Pacific Journal of Mathematics

THE NONMINIMALITY OF THE DIFFERENTIAL CLOSURE

Maxwell Alexander Rosenlicht

Vol. 52, No. 2 February 1974

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 52, No. 2, 1974

THE NONMINIMALITY OF THE DIFFERENTIAL CLOSURE

MAXWELL ROSENLICHT

The differential closure of a given ordinary differential field k is characterized to within (differential) k-isomorphism as a differentially closed (differential) extension field $\hat{k}$ of k which is k-isomorphic to a subfield of any differentially closed extension field of k. It has been conjectured that, in analogy to the cases of the algebraic closure of a field and the real closure of an ordered field, the differential closure of any differential field k is minimal, that is, not k-isomorphic to a proper subfield of itself. The conjecture is here shown to be false.

Let k be a differential field (ordinary, that is with one specified derivation) of characteristic zero and let $k\{y\}$ be the differential ring of differential polynomials over k in the differential indeterminate y. Recall that the *order* of a nonzero differential polynomial in $k\{y\}$ is simply the smallest integer $r \geqq -1$ such that the differential polynomial involves none of the derivatives $y^{(r+1)}, y^{(r+2)}, \cdots$. According to Lenore Blum's definition, k is *differentially closed* if, for any $f, g \in k\{y\}$ with g of smaller order than f, there is a zero of f in k that is not a zero of g. For any differential field k, a *differential closure* of k is a differential extension field $\hat{k}$ of k that is differentially closed and that can be k-embedded in any differentially closed differential extension field of k. Blum has used the methods of model theory to show the existence of $\hat{k}$ and to derive a number of its properties [2], appreciably extending and simplifying a theory initiated by Abraham Robinson [5]. The uniqueness of $\hat{k}$ to within differential k-isomorphism follows from a recent result of Shelah [7]. The differential closure $\hat{k}$ of k is called *minimal* if there is no (differential) k-isomorphism of $\hat{k}$ with a proper subfield of itself. One of the unsolved problems of the theory has been to determine whether or not $\hat{k}$ is always minimal. Sacks has conjectured [6] that $\hat{k}$ is minimal over k in the special case $k = \boldsymbol{Q}$. It is proved here, among other things, that this conjecture is false. It was learned after the completion of this paper that this result has also been proved by Kolchin [4] and announced by Shelah [8]. The author is greatly indebted to Lenore Blum for calling his attention to the problem and for numerous conversations on her work.

We begin by recalling some facts outlined in a recent paper of Ax [1]. Let $k \subset K$ be fields. There is a K-module $\Omega^1_{K/k}$, the space of differential forms of degree one of K/k, and a k-linear map $d: K \to \Omega^1_{K/k}$ such that $d(xy) = xdy + ydx$ for all $x, y \in K$ (and these can be constructed just by insisting on universality for these properties) which is the usual dual space of the K-module of k-derivations of K, a vector space over K of dimension tr. deg. K/k if the latter is finite and the field characteristic is zero. For any derivation D of K such that $Dk \subset k$, there is a map $D^1: \Omega^1_{K/k} \to \Omega^1_{K/k}$ (most easily constructed using the universal properties of $\Omega^1_{K/k}$) which is characterized by the following properties: for all $\omega, \eta \in \Omega^1_{K/k}$ and all $f \in K$ we have $D^1(\omega + \eta) = D^1\omega + D^1\eta$, $D^1(f\omega) = (Df)\omega + f(D^1\omega)$, $D^1(df) = d(Df)$.

The following generalizes a lemma in Ax's paper [1, Lemma 3].

