

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

WEYL'S INEQUALITY AND QUADRATIC FORMS ON THE GRASSMANNIAN

PATRICIA ANDRESEN AND MARVIN DAVID MARCUS

WEYL'S INEQUALITY AND QUADRATIC FORMS ON THE GRASSMANNIAN

PATRICIA ANDRESEN AND MARVIN MARCUS

This paper is concerned with the largest absolute value taken on by an m -square principal subdeterminant in any unitary transform of an n -square complex matrix A . For $m = 1$ this maximum coincides with the numerical radius of A . The results obtained constitute generalizations of the Gohberg-Kreĭn analysis of the case of equality in Weyl's inequalities relating eigenvalues and singular values.

Introduction. Let A be an n -square complex matrix with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, |\lambda_1| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_n|$, and singular values $\alpha_1(A) \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n(A)$. The *numerical radius* of A , $r(A)$, is the maximum absolute value assumed by a diagonal element in any unitary transform of A , i.e., in any matrix unitarily similar to A . Of course,

$$(1) \quad |\lambda_1| \leq r(A).$$

Matrices for which equality holds in (1) are called *spectral*. In this paper we consider $r_{d,m}(A)$, the largest absolute value taken on by an m -square principal subdeterminant in any unitary transform of A . As we shall see in the sequel

$$(2) \quad |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m| \leq r_{d,m}(A).$$

For $m = 1$, (2) collapses to (1). Matrices for which equality holds in (2) will be called *m -decomposably spectral*. One of the purposes of this paper is to examine the structure of matrices A which are *m -decomposably spectral* for each $m = 1, \dots, n$. Such results are related to the inequalities of Weyl [5],

$$(3) \quad |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_k| \leq \alpha_1(A) \cdots \alpha_k(A), \quad k = 1, \dots, n,$$

and to the case of equality in (3) for $k = 1, \dots, n$ discussed by Gohberg and Kreĭn [1]. We also examine the case where A is *m -decomposably spectral* for a particular m and, in fact, show that if A has s eigenvalues of maximum modulus $|\lambda_1|$, $s > m$, then *spectral* and *m -decomposably spectral* are equivalent. To examine the concept of *m -decomposably spectral* we require the machinery of induced maps on the m th Grassmann space.

2. Preliminary notions and theorems. Let V be an n -dimensional unitary space with an inner product (x, y) . Let $T: V \rightarrow V$ be

a linear transformation with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, |\lambda_1| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_n|$, and singular values $\alpha_1(T) \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n(T)$. Let $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be an o.n. basis of V and let $A = [T]_E^E$, the matrix representation of T with respect to E . We will consider A as a linear transformation on C^n , the space of complex n -tuples. For each $m, 1 \leq m \leq n$, let $\Lambda^m V$ be the m th Grassmann space over V where the inner product induced on $\Lambda^m V$ by (x, y) is defined by

$$(x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_m, y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge y_m) = \det [(x_i, y_j)]$$

for any decomposable tensors x^\wedge and y^\wedge in $\Lambda^m V$, i.e., $x^\wedge = x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_m, y^\wedge = y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge y_m$ where x_i and y_i are in $V, i = 1, \dots, m$. The space $\Lambda^m V$ has an ordered o.n. basis $E^\wedge = \{e_{\omega(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{\omega(m)} = e_\omega^\wedge : \omega \in Q_{m,n}\}$ where $Q_{m,n}$ is the totality of strictly increasing sequences ω of length $m, 1 \leq \omega(1) < \dots < \omega(m) \leq n$, and where the ω 's are assumed to be ordered lexicographically. The compound $C_m(T): \Lambda^m V \rightarrow \Lambda^m V$ is defined by

$$C_m(T)x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_m = Tx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Tx_m$$

for any decomposable $x^\wedge \in \Lambda^m V$. Let $C_m(A) = [C_m(T)]_{E^\wedge}^{E^\wedge}$. Then $C_m(A)$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_\beta = \lambda_{\beta(1)} \dots \lambda_{\beta(m)}, \beta \in Q_{m,n}$ and singular values $\alpha_\gamma = \alpha_{\gamma(1)}(A) \dots \alpha_{\gamma(m)}(A), \gamma \in Q_{m,n}$.

