

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

TORSION-FREE MODULES OVER $K[x, y]$

STEPHEN URBAN CHASE

TORSION-FREE MODULES OVER $K[x, y]$

STEPHEN U. CHASE

1. Introduction. Let $R = K[x, y]$ be the ring of polynomials in two variables x and y over a field K . In this note we shall consider the following question: What conditions must be satisfied by two torsion-free R -modules¹ A and B in order that there exist a third R -module C such that $A \oplus C \approx B \oplus C$? Our principal result is the following theorem.

THEOREM. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *There exists an R -module C (not necessarily torsion-free) such that $A \oplus C \approx B \oplus C$.*
- (b) $A \oplus R \approx B \oplus R$.
- (c) *For any maximal ideal M in R , $A_M \approx B_M$ as R_M -modules.*
- (d) *For any maximal ideal M in R , $\bar{A}_M \approx \bar{B}_M$ as \bar{R}_M -modules.*

In (c) and (d) above, R_M is the ring of quotients of R with respect to the maximal ideal M , \bar{R}_M is the completion of the local ring R_M , and A_M, \bar{A}_M are the R_M and \bar{R}_M -modules, respectively, constructed from A in the standard way. We shall adhere to this notation throughout the paper.

It is natural to ask whether the conditions of the above theorem imply that $A \approx B$, as is trivially the case for the ring of polynomials in one variable. It is perhaps curious that the answer here depends upon the field K . We show that, if K is algebraically closed of characteristic zero, then A and B satisfy conditions (a)–(d) above if and only if $A \approx B$. However, we provide an example to show that this is not the case if K is the real number field.

The proofs of the preceding statements are based primarily upon the theorem of Seshadri [6] that projective R -modules are free, together with some results of Auslander-Buchsbaum-Goldman ([1], [2]) on duality of modules over commutative Noetherian domains. These will be explained in the next section.

2. Some remarks on duality. Throughout this section R may be any commutative Noetherian normal domain. If A is an R -module, we define $A^* = \text{Hom}_R(A, R)$; A^* will be called the *dual* of A . If B is a second R -module and $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a homomorphism, we shall denote by f^* the induced homomorphism of B^* into A^* . For the basic properties

Received May 8, 1961.

¹ Throughout this note, all modules which we consider will be assumed to be finitely generated.

of this functor we refer the reader to [4], p. 476. We shall denote the natural mapping of A^{**} by i_A . If A is torsion-free, then i_A is a monomorphism. In this case we shall consistently identify A with its image in A^{**} . A will be called *reflexive* in case $A = A^{**}$. It is not hard to show that every dual is reflexive; this follows essentially from the fact that, if A is torsion-free, then A and A^* have the same rank.

The following proposition is essentially due to Auslander-Buchsbaum-Goldman ([1], Proposition 3.4, p. 758.)

PROPOSITION 2.1. Let A, B be torsion-free R -modules with the same rank, and assume $A \subseteq A^{**} \subseteq B$, $A \neq B$. Let I be the annihilator of B/A (note that $I \neq 0$, since A and B have the same rank.) Then

- (a) If $A^{**} = B$, $\text{rank}(I) > 1$.
- (b) If $A^{**} \neq B$, $\text{rank}(I) = 1$.

Proof. Assume $\text{rank}(I) = 1$, in which case there exists a prime ideal P in R of rank one such that $I \subseteq P$. Then $A_P \subsetneq B_P$. Since R is normal and $\text{rank}(P) = 1$, R_P is a Dedekind ring. Then A_P , being a torsion-free R_P -module, is projective, and therefore trivially reflexive. It then follows from an easy localization argument that $(A^{**})_P = (A_P)^{**} = A_P \subsetneq B_P$, and therefore $A^{**} \subsetneq B$. Hence, if $A^{**} = B$, then $\text{rank}(I) > 1$, completing the proof of (a).

Suppose now that $A^{**} \neq B$, and let J be the annihilator of B/A^{**} . We may then apply Proposition 3.4 of [1] (p. 758) to conclude that $\text{rank}(J) = 1$. Since $0 \subsetneq I \subseteq J$, it follows that $\text{rank}(I) = 1$, completing the proof of (b).

COROLLARY. Let B be a reflexive R -module, and A_1, A_2 be submodules of B with same rank as B . Let I_1 and I_2 be the annihilators of B/A_1 and B/A_2 , respectively. If the ranks of both ideals are greater than one, then any isomorphism between A_1 and A_2 can be extended to an automorphism of B .