LEMMA 1. *Let $k \subset K$ be fields of characteristic zero, D a derivation of K such that $Dk \subset k$, C the D-constants of k, u and t elements of K that are algebraically dependent over C. Consider the k-differential of K given by udt. Then $D^1(udt) = d(uDt)$.*

For $D^1(udt) = (Du)dt + udDt$, while $d(uDt) = (Dt)du + udDt$, so we have to show that $(Du)dt = (Dt)du$. Let U, T be indeterminates over C and let $F(U, T) \in C[U, T]$ be an irreducible polynomial such that $F(u, t) = 0$. If u is transcendental over C then t is algebraic over $C(u)$ and $F(u, T)$ is irreducible over $C(u)$, so that $(\partial F/\partial T)(u, t) \neq 0$. Similarly if t is transcendental over C then $(\partial F/\partial U)(u, t) \neq 0$. The relation $(Du)dt = (Dt)du$ follows from the equations

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial U}(u, t)du + \frac{\partial F}{\partial T}(u, t)dt = 0 ,$$

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial U}(u, t)Du + \frac{\partial F}{\partial T}(u, t)Dt = 0$$

unless $(\partial F/\partial U)(u, t)$ and $(\partial F/\partial T)(u, t)$ are both zero, which can happen only if u and t are both algebraic over C, in which case both du and dt are zero.

PROPOSITION 1. *Let k be a differential field of characteristic zero, C its field of constants, x an indeterminate over C, and $f(x)$ a nonzero element of $C(x)$ such that $1/f(x)$ has the form*

$$\frac{1}{f(x)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{\partial u_i(x)/\partial x}{u_i(x)} + \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x} ,$$

where $c_1, \cdots, c_n \in C$ and $u_1(x), \cdots, u_n(x)$, $v(x) \in C(x)$. Let x_1, x_2 be elements of a differential extension field of k whose constants are all algebraic over k, each of x_1, x_2 being a solution of the differential equation $x' = f(x)$, and suppose that x_1, x_2 are algebraically dependent over k. Then either x_1 or x_2 is algebraic over k or $(v(x_1))' = (v(x_2))'$.

The field $K = k(x_1, x_2)$ is a differential extension field of k, so for $j = 1, 2$ we may apply the Lemma to $dx_j/f(x_j) \in \Omega^1_{K/k}$ and $D = '$ to get

$$D^1\left(\frac{dx_j}{f(x_j)}\right) = d\left(\frac{Dx_j}{f(x_j)}\right) = D(1) = 0 .$$

Assuming that neither x_1 nor x_2 is algebraic over k, each $dx_j/f(x_j)$ is a nonzero element of the one-dimensional K-module $\Omega^1_{K/k}$, so that we can write $dx_2/f(x_2) = c\,dx_1/f(x_1)$, for some nonzero $c \in K$. Hence

$$0 = D^1\left(\frac{dx_2}{f(x_2)}\right) = D^1\left(c\frac{dx_1}{f(x_1)}\right) = (Dc)\frac{dx_1}{f(x_1)} + cD^1\left(\frac{dx_1}{f(x_1)}\right) = (Dc)\frac{dx_1}{f(x_1)} ,$$

so that $Dc = 0$. Thus c is a constant of K, hence, by assumption, algebraic over k. Now for $j = 1, 2$,

$$\frac{dx_j}{f(x_j)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x}(x_j)}{u_i(x_j)} dx_j + \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}(x_j)dx_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{du_i(x_j)}{u_i(x_j)} + dv(x_j) ,$$

so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{du_i(x_2)}{u_i(x_2)} + dv(x_2) = c\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{du_i(x_1)}{u_i(x_1)} + dv(x_1)\right) .$$

From the well-known fact that a linear combination with constant coefficients of normal differentials of third kind can be exact only if it is zero (cf. [1, Prop. 2], which generalizes the usual residue considerations) we deduce

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{du_i(x_2)}{u_i(x_2)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c \frac{du_i(x_1)}{u_i(x_1)} , \qquad dv(x_2) = c\,dv(x_1) .$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}(v(x_2))' &= \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}(x_2)x_2' = \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}(x_2)f(x_2) = \frac{dv(x_2)}{dx_2/f(x_2)} = \frac{c\,dv(x_1)}{c(dx_1/f(x_1))} \\ &= \frac{dv(x_1)}{dx_1/f(x_1)} = (v(x_1))' .\end{aligned}$$

