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THE WEIERSTRASS-STONE APPROXIMATION THEOREM
FOR \textit{p-ADIC} \textit{C^n}-FUNCTIONS

J. Araujo and Wim H. Schikhof

Abstract.
Let \( K \) be a non-Archimedean valued field. Then, on compact subsets of \( K \), every \( K \)-valued \( C^n \)-function can be approximated in the \( C^n \)-topology by polynomial functions (Theorem 1.4). This result is extended to a Weierstrass-Stone type theorem (Theorem 2.10).

INTRODUCTION
The non-archimedean version of the classical Weierstrass Approximation Theorem - the case \( n = 0 \) of the Abstract - is well known and named after Kaplansky ([1], 5.28). To investigate the case \( n = 1 \) first let us return to the Archimedean case and consider a real-valued \( C^1 \)-function \( f \) on the unit interval. To find a polynomial function \( P \) such that both \( |f - P| \) and \( |f' - P'| \) are smaller or equal than a prescribed \( \varepsilon > 0 \) one simply can apply the standard Weierstrass Theorem to \( f' \) obtaining a polynomial function \( Q \) for which \( |f' - Q| \leq \varepsilon \). Then \( x \mapsto P(x) := f(0) + \int_0^x Q(t) \, dt \) solves the problem.

Now let \( f : X \rightarrow K \) be a \( C^1 \)-function where \( K \) is a non-archimedean valued field and \( X \subseteq K \) is compact.

Lacking an indefinite integral the above method no longer works. There do exist continuous linear antiderivations ([3], §64) but they do not map polynomials into polynomials ([3], Ex. 30.C). A further complicating factor is that the natural norm for \( C^1 \)-functions on \( X \) is given by

\[
\|f\| = \max\{|f(x)| : x \in X\} \vee \max\{|f'(x)| : x \in X\}
\]

rather than the more classical formula

\[
\|f\| = \max\{|f(x) : x \in X\} \vee \max\{|f'(x)| : x \in X\}.
\]

(Observe that in the real case both formulas lead to the same norm thanks to the Mean Value Theorem, see [3], §§26,27 for further discussions.)
Thus, to obtain non-archimedean $C^n$-Weierstrass-Stone Theorems for $n \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ our methods will necessarily deviate from the 'classical' ones.

0. PRELIMINARIES

1. Throughout $K$ is a non-archimedean complete valued field whose valuation $|\cdot|$ is not trivial. For $a \in K$, $r > 0$ we write $B(a, r) := \{x \in K : |x - a| \leq r\}$, the 'closed' ball about $a$ with radius $r$. 'Clopen' is an abbreviation for 'closed and open'. The function $z \mapsto x (x \in K)$ is denoted $X$. The $K$-valued characteristic function of a subset $Y$ of $K$ is written $\chi_Y$. For a set $Z$, a function $f : Z \to K$ and a set $W \subset Z$ we define $\|f\|_W := \sup\{|f(z)| : z \in W\}$ (allowing the value $\infty$). The cardinality of a set $\Gamma$ is $\#\Gamma$. $N_0 := \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}, N := \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$.

We now recall some facts from [2], [3] on $C^n$-theory.

2. For a set $Y \subset K$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $\nabla^n Y := \{(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n) \in Y^n : i \neq j \Rightarrow y_i \neq y_j\}$. For $f : Y \to K$, $n \in N_0$ we define its $n$th difference quotient $\Phi_n f : \nabla^{n+1} Y \to K$ inductively by $\Phi_0 f := f$ and the formula

$$\Phi_n f(y_1, \ldots, y_{n+1}) = \frac{\Phi_{n-1} f(y_1, y_3, \ldots, y_{n+1}) - \Phi_{n-1} f(y_2, y_3, \ldots, y_{n+1})}{y_1 - y_2}$$

$f$ is called a $C^n$-function if $\Phi_n f$ can be extended to a continuous function on $Y^{n+1}$. The set of all $C^n$-functions $Y \to K$ is denoted $C^n(Y \to K)$. The function $f : Y \to K$ is a $C^\infty$-function if it is in $C^\infty(Y \to K) := \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} C^n(Y \to K)$. The space $C^0(Y \to K)$, consisting of all continuous functions $Y \to K$ is sometimes written as $C(Y \to K)$.

FROM NOW ON IN THIS PAPER $X$ IS A NONEMPTY COMPACT SUBSET OF $K$ WITHOUT ISOLATED POINTS.

3. Since $X$ has no isolated points we have for an $f \in C^n(X \to K)$ that the continuous extension of $\Phi_n f$ to $X^{n+1}$ is unique; we denote this extension by $\overline{\Phi}_n f$. Also we write

$$D_n f(a) := \overline{\Phi}_n f(a, a, \ldots, a) \quad (a \in X)$$

The following facts are proved in [2] and [3].

**Proposition 0.3.**

(i) For each $n \in N_0$ the space $C^n(X \to K)$ is a $K$-algebra under pointwise operations.

(ii) $C^0(X \to K) \supset C^1(X \to K) \supset \ldots$
(iii) If \( f \in C^n(X \to K) \) then \( f \) is \( n \) times differentiable and \( j!D_jf = f^{(j)} \) for each \( j \in \{0,1,\ldots,n\} \). More generally, if \( i,j \in \{0,1,\ldots,n\} \), \( i+j \leq n \) then \( \binom{i+j}{i}D_iD_jf = D_{i+j}f \).

