

# Potpourri

Stephen William Semmes  
Rice University  
Houston, Texas

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Real and complex numbers</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b><math>p</math>-Adic numbers</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b><math>\mathbb{Z}[1/p]</math></b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Exponential functions</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Normed vector spaces</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Dual spaces</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Operator norms</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Geometry of numbers</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Linear groups</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Trace norms</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Vector spaces</b>	<b>28</b>

---

These notes are connected to the “potpourri” course in the mathematics department at Rice University in the fall of 2004, and in particular they are very much influenced by the participants and the discussions in class.

<b>12 Algebras</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>13 Eigenvalues</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>14 Polynomials, formal power series</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>15 Some other sums</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>A Metric spaces</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>B Compactness</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>C Topological spaces</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>43</b>

Let us begin with a mathematical personality quiz. Consider the five classes of functions given by polynomials, power series that are entire or converge everywhere, power series which converge on the unit disk, power series which converge on a disk of some positive radius, and formal power series. Each of these classes contains the previous one. For the quiz one should arrange them according to preference.

## 1 Real and complex numbers

Let  $\mathbf{Q}$ ,  $\mathbf{R}$ , and  $\mathbf{C}$  denote the fields of rational, real, and complex numbers, respectively. As usual, a complex number  $z$  can be expressed as  $x + yi$ , where  $x$  and  $y$  are real numbers, and  $i^2 = -1$ , and we call  $x$ ,  $y$  the real and imaginary parts of  $z$  and denote them  $\operatorname{Re} z$ ,  $\operatorname{Im} z$ , respectively. We write  $\mathbf{Z}$  for the integers, and  $\mathbf{Z}_+$  for the set of positive integers.

Let us recall that the rational numbers are dense in the real numbers in the sense that if  $x$ ,  $y$  are real numbers such that  $x < y$ , then there is a rational number  $r$  such that

$$(1.1) \quad x < r < y.$$

Also, for each positive real number  $x$  there is a positive integer  $n$  such that

$$(1.2) \quad nx \geq 1,$$

which is the same as saying that

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{1}{n} < x.$$

If  $z = x + yi$  is a complex number,  $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ , then the *complex conjugate* of  $z$  is denoted  $\bar{z}$  and defined to be  $x - yi$ . Thus

$$(1.4) \quad 2 \operatorname{Re} z = z + \bar{z}$$

and

$$(1.5) \quad 2i \operatorname{Im} z = z - \bar{z}$$

for all  $z \in \mathbf{C}$ . Furthermore,

$$(1.6) \quad \overline{z + w} = \bar{z} + \bar{w}$$

and

$$(1.7) \quad \overline{\bar{z}w} = z\bar{w}$$

for any complex numbers  $z, w$ .

If  $x$  is a real number, then the *absolute value* of  $x$  is denoted  $|x|$  and is defined to be equal to  $x$  when  $x \geq 0$  and to be equal to  $-x$  when  $x \leq 0$ . Thus  $|x|$  is always a nonnegative real number which is equal to 0 if and only if  $x = 0$ . The triangle inequality for the absolute value function states that

$$(1.8) \quad |x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ , and this is easy to verify from the definitions. We also have that

$$(1.9) \quad |xy| = |x||y|$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ .

If  $z = x + yi$  is a complex number, with  $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ , then the norm or *modulus* of  $z$  is denoted  $|z|$  and defined by

$$(1.10) \quad |z| = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}.$$

If  $z$  happens to be a real number, then this is the same as the absolute value of  $z$  as in the preceding paragraph. We can also describe  $|z|$  as the nonnegative real number such that

$$(1.11) \quad |z|^2 = z\bar{z}.$$

Notice that  $|z| = 0$  if and only if  $z = 0$ . Also,

$$(1.12) \quad |\operatorname{Re} z|, |\operatorname{Im} z| \leq |z|$$

for any complex number  $z$ .

If  $z, w$  are complex numbers, then

$$(1.13) \quad |z + w|^2 = (z + w)(\bar{z} + \bar{w}) = z\bar{z} + z\bar{w} + \bar{z}w + w\bar{w}$$

and therefore

$$(1.14) \quad \begin{aligned} |z + w|^2 &= |z|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re}(z\bar{w}) + |w|^2 \\ &\leq |z|^2 + 2|z||w| + |w|^2 = (|z| + |w|)^2. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$(1.15) \quad |z + w| \leq |z| + |w|$$

for all complex numbers  $z, w$ . We also have that

$$(1.16) \quad |z w| = |z| |w|$$

for all  $z, w \in \mathbf{C}$ , since the complex conjugate of a product is equal to the product of the corresponding complex conjugates.

The real numbers form a metric space with the standard metric  $|x - y|$ , and the complex numbers form a metric space with the standard metric  $|z - w|$ . One can view the real numbers as a subspace of the complex numbers, since the standard metric on  $\mathbf{R}$  is the same as the restriction of the standard metric on  $\mathbf{C}$  to  $\mathbf{R}$ . Notice that the set of rational numbers is dense inside the real line in the sense of metric spaces, and that the complex numbers with rational real and imaginary parts are dense in the complex plane.

If  $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}, \{w_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  are sequences of complex numbers which converge to  $z, w \in \mathbf{C}$ , then

$$(1.17) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} z_j + w_j = z + w$$

and

$$(1.18) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} z_j w_j = z w.$$

If  $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is a sequence of nonzero complex numbers which converges to  $z \in \mathbf{C}, z \neq 0$ , then

$$(1.19) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{z_j} = \frac{1}{z}.$$

For any sequence of complex numbers  $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  which converges to a complex number  $z$ , we have that

$$(1.20) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |z_j| = |z|,$$

as one can show using the fact that

$$(1.21) \quad \left| |a| - |b| \right| \leq |a - b|$$

for all complex numbers  $a, b$ , which is a consequence of the triangle inequality. Of course the same statements hold for the real numbers as a special case.

Let  $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of complex numbers. One can check that  $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is a Cauchy sequence if and only if the sequences

$$(1.22) \quad \{\operatorname{Re} z_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}, \quad \{\operatorname{Im} z_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$$

of real and imaginary parts of the  $z_j$ 's are Cauchy sequences as sequences of real numbers. If  $z$  is a complex number, then  $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  converges to  $z$  if and only if  $\{\operatorname{Re} z_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}, \{\operatorname{Im} z_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  converge to  $\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Im} z$ , respectively, as sequences of real numbers. A basic result states that the real line with the standard metric is complete as a metric space, which is to say that every Cauchy sequence of real numbers converges. It follows that the complex numbers are also complete as a metric space.

There is another notion of completeness for the real numbers, which is based on ordering. Suppose that  $A$  is a subset of the real line. A real number  $b$  is said to be an *upper bound* for  $A$  if  $a \leq b$  for all  $a \in A$ . A real number  $c$  is said to be a *least upper bound* or *supremum* of  $A$  if  $c$  is an upper bound of  $A$  and if  $c \leq b$  for every upper bound  $b$  of  $A$ . It is easy to see that the supremum of  $A$  is unique if it exists.

As an ordered set, the real numbers are complete in the sense that every nonempty set  $A$  of real numbers which has an upper bound has a least upper bound. One often starts with this and derives completeness in the sense of convergence of Cauchy sequences. One can also start with completeness in the sense of convergence of Cauchy sequences and derive completeness in the sense of ordering.

A sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  of real numbers is said to be *monotone increasing* if  $x_j \leq x_{j+1}$  for all positive integers  $j$ . If there is an upper bound for the  $x_j$ 's, then the sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  converges, and the limit is the supremum of the  $x_j$ 's. If one starts with completeness of the real numbers in terms of ordering, then this statement follows easily from the definitions, and at any

rate the convergence of monotone increasing sequences of real numbers which are bounded from above is basically an equivalent form of completeness.

Notice that every bounded subset of the real or complex numbers is totally bounded, which is to say that it can be expressed as the union of finitely many subsets of arbitrarily small diameter. Basically this reduces to the fact that every interval in the real line can be expressed as the union of finitely many subintervals of arbitrarily small length. It follows from the completeness of the real and complex numbers as metric spaces that a subset of the real or complex numbers is compact if and only if it is closed and bounded.

Let  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  be an infinite series with terms  $a_j \in \mathbf{C}$ . We say that this series *converges* if the sequence of partial sums  $s_l = \sum_{j=0}^l a_j$  converges, in which case  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  is defined to be  $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} s_l$ . Of course the sequence of partial sums converges if and only if it is a Cauchy sequence, which is equivalent to saying that  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  converges if and only if for each  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an  $L \geq 0$  so that  $\left| \sum_{j=l}^m a_j \right| < \epsilon$  whenever  $m \geq l \geq L$ . This is known as the *Cauchy criterion* for convergence of  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$ , and it follows that if  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  converges, then  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = 0$ . If  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  is an infinite series of nonnegative real numbers, then the sequence of partial sums is a monotone increasing sequence of nonnegative real numbers, and hence converges if and only if the sequence of partial sums has an upper bound.

An infinite series  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  of complex numbers is said to *converge absolutely* if the series  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |a_j|$  converges. Absolute convergence implies ordinary convergence, because of the Cauchy criterion. A series  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  of complex numbers converges absolutely if and only if  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \theta_j a_j$  converges for any sequence  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots$  of complex numbers such that  $|\theta_j| \leq 1$  for all  $j$ . If  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  and  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j$  are convergent series of complex numbers and  $\alpha, \beta$  are complex numbers, then  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\alpha a_j + \beta b_j)$  also converges, and if  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j, \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j$  converge absolutely, then  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\alpha a_j + \beta b_j)$  converges absolutely too. A series which converges but does not converge absolutely is said to converge conditionally.

Let  $z$  be a complex number, and consider the series  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} z^j$ , where as usual  $z^j$  is interpreted as being equal to 1 when  $j = 0$ , even when  $z = 0$ . If  $|z| \geq 1$ , then  $|z|^j \geq 1$  for all  $j$ . When  $|z| < 1$ , it is well-known that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} z^j = 0$ . For each positive integer  $n$  we have that  $\sum_{j=0}^n z^j$  is equal to  $(1 - z^{n+1})/(1 - z)$  assuming  $z \neq 1$ . It follows that  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} z^j$  converges when  $|z| < 1$ , and in fact converges absolutely, with the sum equal to  $1/(1 - z)$ .

The *Leibniz alternating series test* states that if  $b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots$  is a monotone decreasing sequence of nonnegative real numbers which converges to 0, then

the series  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j b_j$  converges. This can be verified using the Cauchy criterion. More generally, suppose that the  $b_j$ 's have the same property and that we have a sequence of complex numbers  $c_0, c_1, \dots$  such that the partial sums  $\sum_{j=0}^n c_j$  are bounded. In this case one can again show that  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j b_j$  converges. These results can be used to give examples of series which converge but do not converge absolutely.

If  $a_0, a_1, \dots$ , are complex numbers, then we get the associated power series  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j z^j$ . If this series converges for some particular  $z_0 \in \mathbf{C}$ , then  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j z_0^j = 0$ , and the sequence of  $a_j z_0^j$ 's is bounded. In this case one can check that  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j z^j$  converges absolutely for all complex numbers  $z$  such that  $|z| < |z_0|$ , and  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j z^j$  converges absolutely when  $|z| \leq |z_0|$  if  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j z_0^j$  converges absolutely. The *radius of convergence*  $R$  of  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j z^j$ ,  $0 \leq R \leq \infty$ , is characterized by saying that  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j z^j$  converges absolutely when  $|z| < R$  and does not converge at all when  $|z| > R$ . Any power series converges at 0, and for a complex number  $z$  with  $|z|$  equal to the radius of convergence of the series it may be that the series does not converge, or converges conditionally, or converges absolutely.

## 2 $p$ -Adic numbers

Fix a prime number  $p$ , which is to say a positive integer  $p$  which is divisible only by 1 and itself. The  *$p$ -adic absolute value* of a rational number  $x$  is denoted  $|x|_p$  and defined as follows. If  $x = 0$ , then  $|x|_p = 0$ . If  $x \neq 0$ , then  $x$  can be expressed as

$$(2.1) \quad p^k \frac{m}{n}$$

for some integer  $k$  and nonzero integers  $m, n$ , where neither  $m$  nor  $n$  is an integer multiple of  $p$ , and one puts

$$(2.2) \quad |x|_p = p^{-k}.$$

Thus  $|x|_p$  is small if  $x$  has a lot of factors of  $p$ , and it is large if  $x$  has a lot of factors of  $1/p$ .

Thus  $|x|_p$  is always a nonnegative real number and  $|x|_p = 0$  if and only if  $x = 0$ . The  $p$ -adic absolute value satisfies a stronger version of the triangle inequality, called the *ultrametric* version, which is that

$$(2.3) \quad |x + y|_p \leq \max(|x|_p, |y|_p)$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathbf{Q}$ . This is not too difficult to verify, and we also have that

$$(2.4) \quad |x y|_p = |x|_p |y|_p$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathbf{Q}$ .

Fix a prime number  $p$ . The field of  $p$ -adic numbers is denoted  $\mathbf{Q}_p$ . Basically  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  completes the rational numbers with respect to the  $p$ -adic metric in the same way that the real numbers complete the rational numbers with respect to the standard metric. To be more precise, the  $p$ -adic numbers  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  contain a copy of the rational numbers  $\mathbf{Q}$ . The  $p$ -adic absolute value function extends to  $\mathbf{Q}_p$ , is also denoted  $|\cdot|_p$ , and satisfies the properties that  $|x|_p$  is equal to 0 when  $x = 0$  and is equal to  $p^l$  for some integer  $l$  when  $x \neq 0$ .

