THE ELEMENTARY DIVISOR THEOREM FOR CERTAIN RINGS WITHOUT CHAIN CONDITION

OLAF HELMER

1. Introduction. The Elementary Divisor Theorem is known to hold in principal ideal rings and in rings with Euclidean algorithm.¹ It is an open question whether it holds in every *Prüfer ring*, that is, in every domain of integrity in which every ideal with finite basis is a principal ideal.² (A Prüfer ring can also be characterized as a domain of integrity in which the greatest common factor of any finite number of elements can be represented as a linear combination of these elements.) The Elementary Divisor Theorem will here be proved for what will be called "adequate" rings. They are special Prüfer rings, but not restricted by any equivalent to a chain condition, so that they comprise considerably more than just the principal ideal rings.⁸

2. Definition of adequate rings. Let R be a domain of integrity, a, b in R, and $a \neq 0$. By a relatively prime part of a with respect to b, written RP(a, b), we shall understand a factor a_1 of a such that, if $a = a_1 \cdot a_2$,

(i) $(a_1, b) = 1$,

(ii) $(a_3, b) \neq 1$ for any non-unit factor a_3 of a_2 .⁴

RP(a, b) may or may not exist; if it does, it is, in a sense, a largest factor of a that is relatively prime to b.

We now define R to be an *adequate ring* if

(i) R is a Prüfer ring,

(ii) RP(a, b) exists for all a, b in R with $a \neq 0$.

3. Relationship to Prüfer rings and principal ideal rings. By definition every adequate ring is a Prüfer ring. On the other hand, every

² Rings of this kind were considered by H. Prüfer in Untersuchungen über Teilbarkeitseigenschaften in Körpern, J. Reine Angew. Math. vol. 168 (1932).

⁸ My thanks are due to Professor Reinhold Baer for several helpful suggestions.

⁴ Notation throughout this paper: " (a, b, \dots) " for "greatest common factor of a, b, \dots " " $a \mid b$ " for "a is a factor of b," "a = b" for "a equals b except possibly for a unit factor." (This last convention serves the purpose of replacing statements about principal ideals simply by statements about their generating elements.)

Received by the editors, May 29, 1942.

¹ B. L. van der Waerden, *Moderne Algebra*, vol. 2, Berlin, 1931, p. 122. For further reference, see the papers by J. H. M. Wedderburn (J. Reine Angew. Math. vol. 167 (1932)), N. Jacobson (Ann. of Math. (2) vol. 38 (1937)), and O. Teichmüller (Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Sitzungsber. 1937).

principal ideal ring is adequate; for in a ring of that kind we have unique prime power decomposition, and hence the existence of RP(a, b) for $a \neq 0$ is obvious. An example of an adequate ring which is not a principal ideal ring is furnished by the set of integral functions with coefficients in a field F. That a ring of this type is a Prüfer ring has been proved in a previous paper.⁵ The existence of RP(a, b) is an immediate consequence of the unique factorization theorem for integral functions (Theorem 6 of the same paper). Theorem 8 of that paper, finally, states that the ring is not a principal ideal ring.

4. Six lemmas. Now let R be an adequate ring. Among the properties of such a ring are those stated in the six lemmas below. The first four are well known, and hold in any Prüfer ring; sketches of their proofs have been included, however, for reasons of completeness.

LEMMA 1. If $f \mid ab$ and (f, a) = 1, then $f \mid b$.

PROOF. Let hf + ka = 1; then f | abk = b(1 - hf) = b - bhf and hence f | b.

LEMMA 2. An element a has an inverse $a^* \mod b$,

(1) $a \cdot a^* \equiv 1 \pmod{b},$

if and only if (a, b) = 1. Moreover, a^* , if it exists, is uniquely determined mod b.

PROOF. If $aa^* \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$, then $aa^* = 1 + bk$ and hence (a, b) = 1. Conversely, if (a, b) = 1, then h and k exist such that ha + kb = 1, and hence $ah \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$ and $a^* = h$. Finally, if $aa^* \equiv aa^{**} \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$, then $a^* \equiv a^*(aa^{**}) \equiv (aa^*)a^{**} \equiv a^{**} \pmod{b}$.

LEMMA 3. The congruences

(2) $x \equiv a_i \pmod{m_i}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \cdots, n,$

have a simultaneous solution x, provided any two m_i are relatively prime. Moreover, the solution is uniquely determined mod m, where $m = m_1 m_2 \cdots m_n$.

