Pacific Journal of Mathematics

THE OPERATOR EQUATION $AX - XB = C$ WITH NORMAL A AND B

ALLEN ROSS SCHWEINSBERG

Vol. 102, No. 2 February 1982

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 102, No. 2, 1982

THE OPERATOR EQUATION $AX - XB = C$ WITH NORMAL A AND B

ALLEN SCHWEINSBERG

A necessary and sufficient condition for the solvability of $AX-XB=C$ was given by W. E. Roth for finite matrices and by M. Rosenblum for selfadjoint operators A and B on a Hilbert space. Here the result is extended to include normal operators and finite rank operators on Hilbert space.

1. Introduction. In [6] W. E. Roth proved for finite matrices over a field that $AX - XB = C$ is solvable for X if and only if the matrices $\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ are similar. A considerably briefer proof has been given by Flanders and Wimmer [4]. In [5] Rosenblum showed that the result remains true when A and B are bounded selfadjoint operators on a complex, separable Hilbert space. In the present paper the theorem is extended to include finite rank operators and normal operators on Hilbert space. We give an example to show that normality cannot be weakened to quasinormality. Finally, when $A = B$ the following is true, even in the absence of normality: if $\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$ are similar, then C is a commutator.

2. The normal case. We begin with a lemma.

LEMMA 1. *If $\begin{bmatrix} Q & R \\ S & T \end{bmatrix}$ is an invertible operator acting in the usual way on the direct sum of Hilbert spaces $\mathscr{H}_1 \oplus \mathscr{H}_2$, then $SS^* + TT^*$ is invertible on $\mathscr{H}_2$.*

Proof. Let $W = \begin{bmatrix} Q & R \\ S & T \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} Q & R \\ S & T \end{bmatrix}^*$. Now $SS^* + TT^*$ is bounded below. For if $\|f_n\| = 1$ and $\lim \|(SS^* + TT^*)f_n\| = 0$, we would have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim \| W^{1/2}(0 \oplus f_n)\|^2 &= \lim (W(0 \oplus f_n), (0 \oplus f_n)) \\ &= \lim ((SS^* + TT^*)f_n, f_n) = 0 , \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the invertibility of $W^{1/2}$. Since $SS^* + TT^*$ is Hermitian and bounded below, it is invertible.

This lemma is also a direct consequence of [3, Corollary 1].

THEOREM 1. *Let A and B be bounded normal operators on*

complex Hilbert spaces $\mathscr{H}_1$ *and* $\mathscr{H}_2$ *respectively. Then* $AX - XB = C$ *has a solution* X *if and only if* $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ *and* $\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ *are similar operators on* $\mathscr{H}_1 \oplus \mathscr{H}_2$.

Proof. Since $\begin{bmatrix} I & -X \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} I & X \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & AX - XB \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$, half of the theorem is immediate.

Conversely, assume similarity. Then $\begin{bmatrix} Q & R \\ S & T \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} Q & R \\ S & T \end{bmatrix}$ where $\begin{bmatrix} Q & R \\ S & T \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible. Consequently $QA - AQ = CS$, $RB - AR = CT$, $SA = BS$, and $TB = BT$. The Putnam-Fuglede theorem implies $AS^* = S^*B$ and $T^*B = BT^*$. Also $BSS^* = SAS^* = SS^*B$, so B commutes with both SS^* and TT^*. Now

$$\begin{aligned} C(SS^* + TT^*) &= (QA - AQ)S^* + (RB - AR)T^* \\ &= (QAS^* + RBT^*) - (AQS^* + ART^*) \\ &= (QS^* + RT^*)B - A(QS^* + RT^*)\,. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma shows that $SS^* + TT^*$ is invertible. Since the inverse commutes with B, we arrive at $C = AX - XB$ for $X = -(QS^* + RT^*)(SS^* + TT^*)^{-1}$, and the proof is complete.

This theorem does not hold for all operators. The following example, similar to one given in [5], shows that the normality hypothesis cannot even be weakened to quasinormality. Let $A = U$, the unilateral shift, $B = 0$, and let $P = I - UU^*$. Then we have the similarity

$$\begin{bmatrix} U^* & -I \\ P & U \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} U & I \\ 0 & U^* \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} U & I \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

but clearly for no X does $I = UX - X0$.

Not surprisingly, the order of the diagonal entries is critical. The theorem holds for $A = 0$ and $B = U$, because

$$C = 0(-CU^*) - (-CU^*)U \text{ for every } C\,.$$

Later we will see that the theorem is true for $A = B = U$, as well.