Proof. Since B is reflexive, we have that $A_1 \subseteq A_1^{**} \subseteq B$, $A_2 \subseteq A_2^{**} \subseteq B$. But since $\text{rank}(I_1) > 1$, we obtain from Proposition 2.1 that $A_1^{**} = B$, and similarly $A_2^{**} = B$. Hence, if $\theta_1: A_1 \rightarrow A_2$ is an isomorphism, then θ_1^{**} is an endomorphism of B . Let $\theta_2 = \theta_1^{-1}$; then θ_2^{**} is likewise an endomorphism of B . Also, $\theta_2^{**}\theta_1^{**} = (\theta_2\theta_1)^{**}$ induces the identity automorphism on A_1 . Since B is torsion-free and B/A_1 is a torsion module, it then follows trivially that $\theta_2^{**}\theta_1^{**}$ is the identity on all of B . So is $\theta_1^{**}\theta_2^{**}$, by similar reasoning. Therefore θ_1^{**} is the desired extension of θ_1 to an automorphism of B .

3. **Torsion-free modules over regular rings of dimension two.** We shall begin this section with a few preliminary results which will prepare the ground for the proof of the theorem mentioned in the introduction.

A square matrix over a ring R will be called a *transvection* if its diagonal entries are all "ones" and there is at most one nonzero entry off the diagonal.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let $R = R_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus R_r$, where each R_i is a local ring. Then any unimodular matrix over R is a product of transvections.*

Proof. Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be a unimodular n -by- n matrix over R . We first consider the special case $r = 1$; i.e., R is a local ring. Then every row and column of A must contain a unit. From this we see easily that A may be reduced to a diagonal matrix by means of standard row and column operations which are equivalent to multiplication by transvections. That is, $A = TDU$, where T, U are products of transvections and—

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & & 0 \\ & \cdot & \\ 0 & & d_n \end{pmatrix} \quad d_i \in R \quad d_1 \cdots d_n = 1.$$

We may then apply a well-known trick and write—

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & & 0 \\ & d_1^{-1} & \\ & & 1 \\ 0 & & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & 0 \\ & d_1 d_2 & \\ & & (d_1 d_2)^{-1} \\ 0 & & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & 0 \\ & 1 & \\ & & \cdot \\ 0 & & & d_1 \cdots d_{n-1} \\ & & & & d_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

But it is trivial to verify that each of the factors of the above expression is a product of transvections. Thus A is a product of transvections, and the lemma is true for $r = 1$.

Proceed by induction on r ; assume $r > 1$ and the lemma is true for $k > r$. Let $R_0 = R_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus R_{r-1}$; then $R = R_0 \oplus R_r$. Let e_0, e_r be the units of R_0, R_r , respectively; then $e_0 + e_r = 1$. Also $A = A_0 + A_r$, where A_0, A_r are unimodular matrices over R_0, R_r , respectively. We have from the induction assumption that $A_0 = \prod_{j=1}^m T_0^{(j)}$ and $A_r = \prod_{j=1}^m T_r^{(j)}$, where $T_0^{(j)}$ and $T_r^{(j)}$ are transvections over R_0 and R_r , respectively. But then $e_r I + T_0^{(j)}$ and $e_0 I + T_r^{(j)}$ are transvections over R , and it is easy to see that—

$$e_r I + A_0 = \prod_{j=1}^m (e_r I + T_0^{(j)}) \quad e_0 I + A_r = \prod_{j=1}^m (e_0 I + T_r^{(j)}).$$

Since $A = A_0 + A_r = (e_r I + A_0)(e_0 I + A_r)$, it is clear that A is a product

of transvections, completing the proof.

LEMMA 3.2. *Let R be a direct sum of a finite number of local rings, and F be a free R -module. Let A, B be submodules of F such that $F/A \approx F/B$. Then there exists an automorphism θ of F such that $\theta(A) = B$.*

Proof. If R is a local ring, the lemma follows directly from standard facts concerning minimal epimorphisms ([4], p. 471.) The general case may be deduced from this special case by an easy direct sum argument.