Note that if C is algebraically closed, then any element of $C(x)$ can be written in the form prescribed for $1/f(x)$ in Proposition 1, as is seen by looking at partial fractions with respect to $C[x]$. Note also that since $(v(x_j))' = (\partial v/\partial x)(x_j)x_j' = (\partial v/\partial x)(x_j)f(x_j)$, $j = 1, 2$, the conclusion of Proposition 1 can be written

$$\left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}(x_1)\right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x}(x_1)}{u_i(x_1)} = \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}(x_2)\right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x}(x_2)}{u_i(x_2)} .$$

REMARK. The condition in Proposition 1 that x_1 and x_2 be elements of a differential extension field of k whose constants are algebraic over k will certainly be satisfied if all the constants of $k(x_1, x_2)$ are algebraic over C, and this latter condition will automatically hold for most $f(x)$ of interest, in virtue of Lemma 2 and Proposition 2 below. For the same reason, the condition on constants in the following Corollary is superfluous. But we do not need this information for the nonminimality proof.

COROLLARY. *Let k be a differential field of characteristic zero, and suppose that x_1, x_2 are elements of a differential extension field of k whose constants are all algebraic over k, both x_1 and x_2 being solutions of the differential equation $x' = f(x)$, where $f(x)$ is either $x/(x+1)$ or $x^3 - x^2$. Then if x_1 and x_2 are algebraically dependent over k, either x_1 or x_2 is algebraic over k, or $x_1 = x_2$.*

First note that Proposition 1 is applicable since $1/f(x)$ is of the correct form, namely either

$$\frac{x+1}{x} = \frac{1}{x} + 1 = \frac{\partial x/\partial x}{x} + \frac{\partial x}{\partial x}$$

or

$$\frac{1}{x^3 - x^2} = \frac{1}{x-1} - \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{x^2} = \frac{\dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\dfrac{x-1}{x}\right)}{(x-1)/x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{1}{x}\right).$$

For $j = 1, 2$, in the case $f(x) = x/(x+1)$ we have $(v(x_j))' = x_j' = x_j/(x_j + 1)$, while in the case $f(x) = x^3 - x^2$ we have $(v(x_j))' = (1/x_j)' = -x_j'/x_j^2 = 1 - x_j$, so the Corollary follows directly from the Proposition.

Now let C be a differential field of constants. We shall show that its differential closure $\hat{C}$ is not minimal over C. Let x be an indeterminate over C, $f(x)$ a nonzero element of $C(x)$. For any $x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n$ in $\hat{C}$, the differential equation $y' = f(y)$ has at least one solution in $\hat{C}$ not annulling $(y - x_1)(y - x_2) \cdots (y - x_n)$. Hence the differential equation $y' = f(y)$ has an infinity of solutions in $\hat{C}$. Since there are only a finite number of constant solutions of $y' = f(y)$, namely the zeros of $f(y)$, we can find distinct nonconstant elements $x_1, x_2, \cdots$ of $\hat{C}$ such that $x_i' = f(x_i)$ for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots$. We claim that in either of the special cases $f(x) = x/(x+1)$ or $f(x) = x^3 - x^2$, the set $\{x_1, x_2, \cdots\}$ is a set of indiscernibles over C (or, in the terminology of Sacks [4], a set of *conjugates over* C) and this fact will prove the nonminimality of $\hat{C}$ over C [6, p. 633]. What has to be shown is that for any $n = 1, 2, \cdots$ and any distinct positive integers $i_1, \cdots, i_n$, the differential isomorphism class of $(x_{i_1}, \cdots, x_{i_n})$ over C is independent of the choice of $i_1, \cdots, i_n$. Since $x_i' = f(x_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots$, it suffices to prove that the algebraic isomorphism class of $(x_{i_1}, \cdots, x_{i_n})$ over C is independent of the choice of $i_1, \cdots, i_n$, which will certainly be true if $x_{i_1}, \cdots, x_{i_n}$ are always algebraically independent over C. Hence we are reduced to proving that $x_1, x_2, \cdots$ are algebraically independent over C. As a preliminary, note that the constants of $C(x_1, x_2, \cdots)$ are among the constants of $\hat{C}$, which are precisely the algebraic closure $\bar{C}$ of C, an easy consequence of Blum's theory [2]. We now assume that for a certain $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, the elements $x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n$ are algebraically dependent over C, and we have to derive a contradiction. Taking n minimal and changing our notation, if necessary, we may assume that no proper subset of $\{x_1, \cdots, x_n\}$ is algebraically dependent over C. If $n > 1$, then x_{n-1} and x_n are algebraically dependent over the differential field $C(x_1, \cdots, x_{n-2})$ and are distinct solutions of the differential equation $x' = f(x)$, so the previous Corollary implies that either x_{n-1} or x_n is algebraic over $C(x_1, \cdots, x_{n-2})$, a contradiction of the minimality of n, while if $n = 1$ we have x_1 algebraic over C, therefore a constant, again a contradiction. This proves that $x_1, x_2, \cdots$ are algebraically independent over C, and hence that $\hat{C}$ is not minimal over C.

