

Barry J. Gardner

Rings on completely decomposable torsion-free Abelian groups

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 15 (1974), No. 3, 381--392

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/105565>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1974

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

RINGS ON COMPLETELY DECOMPOSABLE TORSION-FREE ABELIAN
GROUPS

B.J. GARDNER, Hobart

Abstract: The absolute annihilator $G(*)$ of a completely decomposable torsion free abelian group $G(*)$ is characterized. A chain $0 \subseteq G(*) = G(1) \subseteq \dots \subseteq G(\alpha) \subseteq G(\alpha+1) \subseteq \dots \subseteq G(\mu) = G(\mu+1)$ of "iterated absolute annihilators" of G is then defined. All subgroups $G(\alpha)$ are ideals in every ring on G and when $G = G(\mu)$, some information is obtained about the kinds of ring multiplication which G admits.

Key words: Completely decomposable, absolute annihilator.

AMS: 20K99

Ref. Ž.: 2.732.1

Introduction. Szele [7] defined the nil-degree (Nilstufe) of an abelian group G as the largest integer m such that there is an associative ring R on G with $R^m \neq 0$, if such an m exists. Analogously, we define the strong nil-degree as the largest integer m (if there is one) for which G supports a (not necessarily associative) ring R with \vec{R}^m , the subring generated by all products $(\dots((a_1 a_2) a_3) \dots) a_m$, non-zero. (The ostensible asymmetry of this definition can be removed by consideration of opposite rings.)

In this note we characterize the absolute annihilator of a completely decomposable abelian group G : the set of elements common to the annihilators of all rings R on G . This leads to the construction of an ascending chain of "absolute ideals" which provides: (i) a sufficient (but far from necessary) condition for G to admit only T -nilpotent ring multiplications; (ii) in some circumstances, an upper bound for the nil-degree of G ; (iii) in all cases, the exact value of the strong nil-degree of G .

We denote the type of a group element x or a rational group X by $T(x)$, $T(X)$ respectively and otherwise follow the conventions of [2]. All groups considered are torsion-free abelian and in the absence of any qualification, rings are associative. A group is nil [6] (resp. strongly nil [5]) if $R^2 = 0$ for every ring (resp. every not necessarily associative ring) R on G . Other notation: G^0 is the zeroring on a group G , R^+ the additive group of a ring R , \triangleleft indicates an ideal.

1. Completely decomposable nil groups

Ree and Wisner [5] have given a description of the completely decomposable torsion-free nil groups. We begin with a paraphrase of their results, together with a proof, which will be useful later.

Theorem 1.1. Let $G = \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ be a direct sum of rational groups. The following conditions are equivalent.

- (i) G is strongly nil.
- (ii) G is nil.

(iii) $T(X_i)T(X_j) \neq T(X_k)$ for all $i, j, k \in I$.

Proof. Clearly (i) \implies (ii).

(ii) \implies (iii): When considering a rational group X , we lose no generality by assuming that X contains the integers and 1 has any pre-assigned characteristic of appropriate type. Thus, supposing $T(X_i)T(X_j) \leq T(X_k)$ for some $i, j, k \in I$, we may write $X_i = X_i e_i$, $X_j = X_j e_j$, $X_k = X_k e_k$, where $\chi(e_i)\chi(e_j) \leq \chi(e_k)$. A multiplication on $X_i \oplus X_j \oplus X_k$ is completely determined by its effect on $\{e_i, e_j, e_k\}$. There are three cases to consider.

(a) If $X_i = X_j = X_k = X = Xe$, then $T(X)$ is idempotent and we can define $e^2 = e$.

(b) If $X_i = X_j = X = Xe \neq X_k$, we can use the multiplication table

	e	e_k
e	e_k	0
e_k	0	0

If $X_j = X_k = X = Xe \neq X_i$, then $T(X) \leq T(X_i)T(X) \leq T(X)$, so $T(X_i)T(X_i) \leq T(X_i)T(X) = T(X)$, and we are back to the previous case.

(c) If X_i , X_j and X_k are all distinct, the following table can be used:

	e_i	e_j	e_k
e_i	0	e_k	0
e_j	e_k	0	0
e_k	0	0	0

In every case we have defined an associative ring R on $X_i \oplus X_j \oplus X_k$ and $R^2 \neq 0$. Thus $G = (R \oplus [\bigoplus_{l=i,j,k} X_l]^0)^+$ is not nil.