As on  $\mathbf{Q}$ , we have that  $|x + y| \leq \max(|x|_p, |y|_p)$  and  $|x y|_p = |x|_p |y|_p$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbf{Q}_p$ . The function  $|x - y|_p$  defines an ultrametric on  $\mathbf{Q}_p$ , extending the  $p$ -adic metric on  $\mathbf{Q}$ . With respect to this ultrametric,  $\mathbf{Q}$  is a dense subset of  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  is complete.

Let  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  and  $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  be sequences of  $p$ -adic numbers which converge to  $x, y \in \mathbf{Q}_p$ , respectively. In this event we have that

$$(2.5) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_j + y_j = x + y$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_j y_j = x y$$

just as for real and complex numbers. If  $x_j \neq 0$  for all  $j$  and  $x \neq 0$ , then

$$(2.7) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_j^{-1} = x^{-1}.$$

Let  $\sum_{j=0}^\infty a_j$  be an infinite series whose terms are  $p$ -adic numbers. Just as for series of real or complex numbers, we say that the series converges if the sequence of partial sums converges in  $\mathbf{Q}_p$ . If  $\sum_{j=0}^\infty a_j$  is an infinite series of  $p$ -adic numbers which converges and  $\alpha$  is a  $p$ -adic number, then  $\sum_{j=0}^\infty \alpha a_j$  also converges. If  $\sum_{j=0}^\infty a_j, \sum_{j=0}^\infty b_j$  are infinite series of  $p$ -adic numbers which converge, then  $\sum_{j=0}^\infty (a_j + b_j)$  converges too.

Because  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  is complete, an infinite series  $\sum_{j=0}^\infty a_j$  of  $p$ -adic numbers converges if and only if the sequence of partial sums forms a Cauchy sequence. In the  $p$ -adic case this is equivalent to

$$(2.8) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = 0,$$



because of the ultrametric property of the  $p$ -adic absolute value function. In particular, in the  $p$ -adic case, if an infinite series  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  converges, then so does  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \theta_j a_j$  whenever  $|\theta_j|_p \leq 1$  for all  $j$ .

Let  $a_0, a_1, \dots$ , be a sequence of  $p$ -adic numbers, and consider the associated power series  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j x^j$ , where again  $x^j$  is interpreted as being equal to 1 when  $j = 0$  for all  $x$ . If  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j x_0^j$  converges for some particular  $x_0 \in \mathbf{Q}_p$ , then

$$(2.9) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j x_0^j = 0$$

in  $\mathbf{Q}_p$ , which is to say that

$$(2.10) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |a_j|_p |x_0|_p^j = 0$$

as a limit of real numbers. It follows that

$$(2.11) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j x^j = 0$$

for all  $p$ -adic numbers  $x$  such that  $|x|_p \leq |x_0|_p$ .

Let  $x$  be a  $p$ -adic number. If  $x \neq 1$ , then for each positive integer  $n$  we have that  $\sum_{j=0}^n x^j$  is equal to  $(1 - x^{n+1})/(1 - x)$ . If  $|x|_p < 1$ , then we get that  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} x^j$  converges, and that the sum is equal to  $1/(1 - x)$ .

By definition of the  $p$ -adic absolute value, if  $x \in \mathbf{Z}$ , then  $|x|_p \leq 1$ . Let  $x$  be a rational number such that  $|x|_p \leq 1$ . This means that we can write  $x$  as  $a/n$  for some positive integer  $n$  which is not a multiple of  $p$ . More precisely we can write  $x$  as  $a/(b + pl)$ , where  $b, l$  are integers and  $1 \leq b < p$ . We may as well assume that  $b = 1$ , because otherwise we could multiply both the numerator and denominator by a positive integer  $c$  such that  $bc$  is equivalent to 1 modulo  $p$ .

Thus we have a rational number  $x$  which is expressed as  $a/(1 + pl)$  for some integers  $a, l$ . It follows from the earlier discussion that

$$(2.12) \quad x = a \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-pl)^j,$$

where the series converges in the  $p$ -adic metric. Using the approximation by partial sums we get that  $x$  is a limit of integers in the  $p$ -adic metric, so that the set of rational numbers with  $p$ -adic absolute value less than or equal to 1 is the same as the closure of the set of integers in the  $p$ -adic metric. Similarly the set of  $p$ -adic numbers with  $p$ -adic absolute value less than or equal to 1

is equal to the closure of the set of integers as a subset of  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  with respect to the  $p$ -adic metric, and this set is denoted  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  and called the  $p$ -adic integers.

For each positive integer  $n$ , if  $x$  is an integer, then we can write  $x$  as  $b + p^n y$ , where  $b, y$  are integers and  $0 \leq b < p^n$ . In other words, not only does every integer have  $p$ -adic absolute value less than or equal to 1, but we can express  $\mathbf{Z}$  as the union of  $p^n$  subsets each with  $p$ -adic diameter equal to  $p^{-n}$ . In fact the same is true of the  $p$ -adic integer  $\mathbf{Z}_p$ , by approximation. It follows that  $\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Z}_p$  are totally bounded with respect to the  $p$ -adic metric. Because  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  is complete with respect to the  $p$ -adic metric and  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  is closed, we obtain that  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  is a compact subset of  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  with respect to the  $p$ -adic metric.

Similarly,  $p^{-l} \mathbf{Z}_p$  is a compact subset of  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  for each positive integer  $l$ . To be more precise,  $p^{-l} \mathbf{Z}_p$  consists of the  $x \in \mathbf{Q}_p$  of the form  $p^{-l} y$  for some  $y \in \mathbf{Z}_p$ , which is the same as the set of  $x \in \mathbf{Q}_p$  such that  $|x|_p \leq p^l$ . Every bounded subset of  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  is contained in  $p^{-l} \mathbf{Z}_p$  for some positive integer  $l$ , and therefore a subset of  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  is compact if and only if it is closed and bounded.

### 3 $\mathbf{Z}[1/p]$

Let  $\mathbf{Z}[1/p]$  denote the set of rational numbers of the form  $p^{-l} a$ , where  $a$  is an integer and  $l$  is a nonnegative integer. Clearly  $\mathbf{Z}[1/p]$  is dense as a subset of  $\mathbf{Q}$  with respect to the standard metric. One can also check that  $\mathbf{Z}[1/p]$  is dense as a subset of  $\mathbf{Q}$  with respect to the  $p$ -adic metric. This reduces to the fact that every rational number  $x$  with  $|x|_p \leq 1$  can be approximated by integers in the  $p$ -adic metric.

Consider the Cartesian product  $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ , consisting of ordered pairs  $(x_1, x_2)$  with  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbf{Q}$ . Let us combine the standard and  $p$ -adic metrics on  $\mathbf{Q}$  into a product metric on  $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ , in which the distance from  $(x_1, x_2)$  to  $(y_1, y_2)$  in  $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$  is defined to be the maximum of  $|x_1 - y_1|$  and  $|x_2 - y_2|_p$ . That is, we use the standard distance in the first coordinate and the  $p$ -adic distance in the second coordinate.

The diagonal embedding of  $\mathbf{Q}$  into  $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$  sends  $x \in \mathbf{Q}$  to  $(x, x)$ . We can use this embedding to map  $\mathbf{Z}[1/p]$  into  $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ .

Suppose that  $x \in \mathbf{Z}[1/p]$ . If  $|x|_p \leq 1$ , then  $x \in \mathbf{Z}$ , in which case either  $x = 0$  or  $|x| \geq 1$ . In other words, either  $x = 0$ , or

$$(3.1) \quad \max(|x|, |x|_p) \geq 1.$$

If  $x, y \in \mathbf{Z}[1/p]$ , then either  $x = y$ , or

$$(3.2) \quad \max(|x - y|, |x - y|_p) \geq 1.$$

Thus the image of  $\mathbf{Z}[1/p]$  in  $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$  is discrete with respect to the product metric. Namely, the distance between any two distinct points in the image of  $\mathbf{Z}[1/p]$  in  $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$  is at least 1.

Moreover, any point in  $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$  is at bounded distance from a point in the image of  $\mathbf{Z}[1/p]$  under the diagonal embedding. Explicitly, if  $(y, w)$  is any element of  $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ , then there is an  $x \in \mathbf{Z}[1/p]$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad |x - y| < 1$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad |x - w|_p \leq 1.$$

We may as well assume that  $y, w \in \mathbf{Z}[1/p]$ , because  $\mathbf{Z}[1/p]$  is dense in  $\mathbf{Q}$  with respect to both the standard and  $p$ -adic metrics. Let us write  $w$  as  $y + a + b$ , where  $a$  is an integer and  $0 \leq b < 1$ , and put  $x = y + b$ . Then  $x - y = b$  and  $x - w = -a$  have the required properties.

Now let  $E$  be a finite set of primes, which we can also enumerate as  $p_1, \dots, p_n$ , and let  $\mathbf{Z}_E$  denote the set of rational numbers of the form

$$(3.5) \quad p_1^{-l_1} \cdots p_n^{-l_n} a,$$

where  $a$  is an integer and  $l_1, \dots, l_n$  are nonnegative integers. Thus  $\mathbf{Z}_E$  is dense as a subset of  $\mathbf{Q}$  with respect to the standard metric  $|x - y|$  as well as the  $p_i$ -adic metrics  $|x - y|_{p_i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

Consider the Cartesian product

$$(3.6) \quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} \times \cdots \times \mathbf{Q},$$

with  $n + 1$  copies of  $\mathbf{Q}$ . We define the distance between two points in this Cartesian product to be the maximum of the standard distance between the first coordinates and the  $p_i$ -adic distance between the  $(i + 1)$ th coordinate when  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . We can embed  $\mathbf{Z}_E$  into this Cartesian product using the diagonal embedding, which sends  $x \in \mathbf{Q}$  to an  $(n + 1)$ -tuple whose coordinates are all equal to  $x$ .

If  $x \in \mathbf{Z}_E$  and the  $p_i$ -adic absolute value of  $x$  is less than or equal to 1 for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , then  $x$  is an integer. As a result, either  $x = 0$ , or the standard

absolute value of  $x$  is greater than or equal to 1. This implies that if we take two distinct elements of  $\mathbf{Z}_E$  and consider their embeddings into the Cartesian product of  $n + 1$  copies of  $\mathbf{Q}$ , then the distance between the two points in the Cartesian product is greater than or equal to 1. Thus  $\mathbf{Z}_E$  becomes discrete in the Cartesian product.

Suppose that  $(y, w_1, \dots, w_n)$  is an element of the Cartesian product of  $n + 1$  copies of  $\mathbf{Q}$ . We would like to show that there is a point in the image of  $\mathbf{Z}_E$  under the diagonal embedding whose distance to  $(y, w_1, \dots, w_n)$  is less than or equal to  $n$ . Specifically, let us check that there is an  $x \in \mathbf{Z}_E$  such that

$$(3.7) \quad |x - y| < n$$

and

$$(3.8) \quad |x - w_i|_{p_i} \leq 1$$

for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

We may as well assume that  $y \in \mathbf{Z}_E$ , since  $\mathbf{Z}_E$  is dense in  $\mathbf{Q}$  with respect to the standard metric. For  $i = 1, \dots, n$  we may assume that  $w_i - y \in \mathbf{Z}[1/p_i]$ , since  $\mathbf{Z}[1/p_i]$  is dense in  $\mathbf{Q}$  with respect to the  $p_i$ -adic metric. Thus we can write  $w_i$  as  $y + a_i + b_i$ , where  $a_i$  is an integer and  $b_i \in \mathbf{Z}[1/p_i]$  satisfies  $0 \leq b_i < 1$ . If we take  $x = y + b_1 + \dots + b_n$ , then it is easy to see that  $x$  has the required properties. This uses the fact that every element of  $\mathbf{Z}[1/q]$  has  $p$ -adic absolute value less than or equal to 1 when  $p, q$  are distinct prime numbers.

## 4 Exponential functions

Let  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j z^j$  and  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_l z^l$  be formal power series. If we multiply these two series formally, then we get a power series  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n z^n$ , where

$$(4.1) \quad c_n = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j b_{n-j}$$

for each  $n \geq 0$ . The sequence of  $c_n$ 's is called the *Cauchy product* of the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's.

Now suppose that  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  and  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_l$  are convergent series of complex numbers. We can define the  $c_n$ 's as in the preceding paragraph, and consider the series  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$ . Does this series necessarily converge? If so, is the sum equal to the product of the sums of the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's?

If there are only finitely many nonzero  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's, then this is simply an exercise in arithmetic. Suppose now that the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's are nonnegative real numbers. It is easy to see that each partial sum of  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$  is less than or equal to

$$(4.2) \quad \left( \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j \right) \left( \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_l \right).$$

Hence  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$  converges, and the sum is less than or equal to the aforementioned product. One can show too that  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$  is equal to the product of the sums of the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's, because it is greater than or equal to the product of any of their partial sums.

Using this one can check that if  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  and  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_l$  converge absolutely, then  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$  converges absolutely. Namely, one applies the previous case to  $|a_j|$ ,  $|b_l|$ , and one notes that  $|c_n|$  is less than or equal to the  $n$ th term of the Cauchy product of the absolute values of the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's. One way to show that the sum of the  $c_n$ 's is equal to the product of the sums of the  $a_j$ 's and the  $b_l$ 's is to decompose the series into linear combinations of series with nonnegative entries and apply the result already known for them. Another way is to approximate the series of  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's by finite sums. For finite sums we get the right answer by arithmetic, and the point is to check that small errors for the sums of the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's lead to small errors for the sum of  $c_n$ 's in a suitable manner.

It is a nice exercise to check that  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$  converges, and that the sum is equal to the product of the sums of the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's, if one of  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$  and  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_l$  has only finitely many terms and the other is a convergent series. A refinement of this states that if one of  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$ ,  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_l$  converges absolutely and the other converges, then  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$  converges and is equal to the product of the sums of the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's. See [47].