It is of interest to generalize somewhat the argument of the preceding paragraph. Let k be any differential field of characteristic zero and let $x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n$ be distinct elements of a differential extension field of k, none algebraic over k, such that for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ we have $x_i' = f(x_i)$, where $f(x)$ is either $x/(x + 1)$ or $x^3 - x^2$. Then $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ are algebraically independent over k and the constant subfields of $k(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ and of k are the same. To see this, we use the argument of the preceding paragraph, supplemented by Lemma 2 and Proposition 2 below. The Remark following Proposition 1 enables us to follow the above proof literally to get $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ algebraically independent over k, after which the equality of the constant subfields of $k(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ and of k is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.

LEMMA 2. *Let K be a differential field, algebraic over its differential subfield k. Then the constants of K are algebraic over the subfield of constants of k.*

For let c be a constant of K, let $n = [k(c): k]$, and pick $a_1, \cdots, a_n \in k$ such that $c^n + a_1c^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n = 0$. Differentiation gives $a_1'c^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n' = 0$, from which we deduce that each $a_i' = 0$, so each a_i is a constant of k.

LEMMA 3. *Let $k \subset K$ be differential fields of characteristic zero,*

$C \subset \mathscr{C}$ their respective subfields of constants, and suppose that k is algebraically closed in K and that K is a finite field extension of k of transcendence degree one. Then if $C \neq \mathscr{C}$, C is algebraically closed in $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{C}$ is a finite field extension of C of transcendence degree one of genus at most that of K/k.