(iv) If \( f \in C^n(X \to K) \) then for \( x,y \in X \) we have Taylor’s formula

\[
 f(x) = f(y) + (x-y)D_i f(y) + \cdots + (x-y)^{n-1} D_{n-1} f(y) + (x-y)^n \rho_1 f(x,y),
\]

where \( \rho_1 f(x,y) = \Phi_n f(x,y,y,\ldots,y) \).

4. Since \( X \) is compact the difference quotients \( \Phi_i f \) \((0 \leq i \leq n)\) are bounded if \( f \in C^n(X \to K) \). We set

\[
 \|f\|_{n,X} := \max \{ \|\Phi_i f\|_{n+i,X} : 0 \leq i \leq n \}.
\]

Then \( \|f\|_{0,X} = \|f\|_X \). We quote the following from [2] and [3]. Recall that a function \( f : X \to K \) is a local polynomial if for every \( a \in X \) there is a neighbourhood \( U \) of \( a \) such that \( f \mid X \cap U \) is a polynomial function.

**Proposition 0.4.** Let \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \).

(i) The function \( \| \|_{n,X} \) is a norm on \( C^n(X \to K) \) making it into a \( K \)-Banach algebra.

(ii) The local polynomials form a dense subset of \( C^n(X \to K) \).

(iii) The function

\[
 f \mapsto \|f\|_{n,X} := \max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} \|D_i f\|_X \vee \|\rho_1 f\|_{X^3}
\]

(see Proposition 0.3 (iv)) also is a norm on \( C^n(X \to K) \). We have

\[
 \|f\|_{n,X} = \max \{ \|D_i f\|_{n-i,X} : 0 \leq i \leq n \} \quad (f \in C^n(X \to K)).
\]

**Remarks**

1. Proposition 0.4 (ii) will also follow from Proposition 2.8.

2. In general \( \| \|_{n,X} \) is not equivalent to \( \| \|_{n,X} \) for \( n \geq 3 \) (see [3], Example 83.2).
1 THE WEIERSTRASS THEOREM FOR $C^2$-FUNCTIONS

The following product rule for difference quotients is easily proved by induction with respect to $j$.

Let $f, g : X \to K$, let $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then for all $(x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}) \in \nabla^{j+1}X$ we have

$$
\Phi_j(fg)(x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}) = \sum_{k=0}^{j} \Phi_k f(x_1, \ldots, x_{k+1}) \Phi_{j-k} g(x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{j+1}).
$$

Or, less precise,

$$
\Phi_j(fg)(x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}) = \sum_{k=0}^{j} \Phi_k f(x_k) \Phi_{j-k} g(u_{j-k})
$$

for certain $x_k \in \nabla^{k+1}X$, $u_{j-k} \in \nabla^{j-k+1}X$.

In the sequel we need an extension of this formula to finite products of functions. The proof is straightforward by induction with respect to $N$.

**Lemma 1.1. (Product Rule)** Let $h_1, \ldots, h_N : X \to K$, let $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then for all $(x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}) \in \nabla^{j+1}X$ we have

$$
\Phi_j(\prod_{s=1}^{N} h_s)(x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}) = \sum_{\sigma \subseteq \{1, \ldots, N\}} \prod_{s=1}^{N} \Phi_{j_{\sigma,s}} h_s(z_{\sigma,s})
$$

where the sum is taken over all $\sigma := (j_1, \ldots, j_N) \in \mathbb{N}_N^N$ for which $j_1 + \cdots + j_N = j$ and where $z_{\sigma,s} \in \nabla^{j_{\sigma,s}}X$ for each $s \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. (In fact, $z_{\sigma,1} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{j_1+1})$, $z_{\sigma,2} = (x_{j_1+1}, \ldots, x_{j_1+j_2+1}), \ldots, z_{\sigma,N} = (x_{j_1+\cdots+j_{N-1}+1}, \ldots, x_{j_1+\cdots+j_N})$.)

The following key lemma grew out of [1], 5.28.

**Lemma 1.2.** Let $0 < \delta < 1$, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, let $B = B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_m$ where $B_0, \ldots, B_m$ are pairwise disjoint 'closed' balls in $K$ of radius $\delta$. Then, for each $n \in \{0, 1, \ldots\}$ there exists a polynomial function $P : K \to K$ such that $\|P - \xi_B\|_{n,B} \leq \varepsilon$.

**Proof.** We may assume $0 \in B_0$. Choose $c_1 \in B_1, \ldots, c_m \in B_m$; we may assume that $|c_1| \leq |c_2| \leq \cdots \leq |c_m|$. Then $\delta < |c_1|$. We shall prove the following statement by induction with respect to $n$.

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $(\delta/|c_1|)^k \leq \varepsilon \delta^n$, $k > n$. Let $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that for all $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$

$$
\left|\frac{c_{\ell}^{tk_1}}{c_1^{tk_1}}\right| \leq \left|\frac{c_2^{tk_2}}{c_1^{tk_2}}\right| \cdots \leq \left|\frac{c_{\ell-1}^{tk_{\ell-1}}}{c_1^{tk_{\ell-1}}}\right| \left(\frac{\delta}{|c_1|}\right)^{t_\ell} \leq \varepsilon \delta^n
$$
(It is easily seen that such \( k, t_1, \ldots, t_m \) exist since \( \delta/|c_i| < 1 \).) Then the formula

\[
P(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \left(1 - \left(\frac{x}{c_i}\right)^k\right)^{t_i}
\]
defines a polynomial function \( P : K \to K \) for which

\[
\|P - \xi_{B_0}\|_{n,B} \leq \varepsilon.
\]

