

## On a question of Kertész

By HANNA NEUMANN (Manchester)

During a recent visit to Debrecen I learnt from A. KERTÉSZ of a way of constructing semigroups from groups. If  $G$  is a given group, written multiplicatively, define a new operation  $x \circ y$  on the elements of  $G$ , setting  $x \circ y = f(x, y)$ , where  $f(x, y)$  is one of the following five types of function: a constant  $a$ ,  $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $xay$ , or  $yax$ . In each case the new operation is associative; moreover the elements of  $G$  form a group  $G_1$  under the operation  $x \circ y = xay$ , a group  $G_2$  under the operation  $x \circ y = yax$ .  $G_1$  is an isomorphic image of  $G$  under the mapping  $x \rightarrow xa^{-1}$ , similarly  $G_2$  is an anti-isomorphic image of  $G$  under the same mapping. A. KERTÉSZ conjectured that the five functions he found are in fact the only functions defining associative operations. In this note I give a proof of KERTÉSZ' conjecture.

### § 1. Preliminaries

The function  $f(x, y)$  defined on the group  $G$  is a word in the variables  $x$  and  $y$  and constant elements of  $G$ ; that is, it is a product of powers  $x^{\alpha_i}$ ,  $y^{\beta_i}$ , possibly separated from each other by various constants  $a, b, \dots$ . We assume the word to be *reduced*, that is, no two adjacent letters represent elements inverse to each other in  $G$ . Words in three variables will be used as well. Our remarks naturally extend to these *mutatis mutandis*.

The number  $m = \sum |\alpha_i|$  is called the *x-length* of  $f(x, y)$ , and the number  $n = \sum |\beta_i|$  is called the *y-length* of  $f(x, y)$ .

We consider the *x-length* and *y-length* of a power of  $f$ . If  $k$  is a positive integer, cancellations will in general take place between neighbouring factors of the power  $f^k$ . To exhibit these, we write  $f(x, y)$  in the form

$$f(x, y) = r^{-1}(x, y)s(x, y)r(x, y),$$

where we may assume that the first and last letters of  $s$  are not inverse to each other, and that no cancellation takes place between  $r^{-1}$  and  $s$ , and between  $s$  and  $r$ . Then

$$f^k(x, y) = r^{-1}(x, y)s^k(x, y)r(x, y)$$

is reduced as written. If, therefore,  $m_1$  and  $n_1$  denote respectively the  $x$ -length and the  $y$ -length of  $s(x, y)$ , one has for the  $x$ -length  $\mu$  and the  $y$ -length  $\nu$  of  $f^k(x, y)$  the relations

$$(1.1) \quad \mu = m + (k-1)m_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \nu = n + (k-1)n_1.$$

We extend this result to a more general situation: Let  $w(u, v)$  be a word in the variables  $u, v$  and constants; again  $w(u, v)$  is assumed reduced. If the  $u$ -length of  $w(u, v)$  is  $k$ , then

(1.2) *the  $x$ -length  $\mu$  and the  $y$ -length  $\nu$  of  $w(f(x, y), v)$  are subject to the inequalities*

$$m + (k-1)m_1 \leq \mu \leq km \quad \text{and} \quad n + (k-1)n_1 \leq \nu \leq kn.$$

Similar inequalities obtain, of course, when  $f(x, y)$  is substituted for  $v$  in  $w(u, v)$ .

The truth of these inequalities becomes evident, if one considers first the extreme cases leading to the least and greatest possible values for  $\mu$  or  $\nu$ . The least value is taken (as a direct application (1.1)) when  $u$  occurs only once in  $w(u, v)$ , and then in the form  $u^{\pm k}$ . The greatest value is taken when  $w(u, v)$  contains the power  $u^{\pm 1}$  in  $k$  separate places.

Finally we note the following simple fact:

(1.3) *If  $x \circ y = f(x, y)$  is an associative operation, then so is  $x * y = f(y, x)$ .*

For associativity of  $x \circ y$  means

$$f(f(x, y), z) = f(x, f(y, z)) \quad \text{for all } x, y, z;$$

therefore in particular also

$$f(f(z, y), x) = f(z, f(y, x)) \quad \text{for all } x, y, z,$$

and this is just the relation expressing associativity of  $x * y$ .

## § 2. The Theorem

We can now formulate the theorem on associative operations on groups:

**(2.1) Theorem.** *Let  $f(x, y)$  be a reduced word in  $x, y$  and certain constants out of the group  $G$ . If the operation  $x \circ y = f(x, y)$  is associative, then*

$$f(x, y) = a, x, y, xay, \quad \text{or} \quad yax,$$

where  $a$  is an arbitrary constant.

PROOF. We write as before  $f(x, y) = r^{-1}(x, y)s(x, y)r(x, y)$ , where  $m$  and  $m_1$  are the  $x$ -lengths of  $f$  and  $s$  respectively, therefore  $m_1 \leq m$ ; and  $n$  and  $n_1$  are the  $y$ -lengths of  $f$  and  $s$  respectively, therefore  $n_1 \leq n$ .