A theorem of Abel states that if  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$ ,  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_l$ , and  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$  all converge, then the sum of the  $c_n$ 's is equal to the product of the sums of the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's. To prove this, let  $r$  be a positive real number such that  $r < 1$ , and put

$$(4.3) \quad A(r) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j r^j, \quad B(r) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_l r^l, \quad C(r) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n r^n.$$

If the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's are bounded, for instance, then the  $c_n$ 's grow at most linearly, and the series in the definitions of  $A(r)$ ,  $B(r)$ , and  $C(r)$  converge absolutely when  $0 \leq r < 1$ . We also have that

$$(4.4) \quad C(r) = A(r) B(r)$$

for  $0 \leq r < 1$ , because the series defining  $C(r)$  is the Cauchy product of the series defining  $A(r)$  and  $B(r)$ .

By definition, *Abel summability* of  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$ ,  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_l$ ,  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$  means the existence of the limits of  $A(r)$ ,  $B(r)$ ,  $C(r)$  as  $r \rightarrow 1$ ,  $0 \leq r < 1$ , in which case the Abel sum is defined to be the limit. Ordinary convergence of an infinite series implies Abel summability, with the Abel sum equal to the sum as the limit of the partial sums. The Abel sum of the Cauchy product is equal to the product of the Abel sums when they exist, and it follows that if the series converge, then the sum of the Cauchy product is equal to the product of the sums of the other two series. See [47] for more information.

In the  $p$ -adic case the situation is simpler. The series  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j$ ,  $\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_l$  converge if and only if

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} b_l = 0,$$

and in this event

$$(4.6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = 0,$$

as one can check. To see that the sum of the  $c_n$ 's is equal to the product of the sums of the  $a_j$ 's and  $b_l$ 's, one can approximate by finite sums and show that the relevant error terms are small. This is analogous to one of the arguments for absolutely convergent series of real or complex numbers.

Let us now consider the formal power series expansion for the exponential function,

$$(4.7) \quad E(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^n}{n!}.$$

As usual,  $n!$  denotes “ $n$  factorial”, which is the product of the integers from 1 to  $n$ , and which is interpreted as being equal to 1 when  $n = 0$ . Formally we have that

$$(4.8) \quad E(z + w) = E(z) E(w),$$

in the sense that if one expands the series and collect terms then the coefficients match up, as a result of the binomial theorem.

Let us focus first on the case of complex numbers. For each  $z \in \mathbf{C}$  one can show that the series defining  $E(z)$  converges absolutely, and indeed the terms tend to 0 faster than a geometric series. In other words, the power series defining  $E(z)$  has infinite radius of convergence. Hence the formal identity (4.8) does work for the actual sums for all  $z, w \in \mathbf{C}$ , as a special case of the earlier discussion of Cauchy products. In particular,  $E(z) \neq 0$  for all complex numbers  $z$ , with  $1/E(z) = E(-z)$ .

If  $x$  is a nonnegative real number, then  $E(x)$  is real and  $E(x) \geq 0$ . If  $x$  is a real number and  $x \leq 0$ , then  $E(x)$  is a real number such that  $0 < E(x) \leq 1$ , since  $E(x) = 1/E(-x)$ . If  $z$  is a complex number, then the complex conjugate of  $E(z)$  is equal to  $E(\bar{z})$ . This follows from the series expansion for  $E(z)$ , since the coefficients are real numbers. As a consequence we get that

$$(4.9) \quad |E(z)|^2 = E(z) E(\bar{z}) = E(z + \bar{z}) = E(2 \operatorname{Re} z)$$

for every complex number  $z$ .

For the  $p$ -adic case we should begin by considering the number of factors of  $p$  in  $n!$ . The number of positive integers less than or equal to  $n$  which are divisible by  $p$  is equal to the integer part of  $n/p$ . For each positive integer  $k$ , the number of positive integers less than or equal to  $n$  which are divisible by  $p^k$  is equal to the integer part of  $n/p^k$ . The total number of factors of  $p$  in  $n!$  is equal to the sum of the integer parts of  $n/p^k$  over all positive integers  $k$ . This sum is less than  $n/(p-1)$ , by comparison with a geometric series.

It follows that the series for  $E(x)$  converges in  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  when  $x \in \mathbf{Q}_p$  has  $p$ -adic absolute value less than  $p^{-1/(p-1)}$ . This discussion follows the one in [26] starting on p112. As explained very nicely there, this condition may seem a bit strange, since  $1/(p-1)$  is an integer only when  $p = 2$ , but in fact one may wish to consider  $E(x)$  on extensions of  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  where the extension of the  $p$ -adic absolute value has nonzero values other than integer powers of  $p$ . A related point is that there can be Galois actions on such an extension which then interact with the exponential in a nice way, just as complex conjugation does in the complex case. At any rate, because of the ultrametric property for the  $p$ -adic absolute value, a disk around 0 is closed under addition, and one again has the identity that the exponential of a sum is equal to the product of the corresponding exponentials.

## 5 Normed vector spaces

Let  $V$  be a vector space over the real or complex numbers. By a *seminorm* on  $V$  we mean a nonnegative real-valued function  $N(v)$  on  $V$  such that

$$(5.1) \quad N(\alpha v) = |\alpha| N(v)$$

for all real or complex numbers  $\alpha$ , as appropriate, and all  $v \in V$ , and such that

$$(5.2) \quad N(v + w) \leq N(v) + N(w)$$

for all  $v, w \in V$ .

Recall that a subset  $E$  of  $V$  is said to be *convex* if for every pair of vectors  $v, w \in E$  and every real number  $t$  with  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  we have that

$$(5.3) \quad t v + (1 - t) w \in E.$$

Under the homogeneity condition (5.1), one can check that the triangle inequality (5.2) holds if and only if

$$(5.4) \quad \{v \in V : N(v) \leq 1\}$$

is a convex subset of  $V$ .

If  $N(v)$  is a seminorm on  $V$ , and if  $N(v) > 0$  for all  $v \in V$  with  $v \neq 0$ , then we say that  $N(v)$  is a *norm* on  $V$ . In this event we get a metric on  $V$  given by  $N(v - w)$ .

As a special case, suppose that  $\langle v, w \rangle$  is an *inner product* on  $V$ , or more precisely a *hermitian inner product* in the complex case. This means that  $\langle v, w \rangle$  is a real or complex-valued function, according to whether  $V$  is a real or complex vector space, defined for  $v, w \in V$ , such that  $\langle v, w \rangle$  is a linear function of  $v$  for each  $w \in V$ ,

$$(5.5) \quad \langle w, v \rangle = \langle v, w \rangle$$

when  $V$  is a real vector space and

$$(5.6) \quad \langle w, v \rangle = \overline{\langle v, w \rangle}$$

when  $V$  is a complex vector space, and  $\langle v, v \rangle$  is a nonnegative real number for all  $v \in V$  which is equal to 0 if and only if  $v = 0$ . If we put

$$(5.7) \quad \|v\| = \langle v, v \rangle^{1/2},$$

then the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality states that

$$(5.8) \quad |\langle v, w \rangle| \leq \|v\| \|w\|$$

for all  $v, w \in V$ . This can be verified using the fact that  $\langle v + \alpha w, v + \alpha w \rangle$  is a nonnegative real number for all scalars  $\alpha$ . Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality one can check that

$$(5.9) \quad \|v + w\|^2 \leq (\|v\| + \|w\|)^2$$



for all  $v, w \in V$ , so that  $\|v\|$  does in fact define a norm on  $V$ .

If  $V = \mathbf{R}^n$ , then the standard inner product on  $V$  is given by

$$(5.10) \quad \langle v, w \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n v_j w_j.$$

If  $V = \mathbf{C}^n$ , then the standard Hermitian inner product is defined by

$$(5.11) \quad \langle v, w \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n v_j \overline{w_j}.$$

The associated norm is the same as  $\|v\|_2$  defined next.

Let  $p$  be a real number with  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , and put

$$(5.12) \quad \|v\|_p = \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |v_j|^p \right)^{1/p}$$

for  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$  in  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$ . We can extend this to  $p = \infty$  by setting

$$(5.13) \quad \|v\|_\infty = \max(|v_1|, \dots, |v_n|).$$

For  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  we have that  $\|v\|_p$  satisfies the homogeneity condition (5.1), and is equal to 0 if and only if  $v = 0$ . When  $p = 1, \infty$  one can check the triangle inequality directly from the definitions, and when  $p = 2$  this follows from the preceding discussion about inner product spaces. In general when  $1 < p < \infty$  one can check that the closed unit ball associated to  $\|v\|_p$  is a convex set, and hence that  $\|v\|_p$  defines a norm, using the convexity of the function  $t^p$  defined on the nonnegative real numbers.

For  $1 \leq p < \infty$  we have that

$$(5.14) \quad \|v\|_\infty \leq \|v\|_p$$

for all  $v$  in  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$ , by inspection. Using this one can verify more generally that

$$(5.15) \quad \|v\|_q \leq \|v\|_p$$

for all  $v$  in  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$  when  $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$ .

If  $r$  is a real number with  $r \geq 1$ , then

$$(5.16) \quad \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \right)^r \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^r$$

for all nonnegative real numbers  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , by the convexity of the function  $t^r$  on the nonnegative real numbers. As a result,

$$(5.17) \quad \|v\|_p \leq n^{1/p-1/q} \|v\|_q$$

when  $v$  is an element of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$  and  $1 \leq p \leq q < \infty$ . This also works with  $q = \infty$ ,  $1/q = 0$ , by inspection.

Suppose that  $N(v)$  is a seminorm on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$ . One can check that  $N(v)$  is bounded by a constant times the Euclidean norm  $\|v\|_2$ , or any other  $\|v\|_p$  if one prefers, where the constant can be estimated in terms of the values of  $N$  at the standard basis vectors.

On any real or complex vector space  $V$ , if  $N(v)$  is a seminorm on  $V$ , then

$$(5.18) \quad N(v) \leq N(w) + N(v - w)$$

for all  $v, w \in V$ . Similarly,

$$(5.19) \quad N(w) \leq N(v) + N(v - w)$$

for all  $v, w \in V$ , and therefore

$$(5.20) \quad |N(v) - N(w)| \leq N(v - w)$$

for all  $v, w \in V$ . If  $N$  is a norm, then  $N$  is continuous with respect to the metric associated to  $N$ . If  $V$  is  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$ , then  $N$  is also continuous with respect to the standard Euclidean metric, using the remark in the previous paragraph. It follows that there is a positive real number  $\eta$  such that  $N(v) \geq \eta$  when  $\|v\|_2 = 1$ , which is to say that  $v$  lies on the standard Euclidean sphere, since  $N(v)$  is a positive continuous function on the sphere and the sphere is compact.

One could define the notion of a norm just as well on a vector space over a subfield of the real or complex numbers, like the rational numbers. One should be a bit careful, in that for instance if  $\alpha$  is an irrational number, then  $N(x) = |x_1 - \alpha x_2|$  defines a norm on  $\mathbf{Q}^2$  which is more degenerate than norms on  $\mathbf{R}^2$  or  $\mathbf{C}^2$ .

Instead one might consider vector spaces defined over the rational or  $p$ -adic numbers with respect to the  $p$ -adic absolute value function on scalars. In this case one might consider the usual triangle inequality for seminorms, as above, or the stronger “ultrametric” version requiring that the seminorm applied to a sum of two vectors is less than or equal to the maximum of

the values of the seminorm at the two vectors. Assuming homogeneity, this stronger ultrametric version of the triangle inequality is equivalent to saying that the set of vectors in the space with seminorm less than or equal to 1 is closed under addition.

More generally one might consider vector spaces over fields with absolute value functions, including extensions of the  $p$ -adic numbers, as in [12, 26]. This may involve fields which are not locally compact, and sometimes one is interested in completeness instead, as in [12, 26].

## 6 Dual spaces

Let  $V$  be a finite-dimensional real or complex vector space, and let  $V^*$  denote the dual vector space of linear functionals on  $V$ . Thus  $V^*$  consists of the linear mappings from  $V$  into the real or complex numbers, whichever is the scalar field for  $V$ . One can add linear functionals and multiply them by scalars, so that  $V^*$  is indeed a vector space with the same field of scalars as  $V$ .

Suppose that  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  is a basis for  $V$ , so that any vector  $v \in V$  can be expressed in a unique way as a linear combination of the  $v_j$ 's. If  $\lambda$  is a linear functional on  $V$ , then  $\lambda$  is uniquely determined by  $\lambda(v_1), \dots, \lambda(v_n)$ , since  $\lambda(v)$  for any  $v \in V$  can be computed from the knowledge of these quantities and the coefficients of  $v$  in the basis. Furthermore, for any collection of  $n$  scalars  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ , there is a linear functional  $\lambda$  on  $V$  such that  $\lambda(v_j) = \alpha_j$  for each  $j$ . In particular, the dimension of  $V^*$  is equal to the dimension of  $V$ .

Now suppose that  $V$  is also equipped with a norm  $\|v\|$ . Let  $\lambda$  be any linear functional on  $V$ , and put

$$(6.1) \quad \|\lambda\|_* = \sup\{|\lambda(v)| : v \in V, \|v\| \leq 1\}.$$

To see that this is finite one can use an isomorphism between  $V$  and  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$ , as appropriate, and the fact that  $\|v\|$  is equivalent to a standard norm given explicitly in terms of coordinates of vectors, as in Section 5.