In spite of the example given above, the normality hypothesis can be weakened somewhat. For example A and B need only be similar to normal operators, as can be seen from the next theorem.

THEOREM 2. *Let* $\mathscr{C}$ *be the collection of pairs of operators* (A, B) *for which* $AX - XB = C$ *has a solution* X *if and only if* $\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ *and* $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ *are similar. Suppose* $(A, B) \in \mathscr{C}$. *Then*

(i) $(A_1, B_1) \in \mathscr{C}$ *if* A_1 *and* B_1 *are similar to* A *and* B *respectively.*

(ii) $(B^*, A^*) \in \mathscr{C}$.

(iii) $(A^{-1}, B^{-1}) \in \mathscr{C}$ *if* A *and* B *are invertible.*

(iv) $(A + \lambda I, B + \lambda I) \in \mathscr{C}$ *for all complex* λ.

Proof. (i) If $S^{-1}A_1S = A$, $T^{-1}B_1T = B$, and

$$R^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & B_1 \end{bmatrix} R = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & C \\ 0 & B_1 \end{bmatrix},$$

then

$$R^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & T \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} S^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & T^{-1} \end{bmatrix} R = \begin{bmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & T \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} A & S^{-1}CT \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} S^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & T^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $(A, B) \in \mathscr{C}$ we get $S^{-1}CT = AX - XB$ for some X. Then $C = SAXT^{-1} - SXBT^{-1} = A_1(SXT^{-1}) - (SXT^{-1})B_1$.

(ii) If $\begin{bmatrix} B^* & C \\ 0 & A^* \end{bmatrix}$ is similar to $\begin{bmatrix} B^* & 0 \\ 0 & A^* \end{bmatrix}$, then $\begin{bmatrix} A & C^* \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ is similar to $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$. Thus, $C^* = AX - XB$, i.e., $C = B^*(-X^*) - (-X^*)A^*$.

(iii) If $\begin{bmatrix} A^{-1} & C \\ 0 & B^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} A^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & B^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$ are similar, then their inverses, $\begin{bmatrix} A & -ACB \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ are similar. So $-ACB = AX - XB$, or $C = A^{-1}X - XB^{-1}$.

(iv) This is clear, since the relevant equations remain valid if A and B are replaced by $A - \lambda I$ and $B - \lambda I$.

3. The finite rank case. First we observe a lemma which in general would be false without the assumption of finite dimensionality.

LEMMA 2. *If* $\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ *and* $\begin{bmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ *are similar operators on* $\mathscr{H}_1 \oplus \mathscr{H}_2$ *and* $\mathscr{H}_1$ *has finite dimension, then* A_1 *and* B_1 *are similar.*

Proof. Let $A = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $B = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and $k = \dim \mathscr{H}_1$. Denote nullity and rank by ν and ρ respectively. If $\lambda \neq 0$ then $\nu(A_1 - \lambda I)^n = \nu(A - \lambda I)^n = \nu(B - \lambda I)^n = \nu(B_1 - \lambda I)^n$ for all natural numbers n. Also

$$\nu(A_1^n) = k - \rho(A_1^n) = k - \rho(A^n) = k - \rho(B^n) = k - \rho(B_1^n) = \nu(B_1^n).$$

Since $\nu(A_1 - \lambda I)^n = \nu(B_1 - \lambda I)^n$ for all λ and n, A_1 and B_1 are similar.

THEOREM 3. *Let* A *and* B *be finite rank operators on complex Hilbert spaces. Then* $AX - XB = C$ *has a solution* X *if and only*

if $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ *is similar to* $\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$.

Proof. Observe that each finite rank operator A on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$ is unitarily equivalent to one of the form $\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ where A_1 operates on a finite dimensional space. Simply write $\mathscr{H}$ as $\mathscr{H}_1 \oplus \mathscr{H}_2$ where $\mathscr{H}_1$ is finite dimensional and contains the ranges of A and A^*. In light of Theorem (2i) we may assume that A and B are already in this form. Then the assumption that $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ is similar to $\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}$ becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ is similar to } \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 & C_1 & C_2 \\ 0 & 0 & C_3 & C_4 \\ 0 & 0 & B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Equality of ranks requires that $C_4 = 0$, $C_2 = A_1X_2$ and $C_3 = -X_3B_1$ for some X_2 and X_3. Next observe the similarity

