

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

**TANGENTIAL CAUCHY-RIEMANN EQUATIONS AND
UNIFORM APPROXIMATION**

MICHAEL BENTON FREEMAN

TANGENTIAL CAUCHY-RIEMANN EQUATIONS AND UNIFORM APPROXIMATION

MICHAEL FREEMAN

A smooth (\mathcal{C}^∞) function on a smooth real submanifold M of complex Euclidean space \mathbb{C}^n is a *CR function* if it satisfies the Cauchy-Riemann equations tangential to M . It is shown that each *CR function* admits an extension to an open neighborhood of M in \mathbb{C}^n whose \bar{z} -derivatives all vanish on M to a prescribed high order, provided that the system of tangential Cauchy-Riemann equations has minimal rank throughout M . This result is applied to show that on a holomorphically convex compact set in M each *CR function* can be uniformly approximated by holomorphic functions.

1. Extension and approximation of *CR functions*. Each point p of a smooth real submanifold M of \mathbb{C}^n has a *complex tangent space* H_pM . It is the largest complex-linear subspace of the ordinary real tangent space T_pM ; evidently $H_pM = T_pM \cap iT_pM$. Its complex dimension is the *complex rank* of M at p . The theorem of linear algebra relating the real dimensions of T_pM , iT_pM and their sum and intersection shows that if M has real codimension k its complex rank is not less than $n - k$.

DEFINITION 1.1. M is a *CR manifold* if its complex rank is constant. It is *generic* if in addition this rank is minimal; that is, equal to the larger of 0 and $n - k$. A smooth function f on M is a *CR function* if $\ker \bar{\partial}_p f \supset H_pM$ for each p in M .

Here f is assumed to be extended in a smooth manner to an open neighborhood of M and $\bar{\partial}_p f$ is regarded as the conjugate complex-linear part of the ordinary Fréchet differential $d_p f$. Since the condition on $\bar{\partial}_p f$ is independent of the extension chosen, the definition makes sense. Computational equivalents to it and some elaboration are given in § 2. A more comprehensive treatment of these ideas is found in the paper by S. Greenfield [1]. It should be mentioned that his definition [1, Definition II. A.1] of *CR manifolds* also requires that the distribution $p \rightarrow H_pM$ be involutive. That assumption is not needed here.

If M is a complex submanifold of \mathbb{C}^n , then it is *CR* with complex rank equal to its complex dimension. It is not *generic* if it has positive codimension. Of course the *CR functions* on M are just its holomorphic functions.

At the other extreme, every real hypersurface is a *generic CR*

manifold of complex rank $n - 1$. These frequently have no nontrivial complex submanifolds, which is true for example of the usual $2n - 1$ sphere in \mathbb{C}^n .

M is a generic *CR* manifold if its complex rank is everywhere zero, which is the *totally real* [5] case.

An example of a proper generic *CR* submanifold which is neither totally real nor a hypersurface can of course only be found if $n \geq 3$. There is one in \mathbb{C}^3 , a 4-sphere S^4 given as the intersection of the usual 5-sphere and a real hyperplane transverse to it. Let

$$\rho_1 = |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 + |z_3|^2 - 1$$

and $\rho_2 = z_3 + \bar{z}_3$, where z_1, z_2, z_3 are the usual coordinates for \mathbb{C}^3 , and let $S^4 = \{\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 0\}$. It follows from (2.2) below that S^4 has the requisite properties. Furthermore, S^4 has no nontrivial complex submanifolds (since the 5-sphere does not).

THEOREM 1.2. *If f is a CR function on a generic CR manifold M in \mathbb{C}^n and m is a nonnegative integer, then there is an extension of f to a smooth function f_m on an open set $U \supset M$ such that $\bar{\partial}f_m$ vanishes on M to order m in all directions.*

This result is known [3, Lemma 4.3] and [5, Lemma 3.1] when M is totally real. It is also proved in [2, Th. 2.3.2'] when M is a real hypersurface. A local version which does not require that M be generic is proved in [5, Lemma 3.3].

