

Gh.

Sonderdruck aus

Mathematische Nachrichten

Band 46 (1970)

Heft 1-6



AKADEMIE-VERLAG • BERLIN

On FRATTINI one-sided ideals and subgroups

Dedicated to the memory of IVÁN SERES (1907–1966)

By FERENC A. SZÁSZ (Budapest)

(Eingegangen am 14. 10. 1969)

The purpose of this paper is threefold.

Firstly it is given a greater (but not complete) survey on FRATTINI substructures of groups, semigroups and rings (see "References").

Secondly, we disprove some (proved) conjectures of HOMER BECHTELL [3] on FRATTINI right ideals, and we correct also a partially invalid reference by TIMON ANDERSON [1] on BECHTELL's ringtheoretical results.

Finally a solution of a problem, raised verbally by OTTO STEINFELD, solved earlier by the present author [40] (in Hungarian), is here communicated in connection with the FRATTINI right ideal Φ_r of a ring A .

All rings considered in this paper are associative rings (see N. JACOBSON [17]). The notions, used in this paper, can be found in the books D. BARBILIAN [2], N. DIVINSKY [5], M. HALL [11], E. HILLE [12], N. JACOBSON [17], A. G. KUROSH [19], J. LAMBEK [23], N. H. MCCOY [24], L. RÉDEI [28], and H. ZASSENHAUS [43].

As well known, for an arbitrary group G , the FRATTINI subgroup $\Phi(G)$ is the intersection of all maximal subgroups of G , or $\Phi(G) = G$ for groups without maximal proper subgroups. (Cf. A. G. KUROSH [19].) Originally this was defined by G. FRATTINI [9] only for finite groups G , for which always $\Phi(G) \neq G$ holds. For the theory of the FRATTINI subgroup $\Phi(G)$ we refer yet to V. DLAB [6], [7], V. DLAB-V. KORINEK [8], W. GASSCHÜTZ [10], G. A. MILLER [25], B. H. NEUMANN [26], and in the case of special groups e. g. to GH. PIC [27] and H. WIELANDT [42]. It may be remarked that by B. H. NEUMANN [26] the subgroup $\Phi(G)$ coincides with the subset of all elements x of G , such that x can be abandoned from every generating system of G .

For semigroups S the FRATTINI subsemigroup $\Phi(S)$, being the intersection of all maximal subsemigroups and $\Phi(S) = S$, when a maximal subsemigroup fails to be contained in S has been discussed by S. LAJOS [20] and H. J. WEINERT [41]. Obviously $\Phi(S)$ can be also empty.

investigated the inter-
of the problems raised
observed that in the
ement is the multipli-
r only those one-sided
 A , then all six radicals
JACOBSON radical of A .
HOEHNKE has intro-
], [14], [15] a radical,
right ideal of S . H. J.
nce relations of S , in-
o. A list of a sequence
of H. J. HOEHNKE on
a zero is given in the

above, for a property
lered (non-associative)
ret „Bemerkung“ and

ven by F. SZÁSZ [40].
ote the intersection of
r A itself, when A is
well known, E. HILLE
for the JACOBSON ra-
A. KERTÉSZ [18] has
1 satisfying $Ax \subseteq \Phi_r$.

haracterization of the
by the terms of non-

ring A , obviously all
n with this important
of results, written by
t well known general-
m for rings, semirings

led regular. For these
(0), and a characteri-
equivalent conditions

can be found in the joint paper of S. LAJOS and F. SZÁSZ [21]. Any regular ring is a common generalization of the semisimple ARTINIAN rings and of twosided regular rings, and a characterization of regular rings by means of more pairwise equivalent conditions is given by another joint paper of S. LAJOS and F. SZÁSZ [22]. For regular rings we have always $\Phi_r = \Phi_l = 0$, but by „Beispiel“ of F. SZÁSZ [36] also $[\Phi] = \aleph_x$ can occur for every \aleph_x .