The *numerical radius* of A is defined by

$$r(A) = \max_{\|x\|=1} |(Ax, x)|.$$

and the *spectral norm* of A by

$$\alpha_1(A) = \max_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax\|.$$

The Grassmannian in $\Lambda^m V$ is the set

$$G_m = \left\{ x^\wedge \in \Lambda^m V : \|x^\wedge\| = 1 \text{ and } x^\wedge \text{ is decomposable} \right\},$$

and the *decomposable numerical radius* of $C_m(A)$ is defined by

$$(4) \quad r_d(C_m(A)) = \max_{x^\wedge \in G_m} |(C_m(A)x^\wedge, x^\wedge)|.$$

In (4) we may assume without loss of generality that for each $x^\wedge = x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_m$ the vectors x_1, \dots, x_m are o.n. Since the α, β entry of $C_m(A)$ is $\det A[\alpha|\beta]$, where $A[\alpha|\beta]$ indicates the submatrix of A lying in rows α and columns $\beta, \alpha, \beta \in Q_{m,n}$, we see that by taking $Ue_i = x_i, i = 1, \dots, m, U$ unitary, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_d(C_m(A)) &= \max_{x^\wedge \in G_m} |(C_m(A)x^\wedge, x^\wedge)| \\ &= \max_{U \text{ unitary}} |(C_m(A)C_m(U)e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_m, C_m(U)e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_m)| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \max_{U \text{ unitary}} |\det U^* A U [1, \dots, m | 1, \dots, m]| \\
&= r_{d,m}(A).
\end{aligned}$$

Of course if $m = 1$, $r_d(C_m(A)) = r(A)$. In general,

$$(5) \quad r_d(C_m(A)) \leq r(C_m(A)).$$

It is possible to have strict inequality in (5) as the following example shows. Let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

so that

$$C_2(A)_{\alpha,\beta} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \alpha = (12), \beta = (34) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $x^\wedge \in G_m$ then $x^\wedge = \sum_{\alpha \in Q_{2,4}} p(\alpha) e_\alpha^\wedge$ where

$$(6) \quad \sum_{\alpha \in Q_{2,4}} |p(\alpha)|^2 = 1$$

and the $p(\alpha)$ satisfy the quadratic Plücker relations [4]:

$$(7) \quad p(\alpha)p(\beta) = \sum_{t=1}^m p(\alpha[s, t: \beta])p(\beta[t, s: \alpha]), \quad s = 1, \dots, m$$

where $\alpha[s, t: \beta]$ is the sequence $(\alpha(1), \dots, \alpha(s-1), \beta(t), \alpha(s+1), \dots, \alpha(m))$ and $p(\alpha)$ is defined for any sequence α of length m by skew-symmetry. We have for $x^\wedge \in G_m$

$$\begin{aligned}
(8) \quad |(C_2(A)x^\wedge, x^\wedge)| &= |p(12)p(34)| \\
&= |p(32)p(14) + p(42)p(31)|, \quad (\text{from (7) with } s=1) \\
&\leq |p(23)| |p(14)| + |p(24)| |p(13)| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} (|p(23)|^2 + |p(14)|^2 + |p(24)|^2 + |p(13)|^2) \\
&= \frac{1 - |p(12)|^2 - |p(34)|^2}{2}, \quad (\text{from (6)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
(|p(12)| + |p(34)|)^2 &\leq 1, \\
(|p(12)| + |p(34)|) &= c \leq 1, \\
|p(12)| |p(34)| &= |p(12)|(c - |p(12)|),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$|(p(12)p(34))| \leq \frac{c^2}{4} \leq \frac{1}{4} .$$

From (8) we see that

$$r_d(C_2(A)) \leq \frac{1}{4} .$$

If we consider the quadratic form evaluated on the indecomposable unit tensor $1/\sqrt{2}(e_1 \wedge e_2 + e_3 \wedge e_4)$ we have

$$\left(C_2(A) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 \wedge e_2 + e_3 \wedge e_4), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_1 \wedge e_2 + e_3 \wedge e_4)\right) = \frac{1}{2} ,$$

so that

$$r(C_2(A)) \geq \frac{1}{2} .$$

The explanation of this phenomenon is that not every tensor on the unit sphere in $\wedge^2 V$ is decomposable.

The following results are well known [3]:

(i) For M any principal sub-matrix of A ,

$$(9) \quad r(M) \leq r(A) .$$

(ii) (The Elliptical Range Theorem.) For a 2×2 matrix the numerical range is an ellipse with foci the eigenvalues of the matrix; if $A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \alpha \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix}$ then the semi-minor axis of the ellipse has length $|\alpha|/2$.

