

Examples of associative algebras for which the T -space of central polynomials is not finitely based

C. Bekh-Ochir and S. A. Rankin

November 21, 2018

Abstract

In 1988 (see [7]), S. V. Okhitin proved that for any field k of characteristic zero, the T -space $CP(M_2(k))$ is finitely based, and he raised the question as to whether $CP(A)$ is finitely based for every (unitary) associative algebra A for which $0 \neq T(A) \subsetneq CP(A)$. V. V. Shchigolev (see [9], 2001) showed that for any field of characteristic zero, every T -space of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ is finitely based, and it follows from this that every T -space of $k_1\langle X \rangle$ is also finitely based. This more than answers Okhitin's question (in the affirmative) for fields of characteristic zero.

For a field of characteristic 2, the infinite-dimensional Grassmann algebras, unitary and nonunitary, are commutative and thus the T -space of central polynomials of each is finitely based.

We shall show in the following that if $p > 2$ and k is an arbitrary field of characteristic p , then neither $CP(G_0)$ nor $CP(G)$ is finitely based, thus providing a negative answer to Okhitin's question.

1 Introduction and preliminaries

Let k be a field of characteristic p and let X be a countably infinite set, say $X = \{x_i \mid i \geq 0\}$. Then $k_0\langle X \rangle$ denotes the free associative k -algebra on X , while $k_1\langle X \rangle$ denotes the free unitary associative k -algebra on X .

Let A denote any associative k -algebra. For any $H \subseteq A$, $\langle H \rangle$ shall denote the linear subspace of A spanned by H . Any linear subspace of A that is invariant under every endomorphism of A is called a T -space of A , and if a T -space happens to also be an ideal of A , then it is called a T -ideal of A . For $H \subseteq A$, the smallest T -space of A that contains H shall be denoted by H^S , while the smallest T -ideal of A that contains H shall be denoted by H^T . If $V \subseteq A$ is a T -space and there exists finite $H \subseteq A$ such that $V = H^S$, then V is said to be finitely based. In this article, we shall deal only with T -spaces and T -ideals of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ and $k_1\langle X \rangle$. Occasionally, we shall consider $H \subseteq k_0\langle X \rangle \subseteq k_1\langle X \rangle$, and we may wish to have notation for both the T -space generated by H in $k_0\langle X \rangle$ and

the T -space generated by H in $k_1\langle X \rangle$ so that both could appear in the same discussion. Accordingly, we shall write H^{S_0} to denote the T -space of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ that is generated by H , and let H^S denote the T -space of $k_1\langle X \rangle$ that is generated by H . Similarly, we may use H^{T_0} to denote the T -ideal of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ that is generated by H , and H^T for the T -ideal of $k_1\langle X \rangle$ that is generated by H .

A nonzero element $f \in k_0\langle X \rangle$ is called an *identity* of A if f is in the kernel of every homomorphism from $k_0\langle X \rangle$ to A (every unitary homomorphism from $k_1\langle X \rangle$ if A is unitary). The set of all identities of A , together with 0, forms a T -ideal of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ (and of $k_1\langle X \rangle$ if A is unitary), denoted by $T(A)$. An element $f \in k_0\langle X \rangle$ is called a *central polynomial* of A if $f \notin T(A)$ and the image of f under any homomorphism from $k_0\langle X \rangle$ (unitary homomorphism from $k_1\langle X \rangle$ if A is unitary) belongs to C_A , the centre of A . The T -space of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ (or of $k_1\langle X \rangle$ if A is unitary) that is generated by the set of all central polynomials of A is denoted by $CP(A)$.

Let G denote the (countably) infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebra over k , so there exist $e_i \in G_0$, $i \geq 1$, such that for all i and j , $e_i e_j = -e_j e_i$, $e_i^2 = 0$, and $\mathcal{B} = \{e_{i_1} e_{i_2} \cdots e_{i_n} \mid n \geq 1, i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_n\}$, together with 1, forms a linear basis for G . Let E denote the set $\{e_i \mid i \geq 1\}$. The subalgebra of G with linear basis \mathcal{B} is the infinite dimensional nonunitary Grassmann algebra over k , and is denoted by G_0 .

It is well known that $T^{(3)}$, the T -ideal of $k_1\langle X \rangle$ generated by $[[x_1, x_2], x_3]$, is contained in $T(G)$. For convenience, we shall write $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ for $[[x_1, x_2], x_3]$. It is important to observe that $\{[x_1, x_2, x_3]\}^{T_0} = \{[x_1, x_2, x_3]\}^T$.

We shall also let S^2 denote the T -space of $k_1\langle X \rangle$ that is generated by $[x_1, x_2]$; that is, $S^2 = \{[x_1, x_2]\}^S$, and we point out that $\{[x_1, x_2]\}^{S_0} = \{[x_1, x_2]\}^S$.

In 1988 (see [7]), S. V. Okhitin proved that for any field k of characteristic zero, the T -space $CP(M_2(k))$ is finitely based, and he raised the question as to whether $CP(A)$ is finitely based for every (unitary) associative algebra A for which $0 \neq T(A) \subsetneq CP(A)$. Then in 2001, V. V. Shchigolev (see [9]) showed that for any field of characteristic zero, every T -space of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ is finitely based, and it follows from this that every T -space of $k_1\langle X \rangle$ is also finitely based. This more than answers Okhitin's question (in the affirmative) for fields of characteristic zero.

For a field of characteristic 2, the infinite-dimensional unitary and nonunitary Grassmann algebras are commutative and thus each has finitely based T -space of central polynomials.