LEMMA 3.3. *Let R be a commutative Noetherian domain. Let F be a free R -module, and A, B be submodules of F , both having the same rank as F . Assume $F/A \approx F/B$, and every prime ideal of R belonging to A (as a submodule of F) is maximal. Then there exists an automorphism θ of $F \oplus R$ such that $\theta(A \oplus R) = B \oplus R$.*

Proof. Let I be the annihilator of F/A (hence also of F/B). Then $IF \subseteq A \cap B$, and we have the following exact sequences of modules over the ring R/I .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & A/IF & \longrightarrow & F/IF & \longrightarrow & F/A \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & & & 0 \longrightarrow B/IF \longrightarrow F/IF \longrightarrow F/B \longrightarrow 0 . \end{array}$$

Now, it follows from our hypotheses that $\text{Rad}(I) = M_1 \cap \cdots \cap M_r$, where M_i is a maximal ideal in R . Hence we obtain from a direct application of the Chinese Remainder Theorem that R/I is a direct sum of local rings. Therefore, by Lemma 3.2, there exists an automorphism ψ of F/IF such that $\psi(A/IF) = B/IF$. It is easy to see that ψ may be extended to a unimodular automorphism ψ_1 of $(F/IF) \oplus (R/I)$ such that $\psi_1\{(A/IF) \oplus (R/I)\} = (B/IF) \oplus (R/I)$. By Lemma 3.1, ψ_1 is a product of transvections, and thus it is clear that there exists an R -automorphism θ of $F \oplus R$ such that $f\theta = \psi_1 f$, where $f: F \oplus R \rightarrow (F/IF) \oplus (R/I)$ is the canonical mapping. It then follows immediately that $\theta(A \oplus R) = B \oplus R$, completing the proof of the lemma.

We shall also have use for the following proposition, which was communicated to me by R. Swan.

PROPOSITION 3.4. *If R is a complete local ring, then the Krull-Schmidt-Remak Theorem [3] is satisfied by finitely-generated R -modules.*

Proof. According to Azumaya's generalization of Krull-Schmidt-Remak Theorem [3], we need only show that, if A is an indecomposable R -module, then the nonunits in $S = \text{Hom}_R(A, A)$ form an ideal. S is a

finitely generated R -algebra, and S/MS is an R/M -algebra of finite degree, where M is the maximal ideal in R . If \bar{e} is an idempotent in S/MS , then since R is complete it follows from a standard argument that there exists an idempotent e in S mapping on \bar{e} . But $e = 1$ because A is indecomposable, and therefore \bar{e} is the identity of S/MS . We have thus shown that S/MS has a single maximal ideal. Since MS is contained in every maximal ideal of S , we have shown that S itself has a single maximal ideal, and the proposition follows immediately.

Swan, in unpublished work, has shown that Proposition 3.4 does not necessarily hold for incomplete local rings. However, all local rings satisfy a weaker form of the proposition, a fact which is implicit in [3]. For completeness we shall exhibit a proof here.

PROPOSITION 3.5. Let R be a local ring with maximal ideal M , and A and B be R -modules. If there exists a (finitely-generated) free R -module F such that $A \oplus F \approx B \oplus F$, then $A \approx B$.

If A is an R -module, define $d(A)$ to be the dimension of A/MA over the residue class field R/M . Let \mathcal{C} be the class of all R -modules A with the property that there exist R -modules B and F , with F free, such that $A \oplus F \approx B \oplus F$ but $A \neq B$. The proposition simply asserts that \mathcal{C} is empty. Assume the proposition is false; then we may select A from the class \mathcal{C} such that $d(A)$ is minimal. Having fixed A and its companion B , we may then choose F to have minimal rank $n > 0$. Set $C = A \oplus F$; then we may assume that $A, B \subseteq C$ and there exist free submodules F_1, F_2 of C such that $F_1 \approx F \approx F_2$ and $A \oplus F_1 = C = B \oplus F_2$. Let x_1, \dots, x_n and y_1, \dots, y_n be bases of F_1 and F_2 , respectively. Then there exist homomorphisms f and g of C into R such that $f(A) = g(B) = 0$, $f(x_n) = g(y_n) = 1$, and $f(x_i) = g(y_i) = 0$ for $i < n$. Suppose that $f(F_2) \subseteq M$, $g(F_1) \subseteq M$; then, since R is a local ring, it is clear that $f(B) = g(A) = R$. That is, there exist $x \in A, y \in B$, such that $f(y) = g(x) = 1$, in which case there exist submodules $A' \subseteq A, B' \subseteq B$ such that $A = A' \oplus Rx, B = B' \oplus Ry$. From this it follows that $A' \oplus R \oplus F \approx A \oplus F \approx B \oplus F \approx B' \oplus R \oplus F$. But $d(A') = d(A) - 1$, and hence $A' \approx B'$, since A was chosen from the class \mathcal{C} so that $d(A)$ is minimal. But then $A \approx A' \oplus R \approx B' \oplus R \approx B$, a contradiction. Therefore we may assume that either $f(F_2) = R$ or $g(F_1) = R$; let us say that $f(F_2) = R$. Then $f(y_i)$ is a unit for some $i \leq n$, say $i = 1$. Define a homomorphism $j: R \rightarrow C$ by $j(a) = a(f(y_1))^{-1}y_1$, where $a \in R$; then it is clear that fj is the identity map on R . We leave to the reader the trivial verification of the resulting fact that $A \oplus F' \approx \ker(f) \approx \text{coker}(j) \approx B \oplus F'$, where F' is a free R -module of rank $n - 1$. But this contradicts the fact that F was chosen to be the free module of minimal rank with the property that $A \oplus F \approx B \oplus F$. The proof of the proposition is hence complete.