PROOF. Let $m = m_i M_i$. Since any two m_i are relatively prime it follows that $(m_i, M_i) = 1$. Hence, by Lemma 2, the M_i possess inverses $M_i^* \mod m_i$. It is seen at once that

(3)
$$x \equiv a_1 M_1 M_1^* + \cdots + a_n M_n M_n^* \pmod{m}$$

226

⁵ Theorem 9 in *Divisibility properties of integral functions*, Duke Math. J. vol. 6 (1940) p. 351.

is a required solution, and the uniqueness is obvious.

LEMMA 4. Let a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n not be all zero, and

$$(4) \qquad (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n) = d;$$

then there exist elements a_{ij} $(i=2, \cdots, n; j=1, \cdots, n)$ such that

(5)
$$\begin{vmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_n \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{vmatrix} = d.$$

PROOF. If all but one a_k are zero, then $d = a_k$. Choose $a_{2k} = \cdots = a_{nk} = 0$, and the unity matrix for the rest of the a_{ij} ; the resulting determinant will be d or -d, if -d, a change of one 1 into -1 will put things right. If, on the other hand, no more than n-2 of the a_k are zero, we can proceed by induction. For n = 1 the assertion is trivially correct. For n > 1 let

(6)
$$d' = (a_2, \cdots, a_n);$$

by induction we can find a_{ij} $(i = 2, \dots, n-1; j = 2, \dots, n)$ such that

(7)
$$\begin{vmatrix} a_2 & \cdots & a_n \\ a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{n-1,2} & \cdots & a_{n-1,n} \end{vmatrix} = d'.$$

Suppose now that

(8)
$$d = (a_1, d') = h \cdot a_1 + k \cdot d'$$

We can then complete our determinant as follows:

(9)
$$\begin{vmatrix} a_{1} & a_{2} & \cdots & a_{n} \\ 0 & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & a_{n-1,2} & \cdots & a_{n-1,n} \\ (-1)^{n-1}k & (-1)^{n}ha_{2}/d' \cdots & (-1)^{n}ha_{n}/d' \end{vmatrix} = h \cdot a_{1} + k \cdot d' = d.$$

LEMMA 5. RP(a, b) is uniquely determined except for a unit factor. PROOF. Let

(10)
$$a = a_1 \cdot a_2 = a' \cdot a'',$$

1943]

OLAF HELMER

where a_1 and a' are both largest factors of a that are relatively prime to b. We show first that $(a_2, a') = 1$. Suppose that $(a_2, a') = d \neq 1$; then $d | a_2$, and by definition of a_1 , $(d, b) \neq 1$; but d | a' implies (d, b) | (a', b), so that $(a', b) \neq 1$, which is impossible by definition of a'. Hence $(a_2, a') = 1$, and we can now apply Lemma 1: since $a_2 | a'a''$, it follows that $a_2 | a''$. Similarly $a'' | a_2$, so that a_2 and a'' can only differ by a unit factor.

LEMMA 6. Let RP(a, b) = r, and let $d \mid a$ with (d, r) = 1; then RP(d, b) = 1.

PROOF. Let $a = r \cdot s$. By assumption and Lemma 1, d | s. Hence, by definition of r and s, $(\delta, b) \neq 1$ for every non-unit factor δ of d, and consequently RP(d, b) = 1.

5. A preparatory theorem. The main result of this paper will be a consequence of the following theorem.

THEOREM 1. Let

(11)
$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \cdots & a_{1k} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \cdots & a_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} \cdots & a_{nk} \end{pmatrix}$$

be a matrix with coefficients in an adequate ring R, let

$$(12) 1 < n = \operatorname{rank} M \leq k$$

and

(13)
$$(a_{11}, a_{12}, \cdots, a_{1k}, a_{21}, \cdots, a_{nk}) = d;$$

then there exist $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_{n-1}$ in R such that

$$(14) \qquad (A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_k) = d,$$

where

(15)
$$A_i = a_{1i}t_1 + a_{2i}t_2 + \cdots + a_{n-1,i}t_{n-1} + a_{ni}, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, k.$$

PROOF. (a) Suppose the theorem has been proved for d=1. Then the general case results as follows. Let

(16)
$$N = (1/d) \cdot M;$$

the coefficients

$$b_{ij} = a_{ij}/d$$

228

of the matrix N are then relatively prime, and the theorem is considered proved for this case; there are, therefore, quantities $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_{n-1}$ in R such that

(18)
$$(B_1, B_2, \cdots, B_k) = 1,$$

where

(19)
$$B_i = b_{1i}t_1 + b_{2i}t_2 + \cdots + b_{n-1,i}t_{n-1} + b_{ni} = A_i/d.$$

