Pacific Journal of Mathematics

REMARKS ON NONLINEAR CONTRACTIONS

KUN-JEN CHUNG

Vol. 101, No. 1 November 1982

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 101, No. 1, 1982

REMARKS ON NONLINEAR CONTRACTIONS

KUN-JEN CHUNG

Throughout this paper, we assume that K is strongly normal, that $P = \{d(x, y); x, y \in X\}$, that $\bar{P}$ denotes the weak closure of P, and that $P_1 = \{z; z \in \bar{P}$ and $z \neq \mathcal{O}\}$. The main result of this paper is the following.

Let (X, d) be a nonempty K-complete metric space, and let S, T be mappings of X into itself satisfying (1) and (2).

$$\phi(d(Sx, Ty)) \leqq d(x, y)\,, \quad x \neq y \in X\,, \tag{1}$$

$$\phi(t) > t \quad \text{for any} \quad t \in P_1\,, \tag{2}$$

where $\phi: P_1 \to K$ is lower semicontinuous on P_1.

Then exactly one of the following three statements holds:

(a) S and T have a common fixed point, which is the only periodic point for both S and T;

(b) There exist a point $x_0 \in X$ and an integer $p > 1$ such that $Sx_0 = x_0 = T^p x_0$ and $Tx_0 \neq x_0$;

(c) There exist a point $y_0 \in X$ and an integer $q > 1$ such that $S^q y_0 = y_0 = Ty_0$ and $Sy_0 \neq y_0$.

Recently, J. Eisenfeld and V. Lakshmikantham [6, 7, 8], J. C. Bolen and B. B. Williams [1], S. Heikkila and S. Seikkala [9, 10], K. J. Chung [3, 4], M. Kwapisz [12] J. Wazewski [16] proved some fixed point theorems in abstract cones which extend and generalize many known results. In this paper, we extend some main results of A. Meir and E. Keeler [14] and C. L. Yen and K. J. Chung [17] to cone-valued metric spaces.

(I). Definitions. Let E be a normed space. A set $K \subset E$ is said to be a cone if (i) K is closed (ii) if $u, v \in K$ then $\alpha u + \tau v \in K$ for all $\alpha, \tau \geqq 0$, (iii) $K \cap (-K) = \{\mathcal{O}\}$ where $\mathcal{O}$ is the zero of the space E, and (iv) $K^0 \neq \phi$ where K^0 is the interior of K. We say $u \geqq v$ if and only if $u - v \in K$, and $u > v$ if and only if $u - v \in K$ and $u \neq v$. The cone K is said to be strongly normal if there is a $\delta > 0$ such that if $z = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i x_i$, $x_i \in K$, $\|x_i\| = 1$, $b_i \geqq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i = 1$, implies $\|z\| > \delta$. The cone K is said to be normal if there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $\|f_1 + f_2\| > \delta$ for $f_1, f_2 \in K$ and $\|f_1\| = \|f_2\| = 1$. The norm in E is said to be semimonotone if there is a numerical constant M such that $\mathcal{O} \leqq x \leqq y$ implies $\|x\| \leqq M\|y\|$ (where the constant M does not depend on x and y).

Let X be a set and K a cone. A function $d: X \times X \to K$ is said to be a K-metric on X if and only if (i) $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$, (ii) $d(x, y) = \mathcal{O}$ if and only if $x = y$, and (iii) $d(x, y) \leqq d(x, z) + d(z, y)$.

A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in a K-metric space X is said to converge to x_0 in X if and only if for each $u \in K^0$ there exists a positive integer N such that $d(x_n, x_0) \leqq u$ for all $n \geqq N$. A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X is Cauchy if and only if for each $u \in K^0$ there exists a positive integer N such that $d(x_n, x_m) \leqq u$ for all $n, m \geqq N$. The K-metric space (X, d) is said to be complete if and only if every Cauchy sequence in X converges.

Throughout the rest of this paper we assume that K is strongly normal, that E is a reflexive Banach space, that (X, d) is a complete K-metric space, that $P = \{d(x, y); x, y \in X\}$, that $\bar{P}$ denotes that weak closure of P, and that $P_1 = \{z; z \in \bar{P}$ and $z \neq \mathcal{O}\}$.