Equivalently,  $\|\lambda\|_*$  can be characterized as a nonnegative real number such that

$$(6.2) \quad |\lambda(v)| \leq \|\lambda\|_* \|v\|$$

for all  $v \in V$  and  $\|\lambda\|_*$  is as small as possible. One can check that  $\|\lambda\|_*$  defines a norm on the dual space  $V^*$ , called the *dual norm* associated to the norm  $\|v\|$  on  $V$ .

For instance, let  $V$  be a real or complex vector space equipped with an inner product  $\langle v, w \rangle$ . For each  $w \in V$ ,  $\lambda(v) = \langle v, w \rangle$  defines a linear functional on  $V$ . Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality one can check that the dual norm of  $\lambda$  is equal to the norm of  $w$ , with respect to the norm on  $V$  associated to the inner product.

Now let  $n$  be a positive integer, and let  $V$  be  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$ . A linear functional  $\lambda$  on  $V$  can be represented explicitly as

$$(6.3) \quad \lambda(v) = \sum_{j=1}^n v_j w_j,$$

$v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ , where  $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$  is an element of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$ , as appropriate. If  $V$  is equipped with the norm  $\|v\|_1$  as in Section 5, then we have that  $|\lambda(v)| \leq \|w\|_\infty \|v\|_1$  for all  $v \in V$ , just by the triangle inequality. One can also verify that  $\|w\|_\infty$  is the smallest nonnegative real number with this property. In other words, if we use the norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$  on  $V$ , then the dual norm is given by  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ .

Now suppose that we use the norm  $\|v\|_\infty$  on  $V$ . As in the previous paragraph we have that  $|\lambda(v)| \leq \|w\|_1 \|v\|_\infty$  for all  $v \in V$  when  $\lambda$  is associated to  $w$  as in (6.3), by the triangle inequality, and that  $\|w\|_1$  is the smallest nonnegative real number with this property, so that the dual norm of  $\lambda$  is exactly  $\|w\|_1$ .

Let  $p, q$  be real numbers with  $1 < p, q < \infty$  and  $1/p + 1/q = 1$ . In this case we say that  $p, q$  are *conjugate exponents*. One can check that

$$(6.4) \quad ab \leq \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{b^q}{q}$$

for any nonnegative real numbers  $a, b$ , and indeed one can view this as a consequence of the convexity of the exponential function on the real line. If  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  are nonnegative real numbers, then *Hölder's inequality* states that

$$(6.5) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n a_j b_j \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^n a_k^p \right)^{1/p} \left( \sum_{l=1}^n b_l^q \right)^{1/q}.$$

This follows from the previous inequality when  $\sum_k a_k^p \leq 1$  and  $\sum_l b_l^q \leq 1$ , just by applying the inequality termwise and summing, and one can derive the general case from this by a scaling argument.

If we use the norm  $\|v\|_p$  on  $V$ , and if the linear function  $\lambda$  is associated to an  $n$ -tuple  $w$  as before, then we have that  $|\lambda(v)| \leq \|w\|_q \|v\|_p$  for all  $v \in V$  by Hölder's inequality. For a fixed  $w$  one can choose  $v \neq 0$  so that this inequality becomes an equality, as one can check. As a result, the dual norm of  $\lambda$  associated to the norm  $\|v\|_p$  on  $V$  is equal to  $\|w\|_q$ .

## 7 Operator norms

Let  $V$  be a finite-dimensional real or complex vector space, and let  $\mathcal{L}(V)$  denote the collection of linear mappings from  $V$  into itself. Thus  $\mathcal{L}(V)$  is a vector space in a natural way, since one can add linear transformations on  $V$  and one can multiply them by scalars. Moreover one can compose linear transformations on  $V$ , which provides a kind of multiplication on  $\mathcal{L}(V)$ , making it an algebra rather than simply a vector space. The identity transformation  $I$  on  $V$ , which sends each vector  $v \in V$  to itself, acts as a multiplicative identity element in the algebra, since the composition of any linear transformation  $T$  on  $V$  with  $I$  is equal to  $T$ .

Let  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  be a basis for  $V$ . If  $T$  is a linear transformation on  $V$ , then  $T$  is uniquely determined by its values on the  $v_j$ 's. The image of each  $v_j$  under  $T$  is a vector in  $V$  and therefore characterized by its  $n$  coefficients with respect to the basis  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ . Conversely one can start with  $n^2$  scalars, which can be arranged naturally into an  $n \times n$  matrix, and get a linear transformation  $T$  on  $V$  for which the given scalars are the coefficients of the  $T(v_j)$ 's in the basis. In particular  $\mathcal{L}(V)$  has dimension  $n^2$  as a vector space.

Suppose that  $V$  is equipped with a norm  $\|v\|$ . If  $T$  is a linear transformation on  $V$ , then put

$$(7.1) \quad \|T\|_{op} = \sup\{\|T(v)\| : v \in V, \|v\| \leq 1\}.$$

That this is finite can be seen using an isomorphism between  $V$  and  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$ , as appropriate, and the equivalence of  $\|v\|$  with a standard norm given in terms of coordinates.

One can also characterize  $\|T\|_{op}$ , called the *operator norm* of  $T$  associated to the norm  $\|v\|$  on  $V$ , as the smallest nonnegative real number such that

$$(7.2) \quad \|T(v)\| \leq \|T\|_* \|v\|$$

for all  $v \in V$ . It is easy to verify that this does indeed define a norm on the vector space of linear transformations on  $V$ , and it enjoys the additional

property that

$$(7.3) \quad \|T_1 \circ T_2\|_{op} \leq \|T_1\|_{op} \|T_2\|_{op}$$

for any linear operators  $T_1, T_2$  on  $V$ .

Of course the norm of the identity transformation  $I$  on  $V$  is equal to 1. If  $T$  is an invertible linear transformation on  $V$ , so that there is a linear transformation  $T^{-1}$  on  $V$  whose composition with  $T$  is equal to  $I$ , then

$$(7.4) \quad 1 = \|I\|_{op} \leq \|T\|_{op} \|T^{-1}\|_{op}.$$

Suppose that  $A$  is a linear transformation on  $V$ ,  $v$  is a nonzero vector in  $V$ , and that  $\alpha$  is a real or complex number, as appropriate. We say that  $v$  is an *eigenvector* for  $A$  with *eigenvalue*  $\alpha$  if

$$(7.5) \quad A(v) = \alpha v.$$

In this event

$$(7.6) \quad |\alpha| \leq \|A\|_{op}.$$

Let  $V$  be  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$ , and let  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  denote the standard basis vectors for  $V$ , which is to say that the  $l$ th component of  $e_j$  is equal to 1 when  $l = j$  and is equal to 0 otherwise. Suppose that we use the norm  $\|v\|_1$  from Section 5 for  $V$ . If  $T$  is a linear operator on  $V$ , then the operator norm of  $T$  with respect to this norm on  $V$  is equal to the maximum of the norms of  $T(e_1), \dots, T(e_n)$ . This is not difficult to verify just from the definitions. Of course this can be expressed explicitly in terms of the absolute values of the entries of the matrix associated to  $T$  with respect to the standard basis of  $e_j$ 's.

Suppose instead that we use the norm  $\|v\|_\infty$  from Section 5. We can think of  $T$  as being described by  $n$  linear functionals  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  on  $V$ , where  $\lambda_j(v)$  is the same as the  $j$ th component of  $T(v)$  for all  $v \in V$ . The operator norm of  $T$  with respect to the norm  $\|v\|_\infty$  on  $V$  is equal to the maximum of the dual norms of  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ , as one can easily verify. The dual norm associated to  $\|v\|_\infty$  was determined in the previous section, and thus the operator norm of  $T$  can again be given explicitly in terms of the absolute values of the matrix entries of  $T$  with respect to the standard basis in this case.

Let  $T$  be a linear operator on  $V$  whose operator norm with respect to each of  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  is less than or equal to 1. In other words, assume that

$$(7.7) \quad \|T(v)\|_1 \leq \|v\|_1$$

and that

$$(7.8) \quad \|T(v)\|_\infty \leq \|v\|_\infty$$

for all  $v \in V$ . In terms of the matrix of  $T$  associated to the standard basis  $e_1, \dots, e_n$ , this is equivalent to saying that the sum of the absolute values of the matrix entries in any row or column is less than or equal to 1. A result of Schur implies that

$$(7.9) \quad \|T(v)\|_p \leq \|v\|_p$$

for any  $p$ ,  $1 < p < \infty$ , and all  $v \in V$ , which is to say that the operator norm of  $T$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_p$  is also less than or equal to 1.

To show this we may as well assume that the matrix entries of  $T$  are nonnegative real numbers, and we may as well restrict our attention to vectors  $v$  whose components are nonnegative real numbers. In other words, we can reduce to this case by putting in absolute values everywhere and applying the triangle inequality repeatedly. The hypotheses on  $T$  still hold if we replace  $T$  with the linear transformation whose matrix entries are the absolute values of the matrix entries of  $T$ .

Under these conditions, one can check that the  $p$ th power of the  $j$ th component of  $T(v)$  is less than or equal to the  $j$ th component of  $T$  applied to the vector given by the  $p$ th power of the components of  $v$ . This follows from the convexity of the function  $t^p$  on the nonnegative real numbers, using the fact that the operator norm of  $T$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  is less than or equal to 1. Because  $T$  has operator norm less than or equal to 1 with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_1$ , it follows that the sum of the  $p$ th powers of the components of  $T(v)$  is less than or equal to the sum of the  $p$ th powers of the components of  $v$ . This says exactly that  $\|T(v)\|_p^p \leq \|v\|_p^p$ , as desired.

As another special case, let  $T$  be a linear operator on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  or  $\mathbf{C}^n$  which is diagonalized by the standard basis  $e_1, \dots, e_n$ . That is, we assume that there are real or complex numbers  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ , as appropriate, so that

$$(7.10) \quad T(e_j) = \alpha_j e_j$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . In this event the operator norm of  $T$  is equal to

$$(7.11) \quad \max(|\alpha_1|, \dots, |\alpha_n|)$$

with respect to any of the norms  $\|v\|_p$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ .

Now suppose that  $V$  is a finite-dimensional real or complex vector space equipped with an inner product  $\langle v, w \rangle$ , and let  $A$  be a linear transformation

on  $V$ . We say that  $A$  is *self-adjoint* if

$$(7.12) \quad \langle A(v), w \rangle = \langle v, A(w) \rangle$$

for all  $v, w \in V$ . A famous theorem states that  $A$  can be diagonalized in an orthonormal basis in this situation. In other words, there exist vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  in  $V$  and real numbers  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  such that

$$(7.13) \quad \langle v_j, v_l \rangle = 0$$

when  $j \neq l$ ,  $\langle v_j, v_j \rangle = 1$  for all  $j$ , every element of  $V$  can be expressed as a linear combination of the  $v_j$ 's, and  $A(v_j) = \alpha_j v_j$  for each  $j$ . The operator norm of  $A$  is then equal to the maximum of  $|\alpha_1|, \dots, |\alpha_n|$  with respect to the norm associated to the inner product.

## 8 Geometry of numbers

Consider  $\mathbf{Q}^n$ , the subset of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  consisting of points with rational coordinates, and suppose that  $N(v)$  is a seminorm on  $\mathbf{Q}^n$ . As in Section 5, this means that  $N(v)$  is a nonnegative real-valued function defined for  $v \in \mathbf{Q}^n$  such that  $N(\alpha v) = |\alpha| N(v)$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Q}$  and  $v \in V$ , and  $N(v+w) \leq N(v) + N(w)$  for all  $v, w \in V$ . Because  $N(v) \leq N(w) + N(v-w)$  and  $N(w) \leq N(v) + N(v-w)$  for all  $v, w \in \mathbf{Q}^n$ , we have that

$$(8.1) \quad |N(v) - N(w)| \leq N(v - w)$$

for all  $v, w \in \mathbf{Q}^n$ , as before. We also have that  $N(v)$  is bounded by a constant multiple of the Euclidean norm on  $\mathbf{Q}^n$ , with an estimate in terms of  $N(e_j)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , where the  $e_j$ 's are the standard basis vectors in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ . It follows that  $N(v)$  is a uniformly continuous function on  $\mathbf{Q}^n$ , and therefore has a unique continuous extension to a function on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  which is in fact a seminorm on  $\mathbf{R}^n$ .

The extension of  $N$  to  $\mathbf{R}^n$  may or may not be a norm, even if  $N$  is a norm on  $\mathbf{Q}^n$ . For if  $\theta$  is any real number, then  $N(v) = |v_1 - \theta v_2|$  defines a seminorm on  $\mathbf{R}^2$  and on  $\mathbf{Q}^2$  by restriction. As in Section 5, if  $\theta$  is irrational, then  $N(v)$  is a norm on  $\mathbf{Q}^2$ , but it is not a norm on  $\mathbf{R}^2$  for any  $\theta$ . At any rate, if we start with a norm on  $\mathbf{Q}^n$  for some  $n$ , we can extend it to a seminorm on  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , and it is interesting to consider the interplay between the norm on  $\mathbf{Q}^n$  / seminorm on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  and arithmetic.



Suppose now that  $U$  is an open subset of  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , and let  $\mathbf{Z}^n$  denote the subset of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  of points with integer coordinates, which is of course closed under addition. If the volume of  $U$  is strictly larger than 1, then there are points  $x, y \in U$  with  $x \neq y$  and  $x - y \in \mathbf{Z}^n$ . To see this it is convenient to think of the quotient of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  by  $\mathbf{Z}^n$ , which is a torus whose total volume is equal to 1, and the natural projection  $p$  from  $\mathbf{R}^n$  onto the quotient. The existence of distinct points  $x, y$  in  $U$  whose difference is an element of  $\mathbf{Z}^n$  is equivalent to saying that the restriction of  $p$  is not one-to-one, which follows immediately if the volume of  $U$  is strictly larger than the volume of the quotient torus, which is equal to 1.

