Pacific Journal of Mathematics

# HYPONORMAL CONTRACTIONS AND STRONG POWER CONVERGENCE

CALVIN R. PUTNAM

Vol. 57, No. 2 February 1975

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 57, No. 2, 1975

# HYPONORMAL CONTRACTIONS AND STRONG POWER CONVERGENCE

C. R. PUTNAM

**Let $T^*$ be a hyponormal contraction on a Hilbert space, so that $TT^* - T^*T = D \geqq 0$ and $\| T \| \leqq 1$. It is shown that if, in addition, $T^*$ is completely hyponormal, then the sequence $\{T^n\}_{n=1,2,\cdots}$ converges strongly to 0 as $n \to \infty$. The result is obtained as a consequence of properties of the solution $w(z)$ of $(T - zI)w(z) = x$, where $x$ is a certain vector in the range of $D$.**

1. Let $T$ be a bounded operator on a Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ with spectrum $\sigma(T)$ and point spectrum $\Pi_0(T)$. The range and null space of $T$ will be denoted by $R(T)$ and $N(T)$ respectively. If $A$ is any linear manifold in $\mathfrak{H}$, its closure will be denoted by $[A]$. Also, we shall consider the set of numbers $z$ for which $\bar{z} \in \Pi_0(T^*)$ and which will be denoted by $(\Pi_0(T^*))^*$.

Let $T_z = T - zI$ for any complex number $z$ and let $D$ be a nonnegative self-adjoint operator satisfying

$$(1.1) \qquad T_z T_z^* \geqq D \geqq 0 \quad \text{for all } z \text{ in } \boldsymbol{C} .$$

It was shown in Putnam [8] that if $D$ has the spectral resolution

$$(1.2) \qquad D = \int_0^\infty u dF_u$$

and if $x$ is any vector satisfying

$$(1.3) \qquad x = F((s, \infty))x , \quad s > 0 ,$$

then $T_z^{-1}x$ is bounded and weakly continuous on $\boldsymbol{C} - P$, where $P = \{z: z \in \Pi_0(T) \text{ or } \bar{z} \in \Pi_0(T^*)\}$. (Actually, the set $P$ occurring in [8] was defined differently but should have been defined as above.) This result will be strengthened below to the following

THEOREM 1. *Suppose* (1.1), (1.2) *and that* $x \in \mathfrak{H}$ *satisfies*

$$(1.4) \qquad k_x \equiv \int_{+0}^\infty u^{-1} d \, \| F_u x \|^2 < \infty .$$

*Then there exists a vector-valued function* $w(z)$ *on* $\boldsymbol{C}$ *satisfying*

$$(1.5) \qquad T_z w(z) = x \text{ and } \| w(z) \| \leqq k_x^{1/2} , \quad z \in \boldsymbol{C} ,$$

*and having the following properties. At every point* $z_0 \notin \Pi_0(T)$, $w(z)$ *is weakly continuous, that is, for every* $f$ *in* $\mathfrak{H}$, $(w(z), f)$ *is continuous at* $z_0$. *Further, if* $\mathfrak{H}$ *is separable then, for every* $f$ *in* $\mathfrak{H}$, *the function* $(w(z), f)$ *is Lebesgue planar measurable on the set* $C - (\Pi_0(T^*))^*$. *In addition, if* $\alpha$ *is any rectifiable curve in* $C$ *with arc length measure* $m_\alpha$ *and if* $m_\alpha(\alpha \cap (\Pi_0(T^*))^* = 0$ *then* $(w(z), f)$ *is* $m_\alpha$*-measurable as well as* $dz\,(= dx + idy)$*-measurable on* $\alpha$.

REMARKS. Note that if $z \notin \Pi_0(T)$ then necessarily $w(z) = T_z^{-1}x$, and that, for any $f$ in $\mathfrak{H}$, $(w(z), f)$ is analytic in $C - \sigma(T)$. Further, it is clear that all vectors $x$ of (1.3) satisfy (1.4) and hence that the set of vectors $x$ satisfying (1.4) is dense in $R(D)$.