(II). **Preliminary results.** In this section we list Mazur lemma and needed properties of cone K and the related K-metric space which will be used in our theorem.

(a) "Strongly normal" is normal.

(b) A necessary and sufficient condition for the cone K to be normal is that the norm be semimonotone (cf. [11]).

(c) If the sequence $\{u_n\}$ in E converges (in norm) to u, the sequence $\{v_n\}$ in E converges (in norm) to v and $u_n \leqq v_n$ for each n, then $u \leqq v$.

(d) If $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in the K-metric space X that has a limit in X, then the limit is unique.

(e) If $u \in K^0$, then there exists a positive number c such that if $v \in \{p; \|p\| < c\} \cap K$ then $v \leqq u$.

(f) If h is an element in the Banach space E, $h_n \in K$ for each n, $h \leqq h_n$ for each n and $\{h_n\}$ converges (in norm) to $\mathcal{O}$ in E, then $-h \in K$.

(g) If $u \in K^0$ and $\{h_n\}$ is a sequence in K which converges (in norm) to $\mathcal{O}$ in E, then there exists a positive integer N such that $h_n \leqq u$ for $n \geqq N$.

(h) If $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in the K-metric space X that is convergent to x in X then $\{d(x_n, x)\}$ converges (in norm) to $\mathcal{O}$ in E.

(i) Mazur lemma [5, 13]. Let E be a normed space and $\{u_n\}$ a sequence in E converging weakly to u. Then there is a sequence of convex combinations $\{v_n\}$ such that $v_n = \sum_{i=n}^{N} b_i u_i$ where $\sum_{i=n}^{N} b_i = 1$, and $b_i = b_i(n) \geqq 0$, $n \leqq i \leqq N = N(n)$ which converges to u in norm.

(j) Let the sequence $\{u_n\}$ in E be weakly convergent to v, if $u_n \geqq \mathcal{O}$ for each $n \geqq 1$ then $v \geqq \mathcal{O}$.

(III). **Examples and main results.**

EXAMPLE 1. Let $E = R$ (all real numbers) and $K = R^+$ (all nonnegative real numbers), then K is strongly normal and semimonotone, and K satisfies the law of trichotomy.

EXAMPLE 2. Let $E = R^2$ and $K = \{z \in R^2; 0 < a \leqq \operatorname{Arg} z \leqq b < \pi/2\} \cup \{\mathcal{O}\}$, where the symbol $\operatorname{Arg} z$ denotes the argument of the complex number z. Although K is strongly normal, semimonotone, K doesn't satisfy the law of trichotomy.

The mapping $\phi: P_1 \to K$ is said to be lower semicontinuous if $\{u_n\}$ and $\{\phi u_n\}$ are both weakly convergent, then $\lim \phi u_n \geqq \phi(\lim u_n)$.

The property of the law of trichotomy of the set R has been used in the proof of [14] and [17] but it can not be used in our Theorem 1 (cf. Example 2). The proof of Theorem 1 differs from that of theorem [14] and theorem [17].

THEOREM 1. *Let (X, d) be a nonempty complete K-metric space, and let S, T be mappings of X into itself satisfying* (1) *and* (2).

$$(1) \qquad \phi(d(Sx, Ty)) \leqq d(x, y)\ , \quad x \neq y \in X\ ,$$

$$(2) \qquad \phi(t) > t \quad \textit{for any} \quad t \in P_1\ ,$$

where $\phi: P_1 \to K$ is lower semicontinuous on P_1.

Then exactly one of the following three statements holds:

(a) S and T have a common fixed point, which is the only periodic point for both S and T;

(b) There exist a point $x_0 \in X$ and an integer $p > 1$ such that $Sx_0 = x_0 = T^p x_0$ and $Tx_0 \neq x_0$;

(c) There exist a point $y_0 \in X$ and an integer $q > 1$ such that $S^q y_0 = y_0 = Ty_0$ and $Sy_0 \neq y_0$.

(IV). Lemmas and proofs.