Assume further that  $U$  is symmetric about the origin, so that  $w \in U$  implies  $-w \in U$ . We can rephrase the previous conclusion then to say that there are points  $x, y \in U$  such that  $x + y$  is a nonzero element of  $\mathbf{Z}^n$ . If  $U$  is also convex, then  $(x + y)/2$  is a nonzero element of  $U$  which lies in  $(1/2)\mathbf{Z}^n$ , which is to say that its coordinates are integers or half-integers. We can rephrase this again by saying that if  $U$  is a convex open subset of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  which is symmetric about the origin and which has volume strictly larger than  $2^n$ , then  $U$  contains a nonzero element of  $\mathbf{Z}^n$ . This is a version of the basic existence result in the geometry of numbers.

## 9 Linear groups

Let  $V$  be a finite-dimensional real or complex vector space, and let  $GL(V)$  denote the group of invertible linear transformations on  $V$ . Of course any nonzero multiple of the identity operator  $I$  is invertible. As a subset of the vector space  $\mathcal{L}(V)$  of linear transformations on  $V$ ,  $GL(V)$  is open, since it consists simply of the linear transformations with nonzero determinant.

We can also look at this in terms of norms. Let  $\|v\|$  be a norm on  $V$ , so that we have an associated norm  $\|T\|_{op}$  for linear operators on  $V$ . If  $T$  is an invertible linear transformation on  $V$ , then there is a real number  $c > 0$  such that

$$(9.1) \quad c \|v\| \leq \|T(v)\|$$

for all  $v \in V$ , namely,  $c = 1/\|T^{-1}\|_{op}$ . If  $A$  is a linear operator on  $V$  such that  $\|A\|_{op} < c$ , then

$$(9.2) \quad (c - \|A\|_{op}) \|v\| \leq \|(T + A)(v)\|$$

for all  $v \in V$ . It follows that  $T + A$  is injective, and hence invertible, since  $V$  is assumed to have finite dimension.

Once we specify a norm  $\|v\|$  on  $V$ , we get a nice subgroup of  $GL(V)$ , namely the group of linear isometries on  $V$ , which are the linear mappings  $T$  from  $V$  to itself such that

$$(9.3) \quad \|T(v)\| = \|v\|$$

for all  $v \in V$ . This is the same as saying that both  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  have norm equal to 1, and of course the identity operator  $I$  is always an isometry. The group of isometries on  $V$  is a compact subset of  $GL(V)$ , because it is closed and bounded. If the norm on  $V$  comes from an inner product, then the group of isometries is quite rich, and is known as an orthogonal or unitary group, according to whether  $V$  is a real or complex vector space.

Let us take  $V = \mathbf{R}^n$ , and consider the group of invertible linear transformations  $T$  on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  which map  $\mathbf{Z}^n$  onto itself. A linear mapping  $T$  on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  maps  $\mathbf{Z}^n$  into itself if and only if the matrix associated to  $T$  and the standard basis  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  in  $\mathbf{R}^n$  has integer entries. In order that  $T$  be an invertible linear transformation on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  which takes  $\mathbf{Z}^n$  onto itself the matrices associated to both  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  should have integer entries. This is equivalent to saying that the matrix associated to  $T$  has integer entries and determinant equal to  $\pm 1$ .

Now consider  $\mathbf{Q}_p^n$ , the space of  $n$ -tuples of  $p$ -adic numbers, as a vector space over  $\mathbf{Q}_p$  with respect to coordinatewise addition and scalar multiplication. The group of invertible linear transformations on  $\mathbf{Q}_p^n$  is described by the condition that the determinant is nonzero, and is an open subset of the vector space of all linear transformations on  $\mathbf{Q}_p$ , which can be identified with  $\mathbf{Q}_p^{n^2}$ . A natural norm on  $\mathbf{Q}_p^n$  is given by

$$(9.4) \quad N(v) = \max(|v_1|_p, \dots, |v_n|_p)$$

for  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in \mathbf{Q}_p^n$ . The linear mappings  $T$  on  $V$  which are isometries with respect to this norm can be characterized by the condition that the matrix with respect to the standard basis has entries in  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  and the determinant has  $p$ -adic absolute value equal to 1, so that the inverse matrix also has entries in  $\mathbf{Z}_p$ . This is a compact subgroup of the group of all invertible linear transformations on  $\mathbf{Q}_p$ .

## 10 Trace norms

Let  $V$  be a finite-dimensional real or complex vector space equipped with an inner product  $\langle v, w \rangle$ . As before, a linear transformation  $A$  on  $V$  is self-adjoint if

$$(10.1) \quad \langle A(v), w \rangle = \langle v, A(w) \rangle$$

for all  $v, w \in V$ . In this case  $A$  can be diagonalized in an orthonormal basis for  $V$ , which is to say that there is an orthonormal basis  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  for  $V$  and real numbers  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  such that  $A(v_j) = \alpha_j v_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . The  $\alpha_j$ 's are the eigenvalues of  $A$ , and it is easy to verify directly that the eigenvalues of  $A$  are real numbers even if  $V$  is a complex vector space. Notice that the self-adjoint linear operators on  $V$  form a real vector space, which is to say that the sum of two self-adjoint linear operators on  $V$  is a self-adjoint linear operator on  $V$  and that the product of a real number and a self-adjoint linear operator on  $V$  is a self-adjoint linear operator on  $V$ , and that one should use real scalars for this even if  $V$  is a complex vector space.

For  $A$  as in the previous paragraph and  $p \in \mathbf{R}$  such that  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , put

$$(10.2) \quad \|A\|_{\mathcal{S}_p} = \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_j|^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

This is the *Schatten  $p$ -class* or  $\mathcal{S}_p$  norm of  $A$ , although the fact that the triangle inequality holds for the  $\mathcal{S}_p$  norm is somewhat tricky and will be discussed further in a moment. When  $p = \infty$  one can define the  $\mathcal{S}_\infty$  norm of  $A$  to be the maximum of the  $|\alpha_j|$ 's, which is the same as the ordinary operator norm of  $A$ .

Let  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  be another orthonormal basis for  $V$ , in addition to the orthonormal basis  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  of eigenvectors for  $A$ , and consider

$$(10.3) \quad \left( \sum_{l=1}^n |\langle A(w_l), w_l \rangle|^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

This is equal to  $\|A\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}$  when  $w_j = v_j$  for each  $j$ . In general,

$$(10.4) \quad \langle A(w_l), w_l \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j |\langle v_j, w_l \rangle|^2,$$

since  $A(w) = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \langle w, v_j \rangle v_j$  for all  $w \in V$ .

Because  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  is an orthonormal basis,  $\sum_{j=1}^n |\langle v_j, w \rangle|^2 = \|w\|^2$  for all  $w \in V$ . Similarly,  $\sum_{l=1}^n |\langle v, w_l \rangle|^2 = \|v\|^2$  for all  $v \in V$ . It follows that the sum of  $|\langle v_j, w_l \rangle|^2$  over  $j$  for a fixed  $l$ , or the sum over  $l$  for a fixed  $j$ , is equal to 1.

By the result of Schur mentioned in Section 7 we get that

$$(10.5) \quad \left( \sum_{l=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=1}^n x_j |\langle v_j, w_l \rangle|^2 \right|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |x_j|^p \right)^{1/p}$$

for all real or complex numbers  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . This implies that (10.3) is always less than or equal to  $\|A\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}$  for any orthonormal basis  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  on  $V$ . Therefore  $\|A\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}$  is the same as the maximum of (10.3) over all orthonormal bases  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  on  $V$ , and it follows that  $\|A\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}$  is indeed a norm on the real vector space of self-adjoint linear operators on  $V$ .

## 11 Vector spaces

Let  $k$  be a field, and let  $V$  be a vector space over  $k$ . If  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  are elements of  $V$ , then their *span* is denoted  $\text{span}(v_1, \dots, v_n)$  and consists of all linear combinations

$$(11.1) \quad \alpha_1 v_1 + \dots + \alpha_n v_n$$

of  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ , with  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in k$ . The span of  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  is a linear subspace of  $V$ , which is to say that it is closed under addition and scalar multiplication.

A collection of vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  in  $V$  is said to be *linearly independent* if the linear combination (11.1) of  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  is equal to 0 if and only if the scalars  $\alpha_j$  are all equal to 0,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . This is equivalent to saying that each element of the span of  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  can be expressed as a linear combination of  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  in a unique manner. A collection of vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  in  $V$  is said to be *linearly dependent* if the  $v_j$ 's are not linearly independent. This is equivalent to saying that one of the  $v_j$ 's lies in the span of the others.

Suppose that  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  and  $w_1, \dots, w_m$  are vectors in  $V$ , with each  $v_j$  an element of the span of  $w_1, \dots, w_m$ . If  $n > m$ , then the  $v_j$ 's are linearly dependent. Basically this reduces to the fact that a homogeneous system of  $m$  linear equations and  $n$  variables has a nontrivial solution when  $n > m$ .

We say that the vector space  $V$  has finite dimension if there is a finite collection of vectors in  $V$  which span  $V$ . The smallest number of vectors in  $V$  needed to span  $V$  is called the dimension of  $V$ . If  $V$  is the span of  $v_1, \dots, v_n$

and  $n$  is as small as possible, then  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  are linearly independent. A collection of vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  in  $V$  which are linearly independent and whose span is equal to  $V$  is called a basis for  $V$ .

## 12 Algebras

Let  $k$  be a field, and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra over  $k$ . This means that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a vector space over  $k$  equipped with a binary operation of multiplication which is associative and which is bilinear with respect to the vector space operations on  $\mathcal{A}$ . We shall also assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  has a nonzero multiplicative identity element  $e$ , and hence that  $\mathcal{A}$  contains a copy of  $k$ .

Of course  $k$  itself is a 1-dimensional algebra over  $k$ . If  $E$  is a nonempty set, then the vector space  $\mathcal{F}(E, k)$  of  $k$ -valued functions on  $E$  is an algebra over  $k$ , with the constant function equal to 1 at each point as the identity element. If  $V$  is a vector space over  $k$ ,  $V \neq \{0\}$ , then the algebra  $\mathcal{L}(V)$  of linear operators on  $V$  is an algebra over  $k$ , with the identity operator  $I$  as the multiplicative identity element. Notice that for any algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  over  $k$  with nonzero identity element, one can embed  $\mathcal{A}$  into the algebra of linear operators on  $V = \mathcal{A}$ , viewed simply as a vector space. Namely, each element  $x$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  induces a linear transformation on  $\mathcal{A}$  given by left multiplication by  $x$ .

An algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  over  $k$  is said to be *commutative* if the operation of multiplication on  $\mathcal{A}$  is commutative, i.e., if  $xy = yx$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra over  $k$  with nonzero multiplicative identity element  $e$ , which may or may not be commutative, and let  $x$  be any element of  $\mathcal{A}$ . One can get a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{A}$  consisting of linear combinations of powers of  $x$  and  $e$ , and this subalgebra is automatically commutative.

## 13 Eigenvalues

Let  $k$  be a field and let  $V$  be a vector space over  $k$  with positive finite dimension equal to  $n$ . Suppose that  $A$  is a linear transformation on  $V$ . An element  $\alpha$  of  $k$  is said to be an *eigenvalue* for  $A$  if there is a nonzero *eigenvector* corresponding to  $A$ , i.e., a vector  $v \in V$ ,  $v \neq 0$ , such that

$$(13.1) \quad A(v) = \alpha v.$$

In this case  $A - \alpha I$  has nontrivial kernel, where  $I$  is the identity operator on  $V$ , and hence is not invertible. Conversely, if  $A - \alpha I$  is not invertible for some  $\alpha \in k$ , then  $A - \alpha I$  has nontrivial kernel, since  $V$  is assumed to be finite-dimensional, and this implies that  $\alpha$  is an eigenvalue for  $A$ .

As a vector space over  $k$ , the algebra  $\mathcal{L}(V)$  of linear transformations on  $V$  has dimension equal to  $n^2$ . If  $T$  is a linear transformation on  $V$ , then there is a positive integer  $l \leq n^2$  such that  $T^l$  can be expressed as a linear combination of the  $T^j$ 's with  $1 \leq j < l$  and the identity operator  $I$ , since otherwise  $\mathcal{L}(V)$  would have dimension larger than  $n^2$ . Here  $T^j$  refers to the product of  $j$   $T$ 's when  $j$  is a positive integer. The Cayley–Hamilton Theorem gives a more precise version of this, with  $T^n$  expressed as a linear combination of  $T^j$ ,  $1 \leq j < n$ , and the identity operator.

At any rate there is a positive integer  $l$  and scalars  $c_0, \dots, c_{l-1} \in k$  such that

$$(13.2) \quad T^l = c_{l-1} T^{l-1} + \dots + c_1 T + c_0 I.$$

If  $T$  is invertible and  $l$  is as small as possible, then  $c_0 \neq 0$ , because otherwise we could remove a factor of  $T$  and express  $T^{l-1}$  as a linear combination of smaller powers of  $T$  and the identity operator. As a result, if  $T$  is an invertible linear transformation on  $V$ , then the inverse of  $T$  can be expressed as a linear combination of powers of  $T$  and the identity operator on  $V$ .

Let  $A$  be a linear operator on  $V$  again, and let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the commutative subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}(V)$  consisting of linear operators on  $V$  which can be expressed as a linear combination of powers of  $A$  and the identity transformation. From the previous remarks it follows that if  $T \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $T$  is invertible as a linear operator on  $V$ , then the inverse of  $T$  also lies in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Suppose that  $\alpha \in k$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$ , and let  $v$  be a nonzero vector in  $V$  which is an eigenvector for  $A$  with eigenvalue  $\alpha$ . Of course  $v$  is also an eigenvector for the identity operator with eigenvalue 1, and  $v$  is an eigenvector for  $A^j$  with eigenvalue  $\alpha^j$  for every positive integer  $j$ . If  $T$  is any element of  $\mathcal{A}$ , then  $v$  is an eigenvector for  $T$  with eigenvalue that we shall denote  $\phi(T)$ . One can check that  $\phi$  defines an algebra homomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}$  onto  $k$ .

