

HIGHER DERIVATIONS AND FIELD EXTENSIONS

BY

R. L. DAVIS

ABSTRACT. Let K be a field having prime characteristic p . The following conditions on a subfield k of K are equivalent: (i) $\bigcap_n K^{p^n}(k) = k$ and K/k is separable. (ii) k is the field of constants of an infinite higher derivation defined in K . (iii) k is the field of constants of a set of infinite higher derivations defined in K . If K/k is separably generated and k is algebraically closed in K , then k is the field of constants of an infinite higher derivation in K . If K/k is finitely generated then k is the field of constants of an infinite higher derivation in K if and only if K/k is regular.

Introduction. The relationship between field extensions and derivations was investigated by Baer [1] in 1927. Baer obtained a characterization of those subfields k of the field K that are the fields of constants of derivations defined in K . In the prime characteristic case it was found that k is the field of constants of a nonzero derivation defined in K if and only if K/k is a purely inseparable extension having exponent one. Later Weisfield [7] generalized this result to finite higher derivations and purely inseparable extensions having higher exponent. The works of Weisfield [7] and Sweedler [6] yield the following: Let K be a field having prime characteristic. The following conditions on a subfield k of K are equivalent:

- (i) K/k is a purely inseparable modular extension with finite exponent.
- (ii) k is the field of constants of a finite higher derivation in K .
- (iii) k is the field of constants of a set of finite higher derivations in K .

The purpose of this paper is to extend the above results to infinite higher derivations. The following is obtained: Let K be a field having prime characteristic p . The following conditions on a subfield k of K are equivalent:

- (i) K/k is separable and $\bigcap_n K^{p^n}(k) = k$.
- (ii) k is the field of constants of an infinite higher derivation in K .
- (iii) k is the field of constants of a set of infinite higher derivations in K .

A few comments should be made concerning the theory for characteristic zero fields. Baer [1] showed that in this case the subfields of K which are fields of constants of derivations in K are precisely those subfields algebraically closed in K . These subfields are also the fields of constants of the finite and infinite higher derivations in K .

Received by the editors February 22, 1971.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 12F10, 12F15.

Key words and phrases. Higher derivation, separable extension, separably generated, regular extension, p -basis.

Copyright © 1973, American Mathematical Society

Preliminaries. All fields considered have prime characteristic p . Separable will mean separable in the linear disjoint sense. Let K be a field.

Definition. An infinite higher derivation in K is a sequence of additive mappings (d_i) of K into itself such that, for all x and y in K and $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$d_n(xy) = \sum \{d_i(x)d_j(y) \mid i + j = n\}$$

and d_0 is the identity mapping of K .

The field of constants of a derivation is its kernel and the field of constants of a higher derivation (d_i) is the intersection of the kernels of the d_i for $i \geq 1$. If k is a subfield of the field of constants of the derivation d in K , d is said to be a derivation in K over k . The notation $\text{Der}(K/k)$ is adopted for the collection of derivations in K over k and $H(K/k)$ is adopted for the analogous collection of infinite higher derivations in K .

The following results will be needed repeatedly in this paper.

Theorem A [3, p. 181]. *Let S be a p -basis for the field extension K/k and $f: S \rightarrow K$ an arbitrary function. Then there exists a unique derivation d in K over k such that $d(s) = f(s)$ for each $s \in S$.*

Theorem B [2, Theorem 1]. *Let S be a p -basis for the separable field extension K/k and $f: \{1, 2, \dots\} \times S \rightarrow K$ an arbitrary function. Then there exists a unique higher derivation (d_i) in K over k such that, for each $s \in S$ and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $d_i(s) = f(i, s)$.*

Theorem C [7, p. 436]. *Let (d_i) be a higher derivation in K . Then for each $a \in K$: (i) $d_{pj}(a^p) = (d_j(a))^p$ for each $j \geq 1$ and (ii) $d_j(a^p) = 0$ if p does not divide j .*

Main result.

