

IS ADDITION DEFINABLE FROM MULTIPLICATION AND SUCCESSOR?

FRIEDRICH WEHRUNG

ABSTRACT. A map $f: R \rightarrow S$ between (associative, unital, but not necessarily commutative) rings is a *brachymorphism* if $f(1+x) = 1+f(x)$ and $f(xy) = f(x)f(y)$ whenever $x, y \in R$. We tackle the problem whether every brachymorphism is additive (i.e., $f(x+y) = f(x) + f(y)$), showing that in many contexts, including the following, the answer is positive:

- R is finite (or, more generally, R is left or right Artinian);
- R is any ring of 2×2 matrices over a commutative ring;
- R is Engelian;
- every element of R is a sum of π -regular and central elements (this applies to π -regular rings, Banach algebras, and power series rings);
- R is the full matrix ring of order greater than 1 over any ring;
- R is the monoid ring $K[M]$ for a commutative ring K and a π -regular monoid M ;
- R is the Weyl algebra $A_1(K)$ over a commutative ring K with positive characteristic;
- f is the power function $x \mapsto x^n$ over any ring;
- f is the determinant function over any ring R of $n \times n$ matrices, with $n \geq 3$, over a commutative ring, such that if $n > 3$ then R contains n scalar matrices with invertible differences.

We leave open the problem whether every brachymorphism is additive.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. The problem	2
1.2. Background	2
1.3. Addable rings and elements	3
2. The case of division rings: addition on a slide rule	4
3. Summability and addability: a model-theoretical take	4
4. Basic preservation results for addable elements	6
5. Homomorphic images, directed colimits, and finite products	8
6. From commutativity to summability	9
7. Integral closedness of the addable kernel	10
8. From addable commutators to summable pairs	13
9. Monoid algebras and Weyl algebras	16
10. On the determinant function over rings of matrices	17
11. Expanding the context	19

Date: May 27, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 16R60; 16R20; 16R40; 16U50; 16E50; 16N20; 16D60; 16B70; 16Y30; 16Y60.

Key words and phrases. Ring; associative; unital; commutative; functional identity; additive; multiplicative; successor; brachymorphism; brachynomial; summable; addable.

11.1. Semirings	19
11.2. Near-rings	19
11.3. Cancellative semirings	20
11.4. More open problems	20
Acknowledgment	22
References	22

1. INTRODUCTION

After a series of fortuitous mathematical encounters the author accidentally stumbled on the following very easily stated problem.

1.1. The problem. As stated in the Abstract, a map $f: R \rightarrow S$ between (associative, unital, but not necessarily commutative) rings is a *brachymorphism*¹ if $f(1+x) = 1+f(x)$ and $f(xy) = f(x)f(y)$ whenever $x, y \in R$. For every brachymorphism $f: R \rightarrow S$ and every $x \in R$, $f(x)f(0) = f(x0) = f(0)$, thus

$$f(0) + f(0) = f(0) + f(1)f(0) = (1+f(1))f(0) = f(1+1)f(0) = f(0),$$

thus $f(0) = 0$, and thus also $f(1) = 1$. The question whether every brachymorphism is additive (and thus a ring homomorphism) remains a mystery to the author. A positive solution to that problem would probably destroy the present paper.

We verify that the answer to the question is positive in many “classical” contexts, thus letting the concept of brachymorphism ring various bells including regular rings (in von Neumann’s sense), commutative rings (or, more generally, PI rings), and rings of matrices (over commutative rings).

1.2. Background. Throughout the paper all our rings will be unital, but not necessarily commutative. They will also be associative, except in our final Section 11 where more contexts, including right near-rings and cancellative semirings, will be discussed.

Rickart [32], Johnson [19], Martindale [23] state sufficient conditions implying that a multiplicative homomorphism, between rings, is additive. Related functional equations, such as

$$f(x+y) + f(xy) = f(x) + f(y) + f(x)f(y),$$

are studied in Dhombres [10]. Ger and Reich [14] handle functional equations of the form

$$af(xy) + bf(x)f(y) + cf(x+y) + df(x) + kf(y) = 0,$$

in particular when such an equation yields a ring homomorphism. Functional identities are studied further in Brešar [7], Brešar, Chebotar, and Martindale [8]; see also Molnár [26] for related work oriented towards operator algebras.

However, none of those works seems to involve the preservation of the successor function (i.e., $f(1+x) = 1+f(x)$). Anticipating on Definition 3.1, we say that a ring R is *addable* if every brachymorphism with domain R is additive.

A well studied example of successor-preserving map is the *Frobenius map* $\varphi: x \mapsto x^p$ on any algebra R over a field of characteristic $p > 0$: indeed

¹The prefix *brachy*, from the ancient Greek *brakhýs*, means “short”. (*Source*: Wiktionary.)

$(1+x)^p = 1+x^p$ whenever $x \in R$. On the other hand, the ring-theoretical identity $(xy)^p = x^p y^p$ follows from commutativity but does not imply it unless $p = 2$ (cf. Johnsen *et al.* [18, Example 3]). Riley proves in [33] that *if R is Engelian (definition recalled in Section 8), then some power of φ is a ring homomorphism*. Our Corollary 8.11 implies immediately that *a power of φ is a ring homomorphism iff it is a multiplicative homomorphism*. We also verify (Corollary 8.12) that *every Engelian ring is addable*.

As far as we could check, the investigation of the definability of addition in terms of other operations including the successor $x \mapsto 1+x$ started in Foster [12]. In [36], Yaqub expresses the addition of any ring $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ as a composition of multiplication and the successor function (anticipating on Definition 3.2, we call such operations *brachynomials*). Moore and Yaqub [27] extend that result to any ring satisfying a polynomial identity of the form $x^n = x^{n+1}p(x)$ in which every idempotent is central. Those results are further refined in Abu-Khuzam, Tominaga, and Yaqub [1]. The assumption that every idempotent is central is removed in Putcha and Yaqub [29]. The result is extended to commutative rings in which every element is a sum of idempotents in Yaqub [37]. Finally, Komatsu [21] proves that *rings in which the addition is a composition of multiplication and the successor function are characterized by their satisfying a polynomial identity of the form $x^n = x^{n+1}p(x)$, and then the latter can be taken as $x^n = x^{2n}$ for a suitable n* .

All the above-mentioned works establish that in certain classes of rings R , the addition can be expressed as a brachynomial. Although this implies (non-trivially!) that every brachymorphism from R is additive (Corollary 7.9), the converse does not hold: for example, \mathbb{Z} does not satisfy any identity of the form $x^n = x^{2n}$, nonetheless every brachymorphism from \mathbb{Z} is (trivially) additive. The distinction in play boils down to the meaning of *definable*: in all the above-mentioned works, “definable” functions are meant in the strongest possible sense (i.e., brachynomials), which leads to the description of addition *via quantifier-free formulas*. By contrast, the statement that every brachymorphism from R is additive can be expressed in terms of certain *positive existential formulas* that we call *summability formulas* (Lemma 3.3). We are therefore reaching a much wider class of rings than the ones characterized by Komatsu as above — in fact, so wide that we do not know so far whether there is anything outside.