We shall show in the following that if $p > 2$ and k is an arbitrary field of characteristic p , then neither $CP(G_0)$ nor $CP(G)$ is finitely based, thus providing a negative answer to Okhitin's question.

We shall make frequent reference to the following familiar facts.

Lemma 1.1. (i) $[u, vw] = [u, v]w + v[u, w]$ for all $u, v, w \in k_0\langle X \rangle$.

(ii) $[u, vw] = [u, v]w + [u, w]v + [v, [u, w]]$ for all $u, v, w \in k_0\langle X \rangle$.

(iii) $[u, \prod_{i=1}^n v_i] \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n ([u, v_i] \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n v_j) \pmod{T^{(3)}}$ for any positive integer n , and any $u, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n \in k_0\langle X \rangle$.

- (iv) $[u, v][w, x] \equiv -[u, w][v, x] \pmod{T^{(3)}}$ for all $u, v, w \in k_0\langle X \rangle$.
- (v) $[u, v][u, w] \equiv 0 \pmod{T^{(3)}}$ for all $u, v, w \in k_0\langle X \rangle$.
- (vi) $[u, v]uw \equiv [u, v]wu \pmod{T^{(3)}}$ for all $u, v, w \in k_0\langle X \rangle$.
- (vii) For any $n \geq 2$, $x_1^n x_2^n \equiv (x_1 x_2)^n + \binom{n}{2} [x_1, x_2] x_1^{n-1} x_2^{n-1} \pmod{T^{(3)}}$.

Proof. Parts (i) and (ii) are evident by direct calculation. We prove (iii) by induction on n . The result is trivial when $n = 1$, while (ii) establishes the case for $n = 2$. Suppose now that $n \geq 2$ is an integer for which the result holds, and consider $u, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n, v_{n+1} \in k_0\langle X \rangle$. Working modulo $T^{(3)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[u, \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} v_i] &\equiv [u, \prod_{i=1}^n v_i] v_{n+1} + [u, v_{n+1}] \prod_{j=1}^n v_j \quad \text{by (i)} \\
&\equiv \sum_{i=1}^n ([u, v_i] \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{n+1} v_j) + [u, v_{n+1}] \prod_{j=1}^n v_j \quad \text{by the inductive hypothesis} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} ([u, v_i] \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{n+1} v_j).
\end{aligned}$$

The result follows now by induction.

For (iv) and (v), see Latyshev [6]. (vi) follows immediately from (v), as we have $[u, v]uw - [u, v]wu = [u, v][u, w] \equiv 0 \pmod{T^{(3)}}$.

For (vii), observe that $x_1^2 x_2^2 = (x_1 x_2)^2 + x_1 [x_1, x_2] x_2 \equiv (x_1 x_2)^2 + [x_1, x_2] x_1 x_2$ modulo $T^{(3)}$. Suppose now that $n \geq 2$ is an integer such that $x_1^n x_2^n \equiv (x_1 x_2)^n + \binom{n}{2} [x_1, x_2] x_1^{n-1} x_2^{n-1}$, again modulo $T^{(3)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
x_1^{n+1} x_2^{n+1} &= x_1 (x_1^n x_2^n) x_2 \equiv x_1 (x_1 x_2)^n x_2 + \binom{n}{2} x_1 [x_1, x_2] x_1^{n-1} x_2^n \\
&\equiv (x_1 x_2)^{n+1} + [x_1, (x_1 x_2)^n] x_2 + \binom{n}{2} [x_1, x_2] x_1^n x_2^n \\
&\equiv (x_1 x_2)^{n+1} + n [x_1, x_1 x_2] (x_1 x_2)^{n-1} x_2 + \binom{n}{2} [x_1, x_2] x_1^n x_2^n \quad \text{by (iii)} \\
&\equiv (x_1 x_2)^{n+1} + \binom{n+1}{2} [x_1, x_2] x_1^n x_2^n \quad \text{by (vi)},
\end{aligned}$$

and so the result follows by induction. \square

Lemma 1.2. *Let α_1, α_2 be positive integers, and suppose that $u \in k_0\langle X \rangle$ is central modulo $T^{(3)}$. Then $[x_2, x_1^{\alpha_1+1} x_2^{\alpha_2} u] \equiv (\alpha_1 + 1) [x_2, x_1] x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} u \pmod{T^{(3)}}$ for any $x_1, x_2 \in X$.*

Proof. Working modulo $T^{(3)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[x_2, x_1^{\alpha_1+1} x_2^{\alpha_2} u] &\equiv [x_2, x_1^{\alpha_1+1} x_2^{\alpha_2}] u + [x_2, u] x_1^{\alpha_1+1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \quad \text{by Lemma 1.1 (ii)} \\
&\equiv [x_2, x_1^{\alpha_1+1} x_2^{\alpha_2}] u \quad \text{since } [x_2, u] \equiv 0 \pmod{T^{(3)}} \\
&\equiv [x_2, x_2^{\alpha_2}] x_1^{\alpha_1+1} u + [x_2, x_1^{\alpha_1+1}] x_2^{\alpha_2} u \quad \text{by Lemma 1.1 (ii)} \\
&\equiv (\alpha_1 + 1) [x_2, x_1] x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} u \quad \text{by Lemma 1.1 (iii)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

2 For $p > 2$, $CP(G_0)$ is not finitely based

We assume from this point on that $p > 2$.