We are now ready to prove a slight generalization of the theorem stated in the introduction.

THEOREM 3.6. *Let R be a commutative Noetherian domain. Assume that the global dimension of R is less than or equal to two, and every projective R -module is free. Let A, B be torsion-free R -modules. Then the following statements are equivalent—*

- (a) *There exists an R -module C such that $A \oplus C \approx B \oplus C$.*
- (b) *$A \oplus R \approx B \oplus R$.*
- (c) *$A_M \approx B_M$ as R_M -modules for every maximal ideal M in R .*
- (d) *$\bar{A}_M \approx \bar{B}_M$ as \bar{R}_M -modules for every maximal ideal M in R .*

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (d): If $A \oplus C \approx B \oplus C$, then certainly $\bar{A}_M \oplus \bar{C}_M \approx \bar{B}_M \oplus \bar{C}_M$ for any maximal ideal M in R . It then follows from Proposition 3.4 that $\bar{A}_M \approx \bar{B}_M$.

(b) \Rightarrow (a): Obvious.

(c) \Rightarrow (d): Obvious.

(b) \Rightarrow (c): If $A \oplus R \approx B \oplus R$, then $A_M \oplus R_M \approx B_M \oplus R_M$ for any maximal ideal M in R . We may then apply Proposition 3.5 to conclude that $A_M \approx B_M$.

(d) \Rightarrow (b); If (d) holds, we have immediately that A and B have the same rank. If A is projective, it follows from a standard result of homological algebra that B is likewise projective, in which case both are free by hypothesis and (b) follows trivially. Thus we may assume that neither A nor B is projective. Since $\text{gl.dim.}(R) \leq 2$, we obtain from the Corollary to Proposition 4.7 of [2] (p. 17) that A^{**} and B^{**} are projective (the hypothesis given there that R be local is easily seen to be unnecessary. This fact also follows, perhaps more simply, from (4.4) of [4], p. 477.) Our hypotheses then imply that A^{**} and B^{**} are free; and, of course, they have the same rank. We may then identify A^{**} and B^{**} , and write $A^{**} = B^{**} = F$, a free R -module. $A \subseteq F$, $B \subseteq F$, and if I and J are the annihilators of F/A and F/B , respectively, then it follows from Proposition 2.1 that both ideals have rank greater than one (we should remark at this point that R is normal, since it has finite global dimension; hence the hypotheses of Proposition 2.1 are satisfied.)

Let M be a maximal ideal in R ; then by hypothesis $\bar{A}_M \approx \bar{B}_M$. IR_M and JR_M are the annihilators of \bar{F}_M/\bar{A}_M and \bar{F}_M/\bar{B}_M , respectively, and both of these ideals in \bar{R}_M have rank greater than one. Furthermore, since R has finite global dimension, \bar{R}_M is a regular local ring, and so we may apply the Corollary to Proposition 2.1 to conclude that there exists an \bar{R}_M -automorphism φ of \bar{F}_M such that $\varphi(\bar{A}_M) = \bar{B}_M$. In particular, $(\bar{F}/\bar{A})_M \approx \bar{F}_M/\bar{A}_M \approx \bar{F}_M/\bar{B}_M \approx (\bar{F}/\bar{B})_M$. Now, since $\text{rank}(I) > 1$ and Krull

$\dim.(R) = \text{gl.dim.}(R) \leq 2$, we obtain easily from the Chinese Remainder Theorem that R/I is a direct sum of local rings, each with nilpotent maximal ideal. Then, since $(\overline{F/A})_M$ and $(\overline{F/B})_M$ may be viewed as modules over $\overline{R}_M/I\overline{R}_M \approx R_M/IR_M$, it follows from standard properties of completions of local rings that $(F/A)_M \approx (F/B)_M$. This is true for every maximal ideal M in R , and hence $F/A \approx F/B$ as R -modules, since both may be viewed as modules over R/I , a direct sum of local rings. Since every prime ideal in R belonging to A or B (as a submodule of F) is maximal, we may apply Lemma 3.3 to conclude that there exists an automorphism θ of $F \oplus R$ such that $\theta(A \oplus R) = B \oplus R$. In particular, $A \oplus R \approx B \oplus R$, completing the proof of the theorem.