1.3. Addable rings and elements. As stated in the Abstract, the main aim of the paper is to establish a sample of addability results for large classes of rings, such as π -regular rings, Banach algebras, or commutative rings. A ubiquitous byproduct of our discussion will be the concept of an *addable element*. An element x in a ring R is *addable* if $f(x+y) = f(x) + f(y)$ whenever $y \in R$ and f is a brachymorphism with domain R (Definition 3.1). We will verify that the set $\text{Add } R$ of all addable elements in R is an additive subgroup of R (Proposition 4.1), closed under multiplication by regular elements (Proposition 4.3), containing the Jacobson radical of R (Corollary 4.5), the center of R (Corollary 6.3), and all nilpotent elements of R (Corollary 7.7). We will further verify that $\text{Add } R$ is right and left integrally closed in R (Theorem 7.5), and that if $xy - yx$ is addable for all $y \in R$ then x is addable (Corollary 8.5). As an illustration, we will verify the addability of certain monoid rings $K[M]$, including the case where M is π -regular (Theorem 9.1), and of the Weyl algebra $A_1(K)$ in case K has positive characteristic (Theorem 9.2), where K denotes a commutative ring.

2. THE CASE OF DIVISION RINGS: ADDITION ON A SLIDE RULE

Warming up to the context, we begin with a very easy observation.

Proposition 2.1. *Let R be a division ring and let S be a unital ring. Then every brachymorphism $f: R \rightarrow S$ is additive.*

Proof. Let $x, y \in R$ and set $z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x + y$; we must prove that $f(z) = f(x) + f(y)$. If $x = 0$ then this follows from the observation above that $f(0) = 0$; thus suppose that $x \neq 0$. From $zx^{-1} = 1 + yx^{-1}$ it follows that $f(z)f(x)^{-1} = 1 + f(y)f(x)^{-1}$, whence $f(z) = f(x) + f(y)$. \square

Proposition 2.1, though trivial, is quite instructive, in that it showcases the method, familiar to math students from the pre-calculator era, for adding numbers on a slide rule: namely, apply the formula $x + y = (1 + yx^{-1})x$. Many of our “brachymorphism \Rightarrow additive” results will be established by refinements of that argument, with various degrees of sophistication.

3. SUMMABILITY AND ADDABILITY: A MODEL-THEORETICAL TAKE

A central concept underlying our framework is the following.

Definition 3.1. A finite tuple (a_1, \dots, a_n) of elements in a ring R is *summable* if for every ring S and every brachymorphism $f: R \rightarrow S$, $f(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(a_i)$. An element a of R is *addable* if the pair (a, x) is summable for all $x \in R$. We define the *addable kernel* of R as the set $\text{Add } R$ of all addable elements of R . A subset X of R is addable if $X \subseteq \text{Add } R$. In particular, the ring R is addable iff $R = \text{Add } R$.

In particular, 0, 1, and more generally all integer multiples of the unit, are addable. (Formally this follows from the forthcoming Proposition 4.1; however, checking it directly is a straightforward exercise.)

This section will be centered on Lemma 3.3, which expresses summability in terms of satisfaction of certain positive existential formulas. The main first-order vocabularies used throughout the paper are the following:

- $\mathcal{R} = (+, \cdot, 0, 1)$, with $+$ (the “addition”) and \cdot (the “multiplication”) both binary operation symbols and 0, 1 symbols of constant: the language of (unital) rings;
- $\mathcal{S} = (', \cdot, 0)$, with $'$ a unary operation symbol, \cdot a binary operation symbol, and 0 a symbol of constant.

In any ring, the symbols of \mathcal{R} will be interpreted the usual way, while the operation $'$ will be interpreted by the successor function $x \mapsto x' = 1 + x$. In particular, for any rings R and S , the \mathcal{R} -homomorphisms from R to S are exactly the ring homomorphisms, while the \mathcal{S} -homomorphisms from R to S are exactly the brachymorphisms.

To \mathcal{R} -terms we will prefer their associated (non-commutative) polynomials: for example, $x + y$ and $y + x$ are not the same \mathcal{R} -term, but they define the same polynomial. Every \mathcal{S} -term t can be interpreted as a polynomial \tilde{t} , and every \mathcal{S} -formula E can be interpreted as an \mathcal{R} -formula \tilde{E} : formally, $\tilde{0} = 0$, $\tilde{t}' = 1 + \tilde{t}$ (accordingly, let us from now on abbreviate the \mathcal{S} -term $0'$ by 1, then $1'$ by 2, and so on), and $\widetilde{t_1 t_2} = \tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_2$, whenever t, t_1, t_2 are \mathcal{S} -terms. If E is $t_1 = t_2$, then \tilde{E} is $\tilde{t}_1 = \tilde{t}_2$. In particular, for any ring R and any \mathcal{S} -sentence E with parameters from R , $(R, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ satisfies \tilde{E} iff $(R, ', \cdot, 0)$ satisfies E .

Definition 3.2. Polynomials of the form \tilde{t} will be called *brachynomials*.

For example, for distinct variables x and y , $x + xy = x(1 + y)$ is a brachynomial (it is \tilde{t} where $t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} xy'$) but $x + y$ is not (exercise).

Recall that a formula, in a first-order language without relation symbols (e.g., \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{S}), is *atomic* if it has the form $s = t$ for terms s and t . A formula is *positive primitive* (resp., *positive existential*) if it has the form $(\exists \vec{x})E$ where E is a conjunction (resp., a disjunction of conjunctions) of atomic formulas (we are using the vector notation $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for strings of variables).

The proof of the following lemma is a standard argument of elementary model theory; we include it for completeness. The reader unfamiliar with the language of model theory may skip the proof of the “only if” direction in Lemma 3.3, as that direction will not be needed through the paper.

Lemma 3.3. *A finite tuple (a_1, \dots, a_n) of elements in a ring R is summable iff there exists a positive existential \mathcal{S} -formula $E(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1})$ such that:*

- (1) *Every ring satisfies the implication² $\tilde{E}(\vec{x}) \Rightarrow x_{n+1} = x_1 + \dots + x_n$;*
- (2) *R satisfies $\tilde{E}(a_1, \dots, a_n, a_1 + \dots + a_n)$.*

Furthermore, E can be taken positive primitive.

A formula E satisfying (1), (2) above will thus be called a *summability formula* for (a_1, \dots, a_n) (in R).

Proof. Set $a_{n+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a_1 + \dots + a_n$ and suppose first that there exists a formula E as stated. Let $f: R \rightarrow S$ be a brachymorphism between rings. Since E is positive existential and f is a brachymorphism, it follows from (2) that S satisfies $\tilde{E}(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n), f(a_{n+1}))$, which, by (1), entails $f(a_{n+1}) = f(a_1) + \dots + f(a_n)$.