(iii) \implies (i): If R is a ring (not necessarily associative) on G with $R^2 \neq 0$, then $X_i X_j \neq 0$ for some $i, j \in I$. Let $x \in X_i, y \in X_j$ be such that

$$0 \neq xy = z_1 + \dots + z_m, \quad 0 \neq z_n \in X_{i_n}.$$

Then

$$T(X_i) T(X_j) \leq T(xy) = T(X_{i_1}) \cap \dots \cap T(X_{i_n}) \leq T(X_{i_1}).$$

Remark. The second possibility mentioned in (b) of the proof just given can occur even for non-idempotent types, e.g. the types corresponding to the characteristics

$$\chi_1 = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, \dots)$$

$$\chi_2 = (1, \infty, 1, \infty, 1, \infty, 1, \infty, 1, \infty, 1, \infty, \dots).$$

The assumption that it cannot leads to some incorrect statements in [1]. In particular, while it is true that the direct sum of two nil rational groups has nil-degree 1 or 2, the strong nil-degree need not be defined. For example if $X = Xe$ and $Y = Yf$ are rational with $\chi(e) = \chi_1$ and $\chi(f) = \chi_2$, consider the non-associative ring defined.

on $X \oplus Y$ by the multiplication table

	e	f
e	0	f
f	f	0

2. The absolute annihilator

Fuchs ([2], Problem 94) refers to the absolute annihilator of a group G , the set of elements belonging to the annihilator of every ring on G . In this section we investigate the absolute annihilator, which we denote by $G(*)$, when G is completely decomposable.

Theorem 2.1. Let $G = \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ be a direct sum of rational groups. Then

$$G(*) = \bigoplus \{X_i \mid i \in I \text{ and } \exists \text{ no } j, k \in I \text{ with } T(X_j)T(X_k) \not\subseteq T(X_i)\} .$$

Proof. Note firstly that if $X_i \cap G(*) \neq 0$, then $X_i \subseteq G(*)$.

If $T(X_j)T(X_k) \not\subseteq T(X_i)$ for some $j, k \in I$, then as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, there is a ring A on G with $X_i A \neq 0$, so that $X_i \not\subseteq G(*)$. Conversely, if $X_i \not\subseteq G(*)$ then for any non-zero $x \in X_i$, there exists a ring R on G in which $xX_j \neq 0$ for some $j \in I$. If $xy \neq 0$, where $y \in X_j$, let

$$xy = z_1 + \dots + z_m$$

where z_n is a non-zero element of X_{i_n} for (distinct)

$i_1, \dots, i_m \in I$. Then

$$T(X_{i_1}) T(X_{i_2}) \leq T(x_{i_1}) = T(x_1) \cap \dots \cap T(x_m) \leq T(x_m) = T(X_{i_m}).$$

Finally, let $x_1 + \dots + x_m$ be any element of $G(*)$, where $0 \neq x_n \in X_{i_n}$ for $n = 1, \dots, m$ and the i_n are distinct. We complete the proof by showing that $x_1 \in G(*)$. If $x_1 \notin G(*)$, then $T(X_{i_1}) T(X_{i_2}) \leq T(X_{i_2})$ for some $j, k \in I$ and as in Theorem 1.1 we can define a commutative ring A on G such that for some $l \in I$, $X_{i_1} X_l \neq 0$ but $X_m X_l = 0$ for all other $m \in I$. But then for $0 \neq y \in X_l$ we have

$$x_1 y = (x_1 + \dots + x_m) y = 0.$$

We now consider a chain

$$0 \subseteq G(1) \subseteq G(2) \subseteq \dots \subseteq G(\alpha) \subseteq \dots$$

of subgroups of G , defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} G(1) &= G(*) ; G(\alpha+1)/G(\alpha) = [G/G(\alpha)](*) ; \\ G(\beta) &= \bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} G(\alpha) \quad \text{if } \beta \text{ is a limit ordinal.} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly $G(\mu) = G(\mu+1)$ for some ordinal μ .

A straightforward transfinite induction argument provides a proof of

Lemma 2.2. Let $G = \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ be a direct sum of rational groups. For every α , there exists a subset I_α of I such that $G(\alpha) = \bigoplus_{i \in I_\alpha} X_i$.

Theorem 2.3. Let $G = \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ be a direct sum of rational groups, R a ring on G . Then $G(\alpha) \triangleleft R$ for eve-

ry α .