COROLLARY. *If $R = K[x, y]$, K a field, then R satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.6.*

Proof. The well-known fact that $\text{gl.dim.}(R) = 2$ ([5], p. 180), together with Seshadri's result [6] that projective R -modules are free, imply that R satisfies the hypotheses, and hence the conclusions, of Theorem 3.6.

As mentioned in the introduction, we are able to improve Theorem 3.6 for $R = K[x, y]$ if certain assumptions are made concerning the field K .

THEOREM 3.7. *Let $R = K[x, y]$, where K is an algebraically closed field of characteristic p . Let A, B be torsion-free R -modules of the same rank n . If p does not divide n , then A and B satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.6 if and only if $A \approx B$.*

Proof. As in Theorem 3.6, we may assume that neither A nor B is projective, but both are contained in a free R -module F in such a way that $F/A \approx F/B$. Furthermore, if I is the annihilator of F/A (hence also of F/B) then $R/I = R_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus R_r$, where R_i is a local ring with nilpotent maximal ideal M_i . Let e_i be the unit of R_i and \bar{e}_i be the unit of R_i/M_i . Since K is algebraically closed, $R_i/M_i = K\bar{e}_i$.

Now, F/IF is a free R/I -module, and so we may apply Lemma 3.2 to obtain an automorphism θ of F/IF such that $\theta(A/IF) = B/IF$. Write $\theta_i = e_i\theta$; then $\theta = \theta_1 + \cdots + \theta_r$. If $d_i = \det(\theta_i)$, then $d_1 + \cdots + d_r = d = \det(\theta)$. d is a unit in R/I , and d_i is a unit in R_i . Since $R_i/M_i = K\bar{e}_i$, we may write $d_i = a_i(e_i + u_i)$, where $a_i \in K$ and $u_i \in M_i$. Since K is algebraically closed, there exist $b_i \in K$ such that $b_i^n = a_i^{-1}$. Since M_i is nilpotent, we see immediately that the multiplicative group of units of R_i which map on \bar{e}_i has exponent a power of p , and therefore, since p does not divide n , there exist $c_i \in R_i$ such that $c_i^n = (e_i + u_i)^{-1}$. Set

$\theta' = b_1c_1\theta_1 + \dots + b_r c_r \theta_r = (b_1c_1 + \dots + b_r c_r)\theta$; then θ' is a unimodular automorphism of F/IF and $\theta'(A/IF) = B/IF$. By Lemma 3.1, θ' is a product of transvections, and thus there exists an R -automorphism φ of F such that $\theta'f = f\varphi$, where $f: F \rightarrow F/IF$ is the canonical mapping. Since $IF \subseteq A \cap B$, it follows easily that $\varphi(A) = B$. Therefore $A \approx B$, completing the proof of the theorem.²

4. Examples. In this section we shall show that $R = K[x, y]$ does not satisfy Theorem 3.7 if K is the field of real numbers.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $S = K[x, y]/((x^2 - 1)^3, (x^2 - 1)^2y^2, y^3)$, where K is the real number field. Set $F = S \oplus S$, and define submodules A and B of F to be generated by the rows of the following matrices—*

$$A: \begin{pmatrix} (x^2 - 1)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & y^2 \\ y & x^2 - 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad B: \begin{pmatrix} x(x^2 - 1)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & y^2 \\ xy & x^2 - 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then there exists no automorphism θ of F such that $\theta(A) = B$ and $\det(\theta) \in K$.

Proof. Set $P_1 = (x - 1, y) \subseteq S$, $P_2 = (x + 1, y) \subseteq S$, and $Q = P_1 \cap P_2 = (x^2 - 1, y)$; then Q is easily seen to be the radical of S , and $S/Q \approx S/P_1 \oplus S/P_2 \approx K \oplus K$. $(1 + x)/2$ and $(1 - x)/2$ are orthogonal idempotents modulo Q , and therefore it is clear that any u in S can be expressed in the form $u = \lambda(x + 1) + \mu(x - 1) + u'$, where $u' \in Q$ and $\lambda, \mu \in K$.