(iii)

$$(10) \quad |\lambda_1| \leq r(A) \leq \alpha_1(A) .$$

We may generalize (10) for $1 \leq m \leq n$ to

$$(11) \quad |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m| \leq r_d(C_m(A)) \leq r(C_m A) \leq \alpha_1(A) \cdots \alpha_m(A) .$$

The first inequality may be seen as follows. Let

$$U^*AU = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & * \\ & \cdot & & \\ & & \cdot & \\ \circ & & & \lambda_n \end{bmatrix} .$$

Then $C_m(U^*AU)$ is also upper triangular and

$$\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m = C_m(U^*AU)_{(1, \dots, m), (1, \dots, m)} = (C_m(A)u^\wedge, u^\wedge)$$

for an appropriate $u^\wedge \in G_m$. If A is normal then equality holds throughout (10) and (11). A proof of the Weyl inequalities (3) is

now immediate. The first follows from (10) and the subsequent ones from (11). Since $r_{d,m}(A) = r_d(C_m(A))$ we will say that $C_m(A)$, $1 \leq m \leq n$, is *decomposably spectral* if

$$|\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m| = r_d(C_m(A)).$$

M. Goldberg, E. Tadmor and G. Zwas [2] have shown that if $|\lambda_1| = \cdots = |\lambda_s| > |\lambda_{s+1}| \geq \cdots \geq |\lambda_n|$ then A is spectral iff A is unitarily similar to a matrix of the form $T + B$ where

$$(12a) \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & \circ \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ \circ & & & \lambda_s \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{s+1} & & & * \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ \circ & & & \lambda_n \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$(12b) \quad r(B) \leq |\lambda_1|.$$

THEOREM 1 (Gohberg and Kreĭn). *Equality holds in (3) for $k = 1, \dots, n$ iff A is normal.*

We include a proof of this theorem based on properties of the Grassmann algebra which suggests a proof of the following stronger result:

THEOREM 2. *For each $m = 1, \dots, n$*

$$(13) \quad |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m| \leq r_d(C_m(A)), \quad m = 1, \dots, n.$$

Equality holds in (13) for $m = 1, \dots, n$ iff A is normal. Equivalently, the largest absolute value taken on by an m -square principal subdeterminant in any unitary transform of A is at least $|\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m|$, $m = 1, \dots, n$. This largest absolute value is equal to $|\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m|$ for $m = 1, \dots, n$ iff A is normal.

We will also investigate the case of equality in a single one of the inequalities in (13).

THEOREM 3. *Assume that A has s eigenvalues of maximum modulus, $s > m$:*

$$|\lambda_1| = \cdots = |\lambda_s| > |\lambda_{s+1}| \geq \cdots \geq |\lambda_n|.$$

Then $C_m(A)$ is decomposably spectral iff A is spectral.

3. Proofs and examples.

Proof of Theorem 1. Clearly if A is normal then $|\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_k| =$

$\alpha_1(A) \cdots \alpha_k(A)$, $k = 1, \dots, n$. Suppose now that $|\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_k| = \alpha_1(A)_1^k \cdots \alpha_k(A)$, $k = 1, \dots, n$. By Schur's theorem we may assume

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & * \\ & \ddots & \\ \circ & & \lambda_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let

$$|\lambda_1| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_t| > 0 = |\lambda_{t+1}| = \dots = |\lambda_n|,$$

for some t , $1 \leq t \leq n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (AA^*)_{11} &= |\lambda_1|^2 + |\alpha_{12}|^2 + \dots + |\alpha_{1n}|^2 \\ &\leq \alpha_1^2(A). \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\lambda_1| = \alpha_1(A)$ we must have $\alpha_{ii} = 0$, $i \neq 1$ and

$$A_{(1)} = \lambda_1 e_1.$$

$(A_{(1)}$ is the first row of A , i.e., the n -tuple (a_{11}, \dots, a_{1n}) .) Applying this argument to $C_m(A)$, $1 \leq m \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (14) \quad C_m(A)_{(1)} &= A_{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{(m)} \\ &= \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_m. \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that we have shown

$$(15) \quad A_{(i)} = \lambda_i e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k - 1, k \leq t.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} (16) \quad A_{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{(k)} &= \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{k-1} e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_{k-1} \wedge \left(\lambda_k e_k + \sum_{i=k+1}^n a_{ki} e_i \right) \\ &= \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_k e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_k + \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{k-1} \left(\sum_{i=k+1}^n a_{ki} e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_{k-1} \wedge e_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since the representation of $A_{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{(k)}$ with respect to the basis E^\wedge is unique and since $\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_k \neq 0$, (14) and (16) imply $\alpha_{ki} = 0$, $i = k + 1, \dots, n$. We have

$$A = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_t) \dagger B$$

where

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & * \\ & \ddots & \\ \circ & & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