Suppose, conversely, that (a_1, \dots, a_n) is summable within R . Denote by \mathcal{L}_R the vocabulary obtained by adjoining to \mathcal{R} a collection of extra symbols of constant \dot{b} for $b \in R$, and by $\{A_i \mid i \in I\}$ the collection of all atomic \mathcal{S} -formulas such that R satisfies $\tilde{A}_i(\dot{b} \mid b \in R)$.

Denote by \mathcal{T} the set of \mathcal{L}_R -sentences obtaining by adjoining, to the axioms of ring theory, all atomic \mathcal{R} -formulas $\tilde{A}_i(\dot{b} \mid b \in R)$ for $i \in I$. Thus the models of \mathcal{T} are in one-to-one correspondence with the brachymorphisms with domain R (interpret each \dot{b} by $f(b)$). Our assumption that (a_1, \dots, a_n) is summable with sum a_{n+1} thus means exactly that $\mathcal{T} \vdash \dot{a}_{n+1} = \dot{a}_1 + \dots + \dot{a}_n$ (where \vdash denotes entailment). By the compactness Theorem, there are a finite subset J of I and a finite subset B of R containing $\{a_1, \dots, a_n, a_{n+1}\}$, such that, denoting iterated conjunction by \bigwedge ,

$$(\text{ring theory}) + \bigwedge_{j \in J} \tilde{A}_j(\dot{b} \mid b \in B) \vdash \dot{a}_{n+1} = \dot{a}_1 + \dots + \dot{a}_n. \quad (3.1)$$

Setting $\vec{y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (y_b \mid b \in B)$, the formula $E(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1})$ defined as

$$(\exists \vec{y}) \left(\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n+1} (x_i = y_{a_i}) \ \& \ \bigwedge_{j \in J} A_j(y_b \mid b \in B) \right)$$

is positive primitive, and by (3.1),

$$(\text{ring theory}) + \tilde{E}(\vec{x}) \vdash x_{n+1} = x_1 + \dots + x_n.$$

²By convention, the universal quantifiers are skipped: the formula is meant to begin with $\forall \vec{x}$.

Moreover, by the definition of the A_i , R satisfies $\tilde{E}(a_1, \dots, a_n, a_{n+1})$ (interpret each y_b by b). \square

Example 3.4. The summability formula $E(x, y, z)$ underlying the proof of Proposition 2.1 is $(x = 0 \ \& \ z = y)$ or $(\exists u)(ux = 1 \ \& \ zu = (yu)')$. Indeed, modulo ring theory, $\tilde{E}(x, y, z)$ is equivalent to

$$(x = 0 \ \& \ z = y) \text{ or } (\exists u)(ux = 1 \ \& \ zu = 1 + yu),$$

which entails $z = x + y$. Conversely, in any division ring, if $z = x + y$, then $\tilde{E}(x, y, z)$ is satisfied (if $x \neq 0$ set $u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x^{-1}$).

The formula E above is positive existential, but not positive primitive: this is because it is designed to take all possible (x, y) into account, which leads us to separate the cases $x = 0$ and $x \neq 0$.

The observations above yield the following reformulation of our main conjecture.

Corollary 3.5. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *Every brachymorphism, between rings, is additive.*
- (ii) *The pair (x, y) is summable in $\mathbb{Z}\langle x, y \rangle$ (the free ring on two generators).*
- (iii) *There exists a positive existential (resp., positive primitive) \mathcal{S} -formula $E(x, y, z)$ such that every ring satisfies the equivalence $\tilde{E}(x, y, z) \Leftrightarrow z = x + y$.*

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is trivial.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii). Suppose that (ii) holds. Let a positive primitive \mathcal{S} -formula $E(x, y, z)$ witness the summability of (x, y) in $\mathbb{Z}\langle x, y \rangle$ via Lemma 3.3. Since $\mathbb{Z}\langle x, y \rangle$ satisfies the positive existential sentence $\tilde{E}(x, y, x + y)$ of ring theory, every ring satisfies $(\forall x, y)\tilde{E}(x, y, x + y)$. Since every ring satisfies the implication $\tilde{E}(x, y, z) \Rightarrow z = x + y$, it satisfies the required equivalence.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i). If (iii) holds, then, by the easy direction of Lemma 3.3, every pair of elements, in any ring, is addable. \square

The formulation (iii), in Corollary 3.5, implies that if the conjecture had a positive solution, then such a solution could be, in principle, reached *via* number crunching. However, in view of the size of the search space being at least a double exponential (in the degrees of the polynomials involved), that option looks quite unpractical *a priori*.

4. BASIC PRESERVATION RESULTS FOR ADDABLE ELEMENTS

An element x in a monoid M is *regular* if $xtx = x$ for some $t \in M$, then called a *quasi-inverse* of x . Of course, every left or right unit of M is regular. We shall use that concept mainly for multiplicative monoids of rings, except in Theorem 9.1 where M will be a general monoid.

This section will be centered on Propositions 4.1 (addable elements form an additive subgroup) and 4.3 (addable times regular implies addable). The addability of many “classical” rings, including but not restricted to von Neumann regular rings and Banach algebras, will be stated in Corollary 4.4.

Proposition 4.1. *For every ring R , $\text{Add } R$ is an additive subgroup of R .*

Proof. It is obvious that 0 is addable and that the sum of any two addable elements is addable. Hence it suffices to verify that $-x$ is addable whenever x is addable.

Let f be a brachymorphism from R to a ring S . Since x is addable, the equality $f(x) + f(-x + y) = f(y)$ holds whenever $y \in R$; whence $f(-x + y) = -f(x) + f(y)$. The particular case $y = 0$ yields $f(-x) = -f(x)$, so, by the above and for general y , we get $f(-x + y) = f(-x) + f(y)$, as desired. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Consider the \mathcal{S} -formula S_1 defined as $x'y' = (xy)''$. Then every ring satisfies the equivalence $\tilde{S}_1(x, y) \Leftrightarrow x + y = 1$. In particular, every pair (x, y) such that $x + y = 1$ is summable.*

Proof. A straightforward calculation: $\tilde{S}_1(x, y)$ is $(1 + x)(1 + y) = 2 + xy$. Canceling out 1 and xy yields the result. \square

Although it is trivial that the product of an addable element by a unit is addable, the more general statement, whether the product of two addable elements is addable, is unclear. In that direction, we could only achieve the following observation, (slightly) reminiscent of the main result of Martindale [23].

