

Entire functions in B_0 -algebras containing dense division algebras

by

S. ROLEWICZ (Warszawa)

Let R be a B_0^* -algebra, i. e. locally convex metric linear algebra, in which operations of addition and multiplication are continuous with respect to both arguments. If R is moreover complete we say that R is B_0 -algebra. In this note we shall consider only B_0^* -algebras over complex scalars. Without loss of generality we can assume that R possesses the unit e , i. e. such an element e that $ex = xe = x$ for all x belonging to R .

The topology in a B_0^* -algebra R may be introduced by means of a denumerable sequence of pseudonorms satisfying

$$(1) \quad \|x\|_i \leq \|x\|_{i+1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots,$$

and

$$(2) \quad \|xy\|_i \leq \|x\|_{i+1} \|y\|_{i+1}$$

([9], Theorem 24). A sequence x_n tends to x if and only if

$$\lim_n \|x_n - x\|_i = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots$$

If we can choose a sequence of pseudonorms satisfying (1) in such a way that we can replace (2) by

$$(2') \quad \|xy\|_i \leq \|x\|_i \|y\|_i,$$

then we say that R is a *multiplicatively convex algebra*, briefly *m-convex algebra* [1], [4].

We say that a B_0^* -algebra is a *division algebra* if each element x is invertible, i. e. there is an element x^{-1} such that $xx^{-1} = x^{-1}x = e$. If the operation of the inversion $x \rightarrow x^{-1}$ is continuous, then the given algebra is isomorphic to the algebra of complex numbers [2].

If a division B_0^* -algebra is *m-convex*, then it is isomorphic to the algebra of complex numbers ([4], Proposition 2.8).

If a division B_0^* -algebra is complete, i. e. is a B_0 -algebra, then it is isomorphic to the algebra of complex numbers [10]. But in the general case of B_0^* -algebras this is not true. First counter-example has been constructed by Williamson [8].

Let

$$\varphi(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$$

be an arbitrary entire function of the complex variable z . We say that the function $\varphi(x)$ is *determined* in a B_0 -algebra R if for each x belonging to R the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$ is convergent.

If in a B_0 -algebra R there are determined all entire functions, then R is m -convex [5]. It implies that if in the completion \bar{R} of a division B_0^* -algebra R all entire functions are determined, then R is isomorphic to the algebra of complex numbers. It is not known, whether it is possible to replace the assumption that all entire functions are determined in the completion \bar{R} by the assumption that all entire functions are determined in R .

The following question arises: is a division B_0^* -algebra R isomorphic to the algebra of complex numbers, if in its completion \bar{R} there is determined some entire function (for example e^x).

In this paper a negative answer to this question is given. It follows from

THEOREM. *For every entire function*

$$\varphi(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$$

there exists a commutative B_0 -algebra R_φ containing a dense division B_0^* -algebra non-isomorphic to the algebra of complex numbers, such that the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$ is convergent for each $x \in R_\varphi$.

Obviously, if B_0 -algebra contains a division algebra non-isomorphic to the algebra of complex numbers, then there are no multiplicative linear functionals. Hence we have the following

COROLLARY. *For each entire function*

$$\varphi(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n,$$

there is a commutative B_0 -algebra R_φ such that the function $\varphi(x)$ is determined in R_φ and in this algebra there are no multiplicative linear functionals.

This corollary contains the negative answer to Problem 1 of paper [5].

The proof of the theorem is based on the following construction which is an extension of the construction of Williamson [8] on the one hand, and of the construction used in paper [5] in the proof of the Proposition 2.5, on the other hand.

Let $f(u)$ be a non-negative function determined for $u \geq 0$, increasing, equal to 0 in 0 and tending to infinity at infinity. Let $f(u)$ satisfy condition Δ_2 , i. e. there is such a constant C that $f(2u) \leq Cf(u)$ (¹). Without loss of generality we can assume that C is an integer.