However, $|\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{t+1}| = \alpha_1(A) \cdots \alpha_{t+1}(A)$ implies that

$$\alpha_{t+1}(A) = \cdots = \alpha_n(A) = 0.$$

Thus AA^* , and hence A , has rank t so that $B = 0_{n-t}$. Thus A is normal.

Proof of Theorem 2. If A is normal then obviously equality holds in (13) for $m = 1, \dots, n$. Conversely, assume that (13) is equality, $m = 1, \dots, n$. Without loss of generality we can assume

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & * \\ & \ddots & \\ \circ & & \lambda_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Suppose there exists an a_{1i} , $i \neq 1$, such that a_{1i} is nonzero. Then from (9),

$$|\lambda_1| = r(A) \geq r \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & a_{1i} \\ 0 & \lambda_i \end{bmatrix} \geq |\lambda_i|,$$

so that by the Elliptical Range Theorem $a_{1i} = 0$ and

$$A_{(1)} = \lambda_1 e_1.$$

Let

$$|\lambda_1| \geq \cdots \geq |\lambda_t| > 0 = |\lambda_{t+1}| = \cdots = |\lambda_n|$$

for some t , $1 \leq t \leq n$, and suppose we have shown that

$$A_{(i)} = \lambda_i e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k-1, \quad k \leq t.$$

Let $1 \leq r \leq n - k$ and consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} e(u, v) &= (C_k(A)e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k-1} \wedge (ue_k + ve_{k+r}), \\ &\quad e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k-1} \wedge (ue_k + ve_{k+r})) \end{aligned}$$

where $|u|^2 + |v|^2 = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (17) \quad e(u, v) &= \left(\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{k-1} \left(u \lambda_k e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k-1} \wedge e_k + v \sum_{i=k}^{k+r} a_{i, k+r} e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k-1} \wedge e_i \right), \right. \\ &\quad \left. u e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k-1} \wedge e_k + v e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k-1} \wedge e_{k+r} \right) \\ &= \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{k-1} \{ |u|^2 \lambda_k + v \bar{u} a_{k, k+r} + |v|^2 \lambda_{k+r} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_k & a_{k, k+r} \\ 0 & \lambda_{k+r} \end{bmatrix}.$$

If $a_{k,k+r} \neq 0$ then from the Elliptical Range Theorem $r(C) > |\lambda_k|$, i.e., there exist u and v , $|u|^2 + |v|^2 = 1$, such that the expression in curly brackets on the right side of (17) has absolute value greater than $|\lambda_k|$. Since $\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{k-1}$ is nonzero we conclude that $|e(u, v)| > |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_k|$. But $e(u, v)$ is a value of the quadratic form associated with $C_k(A)$ on a decomposable tensor of unit length, and thus it follows that $r_d(C_k(A)) > |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_k|$. Therefore $a_{k,k+r} = 0$, $r = 1, \dots, n - k$ and thus

$$A = \text{diag}(\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_t) \dot{+} B$$

where

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & * \\ & \ddots & \\ \bigcirc & & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Next assume $a_{t+1,i} \neq 0$ for some $i > t + 1$. Then the $(1, \dots, t, t + 1)$, $(1, \dots, t, i)$ element of $C_{t+1}(A)$ is $\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_t a_{t+1,i} \neq 0$. Letting x^\wedge be the decomposable unit tensor $1/\sqrt{2}(e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_t \wedge e_{t+1} + e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_t \wedge e_i)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (C_{t+1}(A)x^\wedge, x^\wedge) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_t e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_t \wedge \left(a_{t+1,i} e_{t+1} + \sum_{j=t+2}^n a_{j_i} e_j \right), \right. \\ &\quad \left. e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_t \wedge e_{t+1} + e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_t \wedge e_i \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_t a_{t+1,i} \\ &\neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