Proposition 4.3. *Let a and u be elements in a ring R . If a is addable and u is regular, then au and ua are both addable.*

Proof. By symmetry it suffices to prove that au is addable. Pick $v \in R$ such that $u = uvu$. Let f be a brachymorphism from R to a ring S , let $x \in R$, and set $y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} au + x$. We must prove that $f(y) = f(au) + f(x)$. First,

$$yvu = auvu + xvu = (a + xv)u,$$

thus, since f is a brachymorphism and a is addable,

$$f(y)f(vu) = (f(a) + f(x)f(v))f(u) = f(au) + f(x)f(vu). \quad (4.1)$$

On the other hand, $u(1 - vu) = 0$, thus $y(1 - vu) = x(1 - vu)$, and thus

$$f(y)f(1 - vu) = f(x)f(1 - vu). \quad (4.2)$$

Adding (4.1) and (4.2) together, and since $f(1 - vu) = 1 - f(vu)$ (cf. Lemma 4.2), we obtain that $f(y) = f(au) + f(x)$, as desired. \square

Bringing together Propositions 4.1 and 4.3, we obtain that *every sum of products of regular elements is addable*. The following corollary sums up a few particular cases of that observation.

Corollary 4.4.

- (1) *Every von Neumann regular ring is addable.*
- (2) *Every formal power series ring $\mathbb{k}\langle\langle\Sigma\rangle\rangle$, with \mathbb{k} a division ring and Σ a set, is addable.*
- (3) *Every (unital) Banach algebra, viewed as a ring, is addable.*
- (4) *For any ring R and any integer $n > 1$, the full matrix ring $M_n(R)$ is addable.*

Proof. Item (1) follows immediately from the observation above.

In all rings considered in (2)–(4), every element is a sum of units, as follows:

- For (2), recall that $\mathbb{k}\langle\langle\Sigma\rangle\rangle$ is the \mathbb{k} -algebra of formal power series over Σ with coefficients from \mathbb{k} (it is non-commutative unless $\text{card } \Sigma \leq 1$). The units of $\mathbb{k}\langle\langle\Sigma\rangle\rangle$ are exactly the power series with nonzero constant term. Hence, every $a \in \mathbb{k}\langle\langle\Sigma\rangle\rangle$ which is not a unit is the sum of two units (viz., $a = (-1) + (1 + a)$).

- For (3) this is because for every element x and every real number $\alpha > \|x\|$, $x = \alpha + (x - \alpha)$ is the sum of two units.
- By Raphael [30], for any ring R and any $n > 1$, every element of $M_n(R)$ is a sum of $2n^2$ units; this result got strengthened in Henriksen [15], with three units. At any rate, we are thus done for (4). \square

It follows from Proposition 4.1 that every ring, in which every element is a sum of units, is addable. For a survey of such rings, see Srivastava [35].

Corollary 4.5. *For every ring R , the Jacobson radical $J(R)$ of R is addable in R .*

Proof. Every $x \in J(R)$ can be written as $x = (-1) + (1+x)$, a sum of two units. \square

Corollary 4.6. *Let R be a simple ring with a nontrivial idempotent. Then R is addable.*

Proof. By Herstein [17, Corollary, p. 18], every element in the ring is a linear combination, with coefficients in \mathbb{Z} , of idempotent elements. By Proposition 4.3 (with $a = 1$), every idempotent is addable. Apply Proposition 4.1. \square

For an extension of Corollary 4.6, see the comments following Corollary 8.6.

5. HOMOMORPHIC IMAGES, DIRECTED COLIMITS, AND FINITE PRODUCTS

This section will be essentially devoted to verifying the preservation of summability by homomorphic images, directed colimits, and finite products of rings. The arguments are straightforward, with the (mild) exception of the case of finite products, which requires the additional lemma below.

Lemma 5.1. *The \mathcal{S} -formula $\mathcal{S}_\perp(x, y, z)$ defined as $xy = 0 \ \& \ z' = x'y'$, is a summability formula for any pair (x, y) of elements satisfying $xy = 0$, in any ring.*

Proof. A straightforward calculation: $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\perp(x, y, z)$ is $xy = 0 \ \& \ 1 + z = (1+x)(1+y)$, which is equivalent (in rings) to $xy = 0 \ \& \ z = x + y$. \square

For a generalization of Lemma 5.1 to a much wider class of pairs, see Lemma 6.2.

Proposition 5.2.

- (1) *Let R and S be rings and let $f: R \rightarrow S$ be a ring homomorphism. For every summable tuple (a_1, \dots, a_n) in R , the family $(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n))$ is summable in S .*
- (2) *Let A and B be rings, let n be a positive integer, and let (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) be summable tuples in A and B , respectively. Then the tuple $((a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n))$ is summable in $A \times B$.*

Proof. The proof of (1) is straightforward and we omit it. As to (2), let R be a ring and let $f: A \times B \rightarrow R$ be a brachymorphism. Set $a_{n+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a_1 + \dots + a_n$ and $b_{n+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b_1 + \dots + b_n$. Then the elements $u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(1, 0)$ and $v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(0, 1)$ are idempotent elements in R , with $uv = 0$; they are the unit elements of the corner rings uRu and vRv , respectively. Let $f_A: A \rightarrow uRu$, $x \mapsto f(x, 0)$ and $f_B: B \rightarrow vRv$, $y \mapsto f(0, y)$. For each $x \in A$, $f_A(x) = f(x, 0) = f(x, 0)u$, thus

$$f_A(1+x) = f(1+x, 0) = f(1+x, 1)f(1, 0) = (1+f(x, 0))u = u+f(x, 0)u = u+f_A(x),$$

so f_A is a brachymorphism. Likewise, f_B is a brachymorphism. Since (a_1, \dots, a_n) is summable in A and (b_1, \dots, b_n) is summable in B , it follows that

$$f_A(a_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_A(a_i) \text{ and } f_B(b_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_B(b_i). \quad (5.1)$$

Now for each $(x, y) \in A \times B$, $(x, 0)(0, y) = (0, 0)$, thus (cf. Lemma 5.1) $A \times B$ satisfies $\tilde{S}_\perp((x, 0), (0, y), (x, y))$, and thus, since f is a brachymorphism, R satisfies $\tilde{S}_\perp(f_A(x), f_B(y), f(x, y))$; whence $f(x, y) = f_A(x) + f_B(y)$. Using (5.1), this entails $f(a_{n+1}, b_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(a_i, b_i)$. \square

Corollary 5.3.

- (1) *Let R and S be rings and let $f: R \rightarrow S$ be a surjective ring homomorphism. Then $f[\text{Add } R] \subseteq \text{Add } S$. In particular, if R is an addable ring, then so is S .*
- (2) *Let A and B be rings. Then $(\text{Add } A) \times (\text{Add } B) = \text{Add}(A \times B)$. In particular, if A and B are both addable rings, then so is $A \times B$.*
- (3) *Consider a directed colimit $(R, f_i \mid i \in I) = \varinjlim (R_i, f_{i,j} \mid i \leq j \text{ in } I)$ of rings and ring homomorphisms. Then for every $i \in I$ and every $a \in \bigcap_{j \geq i} f_{i,j}^{-1}[\text{Add } R_j]$, $f_i(a)$ is addable in R . In particular, if all rings R_i are addable, then so is R .*

Proof. Both (1) and the containment $(\text{Add } A) \times (\text{Add } B) \subseteq \text{Add}(A \times B)$ follow immediately from Proposition 5.2. Let $(a, b) \in A \times B$, let R be a ring, and let $f: A \rightarrow R$ be a brachymorphism. The map $g: A \times B \rightarrow R$, $(x, y) \mapsto f(x)$ is also a brachymorphism, thus if (a, b) is addable in $A \times B$, then for all $x \in R$, $f(a + x) = g((a, b) + (x, 0)) = g(a, b) + g(x, 0) = f(a) + f(x)$; whence $a \in \text{Add } A$. Similarly, $b \in \text{Add } B$, thus completing the proof of (2).