That the set $\Pi_0(T^*)$ occurring in the statement of Theorem 1 and, more generally, the point spectrum of any bounded operator on a separable Hilbert space, is Lebesgue planar measurable follows from a result of Dixmier and Foiaş [3] as Nikolskaya [7]. We are indebted to K. F. Clancey for informing us of these facts.

Recall that a bounded operator $S$ is said to be hyponormal if $S^*S - SS^* \geqq 0$ and completely hyponormal if, in addition, there does not exist any non-trivial reducing subspace of $S$ on which its restriction is normal. If $S_z = S - zI$, then $S_z{}^*S_z - S_zS_z{}^* = S^*S - SS^*$. Clearly, if $S$ is hyponormal then $\Pi_0(S) \subset (\Pi_0(S^*))^*$ and any eigenvector of $S$ belonging to $z$ is also an eigenvector of $S^*$ belonging to $\bar{z}$. In particular, $\Pi_0(S)$ must be empty whenever $S$ is completely hyponormal. Further, it is easy to see that if $T^*$ is hyponormal then (1.1) holds with $D = TT^* - T^*T$. Consequently, in view of Theorem 1, we have the following

THEOREM 2. *Let* $T^*$ *be completely hyponormal on* $\mathfrak{H}$ *and let* $D = TT^* - T^*T\,(\geqq 0)$ *have the spectral resolution* (1.2). *If* $x \in \mathfrak{H}$ *satisfies* (1.4) *then there exists a vector-valued function* $w(z)$ *on* $C$ *satisfying the conditions of Theorem* 1. *Thus, relation* (1.5) *holds and* $w(z)$ *is weakly continuous at all points* $z_0 \notin \Pi_0(T)$. *If* $\mathfrak{H}$ *is separable, then, since* $\Pi_0(T^*)$ *is now empty,* $(w(z), f)$ *is Lebesgue planar measurable in* $C$ *and is measurable with respect to arc length measure and to the* $dz = dx + idy$ *measure on all rectifiable curves in* $C$.

As a consequence of Theorem 2 there will be proved

THEOREM 3. *Let* $T^*$ *be completely hyponormal on* $\mathfrak{H}$ *and suppose that* $T$ *is a contraction, that is,* $\|T\| \leqq 1$. *Then* $\{T^n\}_{n=1,2,\ldots}$ *converges* *strongly to* 0 *as* $n \to \infty$, *that is,* $\| T^n f \| \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$ *for every* $f$ *in* $\mathfrak{H}$.

REMARKS. It follows from Theorem 3 that if $T^*$ is any hyponormal contraction then $T$ can be written as the direct sum $T = T_1 \oplus N$, where $T_1^*$ is completely hyponormal, $T_1^n \to 0$ strongly as $n \to \infty$, and $N$ is normal. Clearly, $N = \int z dK_z$ can be further decomposed as $N = \int_{|z|<1} z dK_z + \int_{|z|=1} z dK_z = N_1 \oplus N_2$, where $N_1^n \to 0$ strongly as $n \to \infty$ and $N_2$ is unitary. Hence, one has the following

COROLLARY 1 OF THEOREM 3. *Let* $T^*$ *be any hyponormal contraction on a Hilbert space. Then* $T = T_2 \oplus U$ *where* $T_2^n \to 0$ *strongly as* $n \to \infty$ *and* $U$ *is unitary, where it is understood that either component of the direct sum may be missing.*

Thus, if $T^*$ is any completely nonunitary (cf. Sz.-Nagy and Foiaş [11], p. 72) hyponormal contraction, then $T^n \to 0$ strongly as $n \to \infty$, so that $T$ is of class $C_0$. (cf. [11], p. 72). In was shown in [8], p. 167, that if $T^*$ is a hyponormal contraction for which $T^n \not\to 0$ then $T$ has a nontrivial invariant subspace. The above Corollary yields the stronger result that $T^*$ (hence $T$) even has a unitary part. Also, it follows from the Corollary that if $T^*$ is a hyponormal contraction for which $T^n f \not\to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ whenever $f \neq 0$, then $T$ must be unitary. In case $T^*$ is also subnormal, this last result was obtained by Stampfli [10].