Conversely, suppose that we start with a homomorphism  $\phi$  from  $\mathcal{A}$  into  $k$  which is not identically equal to 0. It follows that  $\phi(I) = 1$ , and that  $\phi$  maps  $\mathcal{A}$  onto  $k$ . If  $T$  is any element of  $\mathcal{A}$  which is invertible as a linear transformation on  $V$ , and hence has its inverse in  $\mathcal{A}$ , then  $\phi(T) \neq 0$ .

Put  $\alpha = \phi(A)$ . It follows that  $\phi$  applied to  $A - \alpha I$  is equal to 0, and hence  $A - \alpha I$  is not invertible, which is to say that  $\alpha$  is an eigenvalue of

$A$ . In short, the set of eigenvalues of  $A$  is equal to the set of values of nonzero homomorphisms from  $\mathcal{A}$  into  $k$  at  $A$ . Notice also that each nonzero homomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}$  into  $k$  is determined by its value at  $A$ . Therefore the number of nonzero homomorphisms from  $\mathcal{A}$  into  $k$  is equal to the number of distinct eigenvalues of  $A$ .

## 14 Polynomials, formal power series

Let  $k$  be a field, and let us write  $\Sigma_0(k)$ ,  $\Sigma(k)$  for the spaces of sequences  $\{a_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$  with  $a_j \in k$  for all  $j$  and with  $a_j = 0$  for sufficiently large  $j$ , depending on the sequence, in the case of  $\Sigma(k)$ . Thus  $\Sigma_0(k)$ ,  $\Sigma(k)$  are vector spaces over  $k$  with respect to termwise addition and scalar multiplication, and  $\Sigma_0(k)$  is a linear subspace of  $\Sigma(k)$ . If  $\{a_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ ,  $\{b_l\}_{l=0}^\infty$  are sequences in  $\Sigma(k)$ , then their Cauchy product is the sequence  $\{c_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$  in  $\Sigma(k)$  defined by

$$(14.1) \quad c_n = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j b_{n-j}$$

for all  $n \geq 0$ , and this lies in  $\Sigma_0(k)$  if  $\{a_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$  and  $\{b_l\}_{l=0}^\infty$  do. With respect to this product,  $\Sigma_0(k)$  and  $\Sigma(k)$  become commutative algebras over  $k$ .

Let us write  $\mathcal{P}(k)$ ,  $\mathcal{PS}(k)$  for the algebras of polynomials and formal power series over  $k$ . Thus an element of  $\mathcal{P}(k)$  can be expressed as

$$(14.2) \quad a_n t^n + a_{n-1} t^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0$$

for some  $c_0, \dots, c_n \in k$ , while an element of  $\mathcal{PS}(k)$  can be expressed as

$$(14.3) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j t^j$$

for some sequence of coefficients  $a_0, a_1, \dots$  in  $k$ . Here  $t$  is an indeterminate, and one can add and multiply polynomials or power series in the usual manner, so that  $\mathcal{P}(k)$  and  $\mathcal{PS}(k)$  are commutative algebras over  $k$ . Of course  $\mathcal{P}(k)$  is the subalgebra of  $\mathcal{PS}(k)$  with all but finitely many coefficients equal to 0.

There is a natural one-to-one correspondence between  $\Sigma(k)$  and  $\mathcal{PS}(k)$ , in which a sequence with terms in  $k$  is associated to the formal power series with that sequence of coefficients. In this correspondence  $\Sigma_0(k)$  is mapped

onto  $\mathcal{P}(k)$ . More precisely this defines an isomorphism between  $\Sigma_0(k)$  and  $\mathcal{P}(k)$ , and between  $\Sigma(k)$  and  $\mathcal{PS}(k)$ , as algebras over  $k$ , which is to say that addition and multiplication are preserved.

Suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  is any algebra over  $k$  with nonzero multiplicative identity element  $e$ , and let  $x$  be an element of  $\mathcal{A}$ . If  $p(t)$  is a polynomial over  $k$ , with  $p(t)$  given by (14.2) for some  $a_0, \dots, a_n \in k$ , then we can define  $p(x)$  to be the element of  $\mathcal{A}$  given by

$$(14.4) \quad a_n x^n + a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + \dots + a_0 e.$$

Notice that if  $p_1(t), p_2(t)$  are polynomials over  $k$ , then  $(p_1 + p_2)(x) = p_1(x) + p_2(x)$  and  $(p_1 p_2)(x) = p_1(x) p_2(x)$ . As a special case, we can take  $\mathcal{A}$  equal to  $k$ , viewed as a one-dimensional algebra over itself, and then we are simply saying that a formal polynomial  $p(t) \in \mathcal{P}(k)$  defines a function on  $k$  in the usual manner. As another special case, we can take  $\mathcal{A}$  to be the algebra of linear transformations on  $\Sigma_0(k)$  or  $\Sigma(k)$  viewed as vector spaces, we can take  $x$  to be the linear transformation corresponding to multiplication by the indeterminate  $t$ , and then  $p(x)$  is the linear transformation corresponding to multiplication by  $p(t)$ .

## 15 Some other sums

Consider the vector space over  $\mathbf{C}$  of doubly-infinite sequences  $\{a_j\}_{j=-\infty}^{\infty}$  of complex numbers such that  $a_j = 0$  when  $|j|$  is sufficiently large, where the vector space operations are termwise addition and scalar multiplication, as usual. If  $\{a_j\}_{j=-\infty}^{\infty}, \{b_l\}_{l=-\infty}^{\infty}$  are two such sequences, then we can define the Cauchy product to be the sequence  $\{c_n\}_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$  of complex numbers with

$$(15.1) \quad c_n = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} a_j b_{n-j}.$$

For each integer  $n$ , this sum has only finitely many nonzero, and so it makes sense. One can also check that  $c_n = 0$  when  $|n|$  is sufficiently large, so that  $\{c_n\}_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$  lies in the vector space under consideration. In this way we get a commutative algebra over the complex numbers.

If  $\{a_j\}_{j=-\infty}^{\infty}$  is a sequence of this type, then we can define a function associated to it on the non-zero complex numbers by

$$(15.2) \quad \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} a_j z^j.$$



Again the sum makes sense because all but finitely many of the terms are equal to 0. Thus we get a mapping from our algebra to functions on  $\mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , and it is easy to see that this is an algebra homomorphism, i.e., this mapping is linear and it takes Cauchy products of sequences to ordinary products of functions on  $\mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\}$ .

Now consider doubly-infinite sequences of complex numbers  $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  such that

$$(15.3) \quad \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |a_j| < \infty,$$

which is the same as saying that the partial sums  $\sum_{j=-n}^n |a_j|$  are bounded. In other words the series corresponding to the sequence should converge absolutely. As before the space of these sequences is a vector space over the complex numbers. We can define a norm on this space by saying that the norm of such a sequence is equal to the sum of the moduli of its terms. In this way our vector space becomes a Banach space over the complex numbers, which is to say that it is a normed vector space which is complete with respect to the metric associated to the norm.

If  $\{a_j\}_{j=-\infty}^{\infty}$ ,  $\{b_l\}_{l=-\infty}^{\infty}$  are two sequences of this type, with absolutely summable terms, then we can define the Cauchy product  $\{c_n\}_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$  in the same manner as before. The series used to define  $c_n$  converges absolutely for each  $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ . Moreover, one can show that  $\{c_n\}_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$  also lies in our space, so that the Cauchy product makes our vector space a commutative algebra over the complex numbers. The norm of the Cauchy product is less than or equal to the product of the norms of the sequences used in the product, and thus we have a commutative Banach algebra.

If  $\{a_j\}_{j=-\infty}^{\infty}$  is one of these doubly-infinite sequences of complex numbers whose terms are absolutely summable, then we can associate to it the function on the unit circle given by

$$(15.4) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j z^j + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{-1} a_j \bar{z}^{-j}.$$

This is equivalent to the earlier formula, because  $z^{-1} = \bar{z}$  when  $|z| = 1$ , and we need to restrict our attention to complex numbers  $z$  with  $|z| = 1$  to ensure that the series converges. The absolute summability of the coefficients  $a_j$  implies that the partial sums of this series converge uniformly on the unit circle as in the Weierstrass  $M$ -test, and hence the sum defines a continuous function on the unit circle. The mapping from sequences to functions is again

an algebra homomorphism, which is to say that it is linear and takes Cauchy products of sequences to products of functions on the unit circle.

## A Metric spaces

By a *metric space* we mean a nonempty set  $M$  together with a real-valued function  $d(x, y)$  defined for  $x, y \in M$  such that  $d(x, y) \geq 0$  for all  $x, y \in M$ ,  $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$ ,  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in M$ , and

$$(A.1) \quad d(x, w) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, w)$$

for all  $x, y, w \in M$ . This last property is called the *triangle inequality* for the metric  $d(x, y)$  on  $M$ . If  $(M, d(x, y))$  is a metric space and  $E$  is a nonempty subset of  $M$ , then we can view  $E$  as a metric space in its own right, using the restriction of the metric  $d(x, y)$  to  $x, y \in M$ .

Suppose that  $(M, d(x, y))$  is a metric space and that  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is a sequence of points in  $M$ . We say that  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is a *Cauchy sequence* in  $M$  if for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a positive integer  $L$  such that

$$(A.2) \quad d(x_j, x_l) < \epsilon$$

for all  $j, l \geq L$ . We say that  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  *converges* to a point  $x \in M$  if for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a positive integer  $L$  such that

$$(A.3) \quad d(x_j, x) < \epsilon$$

for all  $j \geq L$ . One can check that the limit of a convergent sequence is unique, which is to say that if a sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  of points in  $M$  converges to  $x \in M$  and to  $x' \in M$ , then  $x' = x$ . If  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is a sequence of points in  $M$  which converges to a point  $x \in M$ , then we write

$$(A.4) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_j = x.$$

It is easy to see that a convergent sequence in a metric space is a Cauchy sequence. Roughly speaking, the property of being a Cauchy sequence captures the information of convergence without having a limit. A metric space is said to be *complete* if every Cauchy sequence in the space has a limit.

Let  $(M, d(x, y))$  be a metric space. Suppose that  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ ,  $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  are sequences in  $M$  such that

$$(A.5) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d(x_j, y_j) = 0$$

as a sequence of real numbers. One can show that if  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is a Cauchy sequence, then the same is true of  $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ . Similarly, if  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  converges in  $M$ , then  $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  converges too, and to the same point.

A subset  $E$  of  $M$  is said to be *dense* in  $M$  if for every point  $x \in M$  there is a sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  of points in  $E$  which converges to  $x$ . This is equivalent to saying that for each  $x \in M$  and each positive real number  $\epsilon$  there is a point  $y \in E$  such that  $d(x, y) < \epsilon$ . Indeed, when this condition holds, one can simply choose  $x_j \in E$  for each positive integer  $j$  such that  $d(x_j, x) < 1/j$ .

If  $(M, d(x, y))$  and  $(N, \rho(u, v))$  are metric spaces, then a mapping  $\phi$  from  $M$  into  $N$  is said to be an *isometry* if

$$(A.6) \quad \rho(\phi(x), \phi(y)) = d(x, y)$$

for all  $x, y \in M$ . Any metric space  $(M, d(x, y))$  has a *completion* in the sense that there is a complete metric space  $(N, \rho(u, v))$  and an isometry  $\phi : M \rightarrow N$  such that

$$(A.7) \quad \phi(M) = \{\phi(x) : x \in M\}$$

is dense in  $N$ . The completion is unique up to isomorphism, in the sense that if  $(N', \rho'(z, w))$  is another complete metric space and  $\phi'$  is an isometric embedding of  $M$  into  $N'$  whose image is dense in  $N'$ , then there is an isometry  $\psi$  from  $N$  onto  $N'$  such that

$$(A.8) \quad \psi(\phi(x)) = \phi'(x)$$

for all  $x \in M$ . Basically one defines  $\psi$  first on the image of  $M$  in  $N$  by this condition, and then shows that  $\psi$  can be extended to an isometry from  $N$  onto  $N'$ .

If  $(M, d(x, y))$  is a metric space, then  $d(x, y)$  is said to be an *ultrametric* if

$$(A.9) \quad d(x, w) \leq \max(d(x, y), d(y, w))$$

for all  $x, y, w \in M$ , which is a stronger version of the triangle inequality. For instance, suppose that  $F_1, F_2, \dots$ , is a sequence of finite sets, each with at least 2 elements, and let  $M$  be the set of sequences  $x = \{x_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  such that  $x_l \in F_l$  for each positive integer  $l$ . Let  $\{\rho_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of positive real numbers which is strictly decreasing and converges to 0. If  $x = \{x_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ ,  $y = \{y_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  are elements of  $M$ , then put  $d(x, y) = 0$  if  $x = y$  and otherwise put  $d(x, y) = \rho_n$ , where  $n$  is the smallest positive integer such that  $x_n \neq y_n$ . This defines an ultrametric on  $M$ .

## B Compactness

Let  $A$  be a set, and let  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of points in  $A$ . By a *subsequence* of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  we mean a sequence of the form  $\{x_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^\infty$ , where  $\{j_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$  is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers. In other words, we basically restrict the original sequence to an infinite subset of integer indices, arranged in increasing order.