Proof. Let f be an endomorphism of $G, x \in X_i \in G(*)$.
Then $f(x) = 0$ or

$$0 \neq f(x) = x_1 + \dots + x_m$$

where $x_\kappa \in X_{i_\kappa}, \kappa = 1, \dots, m$ and the i_κ are distinct.
If $f(x) \notin G(*)$, then some $x_\kappa \notin G(*)$, so $T(X_{i_\kappa})T(X_j) \leq T(X_\kappa)$
for some $j, \kappa \in I$. It follows that $T(X_i)T(X_j) \leq T(X_\kappa)$,
which is impossible, so $f(X_i) \in G(*)$. Hence $G(*)$
is fully invariant, so that $G(1) = G(*) \triangleleft R$. If now
 $G(\alpha) \triangleleft R$, then Lemma 2.2 implies that
 $[R/G(\alpha)](*) \triangleleft R/G(\alpha)$, and thus $G(\alpha+1) \triangleleft R$. At limit
ordinals the result is clear.

Suppose now that $G(\mu) = G$ for some ordinal μ . In
any ring R on $G, G(\alpha+1)/G(\alpha) \subseteq (0:R/G(\alpha))$ i.e.
 $G(\alpha+1)R \subseteq G(\alpha)$ and $RG(\alpha+1) \subseteq G(\alpha)$. Thus

$$0 \subseteq G(1) \subseteq G(2) \subseteq \dots \subseteq G(\alpha) \subseteq \dots \subseteq G(\mu) = R$$

is a two-sided annihilator series for R in the sense of
[3]. Thus by Theorem 1.6 of [3] and § 3 of [4], we have

Corollary 2.4. If G is as in Theorem 2.3 and $G =$
 $= G(\mu)$ for some ordinal μ , then any ring R on G is
left and right T -nilpotent. If in addition μ is finite,
then $R^{\mu+1} = 0$ for any such R .

We conclude this section with an "internal" character-
ization of the subgroups $G(m)$ for finite m . A π -mat-
rix is a $2 \times m$ matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tau_{11} & \tau_{12} & \cdots & \tau_{1m} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau_{22} & \cdots & \tau_{2m} \end{bmatrix}$$

of types such that $\tau_{1i} \tau_{2i} \leq \tau_{1, i+1}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$.

Proposition 2.5. Let $G = \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ be a direct sum of rational groups. Then

$$G(m) = \bigoplus \{X_i \mid \exists \text{ no } 2 \times (m+1) \text{ } \sigma \text{-matrix over } \{T(X_i) \mid i \in I\} \text{ with } \tau_{11} = T(X_i)\}.$$

Proof. The result is true for $m = 1$ (Theorem 2.1); if it is true for m , let

$$G = G(m) \oplus H = G(m) \oplus H(*) \oplus K = G(m+1) \oplus K.$$

If there is a $2 \times (m+2)$ σ -matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} T(X_i) & T(X_{j_0}) & \cdots & \tau_{1, m+2} \\ T(X_j) & \tau_{22} & \cdots & \tau_{2, m+2} \end{bmatrix}$$

with $X_i \in G(m+1)$, then $X_i \notin G(m)$ (strike out the last column) and similarly $X_j \notin G(m)$. Thus $X_i \in H(*)$ and $X_j \in H$. But then $X_{j_0} \notin H$, so $X_{j_0} \in G(m)$, which is impossible, as $T(X_{j_0})$ is the $(1, 1)$ entry in a $2 \times (m+1)$ σ -matrix. Conversely, if X_i satisfies the condition for $2 \times (m+2)$ σ -matrices, we need only look at the case where $X_i \in H$. If $X_i \in K$, then $T(X_i) T(X_j) \leq T(X_{j_0})$ for some $X_j, X_{j_0} \in H$. But then there is a $2 \times (m+1)$ σ -matrix $M = [\tau_{ij}]$ with $\tau_{11} = T(X_{j_0})$ which can be augmented to a $2 \times (m+2)$ σ -matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} TX_i \\ TX_j \\ M \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence we conclude that $X_i \subseteq H(*) \subseteq G(m+1)$.

3. Some examples

A completely decomposable group G need not have an absolute annihilator series in order to admit only T -nilpotent multiplications. For instance if G is the group in the Remark in § 1, then $G(1) = 0$, but $R^3 = 0$ for every ring R on G .