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 & X_2 \\ 0 & I & X_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 & C_1 & A_1X_2 \\ 0 & 0 & -X_3B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 & -X_2 \\ 0 & I & -X_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 & C_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

After row and column interchanges we obtain the similarity of

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & C_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Lemma 2 implies the similarity of $\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & B_1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & C_1 \\ 0 & B_1 \end{bmatrix}$, and Roth's original theorem for finite matrices implies $C_1 = A_1X_1 - X_1B_1$ for some X_1. Finally

$$\begin{bmatrix} C_1 & C_2 \\ C_3 & C_4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1X_1 - X_1B_1 & A_1X_2 \\ -X_3B_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & X_2 \\ X_3 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & X_2 \\ X_3 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

i.e., $C = AX - XB$.

3. The case $A = B$. If we set $A = B$ in Theorem 1 then it becomes a statement about commutators in the range of the derivation $\Delta_A(X) = AX - XA$.

THEOREM 4. *Let A be a bounded normal operator on a complex Hilbert space. Then* $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$ *and* $\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$ *are similar if and only if C is in the range of the derivation Δ_A.*

Once again normality cannot be weakened even to quasinormality, because the theorem fails for $A = \begin{bmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ where U is the unilateral shift. Note that, as in the earlier example,

$$\begin{bmatrix} U & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & U & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ is similar to } \begin{bmatrix} U & I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & U & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

which, via a row and column interchange, is similar to

$$\begin{bmatrix} U & 0 & 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & U & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

But clearly $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ is not in the range of Δ_A.

If $A = B = U$ then all is well.

THEOREM 5. *Let U be the unilateral shift. Then $UX - XU = C$ if and only if* $\begin{bmatrix} U & C \\ 0 & U \end{bmatrix}$ *is similar to* $\begin{bmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & U \end{bmatrix}$.

Proof. As usual, one direction is immediate. Suppose though that $\begin{bmatrix} U & C \\ 0 & U \end{bmatrix}$ is similar to $\begin{bmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & U \end{bmatrix}$. Then, with procedure and notation as in the proof of Theorem 1, U commutes with S and T, operator entries in the invertible matrix $\begin{bmatrix} Q & R \\ S & T \end{bmatrix}$. Invertibility implies the existence of operators Y and Z for which $SY + TZ = I$. Let $f \in \mathscr{H}$. Then $f = Y^*S^*f + Z^*T^*f$. So $\|f\| \leqq \|Y^*\| \|S^*f\| + \|Z^*\| \|T^*f\| \leqq (\|Y^*\|^2 + \|Z^*\|^2)^{1/2}(\|S^*f\|^2 + \|T^*f\|^2)^{1/2}$. Since S and T commute with the shift, they must be analytic Toeplitz operators. The inequality $\|S^*f\|^2 + \|T^*f\|^2 \geqq \varepsilon^2\|f\|^2$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ implies the existence of additional analytic Toeplitz operators W and X for which $SW + TX = I$ ([1]; Theorem 6.3). So, again as in the proof of Theorem 1, $C = C(SW + TX) = (QU - UQ)W + (RU - UR)X = (QW + RX)U - U(QW + RX)$, and the proof is complete.

In general, while similarity of $\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$ need not imply

that C is a commutator in the range of Δ_A, it is true that C must be some commutator.

THEOREM 6. *Let A be a bounded operator on a complex Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$. If $\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$ is similar to $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$, then C is a commutator.*

Proof. If $\mathscr{H}$ is finite dimensional then of course Roth's theorem implies the present one. Suppose $\dim \mathscr{H} = \aleph_0$. Recall that in [2] Brown and Pearcy characterized commutators on infinite dimensional, separable Hilbert spaces as all those operators not of the form $\lambda I + K$ where λ is a nonzero scalar and K is compact. Thus it suffices to show that $\begin{bmatrix} A & \lambda I + K \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$ cannot be similar to $\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$. Suppose on the contrary that

$$S^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}S = \begin{bmatrix} A & \lambda I + K \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $S^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} A^n & 0 \\ 0 & A^n \end{bmatrix}S = \begin{bmatrix} A^n & \lambda n A^{n-1} + K_n \\ 0 & A^n \end{bmatrix}$ where K_n is compact, for $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. In fact if f is any analytic function, then

$$S^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} f(A) & 0 \\ 0 & f(A) \end{bmatrix}S = \begin{bmatrix} f(A) & \lambda f'(A) + \hat{K} \\ 0 & f(A) \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\hat{K}$ is compact. Now, letting $\| \ \|_1$ be the Calkin algebra norm, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\lambda f'(A)\|_1 = \|\lambda f'(A) + \hat{K}\|_1 &\leqq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} f(A) & \lambda f'(A) + \hat{K} \\ 0 & f(A) \end{bmatrix} \right\|_1 \\ &\leqq \|S^{-1}\|_1 \|S\|_1 \|f(A)\|_1 . \end{aligned}$$