Theorem 1.2 plays a key role in a program outlined by L. Hörmander for showing that *CR* functions can be uniformly approximated by holomorphic functions. The basic idea is to take a compact set K in M and a given *CR* function f on M and find a solution g of $\bar{\partial}g = \bar{\partial}f$ with $\sup_K |g|$ small. Then $u = f - g$ is holomorphic and approximates f uniformly on K with error no larger than $\sup_K |g|$.

In Hörmander's implementation of this idea, Theorem 1.2 implies that a certain bound on an L^2 norm of the Sobolev type is imposed on $\bar{\partial}g$. The existence of solutions to $\bar{\partial}g = \bar{\partial}f$ subject to the same a priori bound [2] and a Sobolev inequality are used to estimate $\sup_K |g|$. This proof appears in [3] and [5] for the cases cited above. Since the only step of it which depends on the complex rank of M is the conclusion of Theorem 1.2, this proof will, without further modification, yield a result on uniform approximation.

THEOREM 1.3. *If M is a closed generic CR submanifold of a domain of holomorphy U in \mathbb{C}^n and K is a compact subset of M holomorphically convex with respect to U , then each smooth CR func-*

tion on M is a uniform limit on K of functions holomorphic on U .

In fact, the same method in conjunction with Theorem 1.2 will prove the stronger statement that approximation holds in the \mathcal{C}^∞ topology; c.f. [5, Th. 6.1]. One merely replaces $\sup_K |g|$ by a \mathcal{C}^k norm of g on K .

In the totally real case, it is known that the holomorphic convexity of any given compact subset K with respect to *some* domain of holomorphy is a consequence of the absence of complex tangent vectors. This follows from the fact [3, Th. 3.1] and [5, Corollary 4.2] that each K has arbitrarily small tubular neighborhoods which are domains of holomorphy. However, the case of the $2n - 1$ sphere in \mathbf{C}^n shows that in the presence of complex tangent vectors holomorphic convexity must be assumed. When there is complex tangency, the problem of determining holomorphic convexity of a given compact subset of M is very difficult, even for the examples mentioned above.

It should be remarked that in Definition 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 \mathbf{C}^n may be replaced by any complex manifold, and if this manifold is Stein [2], it may replace U in Theorem 1.3. No significant modification of the exposition is required.

2. *CR manifolds and functions.* Each real-linear map $L: \mathbf{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^k$ is uniquely expressible as a sum $L = S + T$ where $S, T: \mathbf{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^k$, S is complex linear, and T is conjugate complex linear. If $J: v \rightarrow iv$, a direct computation shows that $S = \frac{1}{2}(L - J LJ)$ and $T = \frac{1}{2}(L + J LJ)$. Applying this result to the Fréchet differential $d_p \rho$ of a smooth map $\rho: \mathbf{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^k$ at p there results

$$d_p \rho = \partial_p \rho + \bar{\partial}_p \rho$$

in which $\partial_p \rho$ is the complex linear part of $d_p \rho$ and $\bar{\partial}_p \rho$ the conjugate complex linear part.

Each point of M has an open neighborhood U in \mathbf{C}^n on which there exists a smooth map $\rho = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k): U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^k$ with maximal rank k on U and satisfying

$$(2.1) \quad M \cap U = \{z \in U: \rho(z) = 0\}.$$

Regarding \mathbf{R}^k as contained in \mathbf{C}^k in the usual way, and applying the remarks above to Definition 1.1, it follows that M is *CR* if and only if $\bar{\partial} \rho$ has constant complex rank on $M \cap U$, and is generic exactly when this rank is maximal. When $k \geq n$ this means that $H_p M = 0$, which is the totally real case. The case of interest here is $k \leq n$, when M is generic if and only if $\bar{\partial} \rho$ has complex rank k on $M \cap U$. Henceforth, it is assumed that $k \leq n$. Since it is clear that $\bar{\partial} \rho = (\bar{\partial} \rho_1, \dots, \bar{\partial} \rho_k)$ it

follows that the condition

$$(2.2) \quad \bar{\partial}\rho_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{\partial}\rho_k \quad \text{has no zeros on } M \cap U$$

is necessary and sufficient that M be a generic CR manifold.