The right ideal R_1 of a ring A is called small, if $R_1 + R_2$ is a proper right ideal for every proper right ideal R_2 of A . Then one has evidently $R_1 \subseteq \Phi_r$ (cf. LAMBEK [23]).

A collection of statements for the sets of nongenerators of an arbitrary ring A , that is for Φ , Φ_r and Φ_l , defined above, has been formulated in the interesting note of HOMER BECHTELL [3], referred in Mathematical Reviews by TIMON ANDERSON [1]. As already T. ANDERSON remarks in his reference, Theorem 4 of BECHTELL's note fails to be correct and he yet remarks that “the fact that the theorem is not correct, does not really affect the main results of the paper” (of H. BECHTELL).

KAPLANSKY's famous example, in a special case, disproves namely Theorem 4 from [3], being this particular example now, a dense ring A of linear transformations of the form of infinite matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} U & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & d & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & d & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & d & \\ \vdots & & & & \end{bmatrix}$$

Here U is a finite matrix over a ring D , furthermore $d \in D$ is in the diagonal, zeros elsewhere, denoting D such a subring of a field, that D is a radical ring in the sense of JACOBSON. This D can be taken e. g. as the ring of all rationals with even numerator and odd denominator. By a routine calculation we assert that the center Z of A is $\text{diag}(d, d, \dots)$, being isomorphic to D . Moreover, A is primitive in the sense of JACOBSON, but not semisimple in the sense of BROWN and MCCOY [4]. As T. ANDERSON [1] remarks, this ring A was mentioned also by N. JACOBSON [17], page 36, example (3).

For the canonical ring extension B of A with unity element we have obviously $B^2 = B$, but by ANDERSON [1] the relation

$$N(B) \cap Z(B) \subseteq \Phi_r(B) \cap \Phi(B)$$

holds, denoting $N(B)$ and $Z(B)$, respectively, the BROWN-MCCOY radical of B and the center of B . Therefore by [1] Theorem 4 of [3] is incorrect.

Although it can be true that the invalid Theorem 4 from [3] “does not really affect the main results” of the note [3], but unfortunately, there

is a part of further statements from [3], which are incorrect and there is another part of assertions from [3] which are well-known or almost trivial. Now we discuss these:

Example. Let A be the ring, generated by the matrices of the form

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

over a finite prime field of order p , being p a prime number. Then A is a noncommutative ring of p^2 elements, with the multiplication:

$$\begin{array}{c|cc} & x & y \\ \hline x & 0 & x \\ y & 0 & y \end{array}$$

By a routine calculation $(x)_r + (y)_r = A$, $(x)_r \cap (y)_r = 0$ holds, denoting $(z)_r$ the principal right ideal of A generated by the element z . Moreover we obtain evidently $A^2 = A$, having A a right unity y , and $(y)_r$ is a maximal right ideal, which cannot be modular in A . For this finite ring A , which is therefore also ARTINIAN, the KERTÉSZ radical (cf. F. SZÁSZ [33]) being (0) , is properly smaller than the JACOBSON radical I , which coincides with $(x)_r$ and $(x)_r$ modular in A .

It may be remarked that this example was discussed also in the proof of the theorem of F. SZÁSZ [33].

We now observe:

Remark 1. *The Theorem 5 from [3] is false*, because this asserts that $\Phi_r = \Phi_l = I$ would be valid for all rings A satisfying $A^2 = A$. But the example, discussed above, disproves this conjecture of [3]. The mistake of the proof of this conjecture is in the place, where [3] points out that " $(I^*)^2 \Theta = 0$ implies that $R^* M^*$ is annihilated by R^* ".

Remark 2. *But also Theorem 8 from [3] fails to be correct*, asserting that $\Phi_r = \Phi_l = \Phi$ would be true for any right ARTINIAN ring A . Namely, for the ring A from the above example holds obviously:

$$0 = \Phi_r \neq \Phi_l = \Phi = I = (x)_r \neq A.$$

Furthermore every finite ring A is ARTINIAN, contradicting to Theorem 8 in [3]. In his proof [3] has made a mistake, asserting: "then Φ^* is in the annihilator of M^* . This implies that M^* is an ideal of R^* ".

