ISRAEL JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, Vol. 54, No. 1, 1986

# A DISCRIMINANT CRITERIA FOR REDUCIBILITY OF A POLYNOMIAL

BY
M. FRIED[†,a] AND S. FRIEDLAND[††,b]

[a]*Department of Mathematics, University of California at Irvine, Irvine, CA 92717, USA*;
and [b]*Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel*

ABSTRACT

Let $p(w)$ be a polynomial over a domain $K$. If $p$ splits to linear factors then the discriminant $D(p)$ is a square in $K$. In this paper we state an additional condition on the roots of $p$ which together with the discriminant condition imply the splitting of $p$ in case that $K = \mathbf{C}[z]$ or $\mathbf{Z}$. Some extensions are also discussed.

## 1. Introduction

Let $K$ be a domain (a commutative ring without zero divisors) with unity. As usual denote by $K[w_1,\ldots,w_t]$ the ring of polynomials in $t$ variables $w_1,\ldots,w_t$. Assume that $p(w)$ and $q(w)$ are monic polynomials in $K[w]$. That is

$$(1)\qquad p(w)=w^n+a_1w^{n-1}+\cdots+a_n,\qquad q(w)=w^m+b_1w^{m-1}+\cdots+b_m,$$

$$a_i, b_j\in K,\quad i=1,\ldots,n,\quad j=1,\ldots,m.$$

Let $\tilde{K}$ be an algebraic closure of $K$. Thus $p(w)$ and $q(w)$ split into linear factors over $\tilde{K}$:

$$(2)\qquad p(w)=(w-\lambda_1)\cdots(w-\lambda_n),\qquad q(w)=(w-\mu_1)\cdots(w-\mu_m).$$

The resultant $R(p,q)$ and the discriminant $D(p)$ are defined to be

$$(3)\qquad R(p,q)=\prod_{1\le i\le n,1\le j\le m}(\lambda_i-\mu_j),\qquad D(p)=\prod_{1\le i<j\le n}(\lambda_i-\lambda_j)^2.$$

[†] Visiting Lady Davis Research Professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Fall Semester, 1984.

[††] Supported in part by US–Israel Binational Science Foundation grant 3225/84.

*Current address*: Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois, Chicago, IL 60680, USA.

Received March 11, 1985

It is well known that $R(p,q)$ and $D(p)$ are polynomials in the corresponding coefficients

$$R(p,q) = R(a_1,\dots,a_n,b_1,\dots,b_m), \qquad D(p) = D(a_1,\dots,a_n)$$

[6, Appendix 4, Sec. 9, 10]. That is, $R(p,q)$ and $D(p)\in K$ are well defined for any $p(w)$, $q(w)\in K[w]$. Let $r(w)$ be a monic polynomial in $K[w]$. Suppose furthermore that $r(w)$ can be written as $p(w)q(w)$ with $p,q\in K[w]$ (i.e., $r(w)$ is reducible). Then (3) gives

$$D(pq) = D(p)D(q)R(p,q)^2. \tag{4}$$

Thus, there is a connection between the reducibility of $p$ and the form of $D(p)$. In particular, if $p(w)$ splits in $K$ then $D(p)$ is a square in $K$.

If, however, $D(p)$ is a square in $K$ we then can deduce, in general, the following condition. Let $\Omega_p$ be splitting field of $p(w)$. Denote the group of automorphisms of $\Omega_p$ which fix all the elements in $K$ by $G(\Omega_p,K)$. Since any element of $G(\Omega_p,K)$ acts faithfully on the roots $\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n$ of $p$ we view $G(\Omega_p,K)$ as a subgroup of the symmetric group $S_n$.

Clearly, the condition that $D(p)$ is a square in $K$ is equivalent to the condition $\Pi_{1\le i<j\le n}(\lambda_i-\lambda_j)\in K$. Thus, any $\sigma\in G(\Omega_p,K)$ must preserve the above product. In particular,

$$G(\Omega_p,K)\subset A_n \tag{5}$$

where $A_n$ is the alternating group of degree $n$.

Motzkin and Taussky [4] considered a condition, sufficient when combined with (5), to guarantee the splitting of $p(w)$ over $K$.