COROLLARY 2 OF THEOREM 3. *Let* $T$ *be a completely hyponormal contraction on a Hilbert space. Then* $T^*$ *is* (unitarily equivalent to) *the restriction of the adjoint of a unilateral shift to an invariant subspace.*

*Proof.* Actually, every contraction $S$ satisfying $S^n \to 0$ strongly as $n \to \infty$ is unitarily equivalent to the restriction of the adjoint of a unilateral shift to an invariant subspace (Foiaş [4], de Branges and Rovnyak [1, 2]. See also Halmos [5], problem 121, and Sz.-Nagy and Foiaş [11] p. 95. Note that the unilateral shift in question is, in general, not the simple unilateral shift.

2. *Proof of Theorem* 1. The proof will be an extension and refinement of the argument given in [8]. Let $z$ be fixed and let $T_z T_z^*$ have the spectral resolution

$$T_z T_z^* = \int_0^\infty u dE_u^{(z)} . \tag{2.1}$$

Then, by an argument like that on pp. 165-166 of [8],

$$\int_0^\infty \lim_{t\to 0+} (u + t)^{+1} d\, \| E_u^{(z)} x \|^2 \leqq k_x \ ,$$

where $k_x$ is defined by (1.4). It follows that

$$E^{(z)}(\{0\})x = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{+0}^\infty u^{-1} d\, \| E_u^{(z)} x \|^2 \leqq k_x \ , \tag{2.2}$$

and hence, for any $z$ in $C$,

$$y(z) = \int_{+0}^\infty u^{-1/2} dE_u^{(z)} x \text{ is defined and } \| y(z) \|^2 \leqq k_x \ . \tag{2.3}$$

Next, let $T_z = T - zI$ have the polar factorization (see Kato [6], pp. 334-335)

$$T_z = U(z)G(z) \ , \tag{2.4}$$

where $G(z) = (T_z^* T_z)^{1/2}$ and $U(z)$ is partially isometric with initial set $[R(G(z))]$ and final set $[R(T_z)]$. Then $T_z U^*(z)y(z) = (U(z)G(z)U^*(z))y(z) = (T_z T_z^*)^{1/2} y(z) = x$. On putting

$$w(z) = U^*(z)y(z) \ , \tag{2.5}$$

one sees that (1.5) follows from (2.3).

Next, it will be shown that the above defined bounded vector-valued function $w(z)$ on $C$ is weakly continuous at every point $z_0$ not in $\Pi_0(T)$. It must be shown that $w(z)$ converges weakly to $w(z_0)$, that is, for any $f$ in $\mathfrak{H}$, $(w(z), f) \to (w(z_0), f)$ as $z \to z_0$. If this limit relation did not hold however, then, since $w(z)$ is bounded, there would exist a $z_0$ and a sequence $\{z_n\}$ such that $w(z_n) \to p$ (weakly) as $z_n \to z_0$ with $p \neq w(z_0)$. It follows from the relation $T_z w(z) = x$, on letting $z = z_n$ and noting that $\| T - T_n \| \to 0$, that $T_{z_0} p = x$ and, since $T_{z_0} w(z_0) = x$, that

$$T_{z_0}(p - w(z_0)) = 0 \ . \tag{2.6}$$

Since $z_0 \notin \Pi_0(T)$, then $p = w(z_0)$, a contradiction.

There remains then to establish the measurability of $w(z)$ in the sense described in Theorem 1, at least if $\mathfrak{H}$ is separable. To this end, we first shall show that, whether or not $\mathfrak{H}$ is separable, if $T$ is any operator with the polar factorization of (2.4), then

$$U(z) \to U(z_0) \text{ strongly as } z \to z_0 \text{ whenever } z_0 \notin \Pi_0(T) \ . \tag{2.7}$$

Assume then that $z_0 \notin \Pi_0(T)$. Note (cf. [6], pp. 334-335) that

$U(z)$ is defined for vectors in $R(G(z))$ by $U(z): G(z)u \to T_z u$ and that $U(z)$ is then extended by continuity to be isometric on $[R(G(z))]$. For $y$ in $N(G(z))(=N(T_z))$, $U(z)y = 0$. Since $z_0 \notin \Pi_0(T)$, then $N(G(z_0)) = 0$ and so $U(z_0)$ is isometric.

