

AN EXAMPLE OF A LOCALLY UNBOUNDED  
COMPLETE EXTENSION OF THE  $p$ -ADIC NUMBER FIELD

BY

W. WIĘSŁAW (WROCŁAW)

1. In paper [6] (p. 471, Table 1, and p. 472, Table 3) Mutylin raised the question if there exists a complete minimal and not locally bounded extension of the  $p$ -adic number field  $\mathcal{Q}_p$  (a field topology  $\mathcal{T}$  is said to be *locally bounded* provided there exists a bounded neighbourhood  $A$  of zero, i.e., for every neighbourhood  $U$  of zero there exists a neighbourhood  $V$  such that  $AV \subset U$ ). A field topology  $\mathcal{T}$  is called *minimal* if it cannot be non-trivially weakened, i.e., if the only topology weaker than  $\mathcal{T}$  is trivial. It is well known (see [5] and [7]) that if  $(K, \mathcal{T})$  is a topological field endowed with a minimal topology  $\mathcal{T}$ , then the completion  $\hat{K}$  of  $K$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  is a field.

In this note we give an example of a complete locally unbounded extension of a normed field.

I am indebted to Professor S. Hartman for valuable remarks concerning this paper.

2. Let  $k$  denote a non-trivially normed field with a norm  $|a|$ , and let  $L = k(x)$  and  $I = k[x]$ , where  $x$  is transcendental over  $k$ . Let  $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots)$  denote an infinite sequence of positive real numbers. We take the sets of finite sums

$$U(\varepsilon) = \left\{ f(x) = \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n x^n \in I : \forall_n |a_n| < \varepsilon_n \right\},$$

as a base of the neighbourhoods of zero in  $I$ . We extend this topology to  $L$  by putting  $U(\varepsilon, g) = gU(\varepsilon)$ ,  $g \in I$ , and taking the sets  $V(\varepsilon, g) = U(\varepsilon, g)/(1 + U(\varepsilon, g))$  as neighbourhoods of zero in  $L$ . Denote this topology by  $\mathcal{T}$ . It was shown in [3] that if  $k = \mathbf{R}$  (with its usual topology),  $(L, \mathcal{T})$  is not a locally bounded topological field. This result is true also for any locally bounded field  $k$  [2].

Now, let  $k$  be a normed field.

**THEOREM 1.**  $(L, \mathcal{T})$  is a topological field. Moreover,  $\mathcal{T}$  is a locally unbounded field topology.

This theorem can either be deduced from [2] or else proved directly by a slight modification of the original proof of Gould [3].

We prove that the completion  $\hat{L}$  of  $L$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  is a complete locally unbounded topological field. Hence we obtain

**THEOREM 2.** *For every complete non-trivially normed field  $k$ , there exists a complete locally unbounded extension.*

First, we need the following

**THEOREM 3.** *Suppose that  $(K, \mathcal{T})$  is a topological field, and  $\hat{K}$  is the completion of  $K$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then either  $\hat{K}$  is a topological field or it has divisors of zero. In other words,  $\hat{K}$  cannot be a proper integral domain.*

**Proof of Theorem 3.** If  $\mathcal{T}$  is the discrete topology, there is nothing to do since  $\hat{K} = K$ .

Hence suppose that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a proper field topology and that  $R = \hat{K}$  is an integral domain. Since  $R$  contains  $K$  as a topological subring, and  $R$  has a unit element, every non-zero element invertible in  $K$  remains invertible in  $R$ . It follows from [1] (Lemma 3, p. 755) that  $R$  contains no proper closed ideals. On the other hand, every principal ideal of  $R$  is closed:  $aR = \overline{aR}$  holds for every  $a \in R$ ,  $a \neq 0$ .

In fact, if  $a$  is a unit of  $R$ , in particular, if  $a \in K^\times$ , it is clear that  $a^{-1}R = R$ , whence  $aR = \overline{aR} = R$ . Now, let  $a \in R$ ,  $a \neq 0$ , be any non-unit. Since  $K$  lies densely in  $R$ , there is a net  $a_\alpha \in K$  with  $a_\alpha \rightarrow a$ . We can suppose, without loss of generality, that  $a_\alpha \neq 0$  for all  $\alpha$ 's. Let  $V$  be any symmetric neighbourhood of zero in  $R$ . Then  $a_\alpha - a \in V$  for sufficiently large  $\alpha$ . It follows that  $a_\alpha \in a + V$  and, consequently,  $R = a_\alpha R \subset (a + V)R \subset aR + VR \subset R$ , whence  $aR = R - VR = R + VR$ . But  $R \subset R + VR = aR$  and, finally,  $aR = R$  holds for every non-zero  $a \in R$ . It proves that  $R$  is a field. The continuity of division  $x \mapsto x^{-1}$  in  $R$ ,  $x \neq 0$ , follows from the continuity of division in the dense subgroup  $K^\times = K \setminus \{0\}$  of the multiplicative complete group  $R^\times = R \setminus \{0\}$  of  $R$ .