A sequence is automatically considered to be a subsequence of itself, and a subsequence of a subsequence of a sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  is also a subsequence of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ . Observe that if  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  is a sequence of points in  $A$  and if  $A$  is the union of finitely many subsets  $A_1, \dots, A_n$ , then there is a  $q$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq n$ , and a subsequence  $\{x_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^\infty$  of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  such that  $x_{j_l} \in A_q$  for all positive integers  $l$ .

Let  $(M, d(x, y))$  be a metric space. If  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  is a sequence of points in  $M$  which converges to a point  $x \in M$ , then every subsequence  $\{x_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^\infty$  of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  converges to  $x$ . If  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $M$ , then every subsequence  $\{x_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^\infty$  of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  is also a Cauchy sequence.

A subset  $E$  of  $M$  is said to be *closed* if for every sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  of points in  $E$  which converges to a point  $x \in M$  we have that  $x \in E$ . This is equivalent to the requirement that if  $x$  is an element of  $M$  such that for each  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a  $y \in M$  with  $d(x, y) < \epsilon$ , then  $y \in E$ . The empty set and  $M$  itself are automatically closed subsets of  $M$ .

If  $A$  is a subset of  $M$  and  $p$  is a point in  $M$ , then that  $p$  is a *limit point* of  $A$  if for each  $r > 0$  there exists a point  $x \in A$  such that  $d(p, x) < r$  and  $x \neq p$ . This is equivalent to saying that for each  $r > 0$  there are infinitely many elements of  $A$  whose distance to  $p$  is less than  $r$ . Equivalently,  $p$  is a limit point of  $A$  if there is a sequence of points in  $A$ , none of which are equal to  $p$ , and which converges to  $p$ . At any rate, a finite subset of  $M$  has no limit points. A subset of  $M$  is closed if and only if it contains all of its limit points.

For each  $p \in M$  and nonnegative real number  $r$ , the set

$$(B.1) \quad \{x \in M : d(x, p) \leq r\}$$

is a closed subset of  $M$ . One can show this using the triangle inequality. The union of finitely many closed subsets of  $M$  is a closed subset of  $M$ . The intersection of any family of closed subsets of  $M$  is a closed subset of  $M$ .

Let  $A$  be an arbitrary subset of  $M$ . The *closure* of  $A$  is denoted  $\bar{A}$  and is defined to be the set of points  $x \in M$  for which there is a sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$

of points in  $A$  which converges to  $x$ . If  $x \in A$ , then one can take  $x_j = x$  for all  $j$ , and thus we have that  $A \subseteq \overline{A}$ . Equivalently, a point  $x \in M$  lies in the closure of  $A$  if for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a point  $y \in A$  such that  $d(x, y) < \epsilon$ . This is also the same as saying that the closure of  $A$  is equal to the union of  $A$  and the set of limit points of  $A$ .

By definition, the closure of  $A$  is equal to  $A$  if and only if  $A$  is a closed set. In general one can check that if  $A$  is any subset of  $M$ , then the closure of  $A$  is a closed subset of  $M$ . For if  $x$  is a point in  $M$  which can be approximated by elements of  $\overline{A}$ , then  $x$  can be approximated by elements of  $A$ , and therefore lies in  $\overline{A}$ .

A subset  $K$  of  $M$  is said to be *compact* if for every sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  of points in  $K$  there is a subsequence  $\{x_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  which converges to a point in  $K$ . A subset  $K$  of  $M$  has the *limit point property* if every infinite subset  $E$  of  $K$  has a limit point which is an element of  $K$ . It is not too difficult to show that compactness is equivalent to the limit point property. Namely, if  $K$  is compact and  $E$  is an infinite subset of  $K$ , one can choose a sequence of points in  $E$  in which no point occurs more than once, and any subsequential limit of this sequence is a limit point of  $E$ . Conversely, if  $K$  has the limit point property and  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is a sequence of points in  $K$ , then either there is a subsequence of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  which is constant and hence convergent, or the set of  $x_j$ 's is infinite and one can check that a limit point of this set is also the limit of a subsequence of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ .

A compact subset  $K$  of  $M$  is closed. For suppose that  $x$  is an element of  $M$  and  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is a sequence of points in  $K$  which converges to  $x$ . By compactness there is a subsequence  $\{x_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  which converges to a point in  $K$ . However, this subsequence converges to  $x$ , since the whole sequence converges to  $x$ , and it follows that  $x \in K$ .

If  $K_1, \dots, K_n$  are compact subsets of  $M$ , then the union

$$(B.2) \quad K = K_1 \cup K_2 \cup \dots \cup K_n$$

is also a compact subset of  $M$ . Indeed, if  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is a sequence of points in  $K$ , then there is a  $q$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq n$ , and a subsequence  $\{x_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  such that  $x_{j_l} \in K_q$  for all  $l$ . The compactness of  $K_q$  then implies that there is a subsequence of  $\{x_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  which converges to a point in  $K_q$ . This subsubsequence of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is also a subsequence of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ , and it converges to a point in  $K$ , as desired.

Suppose that  $E, K$  are subsets of  $M$ , with  $E \subseteq K$ ,  $E$  closed, and  $K$  compact. Under these conditions  $E$  is also compact. For suppose that  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  is

a sequence of points in  $E$ . Because  $K$  is compact, a subsequence of  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  converges to a point in  $K$ . Because  $E$  is closed, the limit of this subsequence lies in  $E$ .

A subset  $E$  of  $M$  is said to be *bounded* if there is a positive real number  $r$  such that  $d(x, y) \leq r$  for all  $x, y \in E$ . Equivalently,  $E$  is bounded if there exists  $p \in M$  and  $t > 0$  such that  $d(p, x) \leq t$  for all  $x \in E$ . This is also equivalent to the condition that for each  $p \in M$  there is a  $t(p) > 0$  so that  $d(p, x) \leq t(p)$  for all  $x \in E$ . Observe that the union of finitely many bounded sets is bounded.

If  $E$  is a nonempty bounded subset of  $M$ , then the *diameter* of  $E$  is denoted  $\text{diam } E$  and defined to be the supremum of the numbers  $d(x, y)$  for  $x, y \in E$ . The closure of a bounded set is also bounded, and has the same diameter, assuming that it is not empty. The diameter of a union of two bounded subsets of  $M$  is less than or equal to the sum of the diameters of the two subsets if the two subsets have a point in common, and if the metric is an ultrametric, then the diameter of the union is less than or equal to the maximum of the diameters of the two subsets.

A compact subset  $K$  of  $M$  is bounded. Indeed, let  $p$  be any element of  $M$ . If  $K$  is not bounded, then for each positive integer  $n$  there is a point  $x_n \in K$  such that  $d(p, x_n) \geq n$ . In this case  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a sequence of points in  $K$  for which there is no convergent subsequence, contradicting the assumption that  $K$  is compact.

A subset  $E$  of  $M$  is said to be *totally bounded* if for each  $\epsilon > 0$  there exist finitely many points  $p_1, \dots, p_l \in M$  so that for each  $x \in K$  we have  $d(x, p_j) \leq \epsilon$  for at least one  $j$ . Equivalently,  $E$  is totally bounded if it can be expressed as the union of finitely many subsets of arbitrarily small diameter. The closure of a totally bounded subset of  $M$  is also totally bounded.

Compact subsets of  $M$  are totally bounded. Indeed, assume for the sake of a contradiction that  $K$  is a compact subset of  $M$  which is not totally bounded. In this case there is an  $\epsilon > 0$  and a sequence of points  $\{x_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$  in  $K$  such that  $d(x_l, x_m) \geq \epsilon$  when  $l < m$ . Clearly no subsequence of  $\{x_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$  can converge. In fact, no subsequence of  $\{x_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$  can be a Cauchy sequence.

If  $E$  is a subset of  $M$  which is totally bounded, and if  $\{x_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$  is any sequence of points in  $E$ , then for each  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a subsequence of  $\{x_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$  contained in a subset of  $E$  of diameter less than  $\epsilon$ . This is easy to see by expressing  $E$  as a union of finitely many subsets each with diameter less than  $\epsilon$ . One can go a bit further and say that if  $E$  is a totally bounded subset of  $M$  and  $\{x_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$  is a sequence of points in  $E$ , then  $\{x_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$  has a subsequence

which is a Cauchy sequence. This uses a Cantor diagonalization argument.

In short, a subset  $E$  of  $M$  is totally bounded if and only if every sequence of points in  $E$  has a subsequence which is a Cauchy sequence. If  $M$  is a complete metric space, then a subset of  $M$  is compact if and only if it is closed and totally bounded, by the preceding observations. In any metric space, a Cauchy sequence with a convergent subsequence converges to the same limit as the subsequence, and thus a Cauchy sequence contained in a compact set converges. It follows that a metric space  $M$  is compact as a subset of itself if and only if it is complete and totally bounded.

An interesting class of examples is provided by the spaces mentioned at the end of Appendix A, consisting of sequences with the  $l$ th term in a fixed finite set  $F_l$  for each  $l$ . For these spaces one can verify completeness, total boundedness, and compactness quite concretely. A sequence of elements in one of these spaces is a sequence of sequence, and convergence basically amounts to convergence of the individual terms in the  $F_l$ 's.

## C Topological spaces

Let  $X$  be a set, and let  $\tau$  be a collection of subsets of  $X$ , called the *open* subsets of  $X$ . We say that  $\tau$  defines a *topology* on  $X$ , so that  $X$  becomes a *topological space*, if the empty set  $\emptyset$  and  $X$  itself are open subsets of  $X$ , if the intersection of finitely many open subsets of  $X$  is again an open subset of  $X$ , and if the union of any family of open subsets of  $X$  is an open subset of  $X$ . The condition about unions is equivalent to saying that if  $W$  is a subset of  $X$  and if for each  $p \in W$  there is an open subset  $U$  of  $X$  such that  $p \in U$  and  $U \subseteq W$ , then  $W$  is an open subset of  $X$ .

Let  $(M, d(x, y))$  be a metric space. If  $p \in M$  and  $r > 0$ , then the open ball with center  $p$  and radius  $r$  is denoted  $B(p, r)$  and defined to be the set of  $x \in M$  such that  $d(p, x) < r$ . The closed ball with center  $p$  and radius  $r$  is denoted  $\overline{B}(p, r)$  and defined to be the set of  $x \in M$  such that  $d(p, x) \leq r$ . A subset  $U$  of  $M$  is said to be open if for each  $p \in U$  there is an  $r > 0$  such that  $B(p, r) \subseteq U$ . It is easy to check that this defines a topology on  $M$  and that every open ball in  $M$  is an open subset of  $M$ .

If  $(X, \tau)$  is a topological space, then a subset  $E$  of  $X$  is said to be *closed* if the complement  $X \setminus E$  of  $E$  in  $X$ , consisting of the points in  $X$  which do not lie in  $E$ , is an open subset of  $X$ . It follows that the empty set and  $X$  itself are closed subsets of  $X$ , that the union of finitely many closed subsets

of  $X$  is a closed subset of  $X$ , and that the intersection of any family of closed subsets of  $X$  is a closed subset of  $X$ . In a metric space a subset is closed in the sense defined in Appendix B if and only if it is closed in the sense that its complement is open.

If  $A$  is an arbitrary subset of  $X$ , then the *closure* of  $A$  is denoted  $\overline{A}$  and defined to be the set of points  $p \in X$  such that for each open subset  $U$  of  $X$  with  $p \in U$  we have that the intersection of  $A$  and  $U$  is nonempty. Thus the closure of  $A$  contains  $A$  automatically, and in a metric space this definition of the closure is equivalent to the one in Appendix B. One can check that  $A = \overline{A}$  if and only if  $A$  is a closed subset of  $X$ , and that  $\overline{A}$  always is a closed subset of  $X$ .

If  $X, Y$  are topological spaces and  $f$  is a mapping from  $X$  to  $Y$ , then we say that  $f$  is *continuous* at a point  $p \in X$  if for each open subset  $W$  of  $Y$  such that  $f(p) \in W$  there is an open subset  $U$  of  $X$  such that  $p \in U$  and

$$(C.1) \quad U \subseteq f^{-1}(W).$$

Recall that  $f^{-1}(W)$  is by definition the set of points  $x \in X$  such that  $f(x) \in W$ . If  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous at every point in  $X$ , then we say that  $f$  is a continuous mapping from  $X$  to  $Y$ . This is equivalent to saying that  $f^{-1}(V)$  is an open subset of  $X$  for every open subset  $V$  of  $Y$ , or that  $f^{-1}(E)$  is a closed subset of  $X$  for every closed subset  $E$  of  $Y$ .

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be sets, and let  $f$  be a mapping from  $X$  to  $Y$ . We say that  $f$  is injective or one-to-one if for each pair of points  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  with  $x_1 \neq x_2$  we have that  $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$ . We say that  $f$  maps  $X$  onto  $Y$  if for each  $y \in Y$  there is an  $x \in X$  such that  $f(x) = y$ . Thus  $f$  is a one-to-one mapping of  $X$  onto  $Y$  if and only if there is an inverse mapping  $h$  from  $Y$  to  $X$  such that

$$(C.2) \quad h(f(x)) = x$$

for all  $x \in X$  and

$$(C.3) \quad f(h(y)) = y$$

for all  $y \in Y$ . The inverse mapping is unique when it exists, and is denoted  $f^{-1}$ .

Let  $X, Y$  be topological spaces, and let  $f$  be a one-to-one mapping from  $X$  onto  $Y$ . We say that  $f$  is a *homeomorphism* if  $f$  is a continuous mapping from  $X$  to  $Y$  and  $f^{-1}$  is a continuous mapping from  $Y$  to  $X$ . Equivalently,  $f$  is a homeomorphism if  $f$  sends open subsets of  $X$  to open subsets of  $Y$  and



$f^{-1}$  sends open subsets of  $Y$  to open subsets of  $X$ . One could just as well use closed subsets instead of open subsets here.