Since $R(G(z_0))$ is dense in $\mathfrak{H}$, relation (2.7) will follow if it is shown that

$$(2.8) \quad U(z)v \longrightarrow U(z_0)v \text{ (strongly) as } z \longrightarrow z_0 \,, \text{ whenever } v \in R(G(z_0)) \,.$$

Suppose then that $v \in R(G(z_0))$, so that $v = G(z_0)u$ for some vector $u$. In view of $U(z)G(z)u = T_z u$ and $U(z_0)G(z_0)u = T_{z_0}u$, we have $U(z)v - U(z_0)v = (T_z - T_{z_0})u - U(z)(G(z) - G(z_0))u$. Since $\| T_z - T_{z_0} \| \to 0$, hence also $\|G(z) - G(z_0)\| \to 0$, as $z \to z_0$, relation (2.8), hence also (2.7), follows. By symmetry, we have also

$$(2.9) \quad U^*(z) \longrightarrow U^*(z_0) \text{ strongly as } z \longrightarrow z_0 \text{ whenever } \bar{z}_0 \notin \Pi_0(T^*) \,.$$

Henceforth, it will be supposed that $T$ is the operator occurring in the statement of Theorem 1. By (2.2) and (2.3), $y(z) \in [R(T_z T_z^*)^{1/2}] = [R(T_z)]$, and this set is the initial set of $U^*(z)$. Since $w(z) = U^*(z)y(z)$, it follows that $U(z)w(z) = U(z)U^*(z)y(z) = y(z)$. We shall show that

$$(2.10) \qquad y(z) \longrightarrow y(z_0) \text{ weakly as } z \longrightarrow z_0,\ \bar{z}_0 \notin \Pi_0(T^*) \,.$$

If (2.10) did not hold then, since $y(z)$ is (uniformly) bounded in $C$, there would exist a sequence $\{z_n\}$ for which $z_n \to z_0$ and $y(z_n) \to q$ (weakly) as $n \to \infty$ with $q \neq y(z_0)$. Since $w(z)$ is also bounded, we may choose a subsequence of $\{z_n\}$, which will also be denoted by $\{z_n\}$, such that $w(z_n) \to p$ (weakly).

Let $f$ be arbitrary in $\mathfrak{H}$. Then $(y(z_n)f) \to (q, f)$ and also $(y(z_n), f) = (U(z_n)w(z_n), f) = (w(z_n), U^*(z_n)f)$. In view of (2.9), we have $(w(z_n), U^*(z_n)f) \to (p, U^*(z_0)f) = (U(z_0)p, f)$, and hence $q = U(z_0)p$. Since $y(z_0) = U(z_0)w(z_0)$, we see that $q - y(z_0) = U(z_0)(p - w(z_0))$. But, as noted earlier, $T_{z_0}(p - w(z_0)) = 0$ (cf. (2.6)), so that $p - w(z_0) \in N(G(z_0))$ and hence $U(z_0)(p - w(z_0)) = 0$. Thus $q = y(z_0)$, a contradiction, and so (2.10) is proved.

In summary, we see that the vector-valued function $w(z)$ on $C$ is weakly continuous at $z_0 \notin \Pi_0(T)$. The vector-valued function $y(z)$ is weakly continuous at $z_0$ if $\bar{z}_0 \notin \Pi_0(T^*)$. Also, the operator-valued function $U^*(z)$ on $C$ is strongly continuous and, hence, $U(z)$ is weakly continuous at $z_0$ if $\bar{z}_0 \notin \Pi(T^*)$.