Let

$$a_{p,n} = \begin{cases} e^{pf(n)} & \text{for } n = -1, -2, \dots \\ 1 & \text{for } n = 0, \\ e^{-f(n)/p} & \text{for } n = 1, 2, \dots \end{cases}$$

($p = 1, 2, \dots$).

Let $L(a_{p,n})$ denote the space of all sequences $x = \{x_n\}$ of complex numbers such that

$$\|x\|_p = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{p,n} |x_n| < +\infty.$$

$L(a_{p,n})$ is a B_0 -space with respect to the topology induced by the pseudonorms $\|x\|_p$ (see [3] and also [6]).

LEMMA 1. *If we determine multiplication in $L(a_{p,n})$ as convolution, i. e. $z = x * y$, $x = \{x_n\}$, $y = \{y_n\}$, $z = \{z_n\}$, $z_n = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} x_k y_{n-k}$, then $L(a_{p,n})$ is a B_0 -algebra.*

Proof. First, we shall show that for each p there is such an r that

$$(3) \quad a_{p,n+m} \leq a_{r,n} a_{r,m}$$

for all n and m .

Let $n, m \geq 0$. Then

$$a_{p,n+m} = e^{-f(n+m)/p} = e^{-f(n+m)/2p} e^{-f(n+m)/2p} \leq e^{-f(n)/p} e^{-f(m)/p} = a_{2p,n} a_{2p,m}.$$

Let $n, m < 0$. Then

$$a_{p,n+m} = e^{pf(n+m)} \leq e^{Cp[f(n)+f(m)]} = a_{Cp,n} a_{Cp,m}.$$

Let $n \geq 0, m < -n$. Then

$$a_{p,n+m} = e^{pf(n+m)} \leq e^{pf(m)} = e^{2pf(m)} e^{-f(n)/2p} e^{f(n)/2p} e^{-p f(m)} \leq a_{2p,n} a_{2p,m},$$

because

$$e^{f(n)/2p - pf(m)} \leq e^{(1/2p - p)f(n)} \leq 1.$$

Let $n \geq 0, -n \leq m < -n/2$. Then $a_{p,n+m} \leq 1$ but

$$a_{Cp,n} a_{Cp,m} = e^{-f(n)/Cp} e^{Cp f(m)} = e^{Cp f(m) - f(n)/Cp} \geq e^{Cp f(m) - f(2|m|)/Cp} \geq e^{(Cp-1)p f(m)} \geq 1.$$

(¹) We have obviously $f(m+n) < C[f(m)+f(n)]$ for $m, n > 0$.

Hence $a_{p,n+m} \leq a_{Cp,n} a_{Cp,m}$.

Let $n \geq 0$, $-n/2 \leq m \leq 0$. Then $n+m \geq n/2$ and

$$a_{p,n+m} = e^{-f(n+m)/p} \leq e^{-f(n/2)/p} \leq e^{-f(n)/Cp} = a_{Cp,n},$$

hence $a_{p,n+m} \leq a_{Cp,n} a_{Cp,m}$, because $a_{Cp,m} \geq 1$.

Therefore for $r = \max(C, 2)p$ we have

$$(3) \quad a_{p,n+m} \leq a_{r,n} a_{r,m}$$

for all n and m .

Now, we can estimate the pseudonorms of the convolution:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\|_p &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{p,n} \left| \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} x_k y_{n-k} \right| \leq \sum_{n,k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{p,n} |x_k| |y_{n-k}| \\ &\leq \sum_{n,k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{r,k} a_{r,n-k} |x_k| |y_{n-k}| = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{r,k} |x_k| \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{r,m} |y_m| = \|x\|_r \|y\|_r. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $L(a_{p,n})$ is a B_0 -algebra, q. e. d.

Let M be a set of functions, analytic in the set $\{z: 0 < |z| < r_x\}$, where r_x depends on the function $x(z)$ and such that $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} x(z)$ exists, finite or infinite. The set M is a division algebra with respect to the pointwise multiplication. By \tilde{M} we denote the set of all sequences $\{\dots, 0, \dots, 0, x_{-k}, \dots, x_0, \dots, x_n, \dots\}$ of coefficients of expansions of the functions $x(z) \in M$ in the Laurent series

$$x(z) = \sum_{n=-k}^{\infty} a_n z^n.$$

Obviously, the multiplication in \tilde{M} is determined by convolution, and \tilde{M} is a division algebra.