The case \( n = 0 \) is proved in [1], 5.28. To prove the step \( n - 1 \to n \) we first observe that from the induction hypothesis (with \( \varepsilon \) replaced by \( \varepsilon \delta \)) it follows that

\[
\|P - \xi_{B_0}\|_{n-1,B} \leq \varepsilon \delta
\]

So it remains to be shown that

\[
|\Phi_n(P - \xi_{B_0})(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1})| \leq \varepsilon
\]

for all \( (x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \in \nabla^{n+1} B \). Now, if \( |x_i - x_j| > \delta \) for some \( i,j \in \{1, \ldots, n+1\} \) we have, using (2),

\[
|\Phi_n(P - \xi_{B_0})(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1})| = |x_i - x_j|^{-1} |\Phi_{n-1}(P - \xi_{B_0})(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_{n+1}) - \Phi_{n-1}(P - \xi_{B_0})(x_1, \ldots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_{n+1})| \leq \delta^{-1} \cdot \varepsilon \delta = \varepsilon.
\]

So this reduces the proof of (3) to the case where \( |x_i - x_j| \leq \delta \) for all \( i,j \in \{1, \ldots, n+1\} \); in other words we may assume that \( x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1} \) are all in the same \( B_\ell \) for some \( \ell \in \{0,1, \ldots, m\} \). But then, after observing that \( n > 1 \), we have \( \Phi_n \xi_{B_0}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) = 0 \) so it suffices to prove the following.

If \( \ell \in \{0,1, \ldots, m\} \) and \( x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1} \in B_\ell \) are pairwise distinct then

\[
|\Phi_n P(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1})| \leq \varepsilon
\]

To prove it we introduce, with \( \ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \) fixed, the constants \( M_i \) (\( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \)) by

\[
M_i := \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } i > \ell \\
\delta/|c_i| & \text{if } i = \ell \\
|c_\ell/c_i|^k & \text{if } i < \ell
\end{cases}
\]

and use the following three steps.

**Step 1.** For each \( j \in \{0,1, \ldots, n\}, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) we have

\[
|\Phi_j(1 - \left(\frac{x}{c_i}\right)^k)|_{\nabla^{j+1} B_\ell} \leq \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \ell = 0, j = 0 \\
\delta^{-j} \left(\frac{\delta}{|c_\ell|}\right)^k & \text{if } \ell = 0, j > 0 \\
\delta^{-j} M_i & \text{if } \ell > 0.
\end{cases}
\]
Proof.

a. The case \( j = 0 \). Then for \( x \in B_\ell \) we have

- if \( i > \ell \) then \( |1 - \left( \frac{x}{c_i} \right)^k| = 1 \)
- if \( i = \ell \) then \( |1 - \left( \frac{x}{c_i} \right)^k| = \left| \frac{c_i - x}{c_i} \right|^k \leq \frac{\delta^k}{|c_i|^k} \leq \frac{\delta}{|c_i|} \)
- if \( i < \ell \) then \( |1 - \left( \frac{x}{c_i} \right)^k| = \left| \frac{c_i}{c_i} \right|^k = \left| \frac{c_i}{c_i} \right|^k \)

and the statement follows.

b. The case \( j > 0 \). Then \( \Phi_j(1) = 0 \) so that

\[
\Phi_j(1 - \left( \frac{X}{c_i} \right)^k) = \frac{1}{c_i^k} \Phi_j(X^k)
\]

Let \( (x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}) \in \nabla^{j+1} B_\ell \). By the Product Rule 1.1, \( \Phi_j(X^k)(x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}) \) is a sum of terms of the form \( \prod_{s=1}^k (\Phi_j, X)(z_s) \). Such a term is 0 if one of the \( j_s \) is > 1, so we only have to deal with \( j_s = 0 \) (then \( \Phi_j, X = X \)) or \( j_s = 1 \) (then \( \Phi_j, X = 1 \)). The latter case occurs \( j \) times (as \( \sum j_s = j \)) and it follows that

\[
\prod_{s=1}^k (\Phi_j, X)(z_s)
\]

is a product of \( k-j \) distinct terms taken from \( \{x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}\} \) (observe that, indeed, \( j < k \) since \( j \leq n < k \)), so its absolute value is \( \leq |c_i|^{k-j} \). It follows that \( \|\Phi_j(1 - \left( \frac{X}{c_i} \right)^k)\|_{\nabla^{j+1} B_\ell} \leq |c_i|^{k-j}/|c_i|^k \) from which we conclude

- if \( \ell = 0 \) : \( |c_i|^{k-j}/|c_i|^k \leq \delta^{k-j}/|c_i|^k = \delta^{-j}(\delta/|c_i|)^k \),
- if \( i > \ell > 0 \) : \( |c_i|^{k-j}/|c_i|^k \leq |c_i|^{k-j} \leq \delta^{-j} = \delta^{-j} M_i \),
- if \( i = \ell > 0 \) : \( |c_i|^{k-j}/|c_i|^k \leq |c_i|^{k-j} \leq \delta^{-j}(\delta/|c_i|)^k \leq \delta^{-j} M_i \),
- if \( i < \ell \) : \( |c_i|^{k-j}/|c_i|^k \leq |c_i|^{k-j}/|c_i|^k \leq \delta^{-j} M_i \).

and step 1 is proved.

