A Lost Scroll[*]

John B. Walsh
Department of Mathematics
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2, Canada
e-mail: walsh@math.ubc.ca

I recently received a package from a French colleague, together with a note explaining that the contents had been found while excavating a dolmen near the coast of Brittany, wrapped around a pre-christian order of fish and chips. {Yet another evidence of the venerable origins of the cultural exchange between France and Britain, ed.} The contents of the package consisted of a single ancient and flaking scroll of parchment, crowded with hardly-visible runes which were often obliterated by oily stains, some of which still smel'ed faintly of druidic vinegar. The note went on to say that the scroll seemed to concern mathematics and, since I was knowledgeable in the subject, perhaps I could help to decipher it.

Indeed, the scroll did concern mathematics and, after many long candle-lit nights of battling with strange ideas and atrocious handwriting, I was able to aid in some small way with its translation.

Because of the great historical interest of the present paper, I have been so bold as to circulate a copy among certain close friends. I beg the readers indulgence, and warn him that the notion of a proof was less rigorous in the pre-Christian era than it became after the crucifixion, so that the proofs might seem incomplete to the modern eye. But even the gap (which the reader will doubtless remark immediately) in the proof of Theorem 1 is easily bridged, and the resulting mathematics has a certain timeless quality. I might hesitently suggest that, even with its admitted imperfections, it has similarities with some of the most highly regarded of twentieth-century mathematics.

JBW

[*]Appeared in: *Memoriam Paul-André Meyer*, Sém. de Probabilités XXXIX, Lecture Notes in Math. **1874**, 2006

Université du village gaulois
Séminaire des Sujets Habituels

A NEW RESULT OF THE USUAL SUBJECTS

By Probabilix

Most of our readers are familiar with the usual subjects from articles in previous Seminars, so to keep from boring them with an overlong introduction, we refer to (1) for the usual notation, definitions, and the background to the problem.

The usual way of treating the problem is to first solve it under the usual hypotheses plus hypotheses (B) and (L), and then to take a lexicographic limit as L $\to$ Z. However, in this paper we will assume only the usual hypotheses.

As usual, the first theorem is Theorem one. This is proved as usual, so we will omit it. We can now state the basic

THEOREM 2. Under the usual hypotheses, the usual statement holds.

PROOF. Notice that if we first plunge the problem into a Wry compactification, the fact that càd is dual to làg implies qcg. But this is exactly the situation of (1), so the result follows by the usual methods.

REMARK. Theorem 2 is not new. It was proved in (2), although by a more complicated argument. Notice, however, that our proof never used the fact that the functions were bounded! Thus it is valid uniformly over the political spectrum, so that if we use a "$*$" as usual to denote the usual supremum, we have the following much stronger result, which is unusual.

THEOREM 3. Under the usual* hypotheses, the usual* statement holds.

REFERENCES

(1) The usual reference.
(2) Ibid., two pages further on.