LEMMA 1. *For each $x_0 \in X$, we define a sequence $\{x_n\}$ recursively as follows:*

$$x_1 = Sx_0,\ x_2 = Tx_1,\ \cdots,\ x_{2n+1} = Sx_{2n},\ x_{2n+2} = Tx_{2n+1},\ \cdots .$$

Then the sequence $\{d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$ weakly converges to $\mathcal{O}$ if $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) > \mathcal{O}$ for all $n \geqq 1$.

Proof. Suppose that $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) > \mathcal{O}$ for all $n \geqq 1$. Let $d_n = d(x_n, x_{n+1})$. It follows, by (1) and (2), that, for each positive integer n,

$$(3) \qquad \begin{aligned} d_{2n+1} &= d(Sx_{2n}, Tx_{2n+1}) < \phi(d_{2n+1}) \leqq d_{2n}\ , \\ d_{2n} &= d(Sx_{2n}, Tx_{2n-1}) < \phi(d_{2n}) \leqq d_{2n-1}\ . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\{d_n\}$ is decreasing and bounded. Let $\{d_{n(i)}\}$ be a subsequence of $\{d_n\}$. Since $\{d_n\}$ is bounded, there exists a subsequence $\{d_{m(i)}\}$ of $\{d_{n(i)}\}$ such that $\{d_{m(i)}\}$ weakly converges to $z \in K$ and $\{d_{m(i)-1}\}$ to $t \in K$.

From the fact that $d_{m(i)-1} \geqq d_{m(i)} \geqq d_{m(i+1)-1}$, we see that $z = t$. Because $\mathcal{O} \leqq \phi(d_{m(i)}) \leqq d_{m(i)-1}$, we see that $\{\phi(d_{m(i)})\}$ is bounded. For convenience, we can assume that $\{\phi(d_{m(i)})\}$ has a weak limit. By the lower semicontinuity, we have $\phi(z) \leqq z$. Therefore $z = \mathcal{O}$ and $\{d_n\}$ weakly converges to $\mathcal{O}$.

LEMMA 2. *If y is a fixed point for S, then for each $x \in X$, $x \neq y$, either there exists a positive integer p such that $T^p x = y$ or else $\{d(T^n x, y)\}$ weakly converges to $\mathcal{O}$. Moreover, if $\{d(T^n x, y)\}$ weakly converges to $\mathcal{O}$, then $Ty = y$; and if $Ty \neq y$, then $T^p y = y$ for some $p > 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that $d(T^n x, y) > \mathcal{O}$. By (1), we have

$$d(y, T^{n+1}x) = d(Sy, T^{n+1}x) < \phi(d(Sy, T^{n+1}x)) \leqq d(y, T^n x)$$

for all $n = 1, 2, \cdots$. As in Lemma 1, we see $\{d(y, T^n x)\}$ weakly converges to $\mathcal{O}$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} d(T^n x, Ty) &\leqq d(T(T^{n-1}x), S(T^n x)) + d(S(T^n x), Ty) \\ &\leqq \phi(d(T(T^{n-1}x), S(T^n x))) + \phi(d(S(T^n x), Ty)) \\ &\leqq d(T^{n-1}x, T^n x) + d(y, T^n x) \\ &\leqq 3d(y, T^{n-1}x) , \end{aligned}$$

and

$$d(y, Ty) \leqq d(y, T^n x) + d(T^n x, Ty) ,$$

we have, as $n \to \infty$, $y = Ty$.

LEMMA 3. *If S, T have fixed points x_1, x_2 respectively in X, then $x_1 = x_2$ and x_1 is the unique periodic point for S and T.*

Proof. If $x_1 \neq x_2$, then $d(x_1, x_2) < \phi(d(Sx_1, Tx_2)) \leqq d(x_1, x_2)$, a contradiction. Moreover, if $T^q x = x$, then, by Lemma 2, there is a positive integer p such that $T^p x = x_1$, and therefore $T^r x_1 = x$ for some integer $r > 0$. But $Tx_1 = x_1$, so that $x_1 = x$; and by the same argument, if $S^q x = x$, then $x = x_1$, which completes the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1. For a fixed $x_0 \in X$, we define $\{x_n\}$ recursively $x_{2n+1} = Sx_{2n}$, $x_{2n+2} = Tx_{2n+1}$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, as in Lemma 1.