From Definition 1.1 and (2.2) it follows that a smooth function f on M is CR if and only if

$$(2.3) \quad \bar{\partial}f \wedge \bar{\partial}\rho_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{\partial}\rho_k = 0 \quad \text{on } M.$$

Equivalently, since $\{\bar{\partial}\rho_1, \dots, \bar{\partial}\rho_k\}$ is, at points of M , by virtue of (2.2) part of a basis for the space of conjugate-linear functionals on \mathbb{C}^n , there exist smooth functions h_1, \dots, h_k on U such that

$$(2.4) \quad \bar{\partial}f = \sum_{j=1}^k h_j \bar{\partial}\rho_j + O(\rho).$$

Here $O(\rho)$ denotes a form which vanishes on $M \cap U$. It is a standard result [4, Lemma 2.1] that if g is a smooth $O(\rho)$ -form there exist smooth forms g_1, \dots, g_k such that

$$(2.5) \quad g = \sum_{j=1}^k \rho_j g_j.$$

More generally, $O(\rho^m)$ will denote a smooth form on U which vanishes on $M \cap U$ to order m . Induction on m using (2.5) shows that if g is such a form there are smooth forms g_α on U satisfying

$$(2.6) \quad g = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \rho^\alpha g_\alpha,$$

in which the standard multi-index notation has been used. Thus $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ is a k -tuple of nonnegative integers, $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_k$, and $\rho^\alpha = \rho_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots \rho_k^{\alpha_k}$. The coefficients g_α are not unique on U , but the fact that they are determined on $M \cap U$ will be essential.

LEMMA 2.1. *If smooth forms g, g_α are related on U by*

$$g = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \rho^\alpha g_\alpha + O(\rho^{m+1})$$

then for each α , $D^\alpha g|_{M \cap U} = \alpha! g_\alpha|_{M \cap U}$. In particular, if $g = 0$ on U then each $g_\alpha|_{M \cap U} = 0$.

Here $D^\alpha = D_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots D_k^{\alpha_k}$, where D_j denotes differentiation with respect to ρ_j and $\alpha! = \alpha_1! \cdots \alpha_k!$.

Proof. The statement is local and since ρ has rank k , the proof can be reduced to the case where each $\rho_j = x_j$, the j th ordinary Euclidean coordinate function. Then the lemma follows from the gen-

eral Leibniz formula

$$D^\alpha(fg) = \sum_{\gamma \leq \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\gamma} D^\gamma f \cdot D^{\alpha-\gamma} g$$

with $f = x^\alpha$, noting that $D^\gamma x^\alpha = 0$ on $M \cap U$ if $\gamma < \alpha$ and $D^\alpha x^\alpha = \alpha!$. Here $\binom{\alpha}{\gamma} = \alpha!/\gamma!(\alpha - \gamma)!$ and $\gamma < \alpha$ means that $\gamma_j < \alpha_j$ for some j .

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2. The proof is an induction on m in which f_{m+1} is obtained by subtraction of an $O(\rho^{m+1})$ function from f_m . Similar procedures have been used in [2, Th. 2.3.2'], [3, Lemma 4.3], and [5, Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3]. The one used here borrows ideas from all of these. Since the totally real generic cases where $k \geq n$ are treated in [3] and [5], it will be assumed that $k \leq n$. However, the proof below can be read with $k \geq n$, with some slight modifications.

In the presence of complex tangent vectors, the only known result is local in nature [5, Lemma 3.3]. Its proof refers to a particular local coordinate system for \mathbb{C}^n and uses an initial extension f_0 which is independent of the coordinates normal to M . This feature is clearly not preserved by the patching construction intended here, so an arbitrary extension of f must be admitted at each step. This introduces remainder terms of the form $O(\rho^m)$, and it is necessary to keep an accurate account of their effects.