Start the proof by noting that since $C = k \cap \mathscr{C}$ and k is algebraically closed in K, we have C algebraically closed in $\mathscr{C}$. Suppose that $C \neq \mathscr{C}$ and let $t \in \mathscr{C}$, $t \notin C$. Then t is transcendental over C, and indeed over k. If also $u \in \mathscr{C}$, then t and u are algebraically dependent over k, so there exists an irreducible $f(T, U) \in k[T, U]$, T and U being indeterminates over k, such that $f(t, u) = 0$. The minimal polynomial of u over $k(t)$ is $f(t, U)$, up to a factor in $k(t)$, and $f(T, U)$ is unique, up to a factor in k, with the degree in U of $f(T, U)$ at most $[K: k(t)]$. Let $f(T, U) = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} t^i u^j$, with each $a_{ij} \in k$, and with at least one of the a_{ij}'s equal to 1. Applying the derivation D of K, we get $\sum_{i,j} (Da_{ij}) t^i u^j = 0$. Now $\sum_{i,j} (Da_{ij}) T^i U^j$ must equal a multiple of $f(T, U)$, necessarily by an element of k, and this element of k must be 0 since one of the a_{ij}'s is 1. Thus $Da_{ij} = 0$ for all i, j, so that each $a_{ij} \in k \cap \mathscr{C} = C$. Therefore u is algebraic over $C(t)$, of degree at most $[K: k(t)]$. Therefore $\mathscr{C}$ is algebraic over $C(t)$, with $[\mathscr{C}: C(t)] \leqq [K: k(t)]$. It remains to prove the genus statement, and here we give two proofs, each relying on well-known facts about ground field extensions of algebraic function fields that may be found in [3]. First, if $\omega = f dg$ is a differential of first kind of $\mathscr{C}/C$, with $f, g \in \mathscr{C}$, then ω can also be considered a differential of K/k; in fact we have a natural injection of differentials $\Omega^1_{\mathscr{C}/C} \to \Omega^1_{K/k}$. For any k-place P of K, if f, g are finite at P then ω, considered as a differential of K/k, is also finite at P. If either f or g is not finite at P, then P induces a C-place p of $\mathscr{C}$, and since ω is finite at p we can write $\omega = f_1 dg_1$, with $f_1, g_1 \in \mathscr{C}$ both finite at p, so that again ω is finite at P. Therefore ω, considered as a differential of K/k, is of the first kind. Let $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_g$ be a C-basis for the space of differentials of first kind of $\mathscr{C}/C$ ($g =$ genus of $\mathscr{C}/C$). If $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_g$, considered as differentials of K/k, are linearly dependent over k, then there exist $a_1, \cdots, a_g \in k$, not all zero, such that $a_1\omega_1 + \cdots + a_g\omega_g = 0$. Suppose that we have such $a_1, \cdots, a_g$, with a minimal number of nonzero a_i's, one of which is 1. Since each $\omega_i/\omega_1 \in \mathscr{C}$, applying D to $a_1(\omega_1/\omega_1) + \cdots + a_g(\omega_g/\omega_1) = 0$ we get $(Da_1)(\omega_1/\omega_1) + \cdots + (Da_g)(\omega_g/\omega_1) = 0$. At least one Da_i is 0, so that each $Da_i = 0$, so each $a_i \in \mathscr{C}$. Thus $a_i \in \mathscr{C} \cap k = C$, contradicting the linear independence of $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_g$ over C. Therefore $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_g$ are k-linearly independent differentials of first kind of K/k, so that the genus of K/k is at least g. For the second proof of the genus statement, consider what happens when we extend the ground field C of the function field $\mathscr{C}/C$ from C to k. Since C is algebraically closed in k, $\mathscr{C} \otimes_C k$ is an integral domain, isomorphic to $\mathscr{C}[k] \subset K$, and so the ground field extension, which preserves the genus of $\mathscr{C}/C$, gives us $\mathscr{C}(k)/k$. Since $\mathscr{C}(k)$ is a subfield of K that contains k, its genus is at most that of K/k. This completes the second proof.

PROPOSITION 2. *Let k be a differential field of characteristic zero, with derivation D and constants C. Let $k(x)$ be a pure transcendental extension field of k, let $f(x)$ be a nonzero element of $k(x)$, and make $k(x)$ a differential extension field of k by setting $Dx = f(x)$. Suppose that $1/f(x)$ is of neither of the forms*

$$(\textit{element of } C)\ \frac{\partial u(x)/\partial x}{u(x)} \quad \textit{nor} \quad \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x}\,,$$

for $u(x)$, $v(x) \in C(x)$. Then every constant of $k(x)$ is in C.

To prove this, first assume that C is algebraically closed. Suppose that not all constants of $k(x)$ are in C. By Lemma 3, the subfield of constants of $k(x)$ is an algebraic function field of one variable over C of genus zero, hence, since C is algebraically closed, of the form $C(t)$, for some $t \in k(x)$, $t \notin k$. Now consider the nonzero differentials dt and $dx/f(x)$ of $k(x)/k$. We can write $dx/f(x) = \alpha dt$, for some $\alpha \in k(x)$. Applying the operator D^1 on $\Omega^1_{k(x)/k}$, we get $D^1(dx/f(x)) = D^1(\alpha dt) = (D\alpha)dt + \alpha dDt = (D\alpha)dt$. By Lemma 1, $D^1(dx/f(x)) = d(Dx/f(x)) = d(1) = 0$, so $D\alpha = 0$, so that $\alpha \in C(t)$. That is, $dx/f(x) = \alpha dt$, with $\alpha \in C(t)$. Now write $dx/f(x)$ in the form