Even when $G = G(m) \neq G(m+1)$, G can have nil-degree $\leq m$: Let $G = X_1 \oplus X_2 \oplus X_3 \oplus X_4 \oplus X_5$, where the types of X_1, \dots, X_5 are those of the characteristics

$$(1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, \dots)$$

$$(0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots)$$

$$(1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, \dots)$$

$$(0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, \dots)$$

$$(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, \dots)$$

respectively. It is routine to verify that $R^3 = 0$ for any ring R on G but that

$$\begin{bmatrix} T(X_1) & T(X_3) & T(X_5) \\ T(X_2) & T(X_4) & T(X_5) \end{bmatrix}$$

is a π -matrix.

Any direct sum of finitely many rational groups with non-idempotent types has a nil-degree (see e.g. [8], Theorem 3.1). With infinite rank the situation can be quite different. Consider the characteristics

$(\omega, m, \omega, m, \omega, m, \omega, m, \omega, m, \dots)$

$(\omega, 0, m, 0, \omega, 0, m, 0, \omega, 0, \dots)$

$(\omega, 0, 0, 0, m, 0, 0, 0, \omega, 0, \dots)$

...

$m = 1, 2, \dots$. They form a semigroup $(\{\chi_i \mid i \in I\}, \cdot)$.

Let $X_i = X_i e_i$ be a rational group containing e_i with $\chi(e_i) = \chi_i$ and write $\chi_{ij} = \chi_i \chi_j$ etc. Then a ring R is defined on $\bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ by the multiplication rule $e_i e_j = e_{ij}$. Since for any i one can find j with $\chi_j \chi_i = \chi_i$, we have $\alpha e_i = (\alpha e_i) e_j$ and R is idempotent and since $(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i e_i) (\sum_{j=1}^m y_j e_j) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m,m} x_i y_j e_{ij}$, R has no zero-divisors.

4. Non-associative rings

The absolute annihilator series furnishes more precise information about the non-associative rings which can be defined on a completely decomposable group G . If $G = G(m)$ (m finite) it is easily proved that $\vec{R}^s \subseteq G(m-s+1)$ for $s = 1, \dots, m$, whence $\vec{R}^{m+1} = 0$ for any ring R on G .

Proposition 4.1. Let $G = \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ be a direct sum of rational groups. There is a (not necessarily associative) ring R on G with $\vec{R}^m \neq 0$ if and only if there is a $2 \times n$ π -matrix over $\{T(X_i) \mid i \in I\}$.

Proof. If there is such a matrix $[T(X_{ij})]$, let $X_{ij} = X_{ij} e_{ij}$ where the characteristics $\chi(e_{ij})$ sa-

tisfy the relations the matrix requires of their types. Define $e_{1i} e_{2i} = e_{i, i+1}$ and let all products not thus accounted for be zero. (Note that e_{ij} and $e_{\kappa\lambda}$ can be equal for different (i, j) and (κ, λ) .) Then $(\dots((e_{11} e_{21}) e_{22}) e_{23}) \dots) e_{2, m-1} = e_{1m} \neq 0$. On the other hand, if there is no such $2 \times m$ matrix, then $G = G(m-1)$ and $\vec{R}^m = 0$ for all rings R on G .

Summarizing, therefore, we have

Theorem 4.2. Let $G = \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ be a direct sum of rational groups. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $G = G(m)$, $m < \infty$ and $G \neq G(m-1)$.
- (ii) There are $2 \times m$, but no $2 \times (m+1)$ π -matrices over $\{T(X_i) \mid i \in I\}$.
- (iii) G has strong nil-degree m .

References

- [1] S. FEIGELSTOCK: The nilstufe of the direct sum of rank 1 torsion free groups, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 24(1973), 269-272.
- [2] L. FUCHS: Infinite abelian groups, Vol. II (Academic Press, 1973).
- [3] B.J. GARDNER: Some aspects of T-nilpotence, Pacific J. Math. (to appear).
- [4] R.L. KRUSE and D.T. PRICE: Nilpotent rings (Gordon and Breach, 1969).
- [5] R. REE and R.J. WISNER: A note on torsion-free nil groups, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 7(1956), 6-8.
- [6] T. SZELE: Zur Theorie der Zeroringe, Math. Ann. 121(1949), 242-246.

- [7] T. SZELE: Gruppentheoretische Beziehungen bei gewissen Ringkonstruktionen, Math.Z. 54(1951),168-180.
- [8] W.J. WICKLESS: Abelian groups which admit only nilpotent multiplications, Pacific J.Math.40(1972), 251-259.

Mathematics Department
University of Tasmania
Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

(Oblatum 8.4.1974)