THEOREM 1 (Motzkin–Taussky). *Let $p(w)$ be a monic polynomial in $w$ over $K[z,\zeta]$. Assume that $K$ is an algebraically closed field with characteristic not 2. Suppose also that $p(w)=p(w,z,\zeta)$ is a homogeneous polynomial. Then $p(w)$ splits into linear factors over $K[z,\zeta]$ if the following conditions hold:*

(i) *$D(p)$ is a square in $K[z,\zeta]$; and*

(ii) *for any fixed values $(z,\zeta)\ne(0,0)$ the polynomial $p(w,z,\zeta)$ has neither triple roots nor two distinct double roots.*

In fact Motzkin and Taussky stated this Theorem 1 for special polynomials

$$p(w,z,\zeta) = \det(wI - zA - \zeta B)$$

where $A$ and $B$ are $n\times n$ matrices with entries in $K$. But their proof applies for any $p(w,z,\zeta)$ satisfying the above condition.

The purpose of this paper is to generalize the Motzkin–Taussky theorem to two distinct cases. First we extend the above result to polynomials $p(w)$ over the ring $\mathbf{C}[z]$. Second we give a version of the above theorem for polynomials $p(w)$ with integer coefficients. In the first case our main tool is the Riemann–Hurwitz formula. The second case is an application of a theorem of Minkowski [5, Theorem 5.4.10] and it responds to a question of H. Furstenberg.

The second author would like to thank Olga Taussky-Todd for her suggestion to extend the Motzkin–Taussky theorem. We dedicate this paper to her.

## 2. Reducible polynomials in two variables

Let $K$ be $\mathbf{C}[z]$, the ring of polynomials over the complex numbers. Assume that $p = p(w, z) \in \mathbf{C}[w, z]$ is monic with respect to $w$. Then the discriminant $D(p) = D(z)$ is a polynomial in $z$. Call $p$ nondegenerate if $D(p) \neq 0$. Clearly $p$ is degenerate if and only if $p$ has a multiple factor. Assume that $p$ is a nondegenerate monic polynomial of degree $n \geqq 2$ in $w$. Then $\zeta \in \mathbf{C}$ is a zero of $D(z)$ if and only if the equation

$$p(w, z) = 0 \tag{6}$$

has a multiple zero in $w$ when $z = \zeta$. If $\zeta$ is not a zero of $D(z)$, then (6) has $n$ distinct roots (branches) $w_1(z), \dots, w_n(z)$ which are analytic in the neighborhood of $\zeta$. It is, however, possible that $D(\zeta) = 0$, but (6) has $n$ analytic branches in a neighborhood of $\zeta$ (i.e., $\zeta$ is a *singular* point of $p$). A point $\zeta$ is a *branch* point if (6) has fewer than $n$ analytic roots in the neighborhood of $\zeta$. Again this implies that $D(\zeta) = 0$, and there is a minimal positive integer $e(\zeta)$ such that the branches of (6) can be written as $w_i((z-\zeta)^{1/e(\zeta)})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $w_1(z), \dots, w_n(z)$ are analytic in a neighborhood of $z = 0$. Let $\mathbf{C}\{\{(z-\zeta)^{1/e(\zeta)}\}\}$ be the field of convergent Laurent series in $(z-\zeta)^{1/e(\zeta)}$. This field has a canonical automorphism, denoted $\sigma(\zeta)$, that is fixed on the elements of $\mathbf{C}\{\{(z-\zeta)\}\}$. It acts on $\alpha((z-\zeta)^{1/e(\zeta)})$ where $\alpha(z)$ is analytic in a neighborhood of $z = \zeta$ by mapping it to $\alpha(e^{2\pi i/e(\zeta)}(z-\zeta)^{1/e(\zeta)})$. Regard $\Omega_p$ as a subfield of $\mathbf{C}\{\{(z-\zeta)^{1/e(\zeta)}\}\}$. Since $\Omega_p$ is a splitting field over $\mathbf{C}(z)$, and $\sigma(\zeta)$ is fixed on $\mathbf{C}(z)$, restriction of $\sigma(\zeta)$ to $\Omega_p$ is an automorphism of $\Omega_p$. We continue to denote it by $\sigma(\zeta)$.