Hence

(20)
$$(A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_k) = d \cdot (B_1, B_2, \cdots, B_k) = d.$$

(b) For d = 1 the proof will be given by induction with respect to *n*. First, let n = 2. We have to find *t* so that the

(21)
$$A_i = a_{1i}t + a_{2i}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \cdots, k,$$

have the greatest common factor 1. Note that any common factor of A_i and A_j is also a factor of

(22)
$$D_{ij} = \begin{vmatrix} a_{1i} & a_{1j} \\ a_{2i} & a_{2j} \end{vmatrix} = a_{1i}A_j - a_{1j}A_i.$$

If, therefore, we set

(23)
$$D = (D_{12}, D_{13}, D_{23}, D_{14}, \cdots, D_{k-1,k}),$$

then, however t be chosen,

 $(24) \qquad (A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_k) \mid D.$

On account of (12), not all D_{ij} are zero; hence $D \neq 0$, and we may define: $(D_i - RP(D_{ij}))$

We then have, obviously,

$$(26) (D_i, D_j) = 1, i \neq j,$$

because a largest relatively prime factor of a quantity is always prime to the supplementary factor. Consequently, by Lemma 3, there exists a simultaneous solution t of the congruences OLAF HELMER

(27)
$$t \equiv a_{1i}^* (1 - a_{2i}) \pmod{D_i}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \cdots, k,$$

where a_{1i}^* is an inverse of $a_{1i} \mod D_i$:

(28)
$$a_{1i}^* \cdot a_{1i} \equiv 1 \pmod{D_i}$$

(the existence of a_{1t}^* being guaranteed by Lemma 2, since $(a_{1i}, D_i) = 1$ by virtue of (25)). With t chosen thus, we shall now show that

(29)
$$(A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_k) = 1.$$

From (21) and (27) we have

(30)
$$A_i = a_{1i}t + a_{2i} \equiv 1 \pmod{D_i}.$$

Suppose, now, that the A_i have some non-unit factor c in common; then, by (24), it would follow that c|D. This, together with (30), implies that

(31)
$$(c, D_i) = 1;$$

this means that c is a factor of D that is prime to all D_i , and we can apply Lemma 6, with the result that

(32)
$$RP(c, a_{1i}) = 1, \qquad i = 1, 2, \cdots, k.$$

But then, as c was not supposed to be a unit, none of its non-unit factors is prime to any a_{1i} . In particular,

(33)
$$\begin{cases} (c, a_{11}) = c_1 \neq 1, \\ (c_1, a_{12}) = c_2 \neq 1, \\ \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \\ (c_{k-1}, a_{1k}) = c_k \neq 1; \end{cases}$$

the a_{1i} thus have a common non-unit factor c_k , and, since $c_k | A_i$, it follows that c_k is also a factor of $A_i - a_{1i}t = a_{2i}$. But this is incompatible with the assumption that d = 1.

(c) Suppose now that the theorem has been proved for values less than n; we then have to show that it holds for n provided d = 1. Let

(34)
$$d_1 = (a_{21}, a_{22}, \cdots, a_{2k}, a_{31}, \cdots, a_{nk});$$

applying induction, we can find $t_2, t_3, \cdots, t_{n-1}$ so that

$$(35) (B_1, B_2, \cdots, B_k) = d_1$$

where

$$(36) \quad B_i = a_{2i}t_2 + a_{3i}t_3 + \cdots + a_{n-1,i}t_{n-1} + a_{ni}, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, k,$$

230

and it remains to determine t_1 suitably. We have

$$(37) A_i = a_{1i}t_1 + B_i$$

with

(38)
$$(a_{11}, B_1, a_{12}, B_2, \cdots, a_{1k}, B_k) = (a_{11}, a_{12}, \cdots, a_{1k}, d_1) \\ = (a_{11}, a_{12}, \cdots, a_{1k}, a_{21}, \cdots, a_{nk}) = 1.$$

Therefore, using induction with n = 2, we can find t_1 such that

(39)
$$(A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_k) = 1,$$

and the proof of Theorem 1 is completed.

6. The case of a square matrix with nonzero determinant. Before taking up the general case of the Elementary Divisor Theorem we shall first treat the case of a nonsingular matrix.

THEOREM 2. Let R be an adequate ring, M a square matrix with coefficients in R, and $|M| \neq 0$. Then there exist two matrices X and Y with coefficients in R, such that

$$(40) |X| = |Y| = 1$$

and

(41)
$$XMY = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & e_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & e_n \end{pmatrix},$$

where the e_i are the elementary divisors of M.