Remark 3. T. ANDERSON mentions with R instead of A in [1] that "if $A^2 = A$ or if A satisfies the descending chain condition for right ideals, then Φ , Φ_r , Φ_l and I_l would coincide", according to BECHTELL [3]. But,

when $A^2 = A$, then [ARTINIAN case there is no 8). Therefore J. ANDERSON together with his referee

Remark 4. Let be ever the ring has unity of unity in [18] was a

Remark 5. The up of page 242 of [3], but and 15 of page 242 of generally different.

Remark 6.

Theorem 2 of [3] i

Theorem 3 of [3]

Theorem 6 of [3] i

methods, see N. JACOBSON

Generalizing the n of a ring A , by OTTO algebraic discussion) t

Definition. The ma if there exists for eve $c \in A$ an element $b \in$

$$a b c - c^2 \in$$

holds.

Then O. STEINFEL with condition (*) of ideals with condition by the following

Proposition. Every condition (*). Furthe ring A . Moreover con

Proof. Let R be an

Assume that $A^2 \subseteq$

$$a b c - c^2 \in$$

for every $a \in A$, $b \in$.

Supposing now A^2 right A -submodules, a Thus A/R is irreducibl

ncorrect and there is
ell- known or almost

trices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

number. Then A is a
tiplication:

$= 0$ holds, denoting
element z . Moreover
and $(y)_r$ is a maximal
s finite ring A , which
Szász [33]) being (0) ,
which coincides with

ssed also in the proof

use this asserts that
ng $A^2 = A$. But the
of [3]. The mistake
e [3] points out that
 R^{**} .

correct, asserting that
g A . Namely, for the

dicting to Theorem 8
g: "then Φ^* is in the
of R^{**} ".

d of A in [1] that "if
ition for right ideals,
BECHTELL [3]. But,

when $A^2 = A$, then [3] speaks nothing on Φ (Theorem 5); and in the AR-
TINIAN case there is no assertion by [3] on the JACOBSON radical (Theorem
8). Therefore J. ANDERSON's conjectures on the FRATTINI ideals of a ring,
together with his reference on BECHTELL's results, are incorrect.

Remark 4. Let be observed that, contradicting to the sentence "When-
ever the ring has unity" in lines 6 and 7 of page 241 of [3], no existence
of unity in [18] was assumed.

Remark 5. The upper BAER radical has been denoted by N , in line 11
of page 242 of [3], but this situation contradicts to the assertion in lines 13
and 15 of page 242 of [3], being BAER's radical and BROWN-McCox's radical
generally different.

Remark 6.

Theorem 2 of [3] is true, but well- known.

Theorem 3 of [3] is completely trivial.

Theorem 6 of [3] can be easily deduced from earlier known results or
methods, see N. JACOBSON [17], or F. SZÁSZ [35], [34].

Generalizing the notion of the modularity of a maximal right ideal R
of a ring A , by OTTO STEINFELD has been earlier introduced (at a verbal
algebraic discussion) the following

Definition. The maximal right ideal R of a ring A satisfies condition (*),
if there exists for every element $a \in A$ with $a \notin R$ and for every element
 $c \in A$ an element $b \in A$, depending generally on a and c , such that

$$a b c - c^2 \in R$$

holds.

Then O. STEINFELD has also asked, what are all maximal right ideals
with condition (*) of a ring. Denoting by D the intersection of all right
ideals with condition (*) in A , then STEINFELD's problem can be answered
by the following

Proposition. Every maximal right ideal R of a ring A must satisfy the
condition (*). Furthermore $D = \Phi_r$, and $A I \subseteq D \subseteq I$ holds for every
ring A . Moreover condition $A I = I$ implies $D = I$.

Proof. Let R be an arbitrary maximal right ideal of an arbitrary ring A .
Assume that $A^2 \subseteq R$. Then by $A^3 \subseteq R$ obviously we have

$$a b c - c^2 \in R$$

for every $a \in A$, $b \in A$, $c \in A$, which yields condition (*).