Step 2. For each \( j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) we have

\[
\|\Phi_j(1 - \left( \frac{X}{c_i} \right)^k)\|_{\nabla^{j+1} B_\ell} \leq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \ell = 0, j = 0 \\ \delta^{-j}(\delta/|c_i|)^k & \text{if } \ell = 0, j > 0 \\ \delta^{-j} M_i^k & \text{if } \ell > 0 \end{cases}
\]

Proof. The case \( j = 0 \) follows directly from Step 1, part a, so assume \( j > 0 \). By the Product Rule 1.1 applied to \( h_s = 1 - \left( \frac{X}{c_i} \right)^k \) for all \( s \in \{1, \ldots, t_i\} \) we have for \( (x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}) \in \nabla^{j+1} B_\ell \) that \( \Phi_j(1 - \left( \frac{X}{c_i} \right)^k)(x_1, \ldots, x_{j+1}) \) is a sum of terms of the form

\[
(5) \quad \prod_{s=1}^{t_i} \Phi_j(1 - \left( \frac{X}{c_i} \right)^k)(z_s)
\]
where \( j_1 + \cdots + j_s = j \). If \( \ell = 0 \) it follows from Step 1 that the absolute value of (5) is \( \leq \prod \delta^{-j_s \left( \frac{\ell}{|c_i|} \right)^k} \) where the product is taken over all \( s \) in the nonempty set \( \Gamma := \{ s \in \{ 1, \ldots, t_i \} : j_s > 0 \} \), so the product is \( \leq \delta^{-j \left( \frac{\ell}{|c_i|} \right)^k} \leq \delta^{-j \left( \frac{\ell}{|c_i|} \right)^k} \). If \( \ell > 0 \) it follows from Step 1 that the absolute value of (5) is \( \leq \prod_{s=1}^{t_i} \delta^{-j_s} M_i = \delta^{-j} M^i_1 \).

The statement of Step 2 follows.

**Step 3.** Proof of (4). Again, the Product Rule 1.1, now applied to \( h_i = (1 - \left( \frac{x}{c_i} \right)^k)^{i_1} \) for \( i \in \{ 1, \ldots, m \} \) tells us that for \( (x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \in \nabla^{n+1} B_\ell \) the expression \( \Phi_n P(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \) is a sum of terms of the form

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{m} \phi_{n_i} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{x}{c_i} \right)^k \right)^{i_1} (y_i)
\]

where \( n_1 + \cdots + n_m = n \). If \( \ell = 0 \) we have by Step 2 that the absolute value of (6) is \( \leq \prod \delta^{n_i \left( \frac{\ell}{|c_i|} \right)^k} \) where the product is taken over \( i \) in the nonempty set \( \Gamma := \{ i : n_i \neq 0 \} \), so the product is \( \leq \delta^{-n \left( \frac{\ell}{|c_i|} \right)^k} \leq \delta^{-n \cdot \varepsilon \delta n} = \varepsilon \), where we used the assumption \( \left( \delta/|c_i| \right)^k \leq \varepsilon \delta n \). We see that \( \| \Phi_n P(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \| \leq \varepsilon \) if \( (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in B_0 \).

Now let \( \ell > 0 \). By Step 2 we have that the absolute value of (6) is \( \leq \prod \delta^{-n_i} M^i_1 = \delta^{-n} M^m_1 \cdots M^m_1 = \delta^{-n} \cdot |c_{i_1}|^{k_{i_1}} \cdots |c_{i_m}|^{k_{i_m}} \) which is \( \leq \delta^{-n} \varepsilon \delta n \) by (1). This proves (4) and the Lemma.

**Corollary 1.3.** For every locally constant \( f : X \to K \), for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists a polynomial function \( P : K \to K \) such that \( \| f - P \|_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon \).

**Proof.** There exist a \( \delta \in (0,1) \), pairwise disjoint 'closed' balls \( B_1, \ldots, B_m \) of radius \( \delta \) covering \( X \) and \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m \in K \) such that

\[
f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i \xi_{B_i}(x) \quad (x \in X)
\]

By Lemma 1.2 there exist polynomials \( P_1, \ldots, P_m \) such that \( \| \xi_{B_i} - P_i \|_{n,X} \leq \| \xi_{B_i} - P_i \|_{n,\cup B_i} \leq \varepsilon (|\lambda_i| + 1)^{-1} \) for each \( i \in \{ 1, \ldots, m \} \). Then \( P := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i P_i \) is a polynomial function and \( \| f - P \|_{n,X} \leq \max_i \| \lambda_i (\xi_{B_i} - P_i) \|_{n,X} \leq \max_i |\lambda_i| \varepsilon (|\lambda_i| + 1)^{-1} \leq \varepsilon \).

**Theorem 1.4.** (\( C^n \)-Weierstrass Theorem) For each \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( f \in C^n(X \to K) \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists a polynomial function \( P : K \to K \) such that \( \| f - P \|_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon \).

**Proof.** There is by Proposition 0.4 a local polynomial \( g : K \to K \) with \( \| f - g \|_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon \). This \( g \) has the form \( g = \sum_{i=1}^{m} Q_i h_i \) where \( Q_1, \ldots, Q_m \) are polynomials and \( h_1, \ldots, h_m \)...
are locally constant. By Corollary 1.3 we can find polynomials $P_1, \ldots, P_m$ for which
$||h_i - P_i||_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon(||Q_i||_{n,X} + 1)^{-1}$ for each $i$. Then $P := \sum_{i=1}^{m} Q_i P_i$ is a polynomial and
$||g - P||_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon$. It follows that $||f - P||_{n,X} \leq \max(||f - g||_{n,X}, ||g - P||_{n,X}) \leq \varepsilon$.

