

NOTE ON M -GROUPOIDS

NANCY GRAHAM

In a recent paper of Tamura, Merkel, and Latimer [2], the following question was raised:

Suppose S is a groupoid (cf. [1]) which satisfies:

- (1) There is at least one left identity in S .
- (2) If y or z is a left identity of S , then $x(yz) = (xy)z$ for all $x \in S$.
- (3) For all $a, b \in S$ there exists $x \in S$ such that $ax = b$.

Then does S satisfy:

- (3') For any $x \in S$ there is a unique left identity e (which may depend on x) such that $xe = x$?

A groupoid which satisfies (1), (2), and (3') is defined in [2] to be an M -groupoid. It is the purpose of this note to present an example of a groupoid satisfying (1), (2), and (3), which is not an M -groupoid. It will be shown, however, that every finite groupoid satisfying (1), (2), and (3) is an M -groupoid.

Let A be a denumerable set. For simplicity, denote its elements by $1, 2, 3, \dots$. Let \cdot be a binary operation on A which satisfies the following Cayley table:

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | . | . | . | m | . | . | . |
|-----|-----|---|---|----------|---|---|---|----------|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | . | . | . | m | . | . | . |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | a_{24} | . | . | . | a_{2m} | . | . | . |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | a_{34} | . | . | . | a_{3m} | . | . | . |
| 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | a_{44} | . | . | . | a_{4m} | . | . | . |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| n | n | 2 | 3 | a_{n4} | . | . | . | a_{nm} | . | . | . |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |

where the a_{ij} are arbitrary positive integers subject only to the restrictions:

Received by the editors April 6, 1963.

- (a) $a_{ij} \neq 2$ for all $i > 1, j > 3$.
- (b) $a_{2j} = a_{3j}$ for all $j > 3$.
- (c) For each $i > 1, \{a_{ij} : j > 3\} = A$.

That is, the operation \cdot is to satisfy the following conditions:

- (i) $1 \cdot x = x$ for all $x \in A$.
- (ii) $x \cdot 1 = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \neq 2, \\ 3 & \text{if } x = 2. \end{cases}$
- (iii) $x \cdot y = 2$ if and only if $y = 2$.
- (iv) $x \cdot 3 = 3$ for all $x \in A$.
- (v) $2 \cdot x = 3 \cdot x$ for all $x \in A$.
- (vi) For all $x \in A, \{x \cdot y : y \in A\} = A$.

(In particular, if we let $a_{ii} = 1$ for all $i > 1$, and $a_{ij} = j - 1$ for all $i > 1, j > 4$, then the binary operation defined by the Cayley table above satisfies (i)–(vi). Thus these conditions are consistent.)

Then $S = \langle A, \cdot \rangle$ is a groupoid which satisfies conditions (1) and (3), by (i) and (vi). To see that S satisfies (2), consider the two cases:

(α) Suppose $y = 1$ in (2). If $x \neq 2$ then $(x \cdot 1) \cdot z = x \cdot z = x \cdot (1 \cdot z)$, by (ii) and (i). If $x = 2$ then $(x \cdot 1) \cdot z = (2 \cdot 1) \cdot z = 3 \cdot z = 2 \cdot z = 2 \cdot (1 \cdot z) = x \cdot (1 \cdot z)$, by (ii), (v), and (i). Thus we have $(x \cdot 1) \cdot z = x \cdot (1 \cdot z)$ for all $x, z \in S$.

(β) Suppose $z = 1$ in (2). If $y \neq 2$ then $x \cdot y \neq 2$ and $(x \cdot y) \cdot 1 = x \cdot y = x \cdot (y \cdot 1)$, by (iii) and (ii). If $y = 2$ then $x \cdot y = 2$ and $(x \cdot y) \cdot 1 = 2 \cdot 1 = 3 = x \cdot 3 = x \cdot (2 \cdot 1) = x \cdot (y \cdot 1)$, by (iii), (ii), and (iv). Thus we have $(x \cdot y) \cdot 1 = x \cdot (y \cdot 1)$ for all $x, y \in S$.