It remains to verify (3). We must prove that for every $\bar{b} \in R$, the pair $(f_i(a), \bar{b})$ is summable in R . Since the poset I is upward directed, there are $j \geq i$ and $b \in R_j$ such that $\bar{b} = f_j(b)$. By assumption on a , the pair $(f_{i,j}(a), b)$ is summable in R_j . By Proposition 5.2(1), the pair $(f_i(a), \bar{b}) = (f_j f_{i,j}(a), f_j(b))$ is summable in R . \square

6. FROM COMMUTATIVITY TO SUMMABILITY

This section's main result, Lemma 6.2, provides a summability formula on any triple satisfying a certain commutation relation. In particular, *every commutative ring is addable* (Corollary 6.3).

Notation 6.1. We introduce \mathcal{S} -terms \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}(x, y, z) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (xz)'(yz)'; \\ \mathbf{q}(x, y, z) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ((xy)'z^2)'. \end{aligned}$$

The brachynomials associated to \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} are thus the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{p}}(x, y, z) &= (1 + xz)(1 + yz); \\ \tilde{\mathbf{q}}(x, y, z) &= 1 + (1 + xy)z^2. \end{aligned}$$

We shall now generalize an observation, stated at the beginning of Chapter 24 in Boolos, Burgess, and Jeffrey [5], that the addition over nonnegative integers can be defined in the language \mathcal{S} by

$$z = x + y \iff \mathbf{p}(x', y, z') = \mathbf{q}(x', y, z') \quad \text{whenever } x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

In any ring R , define the *commutator operation* by

$$[x, y] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} xy - yx, \quad \text{whenever } x, y \in R. \quad (6.1)$$

As a straightforward calculation shows, the brachynomials \tilde{p} and \tilde{q} are related through the following equation, valid in any ring:

$$\tilde{p}(x, y, z) = \tilde{q}(x, y, z) + (x + y - z)z + x[z, y]z. \quad (6.2)$$

Lemma 6.2. *The S-formula $S_{\text{comm}}(x, y, z)$ defined as*

$$xzy = xyz \ \& \ p(x, y, z) = q(x, y, z) \ \& \ p(x, y', z') = q(x, y', z')$$

is a summability formula at any pair (x, y) , in any ring, such that $xyx = x^2y$.

Proof. We first verify that every triple (x, y, z) , of elements in a ring R , satisfying $\tilde{S}_{\text{comm}}(x, y, z)$, satisfies $z = x + y$. It follows from our assumptions that $x[z, y] = x[z + 1, y + 1] = 0$, thus, by (6.2),

$$(x + y - z)z = 0 \text{ and } (x + (y + 1) - (z + 1))(z + 1) = 0.$$

Since the latter equation simplifies to $(x + y - z)(z + 1) = 0$, it follows that $x + y - z = 0$, as required.

Let, conversely, $x, y \in R$ such that $xyx = x^2y$, and set $z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x + y$. Since $[z, y] = [x, y] = xy - yx$, we get $x[z, y] = x(xy - yx) = 0$, thus also $x[z + 1, y + 1] = x[z, y] = 0$. It follows that $xzy = xyz$ and $x(z + 1)(y + 1) = x(y + 1)(z + 1)$. By (6.2), it follows that $\tilde{p}(x, y, z) = \tilde{q}(x, y, z)$ and $\tilde{p}(x, y + 1, z + 1) = \tilde{q}(x, y + 1, z + 1)$. \square

Corollary 6.3. *The following statements hold, for every ring R :*

- (1) *Any tuple of pairwise commuting elements in R is summable.*
- (2) *The center of R is an addable subset of R .*
- (3) *If R is commutative, then it is addable.*

A mild tweaking of the methods of this section will lead, in Section 8, to further strengthenings of Corollary 6.3.

7. INTEGRAL CLOSEDNESS OF THE ADDABLE KERNEL

The main result of this section, Theorem 7.5, states an integral closedness property of the addable kernel of any ring. Consequences will be stated, such as: if $n > 0$ and x^n is addable, then so is x (cf. Corollary 7.7), or: if the addition of R is a brachynomial then R is addable (Corollary 7.9). This will also enable us to state addability of all K -subalgebras of $M_n(K)$ for commutative K (Corollary 7.6).

Definition 7.1. Let A be a subset in a ring R . An element x of R is *right integral* over A , with degree a positive integer n , if there are elements $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$ such that $x^n = \sum_{k < n} a_k x^k$. We say that A is *right integrally closed* over R if every element of R , which is right integral over A , belongs to A .

Of course, “left integral” can be defined similarly, *via* equations of the form $x^n = \sum_{k < n} x^k a_k$, and then, since addability is left-right symmetric, “right” can be replaced by “left” everywhere in this section.

A straightforward application of the binomial Theorem yields the following.

Lemma 7.2. *Let A be an additive subgroup of a ring R such that $1 \in A$. If an element x of R is right integral over A , then so is $x + 1$, with the same degree.*

Lemma 7.3. *Let n be a nonnegative integer, let $x \in R$, and let $a_0, \dots, a_n \in R$ with a_k addable whenever $k < n$. Then for every ring S and every brachymorphism $f: R \rightarrow S$, $f(a_0 + a_1x + \dots + a_nx^n) = f(a_0) + f(a_1)f(x) + \dots + f(a_n)f(x)^n$.*

Proof. A straightforward induction argument, based on the formula

$$a_0 + a_1x + \dots + a_nx^n = a_0 + (a_1 + a_2x + \dots + a_nx^{n-1})x. \quad \square$$

Corollary 7.4. *Let y be an element in a ring R . If every element of R has the form $\sum_{k=0}^n a_k y^k$ where each $a_k \in \text{Add } R$, then R is addable.*

Proof. Any elements a and b of R can be written $a = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k y^k$ and $b = \sum_{k=0}^n b_k y^k$, with all $a_k, b_k \in \text{Add } R$, respectively. Therefore, for any brachymorphism f with domain R ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(a) + f(b) &= \sum_{k=0}^n f(a_k)f(y)^k + \sum_{k=0}^n f(b_k)f(y)^k \quad (\text{apply Lemma 7.3}) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n (f(a_k) + f(b_k))f(y)^k \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n f(a_k + b_k)f(y)^k \quad (\text{because each } a_k \text{ is addable}) \\ &= f(a + b) \quad (\text{apply again Lemma 7.3}). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 7.5. *For every ring R , $\text{Add } R$ is right integrally closed in R .*