But then $r_d(C_{t+1}(A)) \geq 1/2 |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_t a_{t+1,i}| > |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_t \lambda_{t+1}| = 0$, contradicting the assumption that (13) is equality for $m = t + 1$. Thus

$$A_{(t+1)} = 0.$$

Suppose that we have shown

$$A_{(t+r)} = 0, \quad r = 1, \dots, k - 1.$$

If there exists an element $a_{t+k,i}$, $i > t + k$, which is nonzero we see that the $(1, \dots, t, t + k)$, $(1, \dots, t, i)$ element of $C_{t+1}(A)$ is $\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_t a_{t+k,i} \neq 0$. Let $x^\wedge = 1/\sqrt{2}(e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_t \wedge e_{t+k} + e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_t \wedge e_i) \in G_{t+1}$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} (C_{t+1}(A)x^\wedge, x^\wedge) &= \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_t a_{t+k,i} \\ &\neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the fact that $r_d(C_{t+1}(A)) = 0$. We conclude that $B = 0_{n-t}$

and hence that A is normal.

Proof of Theorem 3. Once again we may assume that

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & * \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ \circ & & & \lambda_m \end{bmatrix},$$

so that $C_m(A)$ is also upper triangular. Let $\alpha \in Q_{m,s}, \gamma \in Q_{m,n}$, and assume $\gamma > \alpha$, i.e., γ follows α in the lexicographic ordering. Moreover suppose that $|\alpha \cap \gamma| = m - 1$, i.e., $\text{Im } \alpha$ and $\text{Im } \gamma$ overlap in $m - 1$ places. Then if $|s|^2 + |t|^2 = 1, se_\alpha^\wedge + te_\gamma^\wedge \in G_m$ and

$$(18) \quad |(C_m(A)(se_\alpha^\wedge + te_\gamma^\wedge), se_\alpha^\wedge + te_\gamma^\wedge)| \leq |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m| ;$$

$$\begin{aligned} |(C_m(A)(se_\alpha^\wedge + te_\gamma^\wedge), se_\alpha^\wedge + te_\gamma^\wedge)| &= |s|^2 C_m(A)_{\alpha,\alpha} + s\bar{t} C_m(A)_{\gamma,\alpha} \\ &\quad + t\bar{s} C_m(A)_{\alpha,\gamma} + |t|^2 C_m(A)_{\gamma,\gamma} \\ &= |s|^2 \lambda_\alpha + t\bar{s} p(\gamma) + |t|^2 \lambda_\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

where $p(\gamma) = C_m(A)_{\alpha,\gamma}$;

$$|(C_m(A)(se_\alpha^\wedge + te_\gamma^\wedge), se_\alpha^\wedge + te_\gamma^\wedge)| = |\lambda_1|^{m-1} \left| |s|^2 \lambda_i + \frac{t\bar{s}}{c} p(\gamma) + |t|^2 \lambda_j \right|$$

where $|\lambda_i| = |\lambda_1|$ and $c \neq 0$. From (18) we have

$$\left| |s|^2 \lambda_i + \frac{t\bar{s}}{c} p(\gamma) + |t|^2 \lambda_j \right| \leq |\lambda_1|.$$

Applying the Elliptical Range Theorem to the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & \frac{p(\gamma)}{c} \\ 0 & \lambda_j \end{bmatrix}$$

tells us that unless $p(\gamma) = 0$ there exists an s and $t, |s|^2 + |t|^2 = 1$, for which $\left| |s|^2 \lambda_i + t\bar{s}/c p(\gamma) + |t|^2 \lambda_j \right| > |\lambda_1|$. Thus

$$C_m(A)_{\alpha,\gamma} = 0 \quad \text{if } \alpha \in Q_{m,s}, \gamma > \alpha, \text{ and } |\alpha \cap \gamma| = m - 1.$$

The elements of row α of $C_m(A)$ are the Plücker coordinates of the decomposable tensor $A_{\alpha(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{\alpha(m)}$ and therefore satisfy the quadratic Plücker relations:

$$(19) \quad p(\alpha)p(\gamma) = \sum_{t=1}^m p(\alpha[s, t; \gamma])p(\gamma[t, s; \alpha]), \quad s = 1, \dots, m.$$

For $\gamma > \alpha, |\alpha \cap \gamma| = m - 1$, we have seen that $p(\gamma) = 0$. Let $\gamma > \alpha, |\alpha \cap \gamma| \neq m - 1$. Pick s in (19) so that $\alpha(s) \notin \text{Im } \gamma$. Then