Since $x \neq 1$ implies $x \cdot 1 \neq 1$ by (ii), then 1 is the only left identity of S . Hence S satisfies (2), by (α) and (β).

However, S is not an M -groupoid because (3') is not satisfied for $x = 2$.

Suppose (3) is replaced by the stronger condition:

(3'') For all $a, b \in S$ there exists a unique $x \in S$ such that $ax = b$. Then it is easy to prove the following

THEOREM. *If a groupoid S satisfies (1), (2) and (3'') then S is an M -groupoid.*

PROOF. Let $a \in S$. By (3'') there is a unique $c \in S$ such that $ac = a$. To show that S is an M -groupoid it suffices, by (3'), to show that c is a left identity of S . By (1) and (2), there exists a left identity e of S such that $a(ce) = (ac)e = ae$, and hence $ce = e$, by (3''). Therefore, for any $x \in S$, we have $cx = c(ex) = (ce)x = ex = x$, and the proof is completed.

Since every finite groupoid satisfying (3) also satisfies (3''), we have the immediate

COROLLARY. *If S is a finite groupoid which satisfies (1), (2) and (3), then S is an M -groupoid.*

REFERENCES

1. A. H. Clifford and G. B. Preston, *The algebraic theory of semigroups*, Vol. 1, Math. Surveys No. 7, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., 1961.
2. T. Tamura, R. B. Merkel and J. F. Latimer, *The direct product of right singular semigroups and certain groupoids*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (1963), 118-123.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

THE INDEX PROBLEM FOR INFINITE SYMMETRIC GROUPS

EDWARD D. GAUGHAN

Let M be an infinite set with cardinal X , $S(X, Y) = \{\sigma: \sigma \text{ is a permutation on } M \text{ such that } |\text{spt } \sigma| < Y\}$, where $\text{spt } \sigma = \{m \in M: \sigma(m) \neq m\}$. If X is a cardinal, denote its successor by X^* . Onofri [2] proved that $S(d, d^*)$ has no proper subgroups of finite index and $S(d, d)$ has precisely one, the alternating group $A(d)$. These results have been extended by Higman [1] and Scott [3]. Higman has shown that $S(X, d)$ has only one proper subgroup of index less than X , the alternating group $A(X)$, and $A(X)$ has no proper subgroups of index less than X . If Z is a cardinal such that $Z^Z < X$, Scott proved that $S(X, Y)$ for $Y > d$ has no subgroups of index less than or equal Z .

In this paper, the following generalization of these results is proven.

THEOREM. *If $d < Y \leq X^*$, $S(X, Y)$ has no proper subgroups of index less than X .*

LEMMA 1. *If $d \leq Z < Y$, $[S(X, Y): H] < X$, then H contains an element σ such that $|\text{spt } \sigma| = Z$ and $|M \setminus \text{spt } \sigma| = X$.*

PROOF. $H \cap S(X, Z^*)$ has index less than X in $S(X, Z^*)$ for any $Z < Y$. Since the index of $S(X, Z)$ in $S(X, Z^*)$ is greater than or equal X , there is $\sigma \in H$ such that $|\text{spt } \sigma| = Z$. If $Z < X$, then $|M \setminus \text{spt } \sigma| = X$. If $Z = X$, there are disjoint sets M_1 and M_2 such that $M = M_1 \cup M_2$ and $|M_1| = |M_2| = X$. Let $G = \{\sigma: \text{spt } \sigma \subset M_1\}$. Then $H \cap G$ has index less than X in G , hence there is $\sigma \in H \cap G$ such that $|\text{spt } \sigma| = X$ and since $\text{spt } \sigma \subset M_1$, $|M \setminus \text{spt } \sigma| = X$.

Presented to the Society, April 27, 1963; received by the editors March 12, 1963.