Lemma 1. *Let K be a purely transcendental extension of k . Then there exists $d \in \text{Der}(K)$ having $k(K^p)$ as field of constants and $(d_i) \in H(K)$ with field of constants k .*

Proof. Let S be a transcendence basis for K/k with $K = k(S)$. If $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ is finite, let $s_0 = 1$ and define $d(s_i) = (s_0 \cdots s_{i-1})^{-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since S is a p -basis for K/k , this defines a unique derivation d in K over k [Theorem A]. Let $0 < m < n$ and $e^{(m)}$ denote the restriction of d to $k(K^p)(s_0, \dots, s_m)$. We induct on m to show that the field of constants of $e^{(m)}$ is $k(K^p)$ and $(s_0 \cdots s_m)^{-1} \notin \text{Im}(e^{(m)})$. If $m = 0$, then the result is clearly true since $e^{(0)}$ is the zero derivation in $k(K^p)$. Thus assume the result for m with $0 < m < n$.

Suppose there are $A_i \in k(K^p)(s_0, \dots, s_m)$ such that

$$(1) \quad e^{(m+1)}\left(\sum_0^{p-1} A_i s_{m+1}^i\right) = \sum_0^{p-1} e^{(m)}(A_i) s_{m+1}^i + \sum_1^{p-1} i A_i s_{m+1}^{i-1} (s_0 \dots s_m)^{-1} = 0.$$

If $A_i \neq 0$ for some $i \geq 1$, then there exists a $j \geq 0$ such that $A_j \neq 0$ and $e^{(m)}(A_j) = 0$. From (1) we have

$$(2) \quad e^{(m)}(-A_{j-1}/jA_j) = (s_0 \dots s_m)^{-1}.$$

This contradicts the induction hypothesis. Thus $A_i = 0$ for each $i \geq 1$ and $A_0 \in k(K^p)$ follows from the induction hypothesis.

Now suppose there are $B_i \in k(K^p)(s_0, \dots, s_m)$ such that

$$(3) \quad e^{(m+1)}\left(\sum_0^{p-1} B_i s_{m+1}^i\right) = \sum_0^{p-2} (e^{(m)}(B_i) + B_{i+1}(i+1)(s_0 \dots s_m)^{-1}) s_{m+1}^i + e^{(m)}(B_{p-1}) s_{m+1}^{p-1} = (s_0 \dots s_{m+1})^{-1}$$

or

$$(4) \quad \sum_0^{p-2} (e^{(m)}(B_i) + B_{i+1}(i+1)(s_0 \dots s_m)^{-1}) s_{m+1}^{i+1} + e^{(m+1)}(B_{p-1} s_{m+1}^p) = (s_0 \dots s_m)^{-1}.$$

Consequently, $e^{(m)}(B_{p-1} s_{m+1}^p) = (s_0 \dots s_m)^{-1}$ and this is a contradiction of the induction hypothesis.

If $S = \{s_\alpha\}$ is infinite, well-order it so that there is no last element. Define $d(s_\alpha) = s_{\alpha+1}$ for each $s_\alpha \in S$. This defines a unique derivation in K over k [Theorem A].

Let $A_i \in k(K^p)$ ($\{s \in S \mid s < s_\alpha\}$) and suppose

$$(5) \quad d\left(\sum_0^{p-1} A_i s_\alpha^i\right) = \sum_0^{p-1} d(A_i) s_\alpha^i + \sum_1^{p-1} i A_i s_\alpha^{i-1} s_{\alpha+1} = 0.$$

Necessarily, $\sum_1^{p-1} i A_i s_\alpha^{i-1} = 0$ and from this it follows that $A_1 = \dots = A_{p-1} = 0$. Iteration of the process yields that $A_0 \in k(K^p)$. Thus the field of constants of d is $k(K^p)$.