Definition 2.1. Let SS denote the set of all elements of the form

- (i) $\prod_{r=1}^t x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}$, or
- (ii) $\prod_{r=1}^s [x_{j_{2r-1}}, x_{2r}] x_{j_{2r-1}}^{\beta_{2r-1}} x_{j_{2r}}^{\beta_{2r}}$, or
- (iii) $(\prod_{r=1}^t x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}) \prod_{r=1}^s [x_{j_{2r-1}}, x_{2r}] x_{j_{2r-1}}^{\beta_{2r-1}} x_{j_{2r}}^{\beta_{2r}}$,

where $\{i_1, \dots, i_r\} \cap \{j_1, \dots, j_{2s}\} = \emptyset$, $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{2s}$, $\beta_i \geq 0$ for all i , $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_t$, and $\alpha_i \geq 1$ for all i .

Let $u \in SS$. If u is of the form (i), then the beginning of u , $\text{beg}(u)$, is $\prod_{r=1}^t x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}$, the end of u , $\text{end}(u)$, is empty, the length of the beginning of u , $\text{lbg}(u)$, is equal to t and the length of the end of u , $\text{lend}(u)$, is 0. If u is of the form (ii), then we say that $\text{beg}(u)$, the beginning of u , is empty, $\text{end}(u)$, the end of u , is $\prod_{r=1}^s [x_{j_{2r-1}}, x_{2r}] x_{j_{2r-1}}^{\beta_{2r-1}} x_{j_{2r}}^{\beta_{2r}}$, and $\text{lbg}(u) = 0$ and $\text{lend}(u) = s$. If u is of the form (iii), then we say that $\text{beg}(u)$, the beginning of u , is $\prod_{r=1}^t x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}$, $\text{end}(u)$, the end of u , is $\prod_{r=1}^s [x_{j_{2r-1}}, x_{2r}] x_{j_{2r-1}}^{\beta_{2r-1}} x_{j_{2r}}^{\beta_{2r}}$, and $\text{lbg}(u) = t$ and $\text{lend}(u) = s$.

Finally, let

$$\begin{aligned}
BSS = \{ u \in SS \mid &\text{for each } i, \text{ deg}_{x_i}(u) < p \text{ if } x_i \text{ appears in } \text{beg}(u) \\
&\text{or } \text{deg}_{x_i}(u) \leq p \text{ if } x_i \text{ appears in } \text{end}(u) \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.1 (Theorem 3 of [8]). $T(G_0) = \{x_1^p\}^{T_0} + T^{(3)}$.

Definition 2.2. For $u, v \in k_1\langle X \rangle$, let $\kappa(u, v) = [u, v] u^{p-1} v^{p-1}$. Then for each $m \geq 1$, let $w_m = \prod_{r=1}^m \kappa(x_{2r-1}, x_{2r})$.

Theorem 2.1 (Theorem 1.3 of [1]). For k any field of characteristic $p > 2$, $CP(G_0) = S^2 + \{w_m \mid m \geq 1\}^S + T(G_0)$.

Lemma 2.2. $\{u + T(G_0) \mid u \in BSS\}$ is a linear basis for $k_0\langle X \rangle / T(G_0)$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.10 of [8] (or Lemma 2.4 of [1]), $\{u + T(G_0) \mid u \in BSS\}$ spans $k_0\langle X \rangle / T(G_0)$, and Theorem 3 of Siderov [8] implies that $\langle BSS \rangle \cap T(G_0) = \{0\}$. □

Definition 2.3. *Let*

$$SPSS = \{ u \in BSS \mid \text{there is } x \in X \text{ in } \text{end}(u) \text{ such that } \deg_x(u) < p \}.$$

Note that as $SPSS \subseteq BSS$, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $\{ u + T(G_0) \mid u \in SPSS \}$ is linearly independent in $k_0\langle X \rangle / T(G_0)$.

Lemma 2.3. $S^2 + T(G_0) \subseteq \langle SPSS \rangle + T(G_0)$.

Proof. It suffices to prove that for any $u, v \in k_0\langle X \rangle$, $[u, v] \in \langle SPSS \rangle + T(G_0)$. By Lemma 4.1 of [4] (we note that while the results of [4] were formulated for the case of characteristic zero, the proof of Lemma 4.1 is valid in general), for any $u, v \in k_0\langle X \rangle$, $[u, v]$ can be written, modulo $T^{(3)}$, as a sum of terms of the form $[u_i, x_i]$, where u_i is a monomial in $k_0\langle X \rangle$ and $x_i \in X$. Now by Lemma 2.10 of [8], modulo $T^{(3)}$, each monomial of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ can be written as a linear combination of elements of BSS , so it suffices to prove that modulo $T(G_0)$, for each $v \in BSS$ and $x \in X$, $[v, x]$ can be written as a linear combination of elements from $SPSS$. Let $v \in BSS$ and $x \in X$. If $\text{beg}(v)$ is empty, Then $[v, x] \in T^{(3)}$ and thus $[v, x]$ is zero modulo $T(G_0)$. Suppose now that $\text{beg}(v)$ is not empty, so $v = \prod_{r=1}^t x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r} \prod_{i=1}^s [x_{j_{2i-1}}, x_{j_{2i}}] x_{j_{2i-1}}^{\beta_{2i-1}} x_{j_{2i}}^{\beta_{2i}} \in BSS$. By Lemma 1.1 (iii) and (vi), $[v, x]$ can be written as a linear combination of terms each of the form $d_j = \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ r \neq j}}^t x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r} \right) x_{i_j}^{\alpha_j - 1} [x_{i_j}, x] \prod_{i=1}^s [x_{j_{2i-1}}, x_{j_{2i}}] x_{j_{2i-1}}^{\beta_{2i-1}} x_{j_{2i}}^{\beta_{2i}}$. By Lemma 1.1 (iv) and (v), for each j , modulo $T(G_0)$, d_j is congruent either to 0 or (up to sign) to an element l_j of $SPSS$ since x_{i_j} has degree at most $p-1$ in d_j and appears in $\text{end}(d_j)$, hence in $\text{end}(l_j)$. \square