A subset  $K$  of a topological space  $X$  is said to be *compact* if every open covering of  $K$  admits a finite subcovering. Recall that an *open covering* of a subset  $K$  of  $X$  is a family  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$  of open subsets of  $X$  whose union contains  $K$  as a subset. Thus  $K$  is compact if for each open covering  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$  of  $K$  there is a finite subset  $A_1$  of  $A$  such that  $K$  is contained in the union of the  $U_\alpha$ 's with  $\alpha \in A_1$ . Finite subsets of  $X$  are automatically compact.

If  $X, Y$  are topological spaces,  $f$  is a continuous mapping from  $X$  to  $Y$ , and  $K$  is a compact subset of  $X$ , then  $f(K)$  is a compact subset of  $Y$ , where  $f(K)$  is by definition the set of points in  $Y$  of the form  $f(x)$  for some  $x \in K$ . Indeed, suppose that  $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$  is an arbitrary open covering of  $f(K)$  in  $Y$ . Then  $\{f^{-1}(V_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in A}$  is an open covering of  $K$  in  $X$ . Because  $K$  is compact, there is a finite subset  $A_1$  of  $A$  such that  $K$  is contained in the union of  $f^{-1}(V_\alpha)$ ,  $\alpha \in A_1$ . This implies that  $f(K)$  is contained in the union of  $V_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in A_1$ .

A topological space  $X$  is said to satisfy the first axiom of separation if subsets of  $X$  with exactly one element are closed subsets. This is equivalent to saying that if  $x, y \in X$  and  $x \neq y$ , then there is an open subset  $U$  of  $X$  such that  $x \in U$  and  $y \notin U$ . If  $X$  satisfies the first axiom of separation, then every finite subset of  $X$  is a closed subset of  $X$ . A topological space  $X$  is said to satisfy the second axiom of separation if for every  $x, y \in X$  with  $x \neq y$  there are open subsets  $U, V$  of  $X$  such that  $x \in U, y \in V$ , and  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ . One also calls  $X$  a Hausdorff topological space in this case, and of course the second axiom of separation implies the first axiom of separation.

Let  $X$  be a Hausdorff topological space, let  $K$  be a compact subset of  $X$ , and fix a point  $x \in X \setminus K$ . For each  $y \in K$  there are open subsets  $U(y), V(y)$  of  $X$  such that  $x \in U(y), y \in V(y)$ , and  $U(y), V(y)$  are disjoint. Because  $K$  is compact there are finitely many points  $y_1, \dots, y_n \in K$  such that

$$(C.4) \quad K \subseteq V(y_1) \cup \dots \cup V(y_n).$$

Thus

$$(C.5) \quad U(y_1) \cap \dots \cap U(y_n)$$

is an open subset of  $X$  which contains  $x$  and is contained in the complement of  $K$ . It follows that  $K$  is a closed subset of  $X$ .

In order for compact subsets of a topological space  $X$  to be closed, it is obviously necessary for  $X$  to satisfy the first axiom of separation, since finite

subsets of  $X$  are compact. The first axiom of separation is not sufficient, as one can show by examples. For this reason the term “quasicompact” is sometimes used for compact subsets in topological spaces which are not necessarily Hausdorff.

For instance, let  $X$  be the real line  $\mathbf{R}$  together with an extra point  $0'$ . Let us write  $\mathbf{R}'$  for the set obtained from  $\mathbf{R}$  by removing  $0$  and adding  $0'$ . One can define a topology on  $X$  so that  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $\mathbf{R}'$  are open subsets of  $X$  which are each homeomorphic to the real line with the standard topology. The resulting space  $X$  satisfies the first axiom of separation but not the second one, because if  $U, V$  are open subsets of  $X$  such that  $0 \in U$  and  $0' \in V$ , then  $U$  and  $V$  have elements in common, namely nonzero real numbers close to  $0$ . Closed and bounded intervals in the real line are compact, and they give rise to compact subsets of  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $\mathbf{R}'$  which are compact subsets of  $X$ , but they may not be closed because of containing  $0$  and not  $0'$  or vice-versa.

In any topological space  $X$ , the union of two compact sets  $K_1, K_2$ . For suppose that  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$  is an open covering of  $K_1 \cup K_2$ . Then this is also an open covering of  $K_1, K_2$  individually, and thus there are finite subsets  $A_1, A_2$  of  $A$  such that  $K_1$  is contained in the union of the  $U_\alpha$ 's with  $\alpha \in A_1$  and  $K_2$  is contained in the union of the  $U_\alpha$ 's with  $\alpha \in A_2$ . Therefore  $A_1 \cup A_2$  is a finite subset of  $A$  such that  $K_1 \cup K_2$  is contained in the union of the  $U_\alpha$ 's with  $\alpha \in A_1 \cup A_2$ .

In any topological space  $X$ , if  $F$  is a closed subset of  $X$  and  $K$  is a compact subset of  $X$ , then the intersection of  $F$  and  $K$  is compact. Indeed, let an arbitrary open covering of  $F \cap K$  be given. Since  $F$  is closed,  $X \setminus F$  is open, and we can add this open set to the open covering of  $F \cap K$  to get an open covering of  $K$ . The compactness of  $K$  implies that finitely many open subsets in the original open covering of  $F \cap K$  together perhaps with  $X \setminus F$  covers  $K$ . Hence these finitely many open subsets from the original covering of  $F \cap K$  covers  $F \cap K$ .

If  $(M, d(x, y))$  is a metric space, then a subset  $K$  of  $M$  is compact in the sense of open coverings if and only if it is compact in the sense of Appendix B. To see this, assume first that  $K$  is compact in the sense of open coverings, and let  $E$  be any infinite subset of  $K$ . If we assume for the sake of a contradiction that  $E$  does not have a limit point in  $K$ , then for each  $p \in K$  there is then a positive real number  $r(p)$  such that  $E \cap B(p, r(p))$  is finite. Since  $K$  is compact in the sense of open coverings,  $K$  is contained in the union of  $B(p, r(p))$  for finitely many  $p \in K$ , which implies that  $E$  is finite. Notice also that compactness in the sense of open coverings immediately implies the

property of being totally bounded.

Conversely, suppose that  $K$  is a totally bounded subset of  $M$  and that every Cauchy sequence in  $K$  converges to a point in  $K$ . Suppose too that there is an open covering of  $K$  which does not admit any finite subcovering. Using the total boundedness of  $K$  one can show that there is a sequence  $K_1, K_2, \dots$  of closed subsets of  $K$  such that  $K_{n+1} \subseteq K_n$  for all  $n$ , the diameter of  $K_n$  is less than  $1/n$  for all  $n$ , and no finite subcollection of open sets from our covering of  $K$  covers any  $K_n$ . Using the convergence of Cauchy sequences one can show that there is a point  $p \in K$  such that  $p \in K_n$  for all  $n$ . Hence  $p$  is contained in one of the open subsets in the covering of  $K$ , which then contains  $K_n$  for sufficiently large  $n$ , a contradiction.

## References

- [1] W. Arveson, *An Invitation to  $C^*$  Algebras*, Springer-Verlag, 1976.
- [2] W. Arveson, *A Short Course on Spectral Theory*, Springer-Verlag, 2002.
- [3] M. Atiyah and I. Macdonald, *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*, Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- [4] S. Axler, P. Bourdon, and W. Ramey, *Harmonic Function Theory*, second edition, Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- [5] S. Axler, J. McCarthy, and D. Sarason, editors, *Holomorphic Spaces*, Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications **33**, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [6] A. Baker, *Matrix Groups: An Introduction to Lie Group Theory*, Springer-Verlag, 2002.
- [7] G. Birkhoff and S. MacLane, *A Survey of Modern Algebra*, fourth edition, Macmillan, 1977.
- [8] A. Borel, *Linear Algebraic Groups*, second edition, Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [9] A. Borel, *Semisimple Groups and Riemannian Symmetric Spaces*, Hindustan Book Agency, 1998.

- [10] A. Borel, *Essays in the History of Lie Groups and Algebraic Groups*, American Mathematical Society and London Mathematical Society, 2001.
- [11] K. Brown, *Buildings*, Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [12] J. Cassels, *Local Fields*, Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- [13] J. Cassels, *An Introduction to the Geometry of Numbers*, Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- [14] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*, Academic Press, 1994.
- [15] J. Dieudonné, *Special Functions and Linear Representations of Lie Groups*, Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences Regional Conference Series in Mathematics **42**, American Mathematical Society, 1980.
- [16] P. Duren, *Theory of  $H^p$  Spaces*, Academic Press, 1970.
- [17] P. Duren and A. Schuster, *Bergman Spaces*, American Mathematical Society, 2004.
- [18] L. Ehrenpreis, *Fourier Analysis in Several Complex Variables*, Wiley, 1970.
- [19] D. Eisenbud, *Commutative Algebra, with a View Toward Algebraic Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [20] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris, *The Geometry of Schemes*, Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [21] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation Theory: A First Course*, Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [22] J. Garnett, *Bounded Analytic Functions*, Academic Press, 1981.
- [23] L. Gillman and M. Jerison, *Rings of Continuous Functions*, Springer-Verlag, 1976.
- [24] I. Gohberg and M. Krein, *Introduction to the Theory of Linear Non-selfadjoint Operators*, American Mathematical Society, 1979.
- [25] R. Goldberg, *Methods of Real Analysis*, second edition, Wiley, 1976.

- [26] F. Gouvêa, *p-Adic Numbers: An Introduction*, second edition, Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- [27] R. Greene and S. Krantz, *Function Theory of One Complex Variable*, second edition, American Mathematical Society, 2002.
- [28] P. Halmos, *A Hilbert Space Problem Book*, second edition, Springer-Verlag, 1982.
- [29] J. Harris, *Algebraic Geometry: A First Course*, corrected edition, Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [30] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- [31] J. Hocking and G. Young, *Topology*, 2nd edition, Dover, 1988.
- [32] K. Hoffman, *Banach Spaces of Analytic Functions*, Dover, 1988.
- [33] J. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie Algebras and Representation Theory*, revised edition, Springer-Verlag, 1978.
- [34] P. Koosis, *Introduction to  $H_p$  Spaces*, second edition, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [35] S. Krantz, *Real Analysis and Foundations*, CRC Press, 1991.
- [36] S. Krantz, *A Panorama of Harmonic Analysis*, Mathematical Association of America, 1999.
- [37] S. Krantz, *Function Theory of Several Complex Variables*, AMS Chelsea Publishing, 2001.
- [38] S. Krantz, *Complex Analysis: The Geometric Viewpoint*, second edition, Mathematical Association of America, 2004.
- [39] S. Krantz and H. Parks, *The Geometry of Domains in Space*, Birkhäuser, 1999.
- [40] S. Krantz and H. Parks, *The Implicit Function Theorem: History, Theory, and Applications*, Birkhäuser, 2002.
- [41] S. Krantz and H. Parks, *A Primer of Real Analytic Functions*, second edition, Birkhäuser, 2002.

- [42] I. Macdonald, *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*, Oxford University Press, 1995.
- [43] S. MacLane and G. Birkhoff, *Algebra*, third edition, Chelsea, 1988.
- [44] D. Mumford, *The Red Book of Varieties and Schemes*, 2nd expanded edition, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1358**, Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [45] V. Peller, *Hankel Operators and their Applications*, Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [46] W. Rudin, *Function Theory in Polydisks*, Benjamin, 1969.
- [47] W. Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*, third edition, McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- [48] W. Rudin, *Function Theory in the Unit Ball of  $\mathbf{C}^n$* , Springer-Verlag, 1980.
- [49] W. Rudin, *Functional Analysis*, second edition, McGraw-Hill, 1991.
- [50] D. Sarason, *Function Theory on the Unit Circle*, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1978.
- [51] J.-P. Serre, *Cohomologie des groupes discrets*, in *Prospects in Mathematics*, 77–169, Annals of Mathematics Studies **70**, 1971.
- [52] J.-P. Serre, *A Course in Arithmetic*, Springer-Verlag, 1973.
- [53] J.-P. Serre, *Linear Representations of Finite Groups*, Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- [54] J.-P. Serre, *Local Fields*, Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- [55] J.-P. Serre, *Lie Algebras and Lie Groups*, second edition, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1500**, Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [56] J.-P. Serre, *Topics in Galois Theory*, Jones and Bartlett, 1992.
- [57] J.-P. Serre, *Local Algebra*, revised edition, Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [58] J.-P. Serre, *Complex Semisimple Lie Algebras*, Springer-Verlag, 2001.

- [59] J.-P. Serre, *Galois Cohomology*, Springer-Verlag, 2002.
- [60] G. Simmons, *Introduction to Topology and Modern Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- [61] B. Simon, *Trace Ideals and their Applications*, Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- [62] E. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- [63] E. Stein and R. Shakarchi, *Fourier Analysis: An Introduction*, Princeton University Press, 2003.
- [64] E. Stein and R. Shakarchi, *Complex Analysis*, Princeton University Press, 2003.
- [65] E. Stein and G. Weiss, *Introduction to Fourier Analysis on Euclidean Spaces*, Princeton University Press, 1971.
- [66] H. Swinnerton-Dyer, *A Brief Guide to Algebraic Number Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [67] M. Taibleson, *Fourier Analysis on Local Fields*, Princeton University Press, 1975.
- [68] G. Tamme, *Introduction to Étale Cohomology*, Springer-Verlag, 1994.
- [69] A. Weil, *Foundations of Algebraic Geometry*, Colloquium Publications **29**, American Mathematical Society, 1946.
- [70] A. Weil, *Basic Number Theory*, Springer-Verlag, 1973.