Since the action of a higher derivation is completely determined by its action

on a p -basis [Theorem B], there exists a higher derivation $(d_i) \in H(K/k)$ with $d_1 = d$. Theorem C is used to show that for each $i \geq 1$, the restriction of d_{p^i} to $K^{p^i}(k)$ is a derivation. Since $d_{p^i}(x^{p^i}) = d(x)^{p^i}$ for each $x \in K$, we see that d_{p^i} operates on S^{p^i} in exactly the same manner d operates on S . Since S^{p^i} is a transcendence basis for $K^{p^i}(k)/k$ with $K^{p^i}(k) = k(S^{p^i})$, the field of constants of the restriction of d_{p^i} to $K^{p^i}(k)$ is $K^{p^{i+1}}(k)$. Thus the field of constants of (d_i) is $\bigcap_n K^{p^n}(k) = \bigcap_n k(S^{p^n}) = k$.

Theorem 1. *The following conditions on a subfield k of K are equivalent.*

- (i) K/k is separable and $\bigcap_n K^{p^n}(k) = k$.
- (ii) k is the field of constants of a higher derivation in K .
- (iii) k is the field of constants of a set of higher derivations in K .

Proof. (i) implies (ii). Let S be a p -basis for K/k and T be a p -basis for k . Since $S \cup T$ is a p -basis for K , it is algebraically independent over K_0 , the maximal perfect subfield of K . The existence of an $(e_i) \in H(K_0(S \cup T))$ with field of constants $K_0(T)$ is guaranteed by Lemma 1. In the proof of Lemma 1 it was shown that (e_i) can be chosen such that the field of constants of the restriction of e_{p^j} to $K_0(S^{p^j} \cup T)$ is $K_0(S^{p^{j+1}} \cup T)$ for each $j \geq 0$. Take (d_i) to be the unique higher derivation in K agreeing with (e_i) on $S \cup T$. Since (d_i) acts trivially on T , k is a subfield of the field of constants of (d_i) . Let U be a linear basis for $K/K_0(S \cup T)$. We note that U^p and hence U^{p^n} for any n is a linear basis for $K/K_0(S \cup T)$. It is easily verified that K^p and $K_0(S \cup T)$ are linearly disjoint over $K_0(S^p \cup T^p)$. Thus U^p is linearly independent over $K_0(S)$ and is a linear basis for $K^p(S \cup T) = K$ over $K_0(S \cup T)$.

Let $x \in K$ and assume $d_i(x) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$. We show that $x \in K^{p^n}(k)$ for each n and consequently $x \in k$. Fix $n \geq 1$ and let $\{A_i\} \subseteq U$ and $\{a_i\} \subseteq K_0(S \cup T)$ be such that $x = \sum_i a_i A_i^{p^n}$. For each $1 \leq j < n$ we have

$$(6) \quad d_{p^j}(x) = \sum d_{p^j}(a_i) A_i^{p^n} = \sum e_{p^j}(a_i) A_i^{p^n} = 0.$$

As a consequence of the fact that each $e_{p^j}(a_i) = 0$ we have that each $a_i \in K_0(S^{p^n} \cup T)$ and hence $x \in K^{p^n}(k)$. It now follows that the field of constants of (d_i) is k .

(ii) implies (iii) is clear.

(iii) implies (i). Let H denote a set of higher derivations and suppose k is the field of constants of H . We first show that $\bigcap_n K^{p^n}(k) = k$. Let $x \in K^{p^n}(k)$ and $(d_i) \in H$. Fix $j \geq 1$ and let $p^g > j$. Since $x \in K^{p^g}(k)$, there are A and B in $K^{p^g}[k]$ such that $xB = A$ and $B \neq 0$. We apply d_j to both sides and use Theorem C to obtain that $d_j(x) = 0$.