$|\alpha[s, t: \gamma] \cap \alpha| = m - 1$ so that the first factor in each summand of (19) is zero. Since $p(\alpha) = \lambda_{\alpha(1)} \cdots \lambda_{\alpha(m)} \neq 0$ we have $p(\gamma) = 0$, i.e.,

$$(20) \quad (C_m(A))_{\alpha, \gamma} = 0, \alpha \in Q_{m,s}, \alpha \neq \gamma.$$

From (20),

$$A_{\alpha(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{\alpha(m)} = \lambda_{\alpha(1)} \cdots \lambda_{\alpha(m)} e_{\alpha(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{\alpha(m)},$$

which in turn implies the equality of the subspaces spanned by the two sets of vectors, i.e.,

$$(21) \quad \langle A_{\alpha(1)}, \dots, A_{\alpha(m)} \rangle = \langle e_{\alpha(1)}, \dots, e_{\alpha(m)} \rangle, \alpha \in Q_{m,s}$$

$\langle x_1, \dots, x_m \rangle$ means the linear span of x_1, \dots, x_m . Since $s > m$, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ there exist sequences $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in Q_{m,s}$ such that $\{i\} = \bigcap_{j=1}^m \text{Im } \alpha_j$. If $\alpha \in Q_{m,s}$ then each $\alpha(i) \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, so that there exist sequences $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ such that $\{\alpha(i)\} = \bigcap_{j=1}^m \text{Im } \alpha_j$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\alpha(i)} \in \bigcap_{j=1}^m \langle A_{\alpha_j(1)}, \dots, A_{\alpha_j(m)} \rangle &= \bigcap_{j=1}^m \langle e_{\alpha_j(1)}, \dots, e_{\alpha_j(m)} \rangle, \text{ (from (21))} \\ &= \langle e_{\alpha(i)} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $A = T \dagger B$ where

$$T = \text{diag} (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s), B = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{s+1} & & * \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \lambda_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Finally, suppose there exists $u \in C^{n-s}, \|u\| = 1$, such that $|(Bu, u)| > |\lambda_1|$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} x_i &= e_i, i = 1, \dots, m - 1, \\ x_m &= 0 \dagger u = (0, \dots, 0, u_1, \dots, u_{n-s}). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |(C_m(A)x^\wedge, x^\wedge)| &= \left| \det \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & \circ \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \lambda_{m-1} & \\ * & \cdots & * & (Bu, u) \end{bmatrix} \right| \\ &= |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{m-1} (Bu, u)| \\ &> |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_m|, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the hypothesis that $C_m(A)$ is decomposably spectral. Therefore $r(B) \leq |\lambda_1|$ and by (12), A is spectral.

To prove the converse, observe that $r_d(C_m(A)) \geq |\lambda_1|^m$. Suppose

$r_d(C_m(A)) > |\lambda_1|^m$. Then there exists $x^\wedge \in G_m$ such that

$$|C_m(A)x^\wedge, x^\wedge| > |\lambda_1|^m.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume x_1, \dots, x_m are o.n. Let $Ue_i = x_i, i = 1, \dots, U$ unitary, and compute that

$$\begin{aligned} |(C_m(A)x^\wedge, x^\wedge)| &= |(C_m((U^*AU)e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_m, e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_m))| \\ &= |\det U^*AU[1, \dots, m | 1, \dots, m]|. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $B = U^*AU[1, \dots, m | 1, \dots, m]$, we have

$$|\det B| > |\lambda_1|^m,$$

so that B has an eigenvalue $\tilde{\lambda}$ satisfying $|\tilde{\lambda}| > |\lambda_1|$. There exists a unitary m -square V for which

$$V^*BV = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\lambda} & & & \\ & \cdot & * & \\ & & \cdot & \\ & & & \cdot & \\ \circ & & & & * \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $W = V \dagger I_{n-m}$ and note that

$$W^*U^*AUW = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \tilde{\lambda} & & & & & \\ & \cdot & * & & & \\ & & \cdot & & & * \\ \circ & & & * & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ * & & & & * & \end{array} \right].$$

Let $X = UW$; $X^{(1)}$, the first column of X , is a unit vector and

$$\begin{aligned} |(AX^{(1)}, X^{(1)})| &= |(X^*AX)_{11}| \\ &= |\tilde{\lambda}| > |\lambda_1|. \end{aligned}$$

But this contradicts the fact that $r(A) = |\lambda_1|$. Therefore, $r_d(C_m(A)) = |\lambda_1|^m$.