PROOF. For n = 1 the theorem is trivially true. For n > 1 assume the theorem proved for all values less than n. It is sufficient to consider the case where e_1 (which is the greatest common factor of the coefficients of M) equals 1; for otherwise we first deal with the matrix M/e_1 , whose elementary divisors are $1, e_2/e_1, \dots, e_n/e_1$; hence if

(42)
$$X \frac{M}{e_1} Y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & e_2/e_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & e_n/e_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

we have at once

(43)
$$XMY = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & e_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & e_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let now $e_1 = 1$ and $M = (a_{ij})$. Applying Theorem 1, with k = n and d = 1, we can find t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n-1} in R such that

(44)
$$(A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_n) = 1,$$

where

(45)
$$A_i = a_{1i}t_1 + a_{2i}t_2 + \cdots + a_{n-1,i}t_{n-1} + a_{ni}, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, n.$$

Applying Lemma 4 to these A_i , a square matrix A with coefficients in R can be found whose first row is A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n and whose determinant is 1. If h_i is the minor belonging to A_i , we have

(46)
$$h_1A_1 + h_2A_2 + \cdots + h_nA_n = 1.$$

As |A| = 1, we can form, in *R*, the inverse matrix

(47)
$$Q = A^{-1}$$
.

Note that the first column of Q is h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n . If, now, we set

(48)
$$q_i = h_1 a_{i1} + h_2 a_{i2} + \cdots + h_n a_{in}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \cdots, n,$$

we can define

$$(49) P = P_1 \cdot P_2,$$

where

(50)
$$P_{1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \cdots & 0 \\ q_{1} & 0 \cdots & -1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ q_{n-1} & -1 \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad P_{2} = \begin{pmatrix} t_{1} \cdots & t_{n-1} & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then

(51)
$$|P_1| = |P_2| = (-1)^{n(n-1)/2}$$

so that

$$(52) | P | = | P_1 | \cdot | P_2 | = 1.$$

Multiplying out, we obtain

(53)
$$P = \begin{pmatrix} t_1 & t_2 & \cdots & t_{n-1} & 1 \\ q_1 t_1 - 1 & q_1 t_2 & \cdots & q_1 t_{n-1} & q_1 \\ q_2 t_1 & q_2 t_2 - 1 & \cdots & q_2 t_{n-1} & q_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ q_{n-1} t_1 & q_{n-1} t_2 & \cdots & q_{n-1} t_{n-1} - 1 & q_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Notice that we also have

$$(54) |Q| = 1.$$

We now multiply M from the left by P and from the right by Q:

$$PMQ = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 & \cdots & A_n \\ q_1A_1 - a_{11} & q_1A_2 - a_{12} & \cdots & q_1A_n - a_{1n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ q_{n-1}A_1 - a_{n-1,1} & q_{n-1}A_2 - a_{n-1,2} \cdots & q_{n-1}A_n - a_{n-1,n} \end{pmatrix}$$
(55)
$$\cdot \begin{pmatrix} h_1 & * \cdots & * \\ h_2 & * \cdots & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_n & * & \vdots & * \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & * & \cdots & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & * & \cdots & * \end{pmatrix}$$

where the zeros in the first row of this matrix arise from multiplying the row A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n by a row of minors of A not belonging to that row, while the zero in the (i+1)st place of the first column results as follows:

$$(q_iA_1 - a_{i1})h_1 + \cdots + (q_iA_n - a_{in})h_n$$

(56)
$$= q_i(A_1h_1 + \cdots + A_nh_n) - (a_{i1}h_1 + \cdots + a_{in}h_n)$$
$$= q_i \cdot 1 - q_i = 0.$$

We can now apply induction to the matrix M_1 of order n-1 that appears in the lower right corner of PMQ. Let

(57)
$$X_1 M_1 Y_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e_1' & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & e_2' & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & e_{n-1}' \end{pmatrix}$$

where $|X_1| = |Y_1| = 1$ and where $e'_1, e'_2, \dots, e'_{n-1}$ are the elementary divisors of M_1 . Then, if we set

1943]

OLAF HELMER

(58)
$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & & \\ \vdots & & \\ 0 & & \end{pmatrix} \cdot P, \quad Y = Q \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & & \\ \vdots & & \\ 0 & & \end{pmatrix},$$

we obtain immediately

(59)
$$XMY = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & e'_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e'_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & e'_{r-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

and all that remains to be shown is that

(60)
$$e_i = e'_{i-1}, \qquad i = 2, 3, \cdots, n.$$

Now, clearly, the determinant divisors of XMY are 1, e'_1, e'_1, e'_2, \cdots , $e'_1e'_2, \cdots, e'_1e'_2, \cdots, e'_{n-1}$; hence its elementary divisors are 1, $e'_1, e'_2, \cdots, e'_{n-1}$, and the rest follows from the fact that "equivalent" matrices (here M and XMY) have the same elementary divisors (proof literally as for the ring of rational integers).