We assert first that $\{(x + 1)(x^2 - 1)y^2, 0\}$, $\{(x - 1)(x^2 - 1)y^2, 0\}$, $\{0, (x + 1)(x^2 - 1)^2y\}$, and $\{0, (x - 1)(x^2 - 1)^2y\}$ are not in A . For suppose $\{(x + 1)(x^2 - 1)y^2, 0\}$ is in A ; then

$$\begin{aligned} \{(x + 1)(x^2 - 1)y^2, 0\} &= p\{(x^2 - 1)^2, 0\} + q\{0, y^2\} + r\{y, x^2 - 1\} \\ &= \{p(x^2 - 1)^2 + ry, qy^2 + r(x^2 - 1)\} \end{aligned}$$

for some p, q, r in S . Then $(x + 1)(x^2 - 1)y^2 = p(x^2 - 1)^2 + ry$, from which it follows that $r = -(x + 1)(x^2 - 1)y + r'(x^2 - 1)^2 + r''$, where $r' \in S$ and $r'' \in Q^3$. But then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = qy^2 + r(x^2 - 1) &= qy^2 - (x + 1)(x^2 - 1)^2y + r'(x^2 - 1)^3 + r''(x^2 - 1) \\ &= qy^2 - (x + 1)(x^2 - 1)^2y, \end{aligned}$$

since $(x^2 - 1)^3 = Q^4 = 0$. But this equation is easily seen to be impossible, and so we have that $\{(x + 1)(x^2 - 1)y^2, 0\}$ is not in A . The other

² The proof of Theorem 3.7 has been phrased for $p > 0$. However, the theorem is also true if $p = 0$, since then the binomial theorem may be used to obtain $c_i \in R_i$ such that $c_i^n = (e_i + u_i)^{-1}$.

assertions can be proved in similar fashion.

Suppose now that there exists an automorphism θ of F such that $\theta(A) = B$ and $\det(\theta) = t \in K$. Define a mapping $\tau: F \rightarrow F$ by $\tau(\{u, v\}) = \{xu, v\}$. τ is an endomorphism of F with determinant x . But $x = (1 + x)/2 - (1 - x)/2$ is a unit modulo Q , and hence is a unit in S , since Q is the radical of S . Therefore τ is an automorphism of F . Clearly $\tau(A) = B$. Set $\sigma = \theta^{-1}\tau$; then, replacing t by t^{-1} , we get that σ is an automorphism of F with determinant tx , and $\sigma(A) = A$. Relative to the given basis of F , σ may be represented by a matrix—

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \quad a, b, c, d \in S \quad ad - bc = tx$$

From the equation—

$$\begin{pmatrix} (x^2 - 1)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & y \\ y & x^2 - 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a(x^2 - 1)^2 & b(x^2 - 1)^2 \\ cy^2 & dy^2 \\ ay + c(x^2 - 1) & by + d(x^2 - 1) \end{pmatrix}$$

it follows that $\{0, b(x^2 - 1)^2\}$ and $\{cy^2, 0\}$ are in A . Write $b = \lambda(x + 1) + \mu(x - 1) + b'$, where $\lambda, \mu \in K$ and $b' \in Q$; then, since $Q^4 = 0$ and $((x + 1)/2)(x + 1) \equiv x + 1 \pmod{Q}$, we have that $\{0, \lambda(x + 1)(x^2 - 1)^2y\} = \{0, ((x + 1)/2)b(x^2 - 1)^2y\} \in A$. If $\lambda \neq 0$, then $\{0, (x + 1)(x^2 - 1)^2y\} \in A$, contradicting our previous remarks. Hence $\lambda = 0$. A similar argument shows that $\mu = 0$. Therefore $b \in Q$, in which case $b = b_1(x^2 - 1) + b_2y$, where $b_1, b_2 \in S$. It follows from similar reasoning that $c = c_1y + c_2(x^2 - 1)$, where $c_1, c_2 \in S$.