Remarks.
1. In the case where $X = \mathbb{Z}_p, K \supseteq \mathbb{Q}_p$ the above Theorem 1.4 is not new: The Mahler
   base $e_0, e_1, \ldots$ of $C(\mathbb{Z}_p \to K)$ defined by $e_m(x) = (\frac{x}{m})$ is proved in [3], §54 to be a
   Schauder base for $C^n(\mathbb{Z}_p \to K)$, for each $n$.
2. It follows directly from Theorem 1.4 that the polynomial functions $X \to K$ form a
   dense subset of $C^\infty(X \to K)$.

2. A WEIERSTRASS-STONE THEOREM FOR $C^n$-FUNCTIONS

For this Theorem (2.10) we will need the continuity of $g \mapsto g \circ f$ in the $C^n$-topologies
(Proposition 2.5). To prove it we need some technical lemmas that are in the spirit of
[3], §77.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For a function $h : \nabla^n X \to K$ we define $\Delta h : \nabla^{n+1} X \to K$ by the formula
\[
\Delta h(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1}) = \frac{h(x_1, x_3, x_4, \ldots, x_{n+1}) - h(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+1})}{x_1 - x_2}
\]
We have the following product rule.

Lemma 2.1. (Product Rule). Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $h, t : \nabla^n X \to K$. Then for all
$(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \in \nabla^{n+1} X$ we have $\Delta(h \circ t)(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1}) =
\Delta h(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \Delta t(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1}) + t(x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \Delta h(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1}).$
Proof. Straightforward.

Lemma 2.2. Let $f : X \to K$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $S_n$ be the set of the following functions
defined on $\nabla^{n+1} X$.
\[
(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \mapsto \Phi_1 f(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}) \quad (1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq n + 1)
\]
\[
(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \mapsto \Phi_2 f(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, x_{i_3}) \quad (1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < i_3 \leq n + 1)
\]
\[
\vdots
\]
\[
(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \mapsto \Phi_n f(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}).
\]
For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $R^n_k$ be the additive group generated by $S_n, S^2_n, \ldots, S^n_k$ where, for each
$j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $S^n_j$ is the product set \{ $h_1 h_2 \ldots h_j : h_i \in S_n$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, j\}$ \}.
Then, for all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Delta R^n_k \subseteq R^{n+1}_k$. 
Proof. We use induction with respect to \( k \). For the case \( k = 1 \) it suffices to prove \( h \in S_n \Rightarrow \Delta h \in R_{n+1}^1 \). Then \( h \) has the form

\[
(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \mapsto \Phi_j f(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots, x_{i_{j+1}})
\]

for some \( j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n+1\} \) and so

\[
\Delta h(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1}) = \frac{h(x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+2}) - h(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+2})}{x_1 - x_2}
\]

vanishes if \( i_1 > 1 \) (and then \( \Delta h \) is the null function), while if \( i_1 = 1 \) it equals

\[
\frac{\Phi_j f(x_1, x_{i_2+1}, \ldots, x_{i_{j+1}+1}) - \Phi_j f(x_2, x_{i_2+1}, \ldots, x_{i_{j+1}+1})}{x_1 - x_2}
\]

and it follows that \( \Delta h \in S_{n+1} \subset R_{n+1}^1 \). For the induction step assume \( \Delta R_{n+1}^{k-1} \subset R_{n+1}^{k-1} \); it suffices to prove that \( \Delta S_n^k \subset R_{n+1}^k \). So let \( h \in S_n^k \) and write

\[
h = h_1 H, \quad h_1 \in S_n, \quad H \in S_{n+1}^{k-1}.
\]

By the Product Rule 2.1 we have

\[
\Delta h(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+2}) = h_1(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+2}) \Delta H(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+2}) + H(x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+2}) \Delta h_1(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+2}).
\]

The fact that \( h_1 \in S_n \) makes

\[
(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+2}) \mapsto h_1(x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+2})
\]

into an element of \( S_{n+1} \). Similarly, since \( H \in S_{n+1}^{k-1} \), the function

\[
(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+2}) \mapsto H(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+2})
\]

is in \( S_{n+1}^{k-1} \). By our first induction step, \( \Delta h_1 \in R_{n+1}^1 \) and by the induction hypothesis \( \Delta H \in R_{n+1}^{k-1} \). Hence,

\[
\Delta h \in S_{n+1} R_{n+1}^{k-1} + S_{n+1}^1 R_{n+1}^1 \subset R_{n+1}^{k-1} + R_{n+1}^1 R_{n+1}^1 \subset R_{n+1}^k.
\]

Lemma 2.3. Let \( f, n, S_n, k, R_k \) be as in the previous lemma. Let \( f(X) \subset Y \subset K \) where \( Y \) has no isolated points. Let \( g : Y \to K \) be a \( C^n \)-function. Let \( B_n \) be the set of the following functions defined on \( \nabla^{n+1} X \):

\[
(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \mapsto \Phi_1 g(f(x_{i_1}), f(x_{i_2})) \quad (1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq n+1)
\]

\[
(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \mapsto \Phi_2 g(f(x_{i_1}), f(x_{i_2}), f(x_{i_3})) \quad (1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < i_3 \leq n+1)
\]

\[
\vdots
\]

\[
(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \mapsto \Phi_n g(f(x_1), f(x_2), \ldots, f(x_{n+1})).
\]
Let $A_n$ be the additive group generated by $B_n R^n_n$. Then

$$\Delta A_n \subset A_{n+1}. $$

Proof. We prove: $h \in B_n R^n_n \Rightarrow \Delta h \in A_{n+1}$. Write $h = br$ where $b \in B_n$, $r \in R^n_n$. By the Product Rule 2.1 we have for all $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+2}) \in \nabla^{n+2} X$

$$\Delta h(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+2}) = b(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+2}) \Delta r(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+2}) +$$

$$+ r(x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+2}) \Delta b(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+2}).$$

We have:

(i) $b \in B_n$ so $(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+2}) \mapsto b(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+1})$ is in $B_{n+1}$.