Corollary 2.1. *For each $m \geq 1$, $w_m \notin S^2 + T(G_0)$.*

Proof. Let $m \geq 1$. Then $w_m \in BSS$, and $w_m \notin SPSS$, so by Lemma 2.2, $\{ w_m \} \cup SPSS$ is linearly independent modulo $T(G_0)$. Thus $w_m \notin \langle SPSS \rangle + T(G_0)$, hence by Lemma 2.3, $w_m \notin S^2 + T(G_0)$. \square

In applications of the following result, it will be important to recall that S^2 is the T -space generated by $[x_1, x_2]$ in either $k_1\langle X \rangle$ or $k_0\langle X \rangle$, and $T^{(3)}$ is the T -ideal generated by $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ in either $k_1\langle X \rangle$ or $k_0\langle X \rangle$.

Lemma 2.4. *For any $u, v, w \in k_1\langle X \rangle$, modulo $T^{(3)}$, we have*

$$\kappa(u, v+w) \equiv \kappa(u, v) + \kappa(u, w) + \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} (i+1)^{-1} \binom{p-1}{i} [u, v^{i+1} w^{p-(i+1)} u^{p-1}].$$

Proof. Recall that $\kappa(u, v+w) = [u, v+w] u^{p-1} (v+w)^{p-1}$. To begin with, we shall prove that

$$\begin{aligned} [u, v+w](v+w)^{p-1} &\equiv [u, v] v^{p-1} + [u, w] w^{p-1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} (i+1)^{-1} \binom{p-1}{i} [u, v^{i+1} w^{p-(i+1)}] \pmod{T^{(3)}}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
[u, v + w](v + w)^{p-1} &= [u, v](v + w)^{p-1} + [u, w](v + w)^{p-1} \\
&\stackrel{T^{(3)}}{\equiv} [u, v]v^{p-1} + [u, v] \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} \binom{p-1}{i} v^i w^{p-1-i} \\
&\quad + [u, w]w^{p-1} + [u, w] \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \binom{p-1}{i} v^i w^{p-1-i}
\end{aligned}$$

so it suffices to show that $[u, v] \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} \binom{p-1}{i} v^i w^{p-1-i} + [u, w] \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \binom{p-1}{i} v^i w^{p-1-i}$ is congruent to $\sum_{i=0}^{p-2} (i+1)^{-1} \binom{p-1}{i} [u, v^{i+1} w^{p-(i+1)}]$ modulo $T^{(3)}$. By Lemma 1.2, we have

$$[u, v] \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} \binom{p-1}{i} v^i w^{p-1-i} \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} (i+1)^{-1} [u, v^{i+1}] \binom{p-1}{i} w^{p-1-i} \pmod{T^{(3)}},$$

and by Lemma 1.1 (ii), $\sum_{i=0}^{p-2} (i+1)^{-1} [u, v^{i+1}] \binom{p-1}{i} w^{p-1-i}$ is congruent modulo $T^{(3)}$ to

$$\sum_{i=0}^{p-2} (i+1)^{-1} [u, v^{i+1} w^{p-1-i}] \binom{p-1}{i} - \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} (i+1)^{-1} [u, w^{p-1-i}] \binom{p-1}{i} v^{i+1}.$$

It is sufficient therefore to prove that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{p-2} (i+1)^{-1} [u, w^{p-1-i}] \binom{p-1}{i} v^{i+1} \equiv [u, w] \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \binom{p-1}{i} v^i w^{p-1-i} \pmod{T^{(3)}}.$$

But by Lemma 1.2, together with a change of variable, we have

$$[u, w] \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \binom{p-1}{i} v^i w^{p-1-i} \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} \binom{p-1}{i+1} (p-i-1)^{-1} [u, w^{p-i-1}] v^{i+1}.$$

Since $p-i-1 = -(i+1)$ and for each i with $0 \leq i \leq p-2$, $0 = \binom{p}{i+1} = \binom{p-1}{i} + \binom{p-1}{i+1}$, and thus $\binom{p-1}{i+1} = -\binom{p-1}{i}$, the result follows.

To complete the proof, observe that by Lemma 1.1 (ii), for each i ,

$$[u, v^{i+1} w^{p-(i+1)}] u^{p-1} \equiv [u, v^{i+1} w^{p-(i+1)}] u^{p-1} \pmod{T^{(3)}}.$$

□

The following additivity result is fundamental for this work.

Corollary 2.2. *For any $m \geq 1$, let $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{2m}, v \in k_1 \langle X \rangle$. Then modulo $S^2 + T^{(3)}$, for any i with $1 \leq i \leq 2m$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
w_m(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i + v, \dots, u_{2m}) &\equiv w_m(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i, \dots, u_{2m}) \\
&\quad + w_m(u_1, u_2, \dots, v, \dots, u_{2m}).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. First we note that for any $u, v \in k_1\langle X \rangle$, $\kappa(u, v)$ is central modulo $T^{(3)}$. Moreover, $\kappa(v, u) \equiv -\kappa(u, v) \pmod{T^{(3)}}$, so it suffices to prove the result for even i . Thus we shall consider $1 \leq i \leq m$, and let $\gamma = \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^m \kappa(u_{2j-1}, u_{2j})$.