We then see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{ay + c(x^2 - 1), by + d(x^2 - 1)\} \\ &= \{ay + c_1(x^2 - 1)y + c_2(x^2 - 1)^2, b_1(x^2 - 1)y + b_2y^2 + d(x^2 - 1)\} \end{aligned}$$

is in A , and then $\{y[a + c_1(x^2 - 1)], (x^2 - 1)[b_1y + d]\}$ is in A , since $\{(x^2 - 1)^2, 0\}$ and $\{0, y^2\}$ are in A . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} w &= \{0, (x^2 - 1)[b_1y - c_1(x^2 - 1) + (d - a)]\} \\ &= \{y[a + c_1(x^2 - 1)], (x^2 - 1)(b_1y + d)\} - [a + c_1(x^2 - 1)]\{y, x^2 - 1\} \end{aligned}$$

is in A . Write $d - a = \lambda(x + 1) + \mu(x - 1) + u$, where $\lambda, \mu \in K$ and $u \in Q$. Then, using once again the facts that $(x + 1)/2$ and $(x - 1)/2$ are orthogonal idempotents modulo Q and $Q^4 = 0$, we obtain that $\{0, \lambda(x + 1)(x^2 - 1)^2y\} = ((1 + x)/2)(x^2 - 1)w \in A$, and hence $\lambda = 0$, since $\{0, (x + 1)(x^2 - 1)^2y\}$ is not in A . $\mu = 0$ for similar reasons, and therefore $d - a \in Q$; i.e., $a \equiv d \pmod{Q}$. But then $tx = ad - bc \equiv ad \equiv a^2 \pmod{Q}$, since $b, c \in Q$. Recall now that $S/Q = K_1 \oplus K_2$, where $K_1 \approx K \approx K_2$. Let $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ be the units of K_1, K_2 , respectively; then, under the isomor-

phism just mentioned, $(1 + x)/2$ maps onto ε_1 and $(1 - x)/2$ maps onto ε_2 , in which case $x = (1 + x)/2 - (1 - x)/2$ maps onto $\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$. We have thus shown that there exists $\alpha \in K_1 \oplus K_2$ such that $\alpha^2 = t\varepsilon_1 - t\varepsilon_2$. This can be true only if both t and $-t$ have square roots in K . But this is impossible unless $t = 0$, and so we have reached a contradiction. Therefore θ cannot exist, and the proof of the lemma is complete.

PROPOSITION 4.2. Let $R = K[x, y]$, where K is the field of real numbers, and set $I = ((x^2 - 1)^3, (x^2 - 1)^2y^2, y^3)$, an ideal in R . Let $F = R \oplus R$, and define submodules A', B' of F to be generated by the rows of the following matrices—

$$A': \begin{pmatrix} (x^2 - 1)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & y^2 \\ y & x^2 - 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad B: \begin{pmatrix} x(x^2 - 1)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & y^2 \\ xy & x^2 - 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and let $A = A' + IF, B = B' + IF$. Then $A \oplus R \approx B \oplus R$, but $A \not\approx B$.

Proof. Set $S = R/I$; then $F/IF \approx S \oplus S$, a free S -module. Define a mapping $\varphi: F/IF \rightarrow F/IF$ by $\varphi(\{u, v\}) = \{xu, v\}$. φ is an endomorphism of F/IF , and $\det(\varphi) = x$, which is a unit of S ; hence φ is an automorphism. Furthermore, $\varphi(A/IF) = B/IF$, from which it follows that $F/A \approx F/B$. Therefore, $A \oplus F \approx B \oplus F$, by the the theorem of Schanuel [7]. We may then apply Theorem 3.6 to conclude that $A \oplus R \approx B \oplus R$.

Suppose now that $A \approx B$. It is easy to see that $\text{rank}(I) = 2$; hence, since $IF \subseteq A \cap B$, we have from the corollary to Proposition 2.1 that the isomorphism between A and B can be extended to an automorphism θ of F . Then $\det(\theta) = t \in K$, since K contains every unit of R . Reducing modulo I , we obtain an automorphism θ' of F/IF such that $\theta'(A/IF) = B/IF$ and $\det(\theta') = t$. But this contradicts Lemma 4.1 as applied to $S, F/IF, A/IF$, and B/IF . Hence $A \not\approx B$, completing the proof of the proposition.

In closing, we remark that it is not difficult to see that Theorems 3.6 and 3.7 do not hold for a ring of polynomials in more than two variables.

REFERENCES

1. M. Auslander and D. A. Buchsbaum, *Ramification theory in Noetherian rings*, Amer. J. Math., **81** (1959), 749-765.
2. M. Auslander and O. Goldman, *Maximal orders*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **97** (1960), 1-24.
3. G. Azumaya, *Correction and supplements to my paper concerning Krull-Remak-Schmidt's theorem*, Nagoya Math. J., **1** (1950), 117-124.
4. H. Bass, *Finitistic dimension and a homological generalization of semi-primary rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **95** (1960), 466-488.