(ii) $r \in R^n_n$ so $(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+2}) \mapsto r(x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+1})$ is in $R^{n+1}_n$ (in the previous proof we had $r \in S^n_n$ so the map $(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+2}) \mapsto r(x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+1})$ is in $S^{n+1}_n$, and (ii) follows from this).

(iii) $r \in R^n_n$ so $\Delta r \in R^{n+1}_n$ (Previous Lemma).

(iv) $b$ has the form

$$(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \mapsto \Phi_j g(f(x_{i_1}), \ldots, f(x_{i+j}))$$

for some $j \in \{2, \ldots, n+1\}$ and so

$$\Delta b(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n+2}) = \frac{b(x_1, x_3, x_4, \ldots, x_{n+2}) - b(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{n+2})}{x_1 - x_2}$$

vanishes if $i_1 > 1$ (and then $\Delta b$ is the null function), while if $i_1 = 1$ it equals

$$\Phi_j g(f(x_1), f(x_{i_1+1}), \ldots, f(x_{i_j+1})) - \Phi_j g(f(x_2), f(x_{i_1+1}), \ldots, f(x_{i_j+1}))$$

$$\frac{1}{x_1 - x_2}$$

$$= \Phi_{j+1} g(f(x_1), f(x_2), f(x_{i_1+1}), \ldots, f(x_{i_j+1})) \Phi_1 f(x_1, x_2).$$

(if $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ we have 0 at both sides). So we see that $\Delta b \in B_{n+1} R^{n+1}_n$. Combining (i) - (iv) we get $\Delta h \in B_{n+1} R^n_n + R^{n+1}_n B_{n+1} R^{n+1}_n \subset B_{n+1} R^{n+1}_n + B_{n+1} \cdot R^{n+1}_n \subset A_{n+1}$.

Corollary 2.4. With the notations as in the previous lemma we have $\Phi_n(g \circ f) \in A_n$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$).

Proof. We proceed by induction on $n$. For the case $n = 1$ we write, for $(x_1, x_2) \in \nabla^2 X$, $\Phi_1(g \circ f)(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 - x_2)^{-1} \left( g(f(x_1)) - g(f(x_2)) \right) = \Phi_1 g(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \Phi_1 f(x_1, x_2).$
Hence, \( \Phi_1(g \circ f) \in B_1 S_1 \subset B_1 R_1 \subset A_1 \). To prove the step \( n \to n+1 \) observe that by the induction hypothesis, \( \Phi_n(g \circ f) \in A_n \). By Lemma 2.3, \( \Phi_{n+1}(g \circ f) = \Delta \Phi_n(g \circ f) \in A_{n+1} \).

**Remark.** From Corollary 2.4 it follows easily that the composition of two \( C^n \)-functions is again a \( C^n \)-function, a result that already was obtained in [3], 77.5.

**Proposition 2.5.** (Continuity of \( g \mapsto g \circ f \)) Let \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), let \( f \in C^n(X \to K) \) and let \( g \in C^n(Y \to K) \) where \( Y \) has no isolated points, \( Y \supset f(X) \). Then \( \| g \circ f \|_{n,X} \leq \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n} \| f \|_{j,X} \).

**Proof.** We may assume \( \| g \|_{n,Y} < \infty \). It suffices to prove \( \| \Phi_n(g \circ f) \|_{n+1,X} \leq \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n} \| f \|_{j,X} \). Now \( \| \Phi_n(g \circ f) \|_{n+1,X} = \max_{x \in X} | g(f(x)) | \leq \| g \|_{0,Y} \| f \|_{0,X} \) which proves the case \( n = 0 \). For \( n \geq 1 \) we apply Corollary 2.4 which says that \( \Phi_n(g \circ f) \in A_n \) i.e. \( \Phi_n(g \circ f) \) is a sum of functions in \( B_n S_n \). By the definition of \( B_n \) we have

\[
(*) \quad h \in B_n \Rightarrow \| h \|_{n+1,X} \leq \| g \|_{n,Y}
\]

Similarly,

\[
k \in S_n \Rightarrow \| k \|_{n+1,X} \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \| \Phi_i f \|_{n+1,X} \leq \| f \|_{n,X}
\]

so that

\[
(**) \quad k \in S_n \Rightarrow \| k \|_{n+1,X} \leq \| f \|_{n,X}.
\]

Combination of (*) and (**) yields \( \| \Phi_n(g \circ f) \|_{n+1,X} \leq \| g \|_{n,Y} \| f \|_{n,X} \).

Proposition 2.5 enables us to prove

**Proposition 2.6.** Let \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) and let \( A \) be a closed subalgebra of \( C^n(X \to K) \). Suppose \( A \) separates the points of \( X \) and contains the constant functions. Then \( A \) contains all locally constant functions \( X \to K \).