7. The general case. We can now prove the general Elementary Divisor Theorem:

THEOREM 3. Let R be an adequate ring, and M a matrix of type (m, n) with coefficients in R. Then there exist two matrices X and Y with coefficients in R and of types (m, m) and (n, n) respectively, such that

$$(61) |X| = |Y| = 1$$

and

(62)
$$XMY = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & e_2 & & \ddots \\ & \ddots & & \ddots \\ & & e_r & & \\ & & & 0 & \\ & & & 0 & \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ 0 & \cdot & & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_r are the elementary divisors of M.

234

PROOF. (a) Let $M = (a_{ij})$, of rank r. If r = 0, we can set $X = E_m$ and $Y = E_n$. Otherwise not all a_{ij} are zero, and we have

(63)
$$(a_{11}, a_{12}, \cdots, a_{1n}, a_{21}, \cdots, a_{mn}) = d \neq 0.$$

The case where m = n = r is covered by Theorem 2. If r < m or r < n or both, it will be shown below that M can be transformed unitarily into a matrix of the form

$$(64) \qquad \qquad \begin{pmatrix} N & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where N is of type (r, r) (and hence $|N| \neq 0$). Once this has been done, Theorem 2 can be applied to N; and if, say, X_1 and Y_1 take N into the desired normal form, then

(65)
$$X = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & E_{m-r} \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y = \begin{pmatrix} X_2 & 0 \\ 0 & E_{n-r} \end{pmatrix}$$

will do the same for M.

1943]

(b) Let r < m. The *m* rows of *M* must then be linearly dependent in *R*:

(66)
$$j_1a_{1i} + j_2a_{2i} + \cdots + j_ma_{mi} = 0, \qquad i = 1, 2, \cdots, n,$$

where the j_i may be assumed to be relatively prime. By Lemma 4 we can find elements j_{ik} in R $(i = 1, \dots, m-1; k = 1, \dots, m)$ such that the matrix

(67)
$$J = \begin{pmatrix} j_{11} & j_{12} \cdots & j_{1m} \\ & \ddots & \ddots \\ j_{m-1,1} & \ddots & \ddots & j_{m-1,m} \\ j_1 & j_2 & \cdots & j_m \end{pmatrix}$$

has determinant 1; and if we multiply M on the left by J, we obtain a matrix whose last row consists of zeros.

Clearly, if r < n, an analogous multiplication of M on the right by a unitary matrix will generate a last column of zeros.

This procedure can be applied repeatedly. If

(68)
$$X_1 M X_2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where M_1 is of type (m_1, n_1) with $r < m_1$ or $r < n_1$, a further row or column of M_1 (and hence of M) can be turned into zeros. This process will break off only when the form

 $\binom{N \ 0}{0 \ 0}$

(69)

236

with N of type (r, r) has been reached. This, according to (a), completes the proof.

College of the City of New York

THE GEOMETRY OF VELOCITY SYSTEMS

EDWARD KASNER AND JOHN DECICCO

1. Introduction. In connection with the investigation of the differential geometric properties of positional fields of force, Kasner introduced certain important systems of curves which he termed *velocity systems.*¹ In this paper, we propose to present some of the old and many new geometric properties of any velocity system.

Since velocity systems serve to characterize the conformal group, many of our results are logically theorems of conformal geometry. This may be contrasted with the study of all the trajectories of positional fields of force, which is essentially differential projective geometry.

2. Velocity systems. We shall find it most convenient for our study to use the minimal coordinates u = x + iy, v = x - iy, p = dv/du, $q = d^2v/du^2$, where, of course, (x, y) are the cartesian coordinates of the plane.

In the plane, consider a particle of unit mass moving in any field of force whose components parallel to the *u*-axis and the *v*-axis are d(u, v) and c(u, v). The equations of motion are

(1)
$$\frac{d^2u}{dt^2} = d(u, v), \qquad \frac{d^2v}{dt^2} = c(u, v),$$

where t is the time. Now if r is the radius of curvature along a trajectory, we have

(2) $\omega^2 = rN,$

Presented to the Society, February 22, 1941, under the title Conformal geometry of velocity systems; received by the editors June 23, 1942.

¹ Kasner, Differential-geometric aspects of dynamics, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications vol. 3 (1912); Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. vols. 9-10 (1908-1909).