$$\frac{dx}{f(x)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{du_i(x)}{u_i(x)} + dv(x)\,,$$

with $c_1, \cdots, c_n \in C$ and $u_1(x), \cdots, u_n(x)$, $v(x) \in C(x)$, which can be done immediately by looking at the partial fraction expansion of $1/f(x)$ with respect to $C[x]$. Using the logarithmic derivative identities

$$\frac{d(ab)}{ab} = \frac{da}{a} + \frac{db}{b}\,, \qquad \frac{da^\nu}{a^\nu} = \nu \frac{da}{a}\,,$$

we can, if necessary, modify $n, c_1, \cdots, c_n, u_1(x), \cdots, u_n(x)$ so that $c_1, \cdots, c_n$ are linearly independent over the rational numbers $\boldsymbol{Q}$. Looking at the partial fraction decomposition of α with respect to $C[t]$, we get an expression

$$\alpha dt = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_i \frac{dw_i}{w_i} + dy\,,$$

where $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_m \in C$ and $w_1, \cdots, w_m, y \in C(t)$. Extend $c_1, \cdots, c_n$ to a basis $c_1, \cdots, c_n, c_{n+1}, c_{n+2}, \cdots, c_N$ of the $\boldsymbol{Q}$-vector space $\boldsymbol{Q}c_1 + \cdots + \boldsymbol{Q}c_n + \boldsymbol{Q}\gamma_1 + \cdots + \boldsymbol{Q}\gamma_m$. Using the logarithmic derivative identities, we can modify $m, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_m, w_1, \cdots, w_m$, so that the same expression for αdt holds with $m = N$, and $\gamma_1 = c_1/M, \cdots, \gamma_N = c_N/M$ for some positive integer M. The above expression for $dx/f(x)$ remains true if we replace n by N, taking $u_{n+1}(x) = u_{n+2}(x) = \cdots = 1$. Hence we may assume that in the displayed expressions for $dx/f(x)$ and αdt we have $m = n$, $c_1, \cdots, c_n$ linearly independent over $\boldsymbol{Q}$, and $M\gamma_1 = c_1, \cdots, M\gamma_n = c_n$, for some positive integer M. From the equation $dx/f(x) = \alpha dt$ we now infer

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{d((u_i(x))^M/w_i)}{(u_i(x))^M/w_i} + Md(v(x) - y) = 0 .$$

At this point we again apply, in more precise form than was necessary for the proof of Proposition 1, the argument about when a linear combination of normal differential forms of third kind is exact [1, Prop. 2] to deduce that each $d((u_i(x))^M/w_i)$ and $d(v(x) - y)$ are zero. (This conclusion can be directly verified in the present case by expressing each $(u_i(x))^M/w_i$ as a power product of irreducible elements of $k[x]$ and $v(x) - y$ in terms of partial fractions.) Therefore $(u_1(x))^M/w_1, \cdots, (u_n(x))^M/w_n, v(x) - y \in k$, so that also $D((u_1(x))^M/w_1), \cdots, D((u_n(x))^M/w_n), D(v(x) - y) \in k$. Since $w_1, \cdots, w_n, y$ are constants, we deduce that

$$(Du_1(x))/u_1(x), \cdots, (Du_n(x))/u_n(x) , \quad Dv(x) \in k .$$

But $u_1(x), \cdots, u_n(x)$, $v(x)$ are in the differential field $C(x)$, so that $(Du_1(x))/u_1(x), \cdots, (Du_n(x))/u_n(x)$, $Dv(x) \in k \cap C(x) = C$. Now for any $\phi(x) \in C(x)$ we have $D\phi(x) = (\partial\phi(x)/\partial x)Dx = (\partial\phi(x)/\partial x)f(x)$. At least one of the quantities $u_1(x), \cdots, u_n(x)$, $v(x)$ is not in k, for otherwise $dx = 0$, so at least one of

$$\frac{\partial u_1(x)/\partial x}{u_1(x)}f(x), \cdots , \quad \frac{\partial u_n(x)/\partial x}{u_n(x)}f(x) , \quad \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x}f(x)$$