Then γ is central modulo $T^{(3)}$, and so

$$w_m(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{2i} + v, \dots, u_{2m}) \equiv \kappa(u_{2i-1}, u_{2i} + v)\gamma \pmod{T^{(3)}}.$$

By Lemma 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(u_{2i-1}, u_{2i} + v) &\equiv \kappa(u_{2i-1}, u_{2i}) + \kappa(u_{2i-1}, v) \\ &\quad + \sum_{r=0}^{p-2} (r+1)^{-1} \binom{p-1}{r} [u_{2i-1}, u_{2i}^{r+1} v^{p-(r+1)} u_{2i-1}^{p-1}] \pmod{T^{(3)}}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus $w_m(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{2i} + v, \dots, u_{2m}) \equiv \kappa(u_{2i-1}, u_{2i})\gamma + \kappa(u_{2i-1}, v)\gamma + \sum_{r=0}^{p-2} (r+1)^{-1} \binom{p-1}{r} [u_{2i-1}, u_{2i}^{r+1} v^{p-(r+1)} u_{2i-1}^{p-1}]\gamma \pmod{T^{(3)}}$. Finally, by Lemma 1.1 (ii) and the fact that γ is central modulo $T^{(3)}$, we have for each r that $[u_{2i-1}, u_{2i}^{r+1} v^{p-(r+1)} u_{2i-1}^{p-1}]\gamma \equiv [u_{2i-1}, u_{2i}^{r+1} v^{p-(r+1)} u_{2i-1}^{p-1}]\gamma \pmod{T^{(3)}}$. It follows now that $\sum_{r=0}^{p-2} (r+1)^{-1} \binom{p-1}{r} [u_{2i-1}, u_{2i}^{r+1} v^{p-(r+1)} u_{2i-1}^{p-1}]\gamma \in S^2 + T^{(3)}$, as required. \square

Thus for any $m \geq 1$, modulo $S^2 + T^{(3)}$, w_m is additive in each variable x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2m} .

Lemma 2.5. *Let $u, v, w \in k_1\langle X \rangle$. Then*

$$\kappa(u, vw) \equiv v^p \kappa(u, w) + w^p \kappa(u, v) \pmod{T^{(3)}}.$$

In particular, if $u, v \in k_0\langle X \rangle$ and $\alpha \in k$, then $\kappa(u, \alpha v) = \alpha^p \kappa(u, v)$.

Proof. By Lemma 1.1 (ii), $[u, v]w \equiv [u, v]w + [u, w]v \pmod{T^{(3)}}$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(u, vw) &= [u, vw]u^{p-1}(vw)^{p-1} \\ &\equiv [u, v]wu^{p-1}(vw)^{p-1} + [u, w]vu^{p-1}(vw)^{p-1} \pmod{T^{(3)}} \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1.1 (vi), in any product expression with $[u, v]$ and u as factors, u commutes within the product expression, modulo $T^{(3)}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} [u, v]wu^{p-1}(vw)^{p-1} &\equiv [u, v]wu^{p-1}v^{p-1}w^{p-1} \equiv [u, v]u^{p-1}v^{p-1}w^p \\ &= \kappa(u, v)w^p \pmod{T^{(3)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\kappa(u, v)$ is central modulo $T^{(3)}$, we have

$$[u, v]wu^{p-1}(vw)^{p-1} \equiv w^p \kappa(u, v) \pmod{T^{(3)}}.$$

Similarly, $[u, w]vu^{p-1}(vw)^{p-1} \equiv v^p \kappa(u, w) \pmod{T^{(3)}}$. \square

Corollary 2.3. *For any $u, v, w \in k_0\langle X \rangle$, $\kappa(u, (vw)) \equiv 0 \pmod{T(G_0)}$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 2.5 since $x_1^p \in T(G_0)$. \square

Let \mathbb{Z}^+ denote the set of positive integers.

Definition 2.4. For each $m \geq 1$, let I_m denote the set of all strictly increasing functions from $J_{2m} = \{1, 2, \dots, 2m\}$ into \mathbb{Z}^+ (that is, $f(i) < f(j)$ if $i < j$), and let $W_m = \{w_j(x_{f(1)}, x_{f(2)}, \dots, x_{f(2j)}) \mid 1 \leq j \leq m, f \in I_j\}$. Finally, let $W = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} W_m$.

Lemma 2.6. Suppose that $V_i, i \geq 1$ are T -spaces of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ (or $k_1\langle X \rangle$) such that for each $i, V_i \subsetneq V_{i+1}$. Then $V = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} V_i$ is a T -space of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ (respectively, $k_1\langle X \rangle$) that is not finitely based.

Proof. If V were finitely based, then for some n, V_n would contain a basis for V , and thus $V = V_n \subsetneq V_{n+1} \subseteq V$, which is not possible. \square

Lemma 2.7. $\{u + S^2 + T(G_0) \mid u \in W\}$ is a linear basis for the vector space $CP(G_0)/(S^2 + T(G_0))$.

Proof. Since $CP(G_0) = W^S + S^2 + T(G_0)$, by Corollary 2.2, it suffices to consider only linear combinations of elements of the form $w_m(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{2m})$, $u_i \in k_0\langle X \rangle$, and by Corollary 2.3, it suffices to consider only such elements where $u_i \in X$ for each i . For any subset of size $2m$ in \mathbb{Z}^+ , say $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2m}\}$, there exists $\sigma \in S_{2m}$ such that $\sigma(i_1) < \sigma(i_2) < \dots < \sigma(i_{2m})$, and by Lemma 1.1 (v), $w_m(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{2m}}) \equiv (-1)^{\text{sgn}(\sigma)} w_m(x_{\sigma(i_1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(i_{2m})}) \pmod{T^{(3)}}$. This proves that $\{u + S^2 + T(G_0) \mid u \in W\}$ spans $CP(G_0)/(S^2 + T(G_0))$.