Proof. Let $x \in R$ be right integral over $\text{Add } R$, so $x^{n+1} = a_0 + a_1x + \dots + a_nx^n$ for some nonnegative integer n and $a_0, \dots, a_n \in \text{Add } R$. Let S be a ring, let $f: R \rightarrow S$ be a brachymorphism, and let $y \in R$. Setting $z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x + y$ and $\bar{z} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(x) + f(y)$, we need to verify that $f(z) = \bar{z}$. First, an immediate application of Lemma 7.3 yields

$$f(x)^{n+1} = f(a_0) + f(a_1)f(x) + \dots + f(a_n)f(x)^n. \quad (7.1)$$

Moreover, from the equations

$$zx^n = x^{n+1} + yx^n = \sum_{k < n} a_k x^k + (a_n + y)x^n \quad (7.2)$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f(z)f(x)^n &= f(zx^n) \\ &= \sum_{k < n} f(a_k)f(x)^k + f(a_n + y)f(x)^n \quad (\text{apply Lemma 7.3}) \\ &= \sum_{k < n} f(a_k)f(x)^k + (f(a_n) + f(y))f(x)^n \quad (\text{because } a_n \text{ is addable}) \\ &= \sum_{k \leq n} f(a_k)f(x)^k + f(y)f(x)^n \\ &= f(x)^{n+1} + f(y)f(x)^n \quad (\text{apply (7.1)}) \\ &= \bar{z}f(x)^n, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$(f(x) + f(y) - f(x + y))f(x)^n = (\bar{z} - f(z))f(x)^n = 0. \quad (7.3)$$

Since $\text{Add } R$ is an additive subgroup of R (cf. Proposition 4.1) containing 1 and by Lemma 7.2, $x + 1$ is also integral with degree $n + 1$ over $\text{Add } R$. Hence (7.3) also applies to the pair $(x + 1, y)$, which, since that change turns $f(x)$ to $f(x) + 1$ but does not affect the value of $f(x) + f(y) - f(x + y)$, leads to the equation

$$(f(x) + f(y) - f(x + y))(f(x) + 1)^n = 0. \quad (7.4)$$

Pick $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ such that

$$t^n u(t) + (t + 1)^n v(t) = 1.$$

Then multiplying (7.3) on the right by $u(f(x))$, (7.4) on the right by $v(f(x))$, and adding the two resulting equations together, we get $f(x) + f(y) - f(z) = 0$, as desired. \square

Let us now reap a few consequences of Theorem 7.5.

Corollary 7.6. *Let K be a commutative ring, let n be a positive integer, and let R be a subring of $M_n(K)$. If R contains all coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of each of its elements, then R is addable.*

Proof. It follows from our assumption, together with the Cayley-Hamilton Theorem, that every element of R is right integral over the subring K' of all its scalar matrices. Since K' is central in R , every element of K' is addable in R (cf. Corollary 6.3(2)). Apply Theorem 7.5. \square

In particular, Corollary 7.6 applies to all subrings of $M_n(K)$ containing all scalar matrices, also to *trace algebras* (in characteristic zero) as considered in Procesi [28]. Further addability results, for rings of matrices not necessarily containing all scalar matrices, will be stated in Corollaries 8.7 and 8.8, together with Theorems 10.1 and 10.3.

Corollary 7.7. *Let x be an element in a ring R and let n be a positive integer. If x^n is addable, then so is x . In particular, every nilpotent element of R is addable.*

Invoking Propositions 4.1 and 4.3, together with Corollary 6.3, we obtain:

Corollary 7.8. *For every element x in a ring R , if some power of x is a sum of products of regular elements and central elements, then x is addable.*

Corollary 7.9. *Every ring R , in which the addition can be expressed as a brachynomial, is addable.*

Proof. By Komatsu [21], there exists a positive integer n such that $x^n = x^{2n}$ whenever $x \in R$. In particular, x^n is idempotent, thus regular. By Corollary 7.8, x is addable. \square

Note. Off-hand, Corollary 7.9 looks (misleadingly) trivial: if $f: R \rightarrow S$ is a brachymorphism and t is a brachynomial representing the addition in R (i.e., $x + y = t(x, y)$ on R), then $f(x + y) = f(t(x, y)) = t(f(x), f(y))$ whenever $x, y \in R$; and then we could be tempted to conclude the proof by stating $t(f(x), f(y)) = f(x) + f(y)$. However, there is no reason *a priori* for the latter argument to work, because we do not know whether the addition of S is represented by the brachynomial t .

A monoid M is π -regular if for every $x \in M$ there exists a positive integer n such that x^n is regular in M (let us then say that x is π -regular in M). A ring is π -regular if its multiplicative monoid is π -regular (cf. McCoy [24], Kaplansky [20],

Azumaya [2]). Trivially, every von Neumann regular ring is π -regular. So is every finite ring, in fact in that case every element has an idempotent power. Kaplansky observes in [20] that every algebraic algebra over a field is π -regular.

Corollary 7.10. *Every π -regular element in a ring is addable. In particular, every π -regular ring is addable.*

Remark 7.11. It follows from Corollary 7.10 that *every finite ring is addable*. More can be said: Dischinger proves in [11] that in any ring R , if every descending chain $aR \supseteq a^2R \supseteq \dots$ stabilizes, then every descending chain $Ra \supseteq Ra^2 \supseteq \dots$ also stabilizes, so R is *strongly π -regular* in the sense of Azumaya [2], thus π -regular. In particular, *every (left or right) Artinian ring is π -regular, thus addable*.

8. FROM ADDABLE COMMUTATORS TO SUMMABLE PAIRS

The main result of this section, Theorem 8.3, has a corollary (Corollary 8.5) stating that for any element x in any ring, if all commutators $[x, -]$ are addable, then x is addable. Consequences of that result are then recorded for rings of triangular matrices (over a commutative ring; see Corollary 8.7), rings of 2×2 matrices, certain PI rings (Corollaries 8.10 and 8.12) including rings satisfying an identity $(xy)^n = x^n y^n$ for some $n \geq 2$ (Corollary 8.11).

Theorem 8.3 will be obtained by extending some of the methods of Section 6.