is a nonzero element of C, implying that $1/f(x)$ is of one of the excluded forms. It remains to prove the Proposition when C is not algebraically closed. Suppose that there are constants of $k(x)$ that are not in C. The differential field structures on k and $k(x)$ extend uniquely to differential field structures on $k(\bar{C})$ and $(k(\bar{C}))(x)$, $\bar{C}$ being the algebraic closure of C, and we get constants of $(k(\bar{C}))(x)$ that are not in the subfield of constants $\bar{C}$ of $k(\bar{C})$, since $k(x) \cap \bar{C} = C$. Hence $1/f(x)$ is of the form $a(\partial u/\partial x)/u$ for some $a \in \bar{C}$, $u \in \bar{C}(x)$, or of the form $1/f(x) = \partial v/\partial x$, for some $v \in \bar{C}(x)$. Suppose first that $1/f(x) =$

$a(\partial u/\partial x)/u$, with a and u as above. Take u, as we may, to be a quotient of monic elements of $\bar{C}[x]$. We shall be done if we show that $a \in C$, $u \in C(x)$. For any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}\,(\bar{C}(x)/C(x)) \approx \mathrm{Aut}\,(\bar{C}/C)$ we get $1/f(x) = a^\sigma(\partial u^\sigma/\partial x)/u^\sigma$, so that $a(\partial u/\partial x)/u = a^\sigma(\partial u^\sigma/\partial x)/u^\sigma$, or

$$(\partial(u^\sigma/u)/\partial x)/(u^\sigma/u) = a/a^\sigma \in \bar{C}\ .$$

Writing u^σ/u as a power product of distinct monic linear elements of $\bar{C}[x]$, we see that we get a nonconstant function on the left of the equation for a/a^σ unless $u^\sigma/u = 1$. Hence $u^\sigma = u$. Since this is true for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}\,(\bar{C}/C)$, we get $u \in C(x)$, hence also $a \in C(x) \cap \bar{C} = C$, showing $1/f(x)$ to be of the desired form. Suppose, finally, that we have $1/f(x) = \partial v/\partial x$, for some $v \in \bar{C}(x)$. We may take v such that its partial fraction expansion with respect to $\bar{C}[x]$ has constant term zero. We wish to show $v \in C(x)$. For any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}\,(\bar{C}/C)$ we get $1/f(x) = (\partial v/\partial x)^\sigma = \partial v^\sigma/\partial x$, so that $\partial v^\sigma/\partial x = \partial v/\partial x$. Hence $v^\sigma = v$, and since this is true for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}\,(\bar{C}/C)$ we get $v \in C(x)$, as desired.

Clearly neither of the two special values for $f(x)$ of which we have made so much use, namely $x/(x+1)$ and $x^3 - x^2$, is of the special form indicated in Proposition 2.

REFERENCES

1. J. Ax, *On Schanuel's conjectures*, Ann. of Math., **93** (1971), 252-268.
2. L. Blum, *Generalized algebraic structures: a model theoretic approach*, Ph. D. dissertation, M. I. T., 1968.
3. C. Chevalley, *Introduction to the theory of algebraic functions of one variable*, Math. Surveys VI, American Math. Soc., 1951.
4. E. Kolchin, *Constrained extensions of differential fields*, (to appear).
5. A. Robinson, *On the concept of differentially closed field*, Bull. Res. Counc. Isr. Sect., F **8** (1959), 113-118.
6. G. Sacks, *The differential closure of a differential field*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **78** (1972), 629-634.
7. S. Shelah, *Uniqueness and characterization of prime models over sets for totally transcendental first order theories*, J. Symbolic Logic, **37** (1972), 107-113.
8. S. Shelah, Abstract 73T-E6, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. **20** (1973), A-444.

Received June 7, 1973, Research supported by National Science Foundation grant number GP-20532.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in duplicate if possible, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Rev. Index to Vol. **39**. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

100 reprints are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific of Journal Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: $72.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: $36.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), 270, 3-chome Totsuka-cho, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 52, No. 2 February, 1974