Suppose now that $\mathfrak{H}$ is separable. Then, as noted earlier, $\Pi_0(T^*)$

(hence also $(\Pi_0(T^*))^*$) is Lebesgue planar measurable. It will be shown that for any $f$ in $\mathfrak{H}$, the function $(w(z), f)$ is Lebesgue planar measurable on $C - (\Pi_0(T^*))^*$. For, let $\{\phi_n\}(n = 1, 2, \cdots)$ be any complete orthonormal system for $\mathfrak{H}$. Then $(w(z), f) = (y(z), U(z)f) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(y(z), \phi_n)(\phi_n, U(z)f)$. But each term of the summation is a function continuous at all points $z$ for which $\bar{z}$ is not in $\Pi_0(T^*)$. In particular, each such term, and hence the sum, is (planar) measurable on $C - \Pi_0(T^*))^*$. (The argument is similar to that used in [9], p. 384, in connection with the proof of Stone's theorem on unitary groups.)

Finally, a similar argument establishes the assertion of the last part of Theorem 1 and the proof is now complete.

3. *Proof of Theorem* 3. Without loss of generality it may be supposed that $\mathfrak{H}$ is separable. It follows from Theorem 2 that if $w(z)$ is defined by (2.5) and if $f$ is arbitrary in $\mathfrak{H}$, then $(w(z), f)$ is (bounded and) measurable with respect to arc length and to the measure $dz = dx + idy$ on every circle $C_r = \{z: |z| = r\}$, $0 < r < \infty$. Let

$$y(r) = -(2\pi i)^{-1}\int_{C_r} w(z)dz\left(= -r(2\pi i)^{-1}\int_C w(rt)dt\right), \tag{3.1}$$

where $C = C_1$ and all circles are oriented positively. It is understood, of course, that $y(r)$ is defined in terms of the relation $(y(r), f) = -(2\pi i)^{-1}\int_{C_r}(w(z), f)dz$ for any $f$ in $\mathfrak{H}$ and that the latter integral is a Lebesgue integral. A similar remark applies to the other integrals of this section.

The set $\Pi_0(T)\cap\{z: |z| = 1\}$ is empty; otherwise, $T$ would have a normal part. (In fact, if $T$ is any contraction and if $z$ is an eigenvalue of $T$ satisfying $|z| = 1$ with eigenvector $f$ then $\bar{z}$ is an eigenvalue of $T^*$ with the same eigenvector $f$; cf. [11], p. 8.) If $z$ is fixed and $|z| = 1$, then, by Theorem 2, $w(rz)\rightarrow w(z)$ (weakly) as $r\rightarrow 1-0$. For any fixed $f$ in $\mathfrak{H}$, it follows from (3.1) and the uniform boundedness convergence theorem that

$$(y(r), f) = -(2\pi i)^{-1}\int_{C_r}(w(z), f)dz \longrightarrow -(2\pi i)^{-1}\int_C(w(z), f)dz \text{ as } r\longrightarrow 1-0\,,$$

Thus, $y(r)\rightarrow y(1)$ (weakly) as $r\rightarrow 1-0$. Similarly, $y(r)\rightarrow y(1)$ (weakly) as $r\rightarrow 1+0$. But, if $r > 1$, $-(2\pi i)^{-1}\int_{C_r} T_z^{-1}vdz = v$, for arbitrary $v$, so that, if $x$ is any vector satisfying (1.4), $y(r) = x$ for $r > 1$ and hence $y(1) = x$. Hence, we have for such vectors $x$, (3.2) $$y(r) \longrightarrow x \text{ (weakly) as } r \longrightarrow 1 - 0 .$$

In view of (1.5),

$$\begin{aligned} Ty(r) &= -(2\pi i)^{-1} \int_{C_r} Tw(z)dz \\ &= -(2\pi i)^{-1} \int_{C_r} (T - z + z)w(z)dz , \\ &= -(2\pi i)^{-1} \int_{C_r} zw(z)dz . \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one sees that $T^n y(r) = -(2\pi i)^{-1} \int_{C_r} z^n w(z)dz$ for $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, and hence