5. H. Cartan and S. Eilenberg, *Homological Algebra*, Princeton University Press, 1956.
6. C. S. Seshadri, *Triviality of vector bundles over the affine space K^2* , Proc. Nat. Acad. Sciences, **44** (1958), 456-458.
7. R. G. Swan, *Groups with periodic cohomology*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **65** (1959), 368-370.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

RALPH S. PHILLIPS

Stanford University
Stanford, California

M. G. ARSOVE

University of Washington
Seattle 5, Washington

A. L. WHITEMAN

University of Southern California
Los Angeles 7, California

LOWELL J. PAIGE

University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

T. M. CHERRY

D. DERRY

M. OHTSUKA

H. L. ROYDEN

E. SPANIER

E. G. STRAUS

F. WOLF

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

OSAKA UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

* * *

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

CALIFORNIA RESEARCH CORPORATION

SPACE TECHNOLOGY LABORATORIES

NAVAL ORDNANCE TEST STATION

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be typewritten (double spaced), and the author should keep a complete copy. Manuscripts may be sent to any one of the four editors. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, L. J. Paige at the University of California, Los Angeles 24, California.

50 reprints per author of each article are furnished free of charge; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December. Effective with Volume 13 the price per volume (4 numbers) is \$18.00; single issues, \$5.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: \$8.00 per volume; single issues \$2.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley 8, California.

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insa'susha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), No. 6, 2-chome, Fujimi-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

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

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

William George Bade and Robert S. Freeman, <i>Closed extensions of the Laplace operator determined by a general class of boundary conditions</i>	395
William Browder and Edwin Spanier, <i>H-spaces and duality</i>	411
Stewart S. Cairns, <i>On permutations induced by linear value functions</i>	415
Frank Sydney Cater, <i>On Hilbert space operators and operator roots of polynomials</i>	429
Stephen Urban Chase, <i>Torsion-free modules over $K[x, y]$</i>	437
Heron S. Collins, <i>Remarks on affine semigroups</i>	449
Peter Crawley, <i>Direct decompositions with finite dimensional factors</i>	457
Richard Brian Darst, <i>A continuity property for vector valued measurable functions</i>	469
R. P. Dilworth, <i>Abstract commutative ideal theory</i>	481
P. H. Doyle, III and John Gilbert Hocking, <i>Continuously invertible spaces</i>	499
Shaul Foguel, <i>Markov processes with stationary measure</i>	505
Andrew Mattei Gleason, <i>The abstract theorem of Cauchy-Weil</i>	511
Allan Brasted Gray, Jr., <i>Normal subgroups of monomial groups</i>	527
Melvin Henriksen and John Rolfe Isbell, <i>Lattice-ordered rings and function rings</i>	533
Amnon Jakimovski, <i>Tauberian constants for the $[J, f(x)]$ transformations</i>	567
Hubert Collins Kennedy, <i>Group membership in semigroups</i>	577
Eleanor Killam, <i>The spectrum and the radical in locally m-convex algebras</i>	581
Arthur H. Kruse, <i>Completion of mathematical systems</i>	589
Magnus Lindberg, <i>On two Tauberian remainder theorems</i>	607
Lionello A. Lombardi, <i>A general solution of Tonelli's problem of the calculus of variations</i>	617
Marvin David Marcus and Morris Newman, <i>The sum of the elements of the powers of a matrix</i>	627
Michael Bahir Maschler, <i>Derivatives of the harmonic measures in multiply-connected domains</i>	637
Deane Montgomery and Hans Samelson, <i>On the action of $SO(3)$ on S^n</i>	649
J. Barros-Neto, <i>Analytic composition kernels on Lie groups</i>	661
Mario Petrich, <i>Semicharacters of the Cartesian product of two semigroups</i>	679
John Sydney Pym, <i>Idempotent measures on semigroups</i>	685
K. Rogers and Ernst Gabor Straus, <i>A special class of matrices</i>	699
U. Shukla, <i>On the projective cover of a module and related results</i>	709
Don Harrell Tucker, <i>An existence theorem for a Goursat problem</i>	719
George Gustave Weill, <i>Reproducing kernels and orthogonal kernels for analytic differentials on Riemann surfaces</i>	729
George Gustave Weill, <i>Capacity differentials on open Riemann surfaces</i>	769
G. K. White, <i>Iterations of generalized Euler functions</i>	777
Adil Mohamed Yaqub, <i>On certain finite rings and ring-logics</i>	785