Case 1. Suppose $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = \mathcal{O}$ for some even integer $n \geqq 1$. Then $x_n = x_{n+1} = Sx_n$ is a fixed point of S, so that by Lemma 2, either x_n is a fixed point of T or else $Tx_n \neq x_n$ and there is a positive integer $p > 1$ such that $T^p x_n = x_n$.

Case 2. Suppose $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = \mathcal{O}$ for some odd integer $n \geqq 1$. Then by the same argument, we have either $Sx_n = Tx_n = x_n$ or else $Sx_n \neq x_n$ and $S^q x_n = x_n$ for some integer $q > 1$.

Case 3. Suppose $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \neq \mathcal{O}$ for all $n = 1, 2, \cdots$. Then $\{d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$ weakly converges to $\mathcal{O}$. We wish to show that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Suppose not. Then there is an $\varepsilon \in K^0$ such that for every integer, there exist integers $n(i)$ and $m(i)$ with $i \leqq n(i) < m(i)$ such that

$$d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)}) \nleqq \varepsilon . \tag{4}$$

Let, for each integer i, $m(i)$ be the least integer exceeding $n(i)$ satisfying (4); that is,

$$d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)}) \nleqq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)-1}) \leqq \varepsilon . \tag{5}$$

Since K is semimonotone, the sequence $\{d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)-1})\}$ is bounded. Consequently the sequence $\{d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)})\}$ is bounded.

Because E is a reflexive Banach space, for convenience, we let

$$\text{(A)} \qquad \begin{cases} \{d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)})\} \text{ be weakly convergent to } z_1 , \\ \{d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)-1})\} \text{ be weakly convergent to } z_2 , \\ \{d(x_{n(i)-1}, x_{m(i)-1})\} \text{ be weakly convergent to } z_3 , \end{cases}$$

where z_1, z_3 and z_2 are in K. According to the triangular inequality, we have

$$d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)-1}) + d(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)-1}) \geqq d(x_{n(i)-1}, x_{m(i)-1}) , \tag{6}$$

$$d(x_{n(i)-1}, x_{m(i)-1}) + d(x_{n(i)-1}, x_{n(i)}) \geqq d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)-1}) , \tag{7}$$

$$d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)}) + d(x_{m(i)}, x_{m(i)-1}) \geqq d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)-1}) , \tag{8}$$

$$d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)-1}) + d(x_{m(i)-1}, x_{m(i)}) \geqq d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)}) . \tag{9}$$

From (6), (7), (8), (9) and Lemma 1, we see that $z_1 \geqq z_2$, $z_2 \geqq z_1$, $z_2 \geqq z_3$, $z_3 \geqq z_2$ and $z_1 = z_2 = z_3 = z$ (say). For convenience, we assume that $n(i) + m(i)$ is odd. We see that

$$\phi(d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)})) \leqq d(x_{n(i)-1}, x_{m(i)-1}) . \tag{10}$$

Let $\{\phi(d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)}))\}$ have a weak limit. Therefore we have $\phi(z) \leqq z$, we obtain that $z = \mathcal{O}$. (If $n(i) + m(i)$ is even, we shall consider putting the sequence $\{d(x_{n(i)+1}, x_{m(i)})\}$, instead of $\{d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)})\}$, into (10).) By (4) and (g), there exist a positive number s and a subsequence $\{d(x_{p(i)}, x_{q(i)})\}$ of $\{d(x_{n(i)}, x_{m(i)})\}$ such that the sequence $\{d(x_{p(i)}, x_{q(i)})\}$ doesn't converge to $\mathcal{O}$ (in norm) and $\lim_{i\to\infty} \| d(x_{p(i)}, x_{q(i)}) \| = s > 0$. Since the sequence $\{d(x_{p(i)}, x_{q(i)})\}$ weakly converges to $\mathcal{O}$, by