To begin the induction, extend a given CR function f from M to a smooth function f_0 on an open set $U \supset M$.

First assume that the representation (2.1) holds on U . Then $\bar{\partial}f_0$ is of the form (2.4) and if $u = \sum_{j=1}^k \rho_j h_j$ it is clear that $\bar{\partial}(f_0 - u) = O(\rho)$.

In general U has a locally finite cover by open sets U_i on each of which there exists a defining function ρ_i presenting $M \cap U_i$ as in (2.1) and a $O(\rho_i)$ function u_i satisfying $\bar{\partial}(f_0 - u_i) = O(\rho_i)$ on U_i . If $\{\varphi_i\}$ is a partition of unity subordinate to $\{U_i\}$ and

$$(3.1) \quad u = \sum_i \varphi_i u_i$$

then

$$(3.2) \quad \bar{\partial}(f_0 - u) = \sum_i \varphi_i \bar{\partial}(f_0 - u_i) - \sum_i u_i \bar{\partial}\varphi_i.$$

By construction each term of either sum in (3.2) vanishes on M . Therefore so does $\bar{\partial}f_1$ if $f_1 = f_0 - u$.

For the inductive step assume that $m > 0$ and f has an extension f_m to U such that $\bar{\partial}f_m$ vanishes on M to order m . A global modification of f_m will again be obtained by patching local ones, so the construction is again begun by assuming that M is globally presented by (2.1).

Then by (2.6) there are smooth $(0, 1)$ forms g_α such that

$$(3.3) \quad \bar{\partial} f_m = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \rho^\alpha g_\alpha .$$

Hence

$$(3.4) \quad 0 = \bar{\partial}^2 f_m = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \rho^{\alpha-j} \bar{\partial} \rho_j \wedge g_\alpha + O(\rho^m) ,$$

in which $\alpha - j$ denotes $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j - 1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ if $\alpha_j > 0$. Wedge this equation with $\bar{\partial} \rho_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{\bar{\partial} \rho_j} \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{\partial} \rho_k$ ($\bar{\partial} \rho_j$ is missing) to show that for each j

$$(3.5) \quad 0 = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \alpha_j \rho^{\alpha-j} \bar{\partial} \rho_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{\partial} \rho_k \wedge g_\alpha + O(\rho^m) .$$

Now for fixed j , the map $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha - j$ is a one-to-one correspondence of $\{\alpha: |\alpha| = m \text{ and } \alpha_j > 0\}$ with $\{\beta: |\beta| = m - 1\}$. Therefore (3.5) may be rewritten as

$$0 = \sum_{|\beta|=m-1} (\beta_j + 1) \rho^\beta \bar{\partial} \rho_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{\partial} \rho_k \wedge g_{\beta+j} + O(\rho^m)$$

and Lemma 2.1 applied to deduce that $g_{\beta+j} \wedge \bar{\partial} \rho_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{\partial} \rho_k = 0$ on M . Since this holds for every j and β , it follows from the linear independence of $\bar{\partial} \rho_1, \dots, \bar{\partial} \rho_k$ on M that for each $\alpha, |\alpha| = m$, and each $j, 1 \leq j \leq k$, there is a function $h_{\alpha j}$ such that

$$(3.6) \quad g_\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^k h_{\alpha j} \bar{\partial} \rho_j + O(\rho) .$$

When substituted for g_α in (3.3) and (3.4) this relation yields

$$(3.7) \quad \bar{\partial} f_m = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \sum_{j=1}^k \rho^\alpha h_{\alpha j} \bar{\partial} \rho_j + O(\rho^{m+1})$$

and

$$(3.8) \quad 0 = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \sum_{i,j=1}^k \alpha_j \rho^{\alpha-j} h_{\alpha i} \bar{\partial} \rho_j \wedge \bar{\partial} \rho_i + O(\rho^m) .$$