Supposing now $A^2 \not\subseteq R$ for R , the right A -module A/R has only trivial
right A -submodules, and A/R is not annihilated by his operator domain A .
Thus A/R is irreducible, consequently strictly cyclic by the Proposition 1 (2)

of N. JACOBSON [17], page 5. From this yet does not follow the modularity of R , only the existence of a modular maximal right ideal M of A satisfying $A/M \cong A/R$, where \cong denotes an isomorphism of the mentioned right A -modules. Then obviously $aA + R = A$ holds for every element $a \in A$ with $a \notin R$, because $A^2 \not\subseteq R$ and the subset $T = \{x; x \in A, xA \subseteq R\}$ is a right ideal of A satisfying $T \supseteq R$ and $TA \subseteq R$, consequently we have $T^2 \subseteq R$. Therefore, in fact $T \neq A$ and $T = R$ holds, which implies the desired equality $aA + R = A$ for any $a \notin R = T$. But now we can conclude to the relation

$$c^2 \in Ac = (aA + R)c = aAc + Rc \subseteq aAc + R$$

for every element $c \in A$.

By this inclusion there exists an element b of A and an element r of R with $c^2 = abc + r$ consequently with

$$abc - c^2 = -r \in R,$$

which exactly means that R satisfies (*).

Therefore it is obtained $D = \Phi_r$ for the above D and Φ_r . By [18] or [36] we have also $AI \subseteq D \subseteq I$, which completes the proof of our Proposition.

Problem 1. Must every quasiprimitive ideal of a multiplicative semigroup with zero element be primitive? (For the definitions see F. SZÁSZ [39], Bemerkungen 2. and yet [38], [37].)

Problem 2. Give a necessary and sufficient condition that the one-sided ideals I_5 and I_6 of a multiplicative semigroup S with zero defined in F. SZÁSZ [37], are two-sided ideals! (As well-known Φ_r is a two-sided ideal in S).

Problem 3. If S is a commutative multiplicative semigroup without zero element such that the intersection of all maximal subsemigroups of S is empty, then must every subset of S be a semigroup? (Cf. yet S. LAJOS [20].)

Problem 4. Does there exist an infinite simple group without proper maximal subgroups? (For this group G holds obviously $\Phi(G) = G$) (cf. DLAB-KORINEK [8]).

Problem 5. Is the class C_1 of rings closed under building subrings, homomorphic images and two-sided discrete direct sums, for which every simple ring from C_1 is semisimple in the sense of JACOBSON? (By E. SIAIDA [29] this C_1 is evidently a proper subclass of the class of all associative rings, and by F. SZÁSZ [34] this C_1 contains the class of all rings with minimum condition on principal right ideals.)

Problem 6. Determine $I = \Phi_r!$ (Cf. ,Satz 5. $AI = I$ for every rin

Problem 7. In relation to TELL [3] discuss the

$$\Phi_r(A \oplus B)$$

denoting \oplus ringtheor

- [1] T. ANDERSON, A rev. (1969).
- [2] D. BARBILIAN, Grupu București 1960.
- [3] H. BECHTELL, Nongel.
- [4] B. BROWN and N. H. (1947).
- [5] N. DIVINSKY, Rings.
- [6] V. DLAB, The Frattini (1960).
- [7] —, Poznamka k jedi Casopis pro Pestovar
- [8] V. DLAB and V. KOI Czechosl. math. J. 10
- [9] G. FRATTINI, Intorno dei Lincei, Rendicon
- [10] W. GASSCHÜTZ, Über (1953).
- [11] M. HALL, The Theory
- [12] E. HILLE, Functiona. Providence 1948.
- [13] H. J. HOEHNKE, Zur
- [14] —, Structure of sem
- [15] —, Eine Charakterisi 11, 72–73 (1964).
- [16] H. J. HOEHNKE and Deutsch. Akad. Wiss
- [17] N. JACOBSON, Structu vidence 1964.
- [18] A. KERTÉSZ, A char 14: 4, 596–597 (1963
- [19] A. G. KUROSH, Theori
- [20] S. LAJOS, Rédei Lás semigroup-theoretica
- [21] S. LAJOS and F. SZÁ math., Szeged 30 (19
- [22] —, Bi-ideals in assoc
- [23] J. LAMBEK, Lectures