**Proof.** 1. We first prove that \( f \in A \), \( U \subset K \), \( U \) clopen implies \( \xi_{f^{-1}(U)} \in A \). In fact, \( f(X) \) is compact so there exist a \( \delta \in (0,1) \) and finitely many disjoint balls \( B_1, \ldots, B_m \) of radius \( \delta \) covering \( f(X) \) where, say, \( B_1 \ldots B_q \) lie in \( U \), and \( B_{q+1}, \ldots, B_m \) are in \( K \setminus U \). Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). By the Key Lemma 1.2 there exists, for each \( i \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \) a polynomial \( P_i \) such that \( \| \xi_{B_i} - P_i \|_{n,B} < \varepsilon \), where \( B := \bigcup_{i=1}^m B_i \). Then \( P := \sum_{i=1}^q P_i \) is a polynomial and

\[
\| P - \xi U \|_{n,B} = \| P - \xi B^0 \|_{n,B} = \| \sum_{i=1}^q (P_i - \xi_{B_i}) \|_{n,B} < \varepsilon,
\]

where \( B^0 := \bigcup_{i=1}^q B_i \).

By Proposition 2.5

\[
\|(P - \xi U) \circ f \|_{n,X} \leq \| P - \xi U \|_{n,B} \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} \| f \|_{j,X} \leq \varepsilon \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} \| f \|_{j,X}
\]
and we see that there exists a sequence \( P_1, P_2, \ldots \) of polynomials such that
\[
\|P_k \circ f - \xi U \circ f\|_{n,X} \to 0.
\]
Since \( A \) is an algebra with an indentity we have \( P_k \circ f \in A \) for all \( k \). Then \( \xi f^{-1}(U) = \xi U \circ f = \lim_{k \to \infty} P_k \circ f \in A \).

2. Now consider
\[
B := \{ V \subset X, \xi U \in A \}.
\]
It is very easy to see that \( B \) is a ring of clopen subsets of \( X \) and that \( B \) covers \( X \). To show that \( B \) separates the points of \( X \) let \( x \in X \), \( y \in X \), \( x \neq y \). Then there is an \( f \in A \) for which \( f(x) \neq f(y) \). Set \( U := \{ A \in K : |A - f(x)| < |f(x) - f(y)| \} \). Then \( U \) is clopen in \( K \). By the first part of the proof, \( f^{-1}(U) \in B \). But \( x \in f^{-1}(U) \) whereas \( y \notin f^{-1}(U) \).

By [1], Exercise 2.8 \( B \) is the ring of all clopens of \( X \). It follows easily that all locally constant functions are in \( A \).

To arrive at the Weierstrass-Stone Theorem 2.10 we need a final technical lemma.

**Lemma 2.7.** Let \( a_1, \ldots, a_m \in X \), let \( \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_m \) be in \((0,1)\) such that \( B(a_1, \delta_1), \ldots, B(a_m, \delta_m) \) form a disjoint covering of \( X \). Let \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( h \in C^n(X \to K) \) and suppose \( D_j h(a_i) = 0 \) and \( |\Phi_{n-j} D_j h(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-j+1})| \leq \varepsilon \) for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \), \( x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1} \in B(a_i, \delta_i) \cap X \), \( j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\} \). Then \( \|h\|_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon \).

**Proof.** We first prove that \( \|h\|_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon \) (see Proposition 0.4(iii)). Let \( i \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \).

Set \( B_i = B(a_i, \delta_i) \). By Taylor's formula (Proposition 0.3(iv)) we have for \( x \in X \cap B_i \):
\[
|h(x)| = |\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (x - a_i)^j D_s h(a_i) + (x - a_i)^n \rho_1 h(x, a_i)| \leq \delta_i^n \varepsilon.
\]
Similarly we have for \( j \in \{0, \ldots, n - 1\} \) and \( x \in X \cap B_i : |D_j h(x)| = |\sum_{i=0}^{n-1-j} (x - a_i)^i D_j D_s h(a_i) + (x - a_i)^n \rho_1 (D_j h)(x, a_i)| \). Now using Proposition 0.3(iii) we see that \( D_j D_s h(a_i) = 0 \) so that
\[
|D_j h(x)| = |x - a_i|^{n-j} |\Phi_{n-j} D_s h(x, a_i, \ldots, a_i)| \leq \delta_i^{n-j} \varepsilon.
\]
It follows that \( \|h\|_{X, X}, \|D_1 h\|_{X, X}, \ldots, \|D_{n-1} h\|_{X, X} \) are all \( \leq \varepsilon \). Now let \( x, y \in X \). If \( x, y \) are in the same \( B_i \) then \( |\rho_1 h(x, y)| = |\Phi_{n} h(x, y, \ldots, y)| \) \( \leq \varepsilon \) by assumption. If \( x \in B_i \), \( y \in B_i \) and \( i \neq s \) then \( |x - y| \geq \delta := \max(\delta_i, \delta_s) \) and by Taylor's formula
\[
h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (x - y)^i D_i h(y) + (x - y)^n \rho_1 h(x, y)
\]
we obtain, using \((*)\),
\[
|\rho_1 h(x, y)| \leq \frac{|h(x) - h(y)|}{|(x - y)^n|} \vee \frac{|D_1 h(y)|}{|x - y|^{n-1}} \vee \ldots \vee \frac{|D_{n-1} h(y)|}{|x - y|} \leq \delta^n \varepsilon \vee \frac{\delta^{n-1} \varepsilon}{\delta} \vee \ldots \vee \frac{\delta \varepsilon}{\delta} \leq \varepsilon.
\]
and we have proved $\|h\|_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon$.
Now to prove that even $\|h\|_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon$ observe that by Proposition 0.4(iii)

$$\|h\|_{n,X} = \|h\|_{n-1,X} \vee \|D_1 h\|_{n-1,X} \vee \cdots \vee \|D_n h\|_{n,X}.$$ 

To prove, for example, that $\|D_1 h\|_{n-1,X} \leq \varepsilon$ we observe that by Proposition 0.4(iii) and we have proved $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon$.