In order to establish linear independence, suppose that $u \in S^2 + T(G_0)$ is a linear combination of elements of W . Order the set $I = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} I_m$ lexically (so that for $m_1 < m_2, f_1 \in I_{m_1}$, and $f_2 \in I_{m_2}$, we have $f_1 < f_2$). Then there exists a smallest $f \in I$ such that for some nonzero $\alpha \in k, \alpha w_m(x_{f(1)}, \dots, x_{f(2m)})$ is a summand of u . Let θ denote the endomorphism of $k_0\langle X \rangle$ that is determined by mapping $x_{f(i)}$ to x_i for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2m$, and mapping all other elements of X to 0. Since $S^2 + T(G_0)$ is a T -space, $\alpha w_m = \theta(u) \in S^2 + T(G_0)$. But by Corollary 2.1, $w_m \notin S^2 + T(G_0)$, so $\alpha = 0$. Since $\alpha \neq 0$, we have a contradiction and thus the linear independence is established. \square

Theorem 2.2. For any prime $p > 2$, and any field of characteristic p , the T -space $CP(G_0)$ is not finitely based.

Proof. We have $CP(G_0) = W^S + S^2 + T(G_0)$. For each $m \geq 1$, let $U_m = W_m^S + S^2 + T(G_0)$. Then $CP(G_0) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} U_m$, and for each $m \geq 1, U_m \subsetneq U_{m+1}$, where the inequality follows from Lemma 2.7. It follows now from Lemma 2.6 that $CP(G_0)$ is not finitely based. \square

The following result is the nonunitary analogue of [10], Theorem 4.

Corollary 2.4. The T -space $W^S + T(G_0)$ is not finitely based.

Proof. If $W^S + T(G_0)$ is finitely based, then $CP(G_0) = W^S + T(G_0) + S^2$ is finitely based, which contradicts Theorem 2.2. \square

Corollary 2.5. W^S is not finitely based.

Proof. Since $T(G_0)$ is finitely based, this follows immediately from Corollary 2.4. \square

3 For $p > 2$, $CP(G)$ is not finitely based

We extend the definition of w_m by setting $w_0 = 1$. It was shown in [1] that $CP(G) = S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^S + T(G)$ if k is an infinite field of characteristic $p > 2$. Subsequently, we showed in [2] that the same is true even if the field is finite. The difference between the two situations is in the expression for $T(G)$. If k is infinite, then it was shown in [5] that $T(G) = T^{(3)}$, while if k is finite, say of size q , then it was shown in [2] that $T(G) = \{x_1^{qp} - x_1^p\}^T + T^{(3)}$.

Lemma 3.1. Let $m \geq 1$, and let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{2m} \in k$. Then

$$w_m(x_1 + \alpha_1, x_2 + \alpha_2, \dots, x_{2m} + \alpha_{2m}) \equiv w_m \pmod{S^2 + T^{(3)}}.$$

Proof. By Corollary 2.2, modulo $S^2 + T^{(3)}$, $w_m(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i + v, \dots, u_{2m})$ is congruent to

$$w_m(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i, \dots, u_{2m}) + w_m(u_1, u_2, \dots, v, \dots, u_{2m})$$

for any $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{2m}, v \in k_1\langle X \rangle$. Since $\kappa(u, v) = 0$ if u or v is an element of k , it follows that modulo $S^2 + T^{(3)}$, we have

$$w_m(x_1 + \alpha_1, x_2 + \alpha_2, \dots, x_{2m} + \alpha_{2m}) \equiv w_m(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2m}) = w_m$$

\square

Lemma 3.2. $CP(G) = S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0} + \{w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^S + T(G)$.

Proof. Let $U = S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0} + \{w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^S + T(G)$. Since $CP(G) = S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^S + T(G)$, it is evident that $U \subseteq CP(G)$. It remains to prove that $\{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^S \subseteq U$. Let $u \in k_0\langle X \rangle$ and $\alpha \in k$. Then $(u + \alpha)^p = u^p + \alpha^p$, $\alpha^p \in k \subseteq \{w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^S$, and $u^p \in \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0}$, so $(u + \alpha)^p \in U$. Next, let $m \geq 1$ and let $u, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{2m} \in k_0\langle X \rangle$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2m} \in k$. By Lemma 3.1, there is $v \in S^2$ such that $w_m(u_1 + \alpha_1, \dots, u_{2m} + \alpha_{2m}) \equiv w_m(u_1, \dots, u_{2m}) + v \pmod{T(G)}$. As $(u + \alpha)^p = u^p + \alpha^p$, we have $(u + \alpha)^p w_m(u_1 + \alpha_1, \dots, u_{2m} + \alpha_{2m}) \equiv u^p w_m(u_1, \dots, u_{2m}) + \alpha^p w_m(u_1, \dots, u_{2m}) + (u + \alpha)^p v \pmod{T(G)}$. Now, since x^p is a central polynomial for G , $(u + \alpha)^p v \in S^2 + T(G)$ (by Lemma 1.1 (ii), for any $u, v, w \in k_1\langle X \rangle$, $[u, vw] \equiv [u, v]w + [u, w]v \pmod{T^{(3)}}$), and if v is a central polynomial of G , then $[u, v] \in T(G)$. Thus $(u + \alpha)^p w_m(u_1 + \alpha_1, \dots, u_{2m} + \alpha_{2m}) \equiv u^p w_m(u_1, \dots, u_{2m}) + \alpha^p w_m(u_1, \dots, u_{2m}) \pmod{S^2 + T(G)}$, and so

$$(u + \alpha)^p w_m(u_1 + \alpha_1, \dots, u_{2m} + \alpha_{2m}) \in U.$$

\square

Lemma 3.3. *For every $m \geq 0$, $w_m \notin S^2 + \{x_0^p w_j \mid j \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G)$.*