The expression (3.7) suggests modifying f_m by

$$u = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \sum_{j=1}^k \rho^\alpha \rho_j h_{\alpha j}$$

(the need for the constant $1/(n+1)$ will appear as a consequence of (3.11)). Now

$$(3.9) \quad (n+1) \bar{\partial} u = \sum_{\alpha,j} \rho^\alpha h_{\alpha j} \bar{\partial} \rho_j + \sum_{\alpha,j} \sum_{i=1}^k \rho_j \alpha_i \rho^{\alpha-i} h_{\alpha j} \bar{\partial} \rho_i + \sum_{\alpha,j} \rho^\alpha \rho_j \bar{\partial} h_{\alpha j} .$$

The first term of this is $\bar{\partial}f_m$. The second is

$$(3.10) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^k \rho_j \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=m} \alpha_i \rho^{\alpha-i} h_{\alpha_j} \right) \bar{\partial} \rho_i ,$$

which will be shown to equal $n\bar{\partial}f_m + O(\rho^{m+1})$.

To that end, for each $i < j$, wedging (3.8) with

$$\bar{\partial} \rho_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{\bar{\partial} \rho_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{\bar{\partial} \rho_j} \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{\partial} \rho_k$$

($\bar{\partial} \rho_i$ and $\bar{\partial} \rho_j$ are missing) gives the symmetry relation

$$(3.11) \quad 0 = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} (\alpha_j \rho^{\alpha-j} h_{\alpha_i} - \alpha_i \rho^{\alpha-i} h_{\alpha_j}) + O(\rho^m) .$$

Using this in (3.10) it becomes

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^k \rho_j \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=m} \alpha_j \rho^{\alpha-j} h_{\alpha_i} \right) \bar{\partial} \rho_i + O(\rho^{m+1})$$

which when the summation over j is performed first is

$$\sum_{|\alpha|=m} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \right) \rho^\alpha h_{\alpha_i} \bar{\partial} \rho_i + O(\rho^{m+1}) .$$

Noting that $\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j = n$ completes the argument that the second term of (3.9) is $n\bar{\partial}f_m + O(\rho^{m+1})$. Therefore $\bar{\partial}u = \bar{\partial}f_m + O(\rho^{m+1})$.

Thus on each U_i there is a function $u_i = O(\rho_i^{m+1})$ such that $\bar{\partial}(f_m - u_i)|_{U_i} = O(\rho_i^{m+1})$. With u defined again by (3.1) and $f_{m+1} = f_m - u$ it follows as before from (3.2) that $\bar{\partial}f_{m+1}$ vanishes on M to order $m + 1$. This completes the proof.

4. **Remarks.** We know of no nongeneric examples where Theorem 1.2 fails. However, when M is not generic, the above proof breaks down at the inductive step from $m = 1$ to $m = 2$: Since $\bar{\partial} \rho$ does not have maximal rank it may be assumed that there is an integer $l < k$ such that $\bar{\partial} \rho_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{\partial} \rho_l$ has no zeros on M but $\bar{\partial} \rho_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{\partial} \rho_j = 0$ on M if $j > l$. Thus there are more unknowns g_α than equations available from (3.4). There are very simple cases where this occurs:

EXAMPLE 4.1. If the usual coordinates of \mathbb{C}^2 are denoted z_1, z_2 and $M = \{z: z_2 = 0\}$ then the function $f = z_2 \bar{z}_1$ is CR, for $\bar{\partial}f = z_2 d\bar{z}_1$. The most general function u vanishing to second order on M is by (the complex analogue of (2.5)) of the form

$$u = z_2^2 g_1 + z_2 \bar{z}_2 g_2 + \bar{z}_2^2 g_3$$

for suitable smooth functions g_1, g_2 , and g_3 . Therefore

$$\bar{\partial}u = z_2^2 \bar{\partial}g_1 + z_2 g_2 d\bar{z}_2 + z_2 \bar{z}_2 \bar{\partial}g_2 + 2\bar{z}_2 g_3 d\bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_2^2 \bar{\partial}g_3 .$$

Each of these terms either vanishes to second order on M or is linearly independent of $\bar{\partial}f$. Therefore no such u will satisfy $\bar{\partial}(f - u) = O(\rho^2)$.