Consider now the expression  $f(f(x, y), z)$ . Let its  $x$ -length be  $\mu$ , and its  $z$ -length be  $\nu_1$ ; then (1.2) — with  $k=m$  — shows that  $\mu_1 \geq m + (m-1)m_1$ . Also, clearly,  $\nu_1 = n$ .

Next consider the  $x$ -length  $\mu_2$  and the  $z$ -length  $\nu_2$  of  $f(x, f(y, z))$ . Obviously  $\mu_2 = m$ ; and, using the analogon to (1.2) for substitution for the second variable, one sees that  $\nu_2 \geq n + (n-1)n_1$ .

But the assumption that the operation  $x \circ y = f(x, y)$  is associative gives us the identity  $f(f(x, y), z) = f(x, f(y, z))$ . Therefore  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$  and  $\nu_1 = \nu_2$ , and so

$$m \geq m + (m-1)m_1 \quad \text{and} \quad n \geq n + (n-1)n_1.$$

Using  $0 \leq m_1 \leq m$  and  $0 \leq n_1 \leq n$ , we obtain

$$(2.2) \quad \text{either } m_1 = 0 \text{ or } m_1 = m = 1, \text{ and either } n_1 = 0 \text{ or } n_1 = n = 1.$$

It follows:

(2.3) *The function  $f(x, y)$  has one of the following forms:*

$r^{-1}(x, y)ar(x, y)$  where  $a \neq 1$ ,  $r^{-1}(y)ax^\varepsilon br(y)$ ,  $r^{-1}(x)ay^\varepsilon br(x)$ ,  $ax^{\varepsilon_1}by^{\varepsilon_2}c$ , or  $ay^{\varepsilon_1}bx^{\varepsilon_2}c$ , where  $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$  have the values  $+1$  or  $-1$ .

Because of (1.3), we need now only consider the first, second, and fourth of these possibilities.

(i) When  $f = r^{-1}(x, y)ar(x, y)$ , then

$$f(f(x, y), z) = r^{-1}(f(x, y), z)ar(f(x, y), z),$$

and

$$f(x, f(y, z)) = r^{-1}(x, f(y, z))ar(x, f(y, z)).$$

With the same notation as before,  $\nu_1 = n$  and  $\mu_2 = m$  are again obvious. Applying (1.2) — with  $m_1 = 0$  — to  $r(f(x, y), z)$  we see that  $r(f(x, y), z)$  has  $x$ -length at least  $m$ . Since the constant  $a \neq 1$  prevents cancellation between  $r^{-1}$  and  $r$ , it follows that  $f(f(x, y), z)$  has  $x$ -length at least  $2m$ ; that is, in the previous notation,  $\mu_1 \geq 2m$ . Similarly one obtains  $\nu_2 \geq 2n$ . But again  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$  and  $\nu_1 = \nu_2$ , because of the associativity. Therefore  $m \geq 2m$  and  $n \geq 2n$ , and so  $m = n = 0$ . It follows that  $r(x, y)$ , and therefore  $f(x, y)$ , is constant.

(ii) When  $f = r^{-1}(y)ax^\varepsilon br(y)$ , then

$$f(f(x, y), z) = r^{-1}(z)a[r^{-1}(y)ax^\varepsilon br(y)]^\varepsilon br(z),$$

and

$$f(x, f(y, z)) = r^{-1}(f(y, z))ax^\varepsilon br(f(y, z)).$$

As  $\varepsilon = \pm 1$ ,  $f(f(x, y), z)$  contains  $x^{\varepsilon^2}$  and no other power of  $x$ , while  $f(x, f(y, z))$  contains precisely  $x^\varepsilon$ , the identity of the two expressions implies therefore  $\varepsilon^2 = \varepsilon$ ,  $\varepsilon = 1$ .

Further one has again  $\nu_1 = n$ ; and (1.2) shows that  $r(f(y, z))$  has  $z$ -length at least  $n$ , so that  $\nu_2 \geq 2n$ ; therefore  $n \geq 2n$  holds again. Thus  $n = 0$ , which means that  $r(y)$  is constant, and so  $f(x, y)$  has the form  $f(x, y) = a_1 x b_1$ . Using the associativity once again, one deduces without difficulty that  $a_1 = b_1 = 1$ .

The remark (1.3) now shows that this case of (2.3) leads to  $f(x, y) = x$  and  $f(x, y) = y$  as the only possibilities.

(iii) When, finally,  $f = ax^{\varepsilon_1} b y^{\varepsilon_2} c$ , then

$$f(f(x, y), z) = a[ax^{\varepsilon_1} b y^{\varepsilon_2} c]^{\varepsilon_1} b z^{\varepsilon_2} c,$$

and

$$f(x, f(y, z)) = ax^{\varepsilon_1} b[ay^{\varepsilon_1} b z^{\varepsilon_2} c]^{\varepsilon_2} c.$$

Comparing the exponents of  $x$  and  $z$  in these two expressions, one gets again  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 1$ ; and the identity of the expressions then leads to  $a^2 = a$ ,  $c^2 = c$ , and therefore  $a = c = 1$ . Using (1.3) once more one obtains from this case the possibilities  $f(x, y) = xby$  and  $f(x, y) = ybx$ , and no others.

This completes the proof of the theorem.

*(Received November 2, 1959.)*