Proof. First, note that $S^2 + \{x_0^p w_j \mid j \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G) \subseteq S^2 + \{x_0^p\}^{T_0} + T(G)$. Now, $T(G) = T^{(3)}$ if k is infinite, while $T(G) = \{(x^{qp} - x^p)^T + T^{(3)}\}$ if k is finite of size q , and in either case, $T(G_0) = \{x_0^p\}^{T_0} + T^{(3)}$. Thus if k is infinite, we have $S^2 + \{x_0^p w_j \mid j \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G) \subseteq S^2 + T(G_0)$. Suppose now that k is finite. As shown in Section 2 of [3], for any $\alpha \in k$ and $u \in k_0\langle X \rangle$, we have $(\alpha + u)^{qp} - (\alpha + u)^p = u^{qp} - u^p$, so $\{x_0^{qp} - x_0^p\}^T = \{x_0^{qp} - x_0^p\}^{T_0} \subseteq \{x_0^p\}^{T_0}$. Thus $S^2 + \{x_0^p w_j \mid j \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G) \subseteq S^2 + T(G_0)$ in this case as well.

The result follows now from Corollary 2.1. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $m \geq 1$. Then for any i with $1 \leq i \leq 2m$,*

$$w_m(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i x_{2m+1}, \dots, x_{2m}) \in \{x_0^p w_j \mid j \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G),$$

while for any $\alpha \in k$,

$$w_m(x_1, x_2, \dots, \alpha x_i, \dots, x_{2m}) = \alpha^p w_m(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_{2m}).$$

Proof. By Lemma 1.1 (vi), $w_1(x_1, x_2) \equiv -w_1(x_2, x_1) \pmod{T^{(3)}}$, and for any $m \geq 1$, $w_m \in CP(G)$, so without loss of generality, it suffices to prove the result for $i = 2m$. If $m = 1$, then we have by Lemma 2.5 that $w_1(x_1, x_2 x_3) \equiv x_2^p w_1(x_1, x_3) + x_3^p w_1(x_1, x_2) \pmod{T^{(3)}}$ and so the result holds in this case. Suppose now that $m > 1$. Since

$$w_m(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2m} x_{2m+1}) = w_{m-1} w_1(x_{2m-1}, x_{2m} x_{2m+1}),$$

and $w_{m-1} w_1(x_{2m-1}, x_{2m} x_{2m+1})$ is congruent to

$$w_{m-1} x_{2m}^p w_1(x_{2m-1}, x_{2m+1}) + w_{m-1} x_{2m+1}^p w_1(x_{2m-1}, x_{2m}) \pmod{T^{(3)}},$$

the first assertion follows. The second assertion is obvious. \square

Recall that W was introduced in Definition 2.4.

Lemma 3.5. *The vector space $CP(G)/(\{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G))$ has linear basis $\{u + S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G) \mid u \in \{1\} \cup W\}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, $CP(G)$ is equal to

$$k + W^S + S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G).$$

Let $U = S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G) \subseteq k_0\langle X \rangle$. The spanning argument in the proof of Lemma 2.7 is applicable here, with the respective roles of Corollary 2.2 and Corollary 2.3 being played by Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.4.

Now for linear independence, suppose that $u \in U$ is a linear combination of elements of $\{1\} \cup W$. Since $U \subseteq k_0\langle X \rangle$, u must be a linear combination of elements of W . Then, just as in the proof of Lemma 2.7, we order the set $I = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} I_m$ lexically, and find the smallest $f \in I$ such that for some nonzero $\beta \in k$, $\beta w_m(x_{f(1)}, \dots, x_{f(i_{2m})})$, is a summand of u . Let θ denote the

endomorphism of $k_1\langle X \rangle$ that is determined by mapping $x_{f(i)}$ to x_i for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2m$, and mapping all other elements of X to 0. Since U is a T -space, $\beta w_m = \theta(u) \in U$. But by Lemma 3.3, $w_m \notin U$, so $\beta = 0$. Since $\beta \neq 0$, we have a contradiction and thus the linear independence is established. \square

We are thus able to obtain the unitary analogues of the main results of Section 2. Let $W'_0 = \{1\}$, and for every $m \geq 1$, let $W'_m = W'_0 \cup W_m$. Finally, let $W' = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} W'_j$.

Theorem 3.1. *For any prime $p > 2$, and any field of characteristic p , the T -space $CP(G)$ is not finitely based.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, $CP(G)$ is equal to

$$(W')^S + S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G).$$

For each m , let $U_m = (W'_m)^S + S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G)$. Then $CP(G) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} U_m$, and for each $m \geq 1$, $U_m \subsetneq U_{m+1}$, where the inequality follows from Lemma 3.5. It follows now from Lemma 2.6 that $CP(G)$ is not finitely based. \square

The following result is basically Theorem 4 of [10], extended in the sense that it holds for all fields of characteristic $p > 2$, not just infinite fields.