However since f is zero on M , it obviously satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 1.2. In fact, if M is a complex manifold, each CR function f is holomorphic, so if U is a domain of holomorphy Theorem 1.2 for U and $M \cap U$ follows from Cartan's Theorem B [2], which implies that f has a holomorphic extension to U . Moreover, standard results in several complex variables show that Theorem 1.3 is true for any complex manifold M . Thus Theorem 1.2 and a consequent Theorem 1.3 may still hold in the nongeneric case, but some new ideas for proof are necessary.

REFERENCES

1. S. J. Greenfield, *Cauchy-Riemann equations in several variables*, Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa Classe di Scienze **22** (1968), 275-314.
2. L. Hörmander, *An introduction to complex analysis in several variables*, D. Van Nostrand, Princeton, New Jersey, 1965.
3. L. Hörmander and J. Wermer, *Uniform approximation on compact sets in C^n* , Math. Scand. (to appear)
4. J. Milnor, *Morse theory*. Ann. of Math. Studies **51**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1963.
5. R. Nirenberg and R. O. Wells, Jr., *Approximation theorems on differentiable submanifolds of a complex manifold*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear)

Received November 21, 1969. This work was supported by NSF Grant GP-8997.

RICE UNIVERSITY

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

H. SAMELSON
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

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

RICHARD PIERCE
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

RICHARD ARENS
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

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

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

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 33, No. 1

March, 1970

Mir Maswood Ali, <i>On some extremal simplexes</i>	1
Silvio Aurora, <i>On normed rings with monotone multiplication</i>	15
Silvio Aurora, <i>Normed fields which extend normed rings of integers</i>	21
John Kelly Beem, <i>Indefinite Minkowski spaces</i>	29
T. F. Bridgland, <i>Trajectory integrals of set valued functions</i>	43
Robert Jay Buck, <i>A generalized Hausdorff dimension for functions and sets</i>	69
Vlastimil B. Dlab, <i>A characterization of perfect rings</i>	79
Edward Richard Fadell, <i>Some examples in fixed point theory</i>	89
Michael Benton Freeman, <i>Tangential Cauchy-Riemann equations and uniform approximation</i>	101
Barry J. Gardner, <i>Torsion classes and pure subgroups</i>	109
Vinod B. Goyal, <i>Bounds for the solution of a certain class of nonlinear partial differential equations</i>	117
Fu Cheng Hsiang, <i>On C_1 summability factors of Fourier series at a given point</i>	139
Lawrence Stanislaus Husch, Jr., <i>Homotopy groups of PL-embedding spaces</i>	149
Daniel Ralph Lewis, <i>Integration with respect to vector measures</i>	157
Marion-Josephine Lim, <i>$\mathcal{L} - 2$ subspaces of Grassmann product spaces</i>	167
Stephen J. Pierce, <i>Orthogonal groups of positive definite multilinear functionals</i>	183
W. J. Pugh and S. M. Shah, <i>On the growth of entire functions of bounded index</i>	191
Siddani Bhaskara Rao and Ayyagari Ramachandra Rao, <i>Existence of triconnected graphs with prescribed degrees</i>	203
Ralph Tyrrell Rockafellar, <i>On the maximal monotonicity of subdifferential mappings</i>	209
R. Shantaram, <i>Convergence of a sequence of transformations of distribution functions. II</i>	217
Julianne Souček, <i>Rings of analytic functions</i>	233
Ted Joe Suffridge, <i>The principle of subordination applied to functions of several variables</i>	241
Wei-lung Ting, <i>On secondary characteristic classes in cobordism theory</i>	249
Pak-Ken Wong, <i>Continuous complementors on B^*-algebras</i>	255
Miyuki Yamada, <i>On a regular semigroup in which the idempotents form a band</i>	261