follow the modularity
 ideal M of A satisfying
 mentioned right A -mo-
 element $a \in A$ with
 $\{x \in A \mid xA \subseteq R\}$ is a right
 tly we have $T^2 \subseteq R$.
 implies the desired
 we can conclude to

$$(Ae + R$$

and an element r of R

and Φ_r . By [18] or
 e proof of our Pro-

multiplicative semi-
 ms see F. SZÁSZ [39],

n that the one-sided
 ith zero defined in
 Φ_r is a twosided ideal

semigroup without
 al subsemigroups of
 oup? (Cf. yet S. LA-

oup without proper
 usly $\Phi(G) = G$ (cf.

building subrings,
 is, for which every
 OBSON? (By E. SA-
 ie class of all asso-
 ie class of all rings

Problem 6. Determine explicitly the class C_2 of all rings satisfying $I = \Phi_r I$ (Cf. „Satz 5.1“ of [38].) What is the subclass C_3 of C_2 , for which $AI = I$ for every ring $A \in C_3$ holds?

Problem 7. In relation with the “twosided” statement (IX) of BECHTEL [3] discuss the validity of a “one-sided” analogon

$$\Phi_r(A \oplus B) = \Phi_r(A) \oplus \Phi_r(B),$$

denoting \oplus ringtheoretical direct sum, A and B arbitrary rings!

References

- [1] T. ANDERSON, A review from the Mathematical Reviews, vol. **37**:1, 252, page 46 (1969).
- [2] D. BARBILIAN, Grupuri cu Operatori, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne, Bucureşti 1960.
- [3] H. BECHTEL, Nongenerators of rings. Proc. Amer. math. Soc. **19**:1, 241–245 (1968).
- [4] B. BROWN and N. H. MCCOY, Radicals and subdirect sums. Amer. J. Math. **69**, 46–58 (1947).
- [5] N. DIVINSKY, Rings and Radicals, London 1965.
- [6] V. DLAB, The Frattini subgroup of abelian groups. Czechosl. math. J. **10**, 1–16 (1960).
- [7] —, Poznámka k jednomu problému týkajícímu se Frattiniho podgroup (in Czech), Časopis pro Pestování Matematiky **85**, 87–90 (1960).
- [8] V. DLAB and V. KOŘINEK, The Frattini subgroup of a direct product of groups. Czechosl. math. J. **10**, 350–358 (1960).
- [9] G. FRATTINI, Intorno alla generazione dei gruppi di operazioni. Atti dell'Accademia dei Lincei, Rendiconti, ser. 4, **1**, 281–285 (1885).
- [10] W. GASSCHÜTZ, Über die Φ -Untergruppe endlicher Gruppen. Math. Z. **58**, 160–170 (1953).
- [11] M. HALL, The Theory of Groups, New York 1959.
- [12] E. HILLE, Functional Analysis and Semi-Groups. Amer. math. Soc. Coll. Publ. **31**, Providence 1948.
- [13] H. J. HOEHNKE, Zur Strukturtheorie der Halbgruppen. Diese Nachr. **26**, 1–13 (1963).
- [14] —, Structure of semigroups. Canadian J. Math. **18**, 449–491 (1966).
- [15] —, Eine Charakterisierung des 0-Radikals einer Halbgruppe. Publ. math., Debrecen **11**, 72–73 (1964).
- [16] H. J. HOEHNKE and H. SEIDEL, Über das 0-Radikal einer Halbgruppe. Monatsber. Deutsch. Akad. Wiss. Berlin **5**, 667–670 (1963).
- [17] N. JACOBSON, Structure of Rings. Amer. math. Soc. Coll. Publ. **37** (2nd edition), Providence 1964.
- [18] A. KERTÉSZ, A characterization of the Jacobson radical. Proc. Amer. math. Soc. **14**:4, 596–597 (1963).
- [19] A. G. KUROSH, Theory of Groups (in Russian, 3rd edition), Moscow 1967.
- [20] S. LAJOS, Rédei László egy félesoportelméleti problémájáról (in Hungarian; On a semigroup-theoretical problem of László Rédei). Mat. Lapok **10**:3–4, 274–277 (1959).
- [21] S. LAJOS and F. SZÁSZ, Some characterizations of twosided regular rings. Acta Sci. math., Szeged **30** (1970).
- [22] —, Bi-ideals in associative rings. Acta Sci. math., Szeged (to appear).
- [23] J. LAMBEK, Lectures on Rings and Modules, Toronto, London 1966.