We now explain the Riemann–Hurwitz formula [1, I. 27]. Just as for $\zeta \in \mathbf{C}$ there is an element $\sigma(\infty)$ corresponding to $\zeta = \infty$. That is, there is a minimal positive integer $e(\infty)$ such that $w_1(z^{-1/e(\infty)}), \dots, w_n(z^{-1/e(\infty)})$ are branches of (6) where $w_1, \dots, w_n$ are meromorphic (not necessarily analytic) in a neighborhood of $z = 0$. For each $\zeta$ satisfying $D(\zeta) = 0$ write $\sigma(\zeta)$ (regarded as an element of

$S_n$) as a product of disjoint cycles $\beta_1 \cdots \beta_t$ with $\beta_i$ of length $s_1, i = 1, \ldots, t$. Denote the sum $\Sigma_{i=1}^t (s_i - 1)$ by $\operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\zeta))$, and do similarly for the element $\sigma(\infty)$. Then the Riemann–Hurwitz formula may be stated as follows under the condition that $p(w, z)$ is irreducible:

$$2(\deg_w(p) + g(p) - 1) = \sum_{\zeta \in \mathbf{C}} \operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\zeta)) + \operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\infty)), \tag{7}$$

where $g(p)$ is a nonnegative integer (the *geometric genus* of $p$). If $p(w, z)$ is reducible, write it as a product $p_1(w, z) \cdots p_u(w, z)$. Then formula (7) applies to each factor $p_i(w, z)$ separately if we restrict $\sigma(\zeta)$ to act on $\Omega_{p_i}$ (and the zeros of $p_i(w, z)$), $i = 1, \ldots, u$. In what follows we state Theorems 4.22 and 4.24 of [3] and give alternative short proofs.

THEOREM 2. *Let $\zeta$ be a simple root of $D(z)$. Then $\operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\zeta)) = 1$ and $\zeta$ is a branch point of* (6) *for which $p(w, \zeta) = 0$ has $n - 1$ distinct roots.*

PROOF. Regard $p(w, z)$ as a polynomial in $w$ with coefficients in $\mathbf{C}\{\{z - \zeta\}\} = K$. Over this field it factors as $p_1(w, z) \cdots p_u(w, z)$ where $\deg_w(p_1), \ldots, \deg_w(p_u)$ are the lengths of the disjoint cycles of $\sigma(\zeta)$ and all roots of $p_i(w, \zeta)$ are the same, $i = 1, \ldots, u$. Now assume that $\zeta$ is a simple root of $D(z)$. From formula (4) (applied inductively to $p_1, \ldots, p_u$) conclude that $p_1(w, \zeta), \ldots, p_u(w, \zeta)$ have no common roots, and at most one of these has degree exceeding 1. Assume that $p_1(w, \zeta)$ has $s$ multiple roots. We show that $(z - \zeta)^{s-1}$ divides $D(p_1)$. Since $\zeta$ is a simple root of $D(z)$, this gives $s = 2$ and the theorem is done.

Indeed, there is a function $w(z) = a_1 z + a_2 z^2 + \cdots$, analytic in a neighborhood of $z = 0$, such that

$$w((z - \zeta)^{1/s}),\ w(e^{2\pi i/s}(z - \zeta)^{1/s}), \ldots, w(e^{2\pi i(s-1)/s}(z - \zeta)^{1/s})$$

are exactly the branches of $p_1(w, z) = 0$ in a neighborhood of $z = \zeta$. Therefore

$$D(p_1) = \prod_{0 \leq l < k \leq s-1} ((a_1 e^{2\pi i l/s}(z - \zeta)^{1/s} + \cdots) - (a_1 e^{2\pi i k/s}(z - \zeta)^{1/s} + \cdots))^2. \tag{8}$$

Clearly this is divisible by $((z - \zeta)^{1/s})^{s(s-1)} = (z - \zeta)^{s-1}$. This concludes the proof from the first paragraph. ∎

THEOREM 3. *Let $\zeta$ be a root of $D(z)$ of even order. Then $\operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\zeta))$ is even. Assume in addition that $\zeta$ is a double root of $D(z)$. Then one of the following holds.*