Mazur lemma, then there is a sequence of convex combinations $\{v_n\}$ such that

$$v_n = \sum_{j=n}^{N} b_j u_j ,$$

where $\sum_{j=n}^{N} b_j = 1$, $b_j = b_j(n) \geqq 0$, $n \leqq j \leqq N = N(n)$ and $u_j = d(x_{p(j)}, x_{q(j)})$, which converges to $\mathcal{O}$ (in norm). For convenience, we can assume $s = 1$. Since K is strongly normal, then there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\|v_n\| > \delta$, when n is sufficiently large. Because $\{v_n\}$ converges to $\mathcal{O}$ (in norm), this is a contradiction. Therefore $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. By completeness, there is a $u \in X$ such that $\{x_n\}$ converges to u in X. We see that

$$d(Tu, u) \leqq d(Tu, Tx_{2n+1}) + d(x_{2n+2}, u) .$$

Let $\{y_n\} \subset X$ converge to y with $y_n \neq y_{n+1}$ and $y_n \neq y$ for all $n \geqq 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(Ty_n, Ty) &\leqq d(Ty_n, Sy_{n+1}) + d(Sy_{n+1}, Ty) \\ &\leqq d(y_n, y_{n+1}) + d(y_{n+1}, y) . \end{aligned}$$

We have, as $n \to \infty$, $Tu = u$. Similarly we have $Su = u$. These three cases show that at least one of (a), (b), (c) in Theorem 1 holds; and therefore, by Lemma 3, exactly one of (a), (b), (c) in Theorem 1 holds.

If E is the set of all real numbers and if K is the set of all nonnegative reals, then, from (4), (10) and Lemma 1, Theorem 1 may now be restated in the following form.

THEOREM 2. *Let (X, d) be a nonempty complete metric space, and let S, T be mappings of X into itself satisfying* (1) *and* (2).

(1) $\phi(d(Sx, Ty)) \leqq d(x, y)$, $x \neq y \in X$,

(2) $\phi(t) > t$ *for any* $t \in P_1$,

where ϕ is lower semicontinuous from the right on P_1.

Then exactly one of (a), (b) and (c) as in Theorem 1 holds.

Utilizing the way of the proof of Theorem 1 [15], we have the following result.

THEOREM 3. *Let S, T be mappings on a nonempty complete metric space (X, d). Then the following conditions are equivalent*:

(i) *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$d(Sx, Ty) < \varepsilon \quad \text{whenever} \quad \varepsilon \leqq d(x, y) < \varepsilon + \delta(\varepsilon) ,$$

(ii) *There exists a self mapping ϕ of $[0, \infty)$ into $[0, \infty]$ such* *that* $\phi(s) > s$ *for all* $s > 0$, ϕ *is lower semicontinuous from the right on* $(0, \infty)$ *and*

$$\phi(d(Sx, Ty)) \leqq d(x, y) , \quad x \neq y \in X .$$

From Theorem 3, we have the following result.

THEOREM 4. *Let* (X, d) *be a complete metric space, and let* S, T *be mappings of* X *into itself satisfying condition* (i) *in Theorem* 3; *then exactly one of* (a), (b) *and* (c) *as in Theorem* 1 *holds.*

Theorem 4 was proved in [17] by Chi-Lin Yen and Kun-Jen Chung, but it is a special case of our Theorem 1.

REMARK 1. If $S = T = F$ in Theorem 4, any one of (a), (b) and (c) implies that F has a fixed point, that is, that S and T have a common fixed point. Hence (a) holds; namely T has a unique fixed point. This result was proved by A. Meir and E. Keeler [14].

REMARK 2. The condition that two mappings T and S satisfy (i) in Theorem 3 does not imply $S = T$ (cf. [17]).

The author would welcome an example of a strongly normal cone K in a reflexive infinite dimensional Banach space.