Corollary 3.1 (Theorem 4, [10]). *The T -space $(W')^S + T(G)$ is not finitely based.*

Proof. If $(W')^S + T(G)$ is finitely based, say with finite basis B , then $B \cup x_0^p B \cup \{x_1, x_2\}$ is a finite basis for $(W')^S + T(G) + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0} + S^2 = CP(G)$, which contradicts Theorem 3.1. \square

Corollary 3.2. *$(W')^S$ is not finitely based.*

Proof. Since $T(G)$ is finitely based, this follows immediately from Corollary 3.1. \square

In [10], Shchigolev introduces polynomials $\varphi'_m = \prod_{j=1}^m x_{2i-1}^{p-1} x_{2i} x_{2i-1} x_{2i}^{p-1}$, $m \geq 1$, and he proves (essentially) the following result:

Corollary 3.3 (Theorem 5, [10]). *The T -space of $k_1\langle X \rangle$ that is generated by the set $\{\varphi'_m \mid m \geq 1\}$ is not finitely based.*

Proof. Let $m \geq 1$ be given, let $J_{2m} = \{1, 2, \dots, 2m\}$ and let J_{2m}^{odd} denote the odd elements of J_{2m} . For any $I \subseteq J_{2m}^{\text{odd}}$, $I \neq \emptyset$, we have $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$ with $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k$, and we shall let $w_{|I|}(x_i, x_{i+1} \mid i \in I)$ denote

$$w_{|I|}(x_{i_1}, x_{i_1+1}, x_{i_2}, x_{i_2+1}, \dots, x_{i_k}, x_{i_k+1}).$$

It is easily seen now that for each $m \geq 1$, φ'_m is congruent modulo $T(G)$ to

$$w_m + \prod_{i=1}^m x_{2i-1}^p x_{2i}^p + \sum_{\substack{I \subseteq J_{2m}^{\text{odd}} \\ I \neq \emptyset, J_{2m}^{\text{odd}}}} \left(\prod_{i \in J_{2m}^{\text{odd}} - I} x_i^p x_{i+1}^p \right) w_{|I|}(x_i, x_{i+1} \mid i \in I).$$

For each $m \geq 1$, let $R_m = \{\varphi'_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}^S$ and $R = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} R_m$. It follows now by a straightforward inductive argument, using the representation of φ'_m above, that for every $m \geq 1$, $(W'_m)^S + (x_0^p W'_m)^S + T(G) = R_m + (x_0^p R_m)^S + \{x_0^p\}^S + T(G)$, and thus $(W')^S + (x_0^p W')^S + T(G) = R + (x_0^p R)^S + \{x_0^p\}^S + T(G)$ (one shows that $\varphi'_m - w_m$ belongs to both $(W'_m)^S + (x_0^p W'_m)^S + T(G)$ and $R + (x_0^p R)^S + \{x_0^p\}^S + T(G)$ by using the inductive hypothesis to show that $\sum_{\substack{I \subseteq J_{2m}^{\text{odd}} \\ I \neq \emptyset, J_{2m}^{\text{odd}}}} (\prod_{i \in J_{2m}^{\text{odd}} - I} x_i^p x_{i+1}^p) w_{|I|}(x_i, x_{i+1} \mid i \in I)$ belongs to $(W'_m)^S + (x_0^p W'_m)^S + T(G)$ and to $R + (x_0^p R)^S + \{x_0^p\}^S + T(G)$, while of course, $x_1^p \cdots x_{2m}^p$ belongs to both sets). If R is finitely based, then $R + (x_0^p R)^S + \{x_0^p\}^S + T(G)$ and thus $(W')^S + (x_0^p W')^S + T(G)$ is finitely based as well. But then

$$\begin{aligned} CP(G) &= (W')^S + S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^{S_0} + T(G) \\ &= (W')^S + S^2 + \{x_0^p w_m \mid m \geq 0\}^S + T(G) \quad \text{by Lemma 3.1} \\ &= (W')^S + S^2 + (x_0^p W')^S + T(G) \end{aligned}$$

is finitely based, contradicting Theorem 3.1. Thus R is not finitely based. \square

References

- [1] Chuluundorj Bekh-Ochir and S. A. Rankin, *The central polynomials of the infinite dimensional unitary and nonunitary Grassmann algebras*, preprint, arXiv:0905.1049
- [2] Chuluundorj Bekh-Ochir and S. A. Rankin, *The identities and the central polynomials of the infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebras over a finite field*, preprint, arXiv:0905.1049.
- [3] Chuluundorj Bekh-Ochir and S. A. Rankin, *The identities and central polynomials of the finite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebras over a finite field*, preprint, arXiv:0905.2388.
- [4] Chuluundorj Bekh-Ochir and D. M. Riley, *On the Grassmann T -space*, Journal of Algebra and its Applications, **7** (2008), no. 3, 319–336.
- [5] A. Giambruno and P. Koshlukov, *On the identities of the Grassmann algebras in characteristic $p > 0$* , Isr. J. Math. **122** (2001), 305–316.
- [6] V. N. Latyshev, *On the choice of a basis in a T -ideal*, Siberian Math. J. **4** (1963), no. 5, 1122–1127.
- [7] S. V. Okhitin, *Central polynomials of an algebra of second-order matrices* (Russian), Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh., (1988), no. 4, 61–63; translation in Moscow Univ. Math. Bull., **43** (1988), no. 4, 49–51.
- [8] Plamen Zh. Chiripov and Plamen N. Siderov, *On bases for identities of some varieties of associative algebras* (Russian), PLISKA Stud. Math. Bulgaria, **2** (1981), 103–115.

- [9] V. V. Shchigolev, *Finite basis property of T -spaces over fields of characteristic zero*, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. **65**, (2001), no. 5, 191-224; translation in Izv. Math., **65** (2001), no. 5, 1041-1071.
- [10] V. V. Shchigolev, *Examples of T -spaces with an infinite basis*, Sbornik Mathematics **191** (2000), no. 3. 459-476.