(i) *$p(w, \zeta) = 0$ has $n - 1$ distinct roots and all branches of $p(w, z) = 0$ are analytic in a neighborhood of $\zeta$;*

(ii) *$p(w,\zeta)=0$ has $n-2$ distinct roots and $\sigma(\zeta)$ consists of one disjoint cycle of length* 3; *or*

(iii) *$p(w,\zeta)=0$ has $n-2$ distinct roots and $\sigma(\zeta)$ consists of* 2 *disjoint cycles of length* 2

PROOF. As we did in the proof of Theorem 2, consider $p(w,z)$ over $K=\mathbf{C}\{\{z-\zeta\}\}$. The condition that $\zeta$ is a root of $D(z)$ of even order is equivalent to $D(z)=((z-\zeta)^l h(z))^2$ where $h(\zeta)\neq 0$ and $h(z)\in K$. That is, $D(z)$ is a square in $K$. Therefore $\sigma(\zeta)$ (the generator of $G(\Omega_p/K)$) is in $A_n$ and $\operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\zeta))$ is even. Again write $p$ as $p_1\cdots p_u$, a product of irreducible factors over $K$ with $\deg(p_i)=s_i$. For simplicity assume $s_1\geqq s_2\geqq\cdots\geqq s_u$. From the last paragraph of the proof of Theorem 2, $\operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\zeta))=\sum_{i=1}^u s_i-1=s\leqq 2l$ where $s_1,\dots,s_u$ are the lengths of the disjoint cycles of $\sigma(\zeta)$. Now take $l=1$. From (4), 2 times the number of analytic branches added to $s$ is bounded by 2.

The case $s=0$ implies that $\sigma(\zeta)$ is the identity and corresponds to (i); and the case $s=2$ corresponds to (ii) or (iii) depending on whether $\sigma(\zeta)$ is a 3-cycle or a product of two disjoint 2-cycles. ■

COROLLARY 4. *Let $p(w,z)\in\mathbf{C}[w,z]$ be monic in $w$ and of degree $n$. Assume that $D(z)$ is not identically zero, and that it has $\zeta$ as a root of even order. If $p(w,\zeta)=0$ has precisely $n-1$ distinct roots, then all branches of $p(w,z)=0$ are analytic in a neighborhood of $\zeta$ (i.e., $\sigma(\zeta)$ is the identity).*

PROOF. From Theorem 3, $\operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\zeta))$ is even and $n-\operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\zeta))$ is an upper bound fr the number of distinct roots of $p(w,\zeta)$. Conclude that $\operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\zeta))=0$. That is, (i) of Theorem 3 holds. ■

We now generalize Theorem 1.

THEOREM 5. *Let $p(w,z)$ be a monic nondegenerate polynomial of degree $n$ in $w$. Assume for each $\zeta\in\mathbf{C}$ that*

$$p(w,\zeta)=0 \textit{ has at least } n-1 \textit{ distinct roots.} \tag{9}$$

*Assume also that $D(p)$ is a square. Then $p(w,z)$ splits into linear factors in $w$.*

PROOF. For each $\zeta\in\mathbf{C}$, Corollary 4 implies that $\sigma(\zeta)$ is the identity. With no loss we may assume that $p(w,z)$ is irreducible over $\mathbf{C}(z)$. Apply the Riemann–Hurwitz formula in (7). As $\operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\infty))\leqq n-1$ and $g(p)\geqq 0$, we get $2(n-1)\leqq n-1$. The only possibility is that $n=1$. ■

THEOREM 6. *Let $p(w,z)\in\mathbf{C}[w,z]$ be a monic nondegenerate polynomial of degree $n$ in $w$. Assume for each $\zeta\in\mathbf{C}$ that (9) holds. Suppose that $D(z)$ has $m$*

*roots of odd order. Let* $p(w,z)=p_1(w,z)\cdots p_u(w,z)$ *be the decomposition of* $p$ *into irreducible monic factors in* $\mathbf{C}[w,z]$. *Then*

$$\sum_{1\leqq i\leqq u}(\deg_w(p_i)-1)\leqq m. \tag{10}$$

*In particular, if* $m+1<n$, *then* $p(w,z)$ *is reducible. Also if* $m\geqq 1$, *then there exists* $i$ *such that* $\deg(p_i)\geqq 2$. *Finally, if* $m=1$, *then* $p(w,z)$ *splits into one irreducible quadric and* $n-2$ *linear factors in* $w$.