- [24] N. H. MCCOY, The Theory of Rings, London, New York 1964.
- [25] G. A. MILLER, The ϕ -subgroup of a group. Trans. Amer. math. Soc. **16**, 20–26 (1915).
- [26] B. H. NEUMANN, Some remarks on infinite groups. J. London Math. Soc. **12**, 120–127 (1937).
- [27] GH. PIC, O proprietate a grupurilor FC-nilpotente. Comunicările Acad. Repub. Popul. Romîne, **12**: 9, 969–972 (1962).
- [28] L. RÉDEI, Algebra I, (in English) Akadémia Kiadó, Budapest 1967.
- [29] E. SASIADA, Solution of the problem of existence of simple radical ring. Bull. Acad. Polonaise Sci. **9**, 257 (1961).
- [30] H. SEIDEL, Über das Radikal einer Halbgruppe. Diese Nachr. **29**, 255–263 (1963).
- [31] —, Eine Charakterisierung des 0-Radikals einer Halbgruppe. Diese Nachr. **34**, 163–166 (1967).
- [32] O. STEINFELD and R. WIEGANDT, Über die Verallgemeinerungen und Analoga der Wedderburn-Artinschen und Noetherschen Struktursätze. Diese Nachr. **34**, 143–156 (1967).
- [33] F. SZÁSZ, Az operátormodulusok Kertész-féle radikáljáról (in Hungarian, On the Kertész radical of operator modules). Magyar Tudományos Akadémia III. Osztályának Közleményei, **10**: 1, 35–38 (1960).
- [34] —, Über Ringe mit Minimalbedingung für Hauptrechtsideale. I. Publ. math., Debrecen **7**, 54–64 (1960); II. Acta math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **12**, 417–439 (1961); III. Acta math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **14**, 447–461 (1963).
- [35] —, An observation on the Brown-McCoy radical. Proc. Japan Acad. **37**, 413–416 (1961).
- [36] F. SZÁSZ, Verbandstheoretische Bemerkungen zum Fuchsschen Zeroidradikal der nichtassoziativen Ringe. Archiv der Math. **12**: 4, 282–289 (1961).
- [37] —, The sharpening of a result concerning primitive ideals of an associative ring. Proc. Amer. math. Soc. **18**: 5, 910–912 (1967).
- [38] —, Lösung eines Problems bezüglich einer Charakterisierung des Jacobsonischen Radikals. Acta math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **18**, 261–272 (1967).
- [39] —, Radikalbegriffe für Halbgruppen mit Nullelement, die dem Jacobsonischen ring-theoretischen Radikal ähnlich sind. Diese Nachr. **34**, 157–161 (1967).
- [40] —, Gyűrűk maximális jobbideáljairól (in Hungarian; On maximal right ideals of rings). Magyar Tudományos Akadémia III. Osztályának Közleményei **17**, 473–476 (1967).
- [41] H. J. WEINERT, Halbgruppen ohne Frattinische Unterhalbgruppe. Acta math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **15**, 309–323 (1964).
- [42] H. WIELANDT, Eine Kennzeichnung der direkten Produkte von p-Gruppen. Math. Z. **41**, 281–282 (1936).
- [43] H. ZASSENHAUS, The Theory of Groups, New York, Chelsea 1949.