

-
1. *Assignment*
 - a. Continue formulating questions about the paper we're outlining in class. In particular,
 - i. the question of further generalization of the scalars, and
 - ii. more major topics, including
 - iii. generalization beyond linear algebra.
 - b. Consider whether and when you might like to discuss material you're working on.
 - c. Continue formulating questions about the social organization of mathematics, particularly the question, why join professional societies?
 2. *Events*
 - a. We discussed plans for a "social" at my house. I'll put the date and time on the next class outline.
 - b. Saturday 1 March, all day. Annual meeting of the MAA Northern California and Nevada Section at CSU Sacramento, University Union, Ballroom I.
 - i. 1000–1100, Kevin McCurley, Google Research: Random walks on graphs
 - ii. 1100–1130, Student poster session
 - iii. 1130–1230, Susan Holmes, Stanford, Mathematics of flipping a coin
 - iv. 1230–1400, Lunch
 - v. 1400–1500, Jesus de Loera, Davis, Volume: hard to get, straightforward
 - vi. 1500–1600, Robert Lang, IEEE, The modern science of origamiSome of us from SFSU will be going, so a carpool might be feasible. But I'll probably stay in Sacramento the night before, so won't be available for that.
 - c. Annual Tarski lectures in Berkeley. Each year a world-class logician gives a series of three lectures. This year's are on the foundations of the theory of algorithms, by Iannis Moschovakis. He received his PhD from Kleene in Madison in 1963, has made major contributions to several areas, and is now retired from the University of Athens.
 - i. Monday 3 March 4 PM 60 Evans: Algorithms and implementations
 - ii. Wednesday 5 March 4 PM Room TBA: English as a programming language
 - iii. Friday 7 March 4 PM 60 Evans: Derivation of absolute lower bounds. (This collides with another such event at SFSU.)
 - d. Fong Colloquium at SFSU. Each year a world-class gives a series of two talks here, the first for the scientifically literate public, the second for mathematics students and faculty. This year's are on combinatorics, by Richard Stanley, Prof. Ardila's MIT Doktorvater.
 - i. Thursday 6 March 4 PM Room TBA: Public lecture
 - ii. Friday 7 March 4 PM TH 211: Department lecture
 3. *Comments on in-class outline*
 - a. We started with some required items, to combat blank-page-phobia.

- b. How feeble it seems at the start of the process!
 - c. Put questions to yourself in your outline so you don't forget them.
 - d. Watch how the "basics" question evolves during the discussion.
 - e. Start the habit of recording sources for the references section as early as possible, so you don't lose track. Do it (nearly) right the first time.
4. *Continuing the in-class outline*
- a. It remained as it was in outline 7, except
 - b. we constructed the reference

Baer, Reinhold. 1952. *Linear Algebra and Projective Geometry*. Pure and applied mathematics, 2. New York: Academic Press. [Cited in ??.]

- c. This uses the same format, with some omissions, that I adopted for the bibliography in Marchisotto and Smith 2007, after some brainstorming, much consultation of Chicago 1993, and some correction of capitalization conventions by an excellent copyeditor. The latter, David Kramer, is a PhD mathematician involved in very many mathematics writing projects. This is the same format I'm using in the Math 800 and 880 bibliographies.
- d. Some reference lists list authors with first name first. That collides with alphabetization and just makes it harder for readers. Some reference lists number the entries and list them in the order that they appear in the work. That's just silly: readers can't find references easily and you have to reorder the list every time you shuffle things in the paper! The conventions here are recommended by Chicago. They are the simplest possible and they really work.
- e. You'll have trouble alphabetizing authors' names. There's no way to avoid that. Someone asked about non-English letters such as *ä*. Standard solution nowadays: ignore the diacritical marks. This supercedes a German convention of regarding, for example, *ä* as identical with *ae*, and a Spanish convention that regards *ñ* as coming after *n*.
- f. You may have trouble deciding which dated version of a book to list. Different editions may differ in content and pagination. It may be important when a book was first published, even though the first edition is not easily accessible. Such problems get *ad hoc* solutions.
- g. The book's title is italicized because that's the Chicago convention for book titles. It uses the English title capitalization style because Kramer told me to. We had some difficulty with that because that style differs from the conventional styles in other languages. We finally agreed to use it just when a title is ((English or Latin) and italicized).
- h. I included the series title and volume number because I know this particular series is often shelved together in libraries. I omit the word "volume" because Chicago doesn't require it and it's different in different languages.

- i. Someone suggested that this reference is hard to distinguish from one for a paper in a journal. Not so. For those, the paper title is not italicized, but the journal title is, and page numbers must be specified.
- j. But it is hard to distinguish a reference to a paper in a journal from one to a paper in a book that is a collection of papers. That is hard in libraries, too, because such books are often published in series, and libraries often treat some but not all series the same as journals.
- k. I omit LC numbers now because they are not standard for many references and are getting less useful nowadays.
- l. This book was published before ISBN numbers were invented.
- m. Some place names require further explanation: for example, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- n. Publishers often add decorations such as “Inc., Publishers” to their name on the book. They are generally quite inconsistent, even with themselves, so I don’t bother.
- o. I generally keep the “Cited in ??” annotation up to date as I’m writing, so that I can find the citations when I must correct errors, or, for example, change Baer 1952 to Baer 1952a, should I decide to refer to a second work that Baer might have published that year. Someone wondered if that is necessary, since I could use the word processor’s search feature to find them. Yes, it’s necessary because a large work generally occupies many files (about a hundred, for Marchisotto and Smith 2007), and the search engine generally only searches one file at a time. Major publishing software products, even my *WordPerfect*, do provide mechanisms for linking multiple files, but the overhead is more severe than I care to learn at this point.
- p. I originally wanted to omit the “Cited in” annotations from the published version of Marchisotto and Smith 2007 but my coauthor decided they were really helpful to readers, so I left them in. Recently I noticed some other books following the same convention.