PROOF. The assumptions (and (4)) imply that the roots of $D(p_1),\ldots,D(p_u)$ are pairwise distinct, and the number of odd roots add up to $m$.

Let $m_i$ be the number of odd roots of $D(p_i)$, $i=1,\ldots,u$. Apply (7) to each $p_i$ separately, $i=1,\ldots,u$ (as in the proof of Theorem 5) to get $\deg(p_i)-1\leqq m_i$ with equality if and only if

$$\deg(p_i)-1=\operatorname{ind}(\sigma(\infty)_i)\quad\text{and}\quad g(p_i)=0 \tag{11}$$

where $\sigma(\infty)_i$ is the $\sigma(\infty)$ associated to $p_i$. Theorem 6 results from summing this expression over $i$. If $m=1$ there must be a factor of degree exceeding 1 for Theorem 2. The remainder of the theorem follows easily. ∎

COROLLARY 7. *Let* $p(w,z)$ *be an irreducible monic polynomial of degree at least* 2 *that satisfies* (9) *and let* $m$ *be the number of roots of odd degree of* $D(z)$. *Then* $\deg_w(p)\leqq m+1$ *with equality if and only if* $\zeta=\infty$ *is totally ramified* ($\sigma(\infty)$ *is a* $\deg_w(p)$*-cycle) and there exist nonconstant polynomials* $h,g\in\mathbf{C}[x]$ *such that* $p(g(x),h(x))\equiv 0$ *and* $(\deg(g),\deg(h))=1$.

PROOF. From (11) the function field $\mathbf{C}(w,z)$ of the curve $p(w,z)=0$ is of genus zero, and therefore $\mathbf{C}(w,z)=\mathbf{C}(w')$ for some element $w'\in\mathbf{C}(w,z)$. Thus there exist $h,g\in\mathbf{C}(x)$ such that

$$h(w')=z\quad\text{and}\quad g(w')=w. \tag{12}$$

We can adjust $w'$ by a linear fractional transformation to assume that $w'=\infty$ is the only value of $w'$ over $z=\infty$. Thus $h(w')$ must be a polynomial. Furthermore, since $p(w,z)$ is monic in $w$ the total ramification condition implies that $w$ is a Laurent series in $z^{-1/n}$ with $n=\deg_w(p)$, but not in $z^{-1/e}$ for $e$ any integer smaller than $n$. The leading coefficient of the Puiseux expansion for $w$ about $\infty$ is of the form

$$w=a_0z^{j/n-i}+a_1z^{(j-1)/n-i}+a_2z^{(j-2)/n-i}+\cdots$$

where $(i,j)$ is the integer pair for which $w^iz^j$ has a nonzero coefficient in $P(w,z)$ and $j/n-i$ is maximal. Thus this occurs for $i=0$ (because of total ramification) and the corresponding term is $(0, m)$ with $(n, m) = 1$ and $\deg_z(p(w, z)) = m$. Conclude therefore that $\mathbf{C}(w, z)$ is also totally ramified over $w = \infty$. That is, $g$ is also a polynomial. ∎

Consider polynomials $p(w, z) = 0$ that satisfy the conclusion of Corollary 7: $p(g(x), h(x)) \equiv 0$ for some nonconstant polynomials $h, g \in \mathbf{C}[x]$. Clearly, $p(w, z) = h(w) - z$ are nonsingular examples, and $p(w, z) = w^3 + w^2 - z^2$ is a singular example (i.e.,

$$0 = \frac{\partial p}{\partial w} = 3w^2 + 2w = \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} = 2z$$

has the solution $(0, 0)$). A complete description of such polynomials (satisfying condition (9)) would be interesting. In the case that the fields $\mathbf{C}(w)$ and $\mathbf{C}(z)$ (inside the function field of $p(w, z) = 0$) have nontrivial intersection (more than just $\mathbf{C}$), then Theorem 3 of [2] shows that $p(w, z)$ must be a linear change of variables of one of two types of examples: (a) $w^n - z^m$, $(m, n) = 1$; or (b) $T_n(w) - T_m(z)$, $(m, n) = 1$, where $T_n(z)$ is the $n$th Chebychev polynomial (i.e., $T_n(\cos(\theta)) = \cos(n\theta)$). If $n > 2$ in case (a), or if $n \geqq 4$ in case (b) then condition (9) no longer holds. Since the condition that $\mathbf{C}(w)$ and $\mathbf{C}(z)$ have nontrivial intersection immediately implies that $p(w, z)$ divides a variable separated polynomial, we have listed all cases of this occurring above.