REFERENCES

1. J. C. Bolen and B. B. Williams, *On the convergence of successive approximations for quasi-nonexpansive mappings through abstract cones*, Technical Report No. 29 (1975), Univ. of Texas at Arlington.
2. D. W. Boyd and J. S. Wong, *On nonlinear contractions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **20** (1969), 458-464.
3. K. J. Chung, *Common fixed point theorems through abstract cones*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Ser. Sci. Math. Astr. Phys., (1980).
4. ———, *Nonlinear contraction in abstract spaces*, Kodai Math. J., **4** (1981), 288–292.
5. M. M. Day, *Normed linear spaces*, 23-24.
6. J. Eisenfeld and V. Lakshmikantham, *Comparison principle and nonlinear contractions in abstract spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **49** (1975), 504-511.
7. ———, *Fixed point theorems through abstract cones*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **52** (1975), 25-35.
8. ———, *Remarks on nonlinear contraction and comparison principle in abstract cones*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **61** (1977), 116-121.
9. S. Heikkila and S. Seikkala, *On fixed points through cluster values of iterates*, J. Nonlinear Anal. Theory and Appl., **1**, No. 6, (1977), 603-606.
10. ———, *On the estimation of successive approximations in abstract spaces*, J. Math. Appl. Anal., **58** (1977), 378-383.
11. M. A. Krasnoselskii, *Positive Solutions of Operator Equations Noordhoff*, Groningen, 1964.
12. M. Kwapisz, *Some generalization of an abstract contraction mapping principle*, J.

Nonlinear Anal. Theory and Appl., **3**, No. 3 (1979), 293-302.
13. S. Mazur, *Über knovexe Menger in linearen normierten Raumen*, Studia Math., **4** (1933), 70-84.
14. A. Meir and E. Keeler, *A theorem on contraction mappings*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **28** (1969), 326-329.
15. C. S. Wong, *Characterizations of certain maps of contractive type*, Pacific J. Math., **68** (1977), 293-296.
16. T. Wszewski, *Sur une procede de prouver la convergence des approximations successive sans utilisation des series de comparaison*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Ser. Sci. Math. Astr. Phys., **8** (1960), 45-52.
17. C. L. Yen and K. J. Chung, *A theorem on fixed point and periodic point*, Tamkang J. Math., **5**, No. 2 (1974), 235-239.

Received September 3, 1980 and in revised form June 18, 1981.

Chung Yuan Christian University
Chung Li, Taiwan
R.O.C.
and
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332

Printed in Japan by International Academic Printing Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 101, No. 1 November, 1982

Natália Bebiano, On the evaluation of permanents . . . 1

David Borwein and Bruce Brigham Watson, Tauberian theorems between the logarithmic and Abel-type summability methods . . . 11

Leo George Chouinard, II, Hermite semigroup rings . . . 25

Kun-Jen Chung, Remarks on nonlinear contractions . . . 41

Lawrence Jay Corwin, Representations of division algebras over local fields. II . . . 49

Mahlon M. Day, Left thick to left lumpy—a guided tour . . . 71

M. Edelstein and Mo Tak Kiang, On ultimately nonexpansive semigroups . . . 93

Mary Rodriguez Embry, Semigroups of quasinormal operators . . . 103

William Goldman and Morris William Hirsch, Polynomial forms on affine manifolds . . . 115

S. Janakiraman and T. Soundararajan, Totally bounded group topologies and closed subgroups . . . 123

John Rowlay Martin, Lex Gerard Oversteegen and Edward D. Tymchatyn, Fixed point set of products and cones . . . 133

Jan van Mill, A homogeneous Eberlein compact space which is not metrizable . . . 141

Steven Paul Plotnick, Embedding homology 3-spheres in S^5 . . . 147

Norbert Riedel, Classification of the C^*-algebras associated with minimal rotations . . . 153

Benedict Seifert, Combinatorial and geometric properties of weight systems of irreducible finite-dimensional representations of simple split Lie algebras over fields of 0 characteristic . . . 163

James E. Simpson, Dilations on locally convex spaces . . . 185

Paolo M. Soardi, Schauder bases and fixed points of nonexpansive mappings . . . 193

Yoshio Tanaka, Point-countable k-systems and products of k-spaces . . . 199

Fausto A. Toranzos, The points of local nonconvexity of starshaped sets . . . 209

Lorenzo Traldi, The determinantal ideals of link modules. I . . . 215

P. C. Trombi, Invariant harmonic analysis on split rank one groups with applications . . . 223

Shinji Yamashita, Nonnormal Blaschke quotients . . . 247