Now we need to show that K^p and k are linearly disjoint over k^p . If this

were not the case, then there would exist a minimal subset of k which is linearly independent over k^p and linearly dependent over K^p . Thus suppose $\{A_i\}$ is such a minimal subset. Then

$$(7) \quad \sum_1^n a_i^p A_i = 0, \quad \{a_i\} \subseteq K, \quad \text{each } a_i \neq 0, \quad n > 1.$$

Without loss of generality we may assume $a_1 = 1$ and $a_2 \notin k$. There exists a $(d_j) \in H$ and $j > 0$ such that $d_j(a_2) \neq 0$.

$$(8) \quad d_{pj} \left(A_1 + \sum_2^n a_i^p A_i \right) = \sum_2^n (d_j(a_i))^p A_i = 0.$$

The minimal nature of n is contradicted by (8). Thus K/k is a separable field extension.

Theorem 2. *If K/k is separably generated and k is algebraically closed in K , then there exists an infinite higher derivation in K having field of constants k .*

Proof. Let S be a separating transcendence basis for K/k . An application of Theorem 1 to the field extension $k(S)/k$ yields the existence of a higher derivation (d_i) defined on $k(S)$ having k as field of constants. Since S is a p -basis for K , there is a unique extension of (d_i) to K/k [Theorem B]. We now show that the field of constants of this extension is k . Suppose s is an element of the field of constants of (d_i) . Let $f(x) = x^m + f_{m-1}x^{m-1} + \dots + f_0$ denote the minimal polynomial of s over $k(S)$. If each $f_i \in k$, then s is algebraic over k and we are finished. So suppose some $f_i \notin k$. Thus there exists $q > 0$ such that $d_q(f_i) \neq 0$. We may assume q to be minimal and that $d_j(f_g) = 0$ for each g and each $j < q$.

$$(9) \quad d_q(f(s)) = d_q \left(s^m + \sum_0^{m-1} f_i s^i \right) = \sum_0^{m-1} d_q(f_i) s^i = 0.$$

The polynomial $\sum_0^{m-1} d_q(f_i) x^i$ is nonzero and has degree less than that of the minimal polynomial of s . This is a contradiction. Thus each $f_i \in k$ and hence $s \in k$.

Corollary 1. *If K/k is separably generated and k is algebraically closed in K , then $\bigcap_n K^{p^n}(k) = k$.*

Recall that a field extension K/k is said to be regular if K and \bar{k} are linearly disjoint over k . Regularity is equivalent to K/k being a separable extension and k being algebraically closed in K [4, p. 56]. Thus we have

Corollary 2. *Let K/k be finitely generated. Then k is the field of constants of a higher derivation in K if and only if the extension K/k is regular.*

The following example due to Mac Lane [5] illustrates that the converse of

Theorem 2 is false. Let k be a perfect field and let $T = \{t_0, t_1, \dots\}$ be algebraically independent over k , define $Y = \{y_2, y_3, \dots\}$ by $y_n^p = t_{n-2} + t_{n-1}t_n^p$, $n \geq 2$, and let $K = k(T)(Y)$. Then K/k is a separable extension having $\bigcap_n K^{p^n}(k) = k$; however, K/k is not separably generated.

REFERENCES

1. R. Baer, *Algebraische Theorie der differentierbaren Runktionenkorper*. I, S.-B. Heidelberg. Akad. 1927, 15–32.
2. N. Heerema, *Derivations and embeddings of a field in its power series ring*. II, Michigan Math. J. 8 (1961), 129–134. MR 25 #69.
3. N. Jacobson, *Lectures in abstract algebra*. Vol. 3: *Theory of fields and Galois theory*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, N. J., 1964. MR 30 #3087.
4. S. Lang, *Introduction to algebraic geometry*, Interscience, New York, 1958. MR 20 #7021.
5. S. Mac Lane, *Steinitz field towers for modular fields*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 46 (1939), 23–45. MR 1, 3.
6. M. Sweedler, *Structure of inseparable extensions*, Ann. of Math. (2) 87 (1968), 401–410. MR 36 #6391.
7. M. Weisfeld, *Purely inseparable extensions and higher derivations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 116 (1965), 435–449. MR 33 #122.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BATON ROUGE,
LOUISIANA 70803