Lemma 8.1. *Let x and y be elements in a ring R . If the commutator $[x, y]$ is addable in R , then $f([x, y]) = [f(x), f(y)]$ whenever S is a ring and $f: R \rightarrow S$ is a brachymorphism.*

Proof. From $xy = [x, y] + yx$ and the addability of $[x, y]$ we get $f(xy) = f([x, y]) + f(yx)$, thus, since f is a brachymorphism, $f(x)f(y) = f([x, y]) + f(y)f(x)$. \square

Lemma 8.2. *Let x , y , and z be elements in a ring R . If the commutator $[x, zy]$ is addable in R , then $f(z + xzy) = f(z) + f(x)f(z)f(y)$ whenever S is a ring and $f: R \rightarrow S$ be a brachymorphism.*

Proof. From $z + xzy = (z + zyx) + [x, zy]$ and the addability of $[x, zy]$ it follows, applying Lemma 8.1, that

$$f(z + xzy) = f(z + zyx) + f([x, zy]) = f(z + zyx) + [f(x), f(z)f(y)]. \quad (8.1)$$

Now $z + zyx = z(1 + yx)$, thus, since f is a brachymorphism,

$$f(z + zyx) = f(z) + f(z)f(y)f(x).$$

It follows, applying (8.1), that

$$f(z + xzy) = f(z) + f(z)f(y)f(x) + [f(x), f(z)f(y)] = f(z) + f(x)f(z)f(y). \quad \square$$

Theorem 8.3. *Let x and y be elements in a ring R . If the commutators $[x, y]$ and $[x, xy + y^2]$ are both addable in R , then the pair (x, y) is summable in R .*

Proof. Let S be a ring and let $f: R \rightarrow S$ be a brachymorphism. We must prove that $f(x + y) = f(x) + f(y)$. We shall invoke the following identity³, similar to (6.2):

$$1 + (x + y + xzy)z = (1 + xz)(1 + yz), \quad (8.2)$$

³It is the particular case, for $n = 2$, of a collection of identities, given in Cohn [9, Lemma 3.1(ii)], relating *continuant polynomials*.

valid in every ring. Now set $z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x + y$. The equation (8.2) then specializes to

$$1 + (z + xzy)z = (1 + xz)(1 + yz). \quad (8.3)$$

Since the element $[x, zy] = [x, xy + y^2]$ is addable, it follows from Lemma 8.2 that

$$f(z + xzy) = f(z) + f(x)f(z)f(y),$$

thus, by evaluating both sides of (8.3) (given by brachynomials in $x, y, z, z + xzy$) under f , we get

$$1 + (f(z) + f(x)f(z)f(y))f(z) = (1 + f(x)f(z))(1 + f(y)f(z)). \quad (8.4)$$

On the other hand, the identity (8.2), evaluated at the triple $(f(x), f(y), f(z))$, yields

$$1 + (f(x) + f(y) + f(x)f(z)f(y))f(z) = (1 + f(x)f(z))(1 + f(y)f(z)),$$

which, owing to (8.4), leads to

$$(f(x) + f(y) - f(z))f(z) = 0. \quad (8.5)$$

Since $[x, zy]$ is addable and (by assumption) $[x, y]$ is addable, the commutator $[x + 1, (z + 1)y] = [x, zy] + [x, y]$ is also addable, hence the above argument also applies to the triple $(x + 1, y, z + 1)$, for which the corresponding version of (8.5) is

$$(f(x) + f(y) - f(z))(f(z) + 1) = 0.$$

Subtracting from (8.5), we get $f(x) + f(y) - f(z) = 0$. \square

Theorem 8.4. *A map $f: R \rightarrow S$, between rings, is a ring homomorphism iff*

$$f(1 + x) = 1 + f(x), \quad (8.6)$$

$$f(z + xzy) = f(z) + f(x)f(z)f(y) \quad (8.7)$$

whenever $x, y \in R$ and $z \in \{0, 1, x + y\}$.

Proof. We verify the nontrivial direction. Set $o \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(0)$ and $e \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(1)$. Substituting $(0, 0, 0)$ then $(1, 0, 1)$ to (x, y, z) in (8.7), we get, after cancellation,

$$o^3 = e^2 o = 0,$$

which, since $e = o + 1$ (evaluate (8.6) at 0) yields $o = 0$, thus $e = 1$. Setting $z = 1$ in (8.7), it follows that for all $x, y \in R$, $f(1 + xy) = 1 + f(x)f(y)$, which, by (8.6), yields $f(xy) = f(x)f(y)$. Therefore f is a brachymorphism.

Now let $x, y \in R$ and set $z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x + y$. Applying the brachymorphism f to the equation (8.3) and using our assumption, we get

$$1 + (f(z) + f(x)f(z)f(y))f(z) = (1 + f(x)f(z))(1 + f(y)f(z)). \quad (8.8)$$

On the other hand, evaluating the identity (8.2) at $(f(x), f(y), f(z))$, we get

$$1 + (f(x) + f(y) + f(x)f(z)f(y))f(z) = (1 + f(x)f(z))(1 + f(y)f(z)).$$

Owing to (8.8) and after cancellation, we get

$$(f(x) + f(y) - f(z))f(z) = 0,$$

thus also, applying that result to the triple $(x + 1, y, z + 1)$,

$$(f(x) + f(y) - f(z))(f(z) + 1) = 0,$$

and therefore, after cancellation, $f(x) + f(y) - f(z) = 0$. \square

Let us now reap a few consequences of Theorem 8.3.

Corollary 8.5. *Let x be an element in a ring R . If all commutators $[x, y]$, for $y \in R$, are addable in R , then x is addable in R .*

By Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 7.7, we thus obtain the following.

Corollary 8.6. *Every ring, in which every commutator is a sum of nilpotent elements, is addable.*

In particular, it follows from Gardella and Thiel [13, Theorem 5.3] that the assumption of Corollary 8.6 is satisfied by all *zero-product balanced rings* as defined in [13]. By [13, Proposition 3.6], the class of such rings includes all rings generated by their idempotents. In [13, Example 3.7] (crediting Brešar [6]), it is observed that that class includes, in turn, the class of all simple rings with a nontrivial idempotent, or more generally the class of all rings R containing an idempotent e such that ReR and $R(1 - e)R$ both generate R as an additive subgroup. For the former class, Corollary 8.6 is superseded by Corollary 4.6.

Corollary 8.7. *Let n be a positive integer and let K be a commutative ring. Then every ring R of $n \times n$ lower triangular matrices over K is addable.*

Proof. For all $a, b \in R$, the commutator $[a, b]$ is a lower triangular matrix with 0 on the diagonal; thus $[a, b]^n = 0$. By Corollary 7.7, $[a, b]$ is addable. Since this holds for all $a, b \in R$, the desired conclusion follows from Corollary 8.5. \square

Corollary 8.8. *Every ring of 2×2 matrices over a commutative ring is addable.*

Proof. Every such ring satisfies Hall's identity $(xy - yx)^2 z = z(xy - yx)^2$ (saying that every commutator has central square). By Corollary 7.8, it follows that every commutator is addable. Apply Corollary 8.5. \square

For 3×3 matrices over a commutative ring, we got only a partial answer so far, namely the case where the brachymorphism in question is the determinant function (Theorem 10.3). Assuming a sufficient supply of scalar units in our ring, the desired result holds for $n \times n$ matrices (Theorem 10.1).

Recall from Bergman [3] that for every prime number p , the endomorphism ring of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}) \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$ is an example of a finite ring that cannot be embedded into any full matrix ring over a commutative ring.