LEMMA 2. If $f(n)/n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\tilde{M} \subset L(a_{p,n})$.

Proof. Obviously it is enough to prove that the series

$$(5) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{p,n} |x_n|$$

is convergent for each p . But $x(z)$ is analytic in the set $\{z: 0 < |z| < r_x\}$ whence the series

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \left(\frac{r_x}{2}\right)^n$$

is convergent. Since $f(n)/n \rightarrow \infty$, $a_{p,n} < (r_x/2)^n$, for sufficiently large n , therefore series (5) is convergent.

It is easy to see that \tilde{M} is dense in $L(a_{p,n})$. In the example of Williamson $f(n)$ was equal to $(n+1)\ln(n+1)$.

LEMMA 3. Let M_1, M_2, \dots be a sequence of positive real numbers such that

$$(6) \quad \frac{M_n}{n} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then there exists such an infinite-dimensional commutative B_0 -algebra R , containing a dense division algebra, that for each complex sequence $\{b_n\}$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, satisfying

$$(7) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |b_n| e^{M_n} < \infty$$

and for each $x \in R$, the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n x^n$ is convergent in R .

Proof. Let

$$I'(n) = \inf_{k \geq n} \sqrt{k M_k}.$$

Then $I'(n)$ is increasing and

$$\frac{I'(n)}{M_n} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{I'(n)}{n} \rightarrow \infty \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

From Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 of paper [5] it follows that there is a function $\Omega(u)$ such that

1. $\Omega(u)$ is a convex function,
2. $\Omega(u)/u$ is increasing and tends to infinity when u tends to infinity.
3. If $i_j \geq 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n i_j = k$, then

$$\Omega(k) \leq 8 \sum_{j=1}^n \Omega(i_j) + I'(n).$$

If in the definition of $L(a_{p,n})$ we put $f(n) = \Omega(n)$, we obtain the algebra which satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 3.

Property 3 implies that $\Omega(u)$ satisfies condition Δ_2 for $u \geq 1$, hence Properties 1 and 3 and Lemma 1 imply that $L(a_{p,n})$ is a B_0 -algebra.

Lemma 2 and Property 2 imply that $L(a_{p,m})$ contains a dense division algebra.

Let $x = \{x_n\}$ be an arbitrary element of $L(a_{p,n})$. Let

$$x = y + z, \quad y = \{y_n\}, \quad z = \{z_n\},$$

where

$$y_n = \begin{cases} x_n & \text{for } n \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } n < 0, \end{cases} \quad z_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } n \geq 0 \\ a_n & \text{for } n < 0. \end{cases}$$

Obviously $\|x\|_p = \|y\|_p + \|z\|_p$.

From Property 2 it follows that

$$\Omega\left(\sum_{j=1}^n i_j\right) \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \Omega(i_j).$$

Hence $\|y^n\|_p \leq \|y\|_p^n$. On the other hand, in the same way as in Proposition 2.5 of paper [5] we can show that $\|z^n\|_p \leq e^{p\Gamma(n)} \|z\|_p^n$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^n\|_p &= \|(y+z)^n\|_p = \left\| \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} y^k z^{n-k} \right\|_p \leq \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \|y^k\|_p \|z^{n-k}\|_p, \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} e^{p\Gamma(n)} \|y\|_p^k \|z\|_p^{n-k} \leq e^{p\Gamma(n)} (\|y\|_p + \|z\|_p)^n \\ &\leq e^{p\Gamma(n)} (\|y\|_{p(p+1)} + \|z\|_{p(p+1)})^n = e^{p\Gamma(n)} \|x\|_{p(p+1)}^n. \end{aligned}$$

And in the same way as in Proposition 2.5 of paper [5] we end the proof of the lemma, q. e. d.

