, 1957.
10. S. Goldberg, *Unbounded Linear Operators: Theory and Applications*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966.
11. R. D. Kemp and S. J. Lee, *Finite dimensional perturbations of differential expressions*, *Canad. J. Math.*, **30** (1978), 262-288.
12. A. M. Krall, *Stieltjes Differential-boundary operators III*, *Pacific J. Math.*, **59** (1975), 125-134.
13. ———, *The development of general differential and general differential-boundary systems*, *The Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, **5** (1975), 125-134.
14. ———, *nth order Stieltjes differential boundary operators and Stieltjes differential boundary systems*, *J. Differential Equations*, **10** (1977), 252-267.
15. S. J. Lee, *Coordinatized adjoint subspaces in Hilbert spaces with applications to ordinary differential operators*, *Proceedings of the London Math. Soc.*, (3), **41** (1980), 138-160.
16. ———, *Perturbations of operators with applications to ordinary differential operators*, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **28** (2) 1979, 291-309.
17. ———, *Boundary conditions for linear manifolds, I*, *Journal of Math. Analysis and Applications*, **73** (2) (1980), 366-380.
18. St. Schwabik, M. Tvrdý and O. Vejvoda, *Differential and Integral Equations Boundary Value Problems and Adjoints*, Academia, Praha, 1979.
19. W. M. Whyburn, *Differential equations with general boundary conditions*, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **48** (1942), 692-704.

Received March 12, 1980 and in revised form May 20, 1981.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
UNIVERSITY, AL 35486

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

DONALD BABBITT (Managing Editor)

University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

HUGO ROSSI

University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

C. C. MOORE and ARTHUR AGUS

University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

J. DUGUNDJI

Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90007

R. FINN and J. MILGRAM

Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

R. ARENS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

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. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of the manuscript. However, you may use them in the displayed equations. 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. Please propose a heading for the odd numbered pages of less than 35 characters. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. 39. Supply name and address of author to whom proofs should be sent. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints to each author are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$102.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$51.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for numbers issued in the last three calendar years, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924, U.S.A. Old back numbers obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

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

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.).
8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Copyright © 1982 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Manufactured and first issued in Japan

Thomas E. Armstrong and Karel Libor Prikry , On the semimetric on a Boolean algebra induced by a finitely additive probability measure	249
Walter Russell Bloom , Strict local inclusion results between spaces of Fourier transforms	265
Richard Clark Brown , Notes on generalized boundary value problems in Banach spaces. II. Infinite-dimensional extension theory	271
Sui Sun Cheng , Isoperimetric eigenvalue problem of even order differential equations	303
Lung O. Chung and Jiang Luh , Derivations of higher order and commutativity of rings	317
Ali Ahmad Fora , A fixed point theorem for product spaces	327
Barry J. Gardner , Radical classes of regular rings with Artinian primitive images	337
John Brady Garnett and Peter Wilcox Jones , BMO from dyadic BMO	351
Allen E. Hatcher , On the boundary curves of incompressible surfaces	373
Richard Howard Hudson and Kenneth S. Williams , Resolution of ambiguities in the evaluation of cubic and quartic Jacobsthal sums	379
Viktor Losert , Counter-examples to some conjectures about doubly stochastic measures	387
Kenneth Derwood Magill, Jr., P. R. Misra and Udai Bhan Tewari , Structure spaces for sandwich semigroups	399
Mark Mandelker , Continuity of monotone functions	413
Kenneth Guy Miller , An index theorem and hypoellipticity on nilpotent Lie groups	419
Evelyn M. Nelson , Homomorphisms of mono-unary algebras	427
Marvin E. Ortel , The support of an extremal dilatation	431
R. S. Pathak and O. P. Singh , Finite Hankel transforms of distributions	439
Richard Cole Penney , The theory of ad-associative Lie algebras	459
Linda Ruth Sons , Zero distribution of functions with slow or moderate growth in the unit disc	473
Russell Bruce Walker , Transversals to laminations	483