## 3. Splitting of polynomials over the integers

Let $K = \mathbf{Z}$, as in the introduction, be the ring of integers, $\mathbf{Q}$ the field of rationals. Assume that $p(w) \in \mathbf{Z}[w]$ is a monic polynomial. Suppose that $D(p)$ is a nonzero square. In order to deduce that $p(w)$ splits in $\mathbf{Z}$ we must assume an analogue of the condition (9) of Theorem 5: For each prime $q$ which divides $D(p)$

$$p(w) = (w - w(q))^2 g(w) (\mathrm{mod}\, q), \qquad g(w(q)) \not\equiv 0 (\mathrm{mod}\, q), \qquad D(g) \not\equiv 0 (\mathrm{mod}\, q). \tag{13}$$

THEOREM 8. *Let $p(w)$ be a monic polynomial with integer coefficients. Assume that $D(p)$ is a nonzero square and that* (13) *holds. Then $p(w)$ splits over the integers.*

PROOF. Let $\Omega_p$ be the splitting field of $p(w)$ over $\mathbf{Q}$, and let $\mathcal{O}_p$ be the elements of $\Omega_p$ that are integral over $\mathbf{Z}$. For each prime ideal $\pi$ of $\mathcal{O}_p$ the inertial group of $\pi$ is defined as follows:

$$I(\pi) = \{\sigma \in G(\Omega_p, \mathbf{Q}), \sigma(\pi) = \pi \text{ and the induced map on } \mathcal{O}_p/\pi \text{ is trivial}\}.$$

Assume that the ideal $\pi \cap \mathbf{Z}$ is generated by the prime $q$. Let $\sigma \in I(\pi)$ be a nontrivial element. Then $\sigma$ permutes the roots $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathcal{O}_p$ of $p(w)$. If $\sigma(\lambda_i) = \lambda_j$ then

$$\sigma(\lambda_i) \equiv \lambda_j \equiv \lambda_i (\operatorname{mod} \pi)$$

since $\sigma$ acts trivially on $\mathcal{O}_p / \pi$. Thus, for $i \neq j$, $\lambda_i (\operatorname{mod} \pi)$ and $\lambda_j (\operatorname{mod} \pi)$ give a repeated zero of $p(w) \operatorname{mod} q$. Therefore (13) implies that $\sigma$ can interchange at most two elements of $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$. If $\sigma$ moves exactly two elements, then $\sigma$ is a 2-cycle $\in S_n - A_n$. However, the assumption that $D(p)$ is a square implies that

$$G(\Omega_p, \mathbf{Q}) \subset A_n.$$

Thus $I(\pi)$ is trivial for each prime ideal $\pi$. Now, Minkowski's theorem [5, Theorem 5.4.10] implies that if $[\Omega_p : \mathbf{Q}] > 1$, then there exists $\pi$, a prime ideal of $\mathcal{O}_p$ such that $|I(\pi)| > 1$. So $[\Omega_p : \mathbf{Q}] = 1 : p(w)$ splits in $\mathbf{Q}$. ■

## References

1. H. M. Farkas and I. Kra, *Riemann Surfaces*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.
2. M. Fried, *On Ritt's theorem and related Diophantine problems*, J. Reine Angew. **264** (1973), 40–55.
3. S. Friedland, *Simultaneous similarity of matrices*, Adv. in Math. **50** (1983), 189–265.
4. T. S. Motzkin and O. Taussky, *Pairs of matrices with property L. II*, Trans. Amer. Math Soc. **73** (1955), 387–401.
5. E. Weiss, *Algebraic Number Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1963.
6. H. Whitney, *Complex Analytic Varieties*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1972.