(3.3) $$T^n y(r) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ (strongly) as } n \longrightarrow \infty, \text{ for } r < 1 .$$

Next, let $\mathfrak{M} = \{v: T^n v \rightarrow 0 \text{ (strongly) as } n \rightarrow \infty\}$. Since $T$ is a constraction, $\mathfrak{M}$ is a subspace invariant under $T$. Also, by (3.3), each $y(r)$, $r < 1$, belongs to $\mathfrak{M}$. Hence, by (3.2), if $u$ is any vector in $\mathfrak{M}^\perp$, $0 = (y(r), u) \rightarrow (x, u)$ as $r \rightarrow 1 - 0$, and so $x \in \mathfrak{M}$, where $x$ is any vector satisfying (1.4). Since such vectors are dense in $R(D)$, $R(D) \subset \mathfrak{M}$.

Let now $\mathfrak{L}$ denote the least subspace containing $R(D)$ and reducing $T$. It will be shown that

(3.4) $$\mathfrak{L} \subset \mathfrak{M} .$$

To see this, note that if $u \in \mathfrak{M}$ then $Tu \in \mathfrak{M}$. Also, $TT^* - TT^* = D$ and hence $T^n T^* u = T^{n-1} T^* Tu + T^{n-1} Du$. Since $Du \in \mathfrak{M}$, then $T^{n-1} Du \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and hence $\limsup_{n\rightarrow\infty} \| T^n T^* u \| \leqq \| Tu \|$. Repetition of this argument shows that $\limsup_{n\rightarrow\infty} \| T^n T^* u \| \leqq \| T^k u \|$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots$, and hence $T^n Tu \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so that $T^* u \in \mathfrak{M}$. Thus, whenever $u$ is in $\mathfrak{M}$ so also are $Tu$ and $T^* u$. Since $R(D) \subset \mathfrak{M}$, the desired relation (3.4) follows.

It is clear that $\mathfrak{L}^\perp$ also reduces $T$ and that $T \mid \mathfrak{L}^\perp$ is normal. Since $T^*$ is completely hyponormal then $\mathfrak{L}^\perp = 0$, and so by (3.4), $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{H}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

## REFERENCES

1. L. de Branges and J. Rovnyak, *The existence of invariant subspaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **70** (1964), 718-721.

2. ———, Correction to *The existence of invariant subspaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **71** (1965), 396.

3. J. Dixmier and C. Foiaş, *Sur le spectre ponctuel d'un opérateur*, Colloq. Math. Soc. János. Bolyai (**5**), Hilbert Space Operators, Tihany (Hungary), (1970), 127-133.

4. C. Foiaş, *A remark on the universal model for contractions of G. C. Rota,* Com. Acad. R. P. Romîne, **13** (1963), 349-352.
5. P. R. Halmos, *A Hilbert Space Problem Book,* van Nostrand Co., Princeton, N. J., 1967.
6. T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators,* Springer-Verlag, 1966.
7. L. N. Nikolskaya, *Structure of the point spectrum of a linear operator*; English translation in Math. Notes, 1974, of article in Math. Zametki, **15** (1974), 149-158.
8. C. R. Putnam, *Resolvent vectors, invariant subspaces and sets of zero capacity,* Math. Ann., **205** (1973), 165-171.
9. F. Riesz and B. Sz.-Nagy, *Functional Analysis,* Frederick Ungar Pub. Co., 1955.
10. J. G. Stampfli, *Spectral subspaces for hyponormal operators,* preprint.
11. B. Sz.-Nagy and C. Foiaş, *Harmonic Analysis of Operators on Hilbert Space,* North Holland-American Elsevier, 1970.

Received November 27, 1974. This work was supported by a National Science Foundation research grant.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS




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

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics expects the author's institution to pay page charges, and reserves the right to delay publication for nonpayment of charges in case of financial emergency.

100 reprints 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: $72.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: $36.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

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

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

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

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 57, No. 2 February, 1975