As a corollary we obtain the proof of the theorem. In fact, if

$$\varphi(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n z^n,$$

then it is easy to construct such a sequence of positive reals that (6) and (7) hold. We can thus define R_φ as algebra R constructed in lemma 3.

The radical of a B_0 -algebra R is defined as the set $A_1 = \{x: \text{for each } y \in R \text{ the element } (e+yx) \text{ is invertible}\}$.

In m -convex commutative algebras the radical is equal to the set $A_2 = \{x: \text{for each number } t \text{ the element } (e+tx) \text{ is invertible}\}$.

Obviously, $A_1 \subset A_2$, but if R contains a division algebra R^* non-isomorphic to the algebra of complex numbers, then $A_1 \neq A_2$.

Indeed, $A_1 \cap R^* = \{0\}$, because if $x \in R^*$, putting $y = -x^{-1}$ we obtain $e+yx = 0$ and it is not invertible. On the other hand, if $x \in R^*$ and $x \neq t$ for all t , then $e+tx \in R^*$ and it is not equal to 0, hence it is invertible and $A_2 \cap R^* \neq \{0\}$. Therefore $A_1 \neq A_2$.

In an m -convex commutative algebra the set A_2 is equal to the set $A_3 = \{x: \text{for each } t \text{ the series } \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} t^n x^n \text{ is convergent}\}$.

Obviously $A_3 \subset A_2$, but if a B_0 -algebra R contains a division algebra R^* non-isomorphic to the algebra of complex numbers, then $A_2 \neq A_3$. Indeed, let $x \neq te$ for all t and x belongs to R^* , then x and x^{-1} obviously belong to A_2 . On the other hand,

$$\|x^n\|_{p+1} \|x^{-n}\|_{p+1} \geq \|e\|_p$$

whence x and x^{-1} cannot simultaneously belong to A_3 .

In the algebra $L(a_{p,n})$, also $A_3 \neq A_1$, because the element

$$x = \{a_n\}, \quad \text{where } a_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } n = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

belongs to A_3 . But we do not know the answer to the following

Problem 1. If a B_0 -algebra R contains a division algebra non-isomorphic to the algebra of complex numbers, is there at least one element $x \in A_3$?

The preceding considerations give a negative answer to a part of the questions raised in Problem 5 of paper [7], but further remains open

Problem 2. If x belongs to the radical of a commutative B_0 -algebra R , must the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} y^n x^n$ be convergent for each $y \in R$?

With radical it is also connected

Problem 3. Let a B_0 -algebra contain a dense division algebra. Is the radical of this algebra equal to $\{0\}$?

References

- [1] R. Arens, *A generalisation of normed rings*. Pacific Jour. Math. 2 (1952), p. 465-471.
- [2] — *Linear topological division algebras*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 53 (1947), p. 623-630.
- [3] G. Köthe, *Die Stufenräume, eine einfache Klasse linearer vollkommener Räume*, Math. Zeitschr. 51 (1948), p. 317-345.
- [4] E. A. Michael, *Locally multiplicatively-convex algebras*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 11 (1952).
- [5] B. Mitiagin, S. Rolewicz and W. Żelazko, *Entire functions in B_0 algebras*, Stud. Math. 21 (1962), p. 291-306.
- [6] A. Pietsch, *Verallgemeinerte vollkommene Folgenräume*, Berlin 1962.
- [7] S. Rolewicz and W. Żelazko, *Some problems concerning B_0 -algebras*, Tensor (New Series) 13 (1963), p. 269-276.
- [8] J. H. Williamson, *On topologising of the field $C(t)$* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 5 (1954), p. 729-734.
- [9] W. Żelazko, *On the locally bounded and m -convex topological algebras*, Stud. Math. 19 (1960), p. 333-356.
- [10] — *A theorem on the B_0 -division algebras*, Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci. 8 (1960), p. 373-375.

INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY POLSKIEJ AKADEMII NAUK
MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF THE POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Reçu par la Rédaction le 9.3.1963