Before proving Theorem 2 we insert

**LEMMA.** *If the completion  $\hat{I}$  of  $I$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ -topology has no zero divisors, then  $\hat{L}$  has none.*

**Proof.** Assume  $a, b \in \hat{L}$ ,  $a \neq 0$ ,  $b \neq 0$ , and  $ab = 0$ . Since  $L$  is dense in  $\hat{L}$  and  $L$  is the quotient field of  $I$ , we have

$$(1) \quad a = \lim_n \frac{a_n}{a'_n}, \quad b = \lim_n \frac{b_n}{b'_n},$$

whence

$$\lim_n \frac{a_n b_n}{a'_n b'_n} = 0 \quad (a_n, a'_n, b_n, b'_n \in I).$$

If  $f_n/g_n \xrightarrow{n} 0$  ( $f_n, g_n \in I$ ), then  $f_n \xrightarrow{n} 0$ . In fact, by the definition of  $\mathcal{F}$ , for any  $\varepsilon$  and  $g \in I$ , there is an  $n_0 \in N$  such that

$$\frac{f_n}{g_n} \in \frac{U(\varepsilon, g)}{1 + U(\varepsilon, g)} \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0.$$

Fixing  $g$ , we have  $f_n = gh_n$ ,  $h_n \in U(\varepsilon)$ , for every  $\varepsilon$  and large  $n$ , and so  $h_n \xrightarrow{n} 0$  in  $I$ . By the continuity of multiplication, we infer that  $f_n \xrightarrow{n} 0$  in  $I$ .

We shall show that  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$  are Cauchy sequences. We have

$$a - \frac{a_n}{a'_n} \in \frac{U(\varepsilon, g)}{1 + U(\varepsilon, g)},$$

whence  $aa'_n - a_n = gh$ , and  $a'_n = 1 + gh_1$  with some  $h_1, h \in U(\varepsilon)$ . Similarly,  $aa'_m - a_m = gh'$ , and  $a'_m = 1 + gh'_1$ . Hence  $a - a_n = g(h - ah_1)$ ,  $a_m - a_n = g(ah'_1 - h')$ , and, finally,  $a_m - a_n = g(ah''_1 - h'')$ , where  $h''_1 = h_1 + h'_1$ ,  $h'' = h + h'$ , and  $h'', h''_1 \in U(\varepsilon)$ . So  $a_n - a_m \rightarrow 0$  for  $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ .

Since  $\hat{I}$  is complete, we have (by (1))

$$a_n \xrightarrow{n} \alpha \in \hat{I}, \quad b_n \xrightarrow{n} \beta \in \hat{I} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha\beta = 0.$$

Then the assumption of the Lemma yields  $\alpha = 0$  or  $\beta = 0$ , so  $a = 0$  or  $b = 0$ . This completes the proof of the Lemma.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** It is sufficient to show that  $\hat{L}$  has no zero divisors and to apply Theorem 3 together with the obvious remark that  $\hat{L}$  is locally unbounded since (by Theorem 1) such is  $L$ . In view of the Lemma, we have but to prove that  $\hat{I}$  has no zero divisors. Let  $ab = 0$  in  $\hat{I}$ , and  $b \neq 0$ , where  $a = \lim_n a_n$ , and  $b = \lim_n b_n$  ( $a_n, b_n \in I$ ). If

$$a_n(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} a_k^{(n)} x^k, \quad b_n(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} b_k^{(n)} x^k,$$

$$c_n(x) = a_n(x)b_n(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} c_k^{(n)} x^k, \quad \text{where } c_k^{(n)} = \sum_{r=0}^k a_r^{(n)} b_{k-r}^{(n)},$$

then, since  $\lim_n a_n b_n = 0$ , we have

$$\forall \varepsilon = (\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots) \exists n_0 \forall n \geq n_0 |c_k^{(n)}| < \varepsilon_k,$$

and so  $c_k^{(n)} \xrightarrow{n} 0$  for every  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . All sequences  $\{a_k^{(n)}\}$  and  $\{b_k^{(n)}\}$  are Cauchy and so convergent in  $\hat{I}$ .

Let  $m$  be the smallest integer for which

$$\lim_n b_m^{(n)} \neq 0$$

(if there were no such  $m$ , we would have  $\lim_n b_n = b = 0$ , contrary to the assumption). Since

$$c_m^{(n)} = a_0^{(n)} b_m^{(n)} + a_1^{(n)} b_{m-1}^{(n)} + \dots + a_m^{(n)} b_0^{(n)} \xrightarrow{n} 0,$$

we have  $\lim_n a_0^{(n)} = 0$ . Since

$$c_{m+1}^{(n)} = a_0^{(n)} b_{m+1}^{(n)} + a_1^{(n)} b_m^{(n)} + \dots + a_{m+1}^{(n)} b_0^{(n)} \xrightarrow{n} 0,$$

there must be  $\lim_n a_1^{(n)} = 0$  and so on. Thus,

$$a_k^{(n)} \xrightarrow{n} 0 \text{ for } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad \text{and} \quad a = \lim_n a_n(x) = 0.$$

It means that  $\hat{I}$  has no zero divisors. The proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

COROLLARY. *The Gould topology  $\mathcal{I}$  on  $L$  fails to be the intersection of the type  $V$  topologies of  $L$ .*

#### REFERENCES

- [1] В. А. Андрунакиевич и В. И. Арнаутов, *Обратимость в топологических кольцах*, Доклады Академии наук СССР 170 (1966), p. 755-758.
- [2] M. Endo, *On the embedding of topological rings into quotient rings II*, Scientific Papers of the College of General Education University of Tokyo 14 (1964), p. 51-54.
- [3] G. G. Gould, *Locally unbounded topological fields and box topologies on products of vector spaces*, The Journal of the London Mathematical Society 36 (1961), p. 273-281.
- [4] I. Kaplansky, *Topological rings*, American Journal of Mathematics 69 (1947), p. 153-183.
- [5] H. J. Kowalsky, *Beiträge zur topologischen Algebra*, Mathematische Nachrichten 11 (1954), p. 143-185.
- [6] А. Ф. Мутылин, *Связные полные локально ограниченные поля. Полные не локально ограниченные поля*, Математический сборник 76 (118) (1968), p. 454-472.
- [7] — *Вполне простые топологические коммутативные кольца*, Математические заметки 5 (1969), p. 161-171.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS  
WROCLAW UNIVERSITY

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 28. 6. 1972*