In the second part of Theorem 3 the hypothesis $s \geq m$ is necessary. For, let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and note that

$$\frac{1}{2}(C_2(A)\{e_1 \wedge e_3 + e_1 \wedge e_2\}, \{e_1 \wedge e_3 + e_1 \wedge e_2\}) = 1 > \lambda_1\lambda_2 = 0.$$

Also the hypothesis $s > m$ in the first part of Theorem 3 is necessary as the following examples illustrate:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$C_2(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix};$$

then $r_d(C_2(A)) = 1 = \lambda_1\lambda_2$, but $r(A) \geq r\left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right) > 1$;

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$C_2(A) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix};$$

then $r_d(C_2(A)) = 1/2 = \lambda_1\lambda_2$, but $r(A) \geq r\left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}\right) > 1$. Also observe that although Theorem 3 implies that if $C_m(A)$ is spectral, $m < s$, then A is spectral, the converse is false. For example, let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $r(A) = 1$ but $r(C_2(A)) \geq r\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) = 2$ so that $C_2(A)$ is not spectral.

REFERENCES

1. I. C. Gohberg and M. G. Krein, *Introduction to the Theory of Linear Nonselfadjoint Operators*, translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 18, Amer. Math. Soc., 1969, p. 36.
2. M. Goldberg, E. Tadmor and G. Zwas, *The numerical radius and spectral metrics*, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, **2** (1975), 209-214.
3. P. R. Halmos, *A Hilbert Space Problem Book*, Van Nostrand, 1967.
4. M. Marcus, *Finite Dimensional Multilinear Algebra*, Part II, Pure and Appl. Math. Series, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1975.

5. H. Weyl, *Inequalities between the two kinds of eigenvalues of a linear transformation*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., **35** (1949), 408-411.

Received August 12, 1976. Research of the second author was supported by a grant from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, 72-2164.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

AND

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-SANTA BARBARA

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

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

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

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

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

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

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

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
* * *
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

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 your manuscript. You may however, 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. 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.),
8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Copyright © 1975 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Manufactured and first issued in Japan

Patricia Andresen and Marvin David Marcus, <i>Weyl's inequality and quadratic forms on the Grassmannian</i>	277
George Bachman and Alan Sultan, <i>Regular lattice measures: mappings and spaces</i>	291
David Geoffrey Cantor, <i>On certain algebraic integers and approximation by rational functions with integral coefficients</i>	323
James Richard Choike, <i>On the value distribution of functions meromorphic in the unit disk with a spiral asymptotic value</i>	339
David Earl Dobbs, <i>Divided rings and going-down</i>	353
Mark Finkelstein and Robert James Whitley, <i>Integrals of continuous functions</i>	365
Ronald Owen Fulp and Joe Alton Marlin, <i>Integrals of foliations on manifolds with a generalized symplectic structure</i>	373
Cheong Seng Hoo, <i>Principal and induced fibrations</i>	389
Wu-Chung Hsiang and Richard W. Sharpe, <i>Parametrized surgery and isotopy</i>	401
Surender Kumar Jain, Surjeet Singh and Robin Gregory Symonds, <i>Rings whose proper cyclic modules are quasi-injective</i>	461
Pushpa Juneja, <i>On extreme points of the joint numerical range of commuting normal operators</i>	473
Athanassios G. Kartsatos, <i>Nth order oscillations with middle terms of order $N - 2$</i>	477
John Keith Luedeman, <i>The generalized translational hull of a semigroup</i>	489
Louis Jackson Ratliff, Jr., <i>The altitude formula and DVR's</i>	509
Ralph Gordon Stanton, C. Sudler and Hugh C. Williams, <i>An upper bound for the period of the simple continued fraction for \sqrt{D}</i>	525
David Westreich, <i>Global analysis and periodic solutions of second order systems of nonlinear differential equations</i>	537
David Lee Armacost, <i>Correction to: "Compactly cogenerated LCA groups"</i>	555
Jerry Malzan, <i>Corrections to: "On groups with a single involution"</i>	555
David Westreich, <i>Correction to: "Bifurcation of operator equations with unbounded linearized part"</i>	555