In particular let $f(z) = e^{\alpha z}$. Then $\|\alpha\lambda e^{\alpha A}\|_1 \leqq \|S^{-1}\|_1 \|S\|_1 \|e^{\alpha A}\|_1$. For large $|\alpha|$ this implies $\|e^{\alpha A}\|_1 = 0$, i.e., $e^{\alpha A}$ is compact. But $e^{\alpha A}$ is invertible and cannot be compact.

Finally suppose $\dim \mathscr{H} > \aleph_0$. Then again the noncommutators are those of the form $\lambda I + K$ where $\lambda \neq 0$ and K belongs to a certain proper closed ideal [2; Theorem 4]. The preceding argument with obvious modifications handles this case as well, and the proof is complete.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. The author is grateful to P. Rosenthal for helpful conversations while the latter was a Distinguished Visiting Professor at Bucknell University.

References

1. W. B. Arveson, *Interpolation problems in nest algebras*, J. Functional Anal., **20** (1975), 208-233.
2. A. Brown and C. Pearcy, *Structure of commutators of operators*, Ann. Math., **82** (1965), 112-127.
3. P. A. Fillmore and J. P. Williams, *On operator ranges*, Adv. in Math., **7** (1971), 254-281.
4. H. Flanders and H. K. Wimmer, *On the matrix equations $AX-XB=C$ and $AX-YB=C$*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., **32** (1977), 707-710.
5. M. Rosenblum, *The operator equation $BX-XA=Q$ with selfadjoint A and B*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **20** (1969), 115-120.
6. W. E. Roth, *The equations $AX-YB=C$ and $AX-XB=C$ in matrices*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **3** (1952), 392-396.

Received August 28, 1979.

Bucknell University
Lewisburg, PA 17837

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

DONALD BABBITT (Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

HUGO ROSSI
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

C. C. MOORE and ARTHUR AGUS
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

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

R. FINN and J. MILGRAM
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

R. ARENS E. F. BECKENBACH B. H. NEUMANN F. WOLF K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF AAWAII
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies,

Mathematical parers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of the manuscript. However, you may use them in the displayed equations. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Please propose a heading for the odd unmbered pages of less than 35 characters. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. **39**. Supply name and address of author to whom proofs should be sent. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

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

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966, Regular subscription rate: $114.00 a year (6 Vol., 12 issues). Special rate: $57.00 a year to individual members of supporting institution.

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

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION
Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.).
8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

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

Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Vol. 102, No. 2 February, 1982

Richard A. Boyce, Irreducible representations of finite groups of Lie type through block theory and special conjugacy classes 253
Robert Jay Daverman and Dennis J. Garity, Intrinsically $(n-2)$-dimensional cellular decompositions of E^n 275
Juan Ferrera, Spaces of weakly continuous functions 285
William George Frederick, μ-theta functions 293
Christopher George Gibson and T. D. Ward, On stratifying pairs of linear mappings 329
Stanley Joseph Gurak, Minimal polynomials for Gauss circulants and cyclotomic units 347
Joachim Georg Hartung, On two-stage minimax problems 355
Robert P. Kaufman, Hausdorff measure, BMO, and analytic functions 369
Neal I. Koblitz, p-adic analog of Heine's hypergeometric q-series 373
Kurt Kreith, Picone-type theorems for hyperbolic partial differential equations 385
Nicholas J. Kuhn, The geometry of the James-Hopf maps 397
Donald Michael Redmond, Explicit formulae for a class of Dirichlet series 413
J. R. Respess and Elliott Ward Cheney, Jr., Best approximation problems in tensor-product spaces 437
Allen Ross Schweinsberg, The operator equation $AX - XB = C$ with normal A and B 447
Hans-Willi Siegberg and Guentcho Svetoslavov Skordev, Fixed point index and chain approximations 455
Kondagunta Sundaresan, Geometry and nonlinear analysis in Banach spaces 487