Now to prove that even $\|A\|_{n,X} < \varepsilon$ observe that by Proposition 0.4(iii)

$$\|A\|_{n,X} = \|A\|_{n-1,X} \vee \|D_1 A\|_{n-1,X} \vee \cdots \vee \|D_n A\|_{n,X}.$$ 

To prove, for example, that $\|D_1 A\|_{n-1,X} \leq \varepsilon$ we observe that by Proposition 0.4(iii) and we have proved $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon$. 

To prove, for example, that $\|D_2 h\|_{n-2,X} \leq \varepsilon$, ..., $\|D_n h\|_{0,X} \leq \varepsilon$ and it follows that $\|h\|_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon$.

**Proposition 2.8.** Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and let $A$ be a closed subalgebra of $C^n(X \to K)$ containing the locally constant functions. Let $g \in C^n(X \to K)$ and suppose for each $a \in X$ there exists an $f_a \in A$ with $D_i g(a) = D_i f_a(a)$ for $i \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$. Then $g \in A$.

**Proof.** Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For each $a \in X$ choose an $f_a \in A$ with $f_a(a) = g(a)$, $D_1 f_a(a) = D_1 g(a)$, ..., $D_n f_a(a) = D_n g(a)$. By continuity there exists a $\delta_a > 0$ such that, with $h_a := f_a - g$, $|D_{n-j} h_a(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-j})| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_{n-j+1} \in B(a, \delta_a)$. The $B(a, \delta_a)$ cover $X$ and by compactness there exists a finite disjoint subcovering $B(a_1, \delta_{a_1}), \ldots, B(a_m, \delta_{a_m})$. Set

$$f := \sum_{i=1}^m f_a \cdot 1_{B(a_i, \delta_{a_i}) \cap X}$$

Then, by our assumption on $A$, $f \in A$. By Lemma 2.7, applied to $h := f - g$ and where $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_m$ are replaced by $\delta_{a_1}, \ldots, \delta_{a_m}$ respectively, we then have $\|f - g\|_{n,X} \leq \varepsilon$. We see that $g \in \overline{A} = A$.

**Remark.** It follows directly that the local polynomial functions $X \to K$ form a dense subset of $C^n(X \to K)$.

**Proposition 2.9.** Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $A$ be a $K$-subalgebra of $C^n(X \to K)$ containing the constant functions. Suppose $f'(a) \neq 0$ for some $f \in A$, $a \in X$. Then there is a $g \in A$ with $g(a) = 0$, $g'(a) = 1$ and $A g(a) = D_2 g(a) = \cdots = D_n g(a) = 0$.

**Proof.** By considering the function $f'(a)^{-1}(f - f(a))$ it follows that we may assume that $f(a) = 0$, $f'(a) = 1$. Then

$$(*) \quad f = (X - a)h$$
where \( h \) is continuous, \( h(a) = 1 \). To obtain the statement by induction with respect to \( n \) we only have to consider the induction step \( n - 1 \to n \) and, to prove that, we may assume that \( D_2 f(a) = \cdots = D_{n-1} f(a) = 0 \). From (*) we obtain

\[
 f^n = (X - a)^n h^n 
\]

and by uniqueness of the Taylor expansion of the \( C^n \)-function \( f^n \) we obtain \( f^n(a) = D_1 f^n(a) = \cdots = D_{n-1} f^n(a) = 0 \) and \( D_n f^n(a) = h^n(a) = 1 \). We see that \( g := f - D_n f(a) f^n \) is in \( A \) and that \( g(a) = 0, g'(a) = 1, D_2 g(a) = \cdots = D_{n-1} g(a) = 0 \) and \( D_n g(a) = D_n f(a) - D_n f(a) D_n f^n(a) = 0 \).

**Theorem 2.10.** (Weierstrass-Stone Theorem for \( C^n \)-functions). Let \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) and let \( A \) be a closed subalgebra that separates the points of \( A \) and that contains the constant functions. Suppose also that for each \( a \in X \) there exists an \( f \in A \) with \( f(a) \neq 0 \). Then \( A = C^n(X \to K) \).

**Proof.** By Proposition 2.9, for each \( a \in X \) there exists an \( f \in A \) with \( f(a) = 0 \), \( f'(a) = 1 \), \( D_i f(a) = 0 \) for \( i \in \{2, \ldots, n\} \). The function \( g := X \) satisfies \( g(a) = 0 \), \( g'(a) = 1 \), \( D_i g(a) = 0 \) for \( i \in \{2, \ldots, n\} \) so applying Proposition 2.8 (observe that \( A \) contains the locally constant functions by Proposition 2.6) we obtain that \( X \in A \). But then all polynomials are in \( A \) and \( A = C^n(X \to K) \) by the Weierstrass Theorem 1.4.

**Remarks.**

1. The case \( n = 0 \) yields, at least for those \( X \) that are embeddable into \( K \), the well known Kaplansky Theorem proved in [1], 6.15.

2. We leave it to the reader to establish a \( C^\infty \)-version of Theorem 2.10.
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