Corollary 8.9. *Let I be a two-sided ideal in a ring R . If every element of I is addable in R and if R/I is commutative, then R is addable.*

Proof. Since R/I is commutative, all commutators from R belong to I , thus, by assumption, they are addable. By Corollary 8.5, every element of R is addable. \square

Other consequences of Theorem 8.3 are extensions of Corollary 6.3(3) to weaker identities than commutativity:

Corollary 8.10. *Let a ring R satisfy a polynomial identity E satisfied neither by any non-commutative division ring nor by $M_2(\mathbb{k})$ for any field \mathbb{k} . Then R is addable.*

Proof. The argument is the one used by Herstein in his proof of [16, Theorem 1]; we sketch it here for convenience. The necessary background can be found in Lam [22, Ch. 11]. If R is a division ring, then, since it satisfies E , it is commutative. If R is primitive then it has to be a division ring (thus, by the above, a field), otherwise

some $M_2(\mathbb{k})$, with \mathbb{k} a division ring, would be a homomorphic image of a subring of R , thus it would satisfy E. Hence, if R is semiprimitive then it is a subdirect product of fields, thus it is commutative. Therefore, in the general case $R/J(R)$ is commutative, which means that every commutator from R belongs to $J(R)$. By Corollary 4.5, $J(R)$ is addable in R . Apply Corollary 8.5. \square

Herstein proves in [16] that both polynomial identities $(xy)^n = x^n y^n$ and $(x + y)^n = x^n + y^n$, where n is an integer greater than 1, satisfy the assumption of Corollary 8.10; hence any ring satisfying any of those is addable. Focusing on the former identity, we obtain that the power function $x \mapsto x^n$, on any ring, cannot be a counterexample to our main conjecture. More precisely:

Corollary 8.11. *For every positive integer n , if a ring R satisfies the identity*

$$(xy)^n = x^n y^n, \quad (8.9)$$

then it is addable. In particular, if R also satisfies the identity

$$(1 + x)^n = 1 + x^n, \quad (8.10)$$

then it further satisfies the identity

$$(x + y)^n = x^n + y^n. \quad (8.11)$$

Hence if the power function $x \mapsto x^n$ on R is a brachymorphism, then it is additive. This applies, in particular, to powers of the Frobenius map $\varphi: x \mapsto x^p$ on any ring of characteristic p : hence, a power of φ is a ring homomorphism iff it is a multiplicative homomorphism.

Setting $[x, y]_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [x, y] = xy - yx$ and $[x, y]_{n+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [[x, y]_n, y]$, a ring is *Engelian* if it satisfies the identity $[x, y]_n = 0$ for some n , and *locally Engelian* if every finitely generated subring is Engelian.

Corollary 8.12. *Every locally Engelian ring is addable.*

Proof. By Corollary 5.3(3), it suffices to verify that every finitely generated Engelian ring R is addable. Set $\gamma^1(R) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R$, and define each $\gamma^{n+1}(R)$ as the two-sided ideal of R generated by the commutators $[x, y]$ where $x \in \gamma^n(R)$ and $y \in R$. By Riley and Wilson [34, Proposition 2], $\gamma^n(R) = 0$ for some nonnegative integer n . Then a straightforward downward induction argument (over the largest $k \leq n$ such that $x \in \gamma^k(R)$), based on Corollary 8.5, shows that every $x \in R$ is addable. \square

9. MONOID ALGEBRAS AND WEYL ALGEBRAS

In this section we illustrate a few of our earlier results by verifying additivity in a few nontrivial cases, namely certain monoid rings (Theorem 9.1) and Weyl algebras in positive characteristic (Theorem 9.2).

Theorem 9.1. *Let K be a commutative ring and let M be a monoid. We set*

$$\alpha_0(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{u \in M \mid (\forall x \in M)(ux = xu)\} \quad (\text{the center of } M),$$

$$\alpha_{n+1}(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{v \in M \mid v^m = x_1 \cdots x_k u y_1 \cdots y_l$$

$$\text{for some } m > 0, u \in \alpha_n(M), \text{ all } x_i, y_j \text{ regular}\} \quad \text{whenever } n \geq 0.$$

If $M = \bigcup_n \alpha_n(M)$, then the monoid ring $K[M]$ is addable.

Note. In particular, Theorem 9.1 specializes to the case where M is π -regular, or, more generally, where every element of M has a positive power which is a product of regular elements and a central element; that is, $M = \alpha_1(M)$.

Proof. Set $N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{v \in M \mid (\forall \lambda \in K)(\lambda v \in \text{Add } K[M])\}$. It suffices to verify that every $v \in M$ belongs to N (because then, by Proposition 4.1, every element of $K[M]$, being a sum of addable monomials, would be addable in $K[M]$). We argue by induction on the least n such that $v \in \alpha_n(M)$. If $v \in \alpha_0(M)$, then λv is central in $K[M]$ whenever $\lambda \in K$, thus, by Corollary 6.3, λv is addable; whence $v \in N$. Now suppose the property established at stage n and let $v \in \alpha_{n+1}(M)$. Pick $m > 0$, $u \in \alpha_n(M)$, and regular $x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_l \in M$ such that $v^m = x_1 \cdots x_k u y_1 \cdots y_l$. It follows from our induction hypothesis that $\lambda^m u \in \text{Add } K[M]$ for every $\lambda \in K$. Invoking Proposition 4.3, it follows that the element $(\lambda v)^m = x_1 \cdots x_k \lambda^m u y_1 \cdots y_l$ is addable in $K[M]$. By Corollary 7.7, it follows that λv is addable in $K[M]$; whence $v \in N$. \square

Theorem 9.2. *Let K be a commutative ring. If K has positive characteristic, then the Weyl algebra $A_1(K) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K\langle x, y \rangle / (xy - yx - 1)$ is addable.*

Proof. By assumption, there exists a positive integer m such that $m \cdot 1 = 0$ within K . It follows that $x^m y - y x^m = m x^{m-1} = 0$ within $A_1(K)$, so x^m commutes with y . Since it also commutes with x , it follows that x^m is central. Hence, for any $\lambda \in K$ and any nonnegative integer k , $(\lambda x^k)^m = \lambda^m x^{km}$ is also central, thus (cf. Corollary 6.3) addable. By Corollary 7.7, it follows that λx^k is addable. By Proposition 4.1, it follows that every element of $K[x]$ is addable in $A_1(K)$. Now every element of $A_1(K)$ has the form $\sum_{k=0}^n a_k y^k$ where each $a_k \in K[x]$. Since, by the above, all a_k are addable, it follows from Corollary 7.4 that $A_1(K)$ is addable. \square

10. ON THE DETERMINANT FUNCTION OVER RINGS OF MATRICES

It is well known that the determinant function $\det: M_n(K) \rightarrow K$, for a positive integer n and a commutative ring K , is multiplicative (i.e., $\det(ab) = \det(a)\det(b)$ for all $n \times n$ matrices a and b). On the other hand, the identity $\det(a+1) = \det(a)+1$ fails for trivial examples. If by chance it holds over a subring R of $M_n(K)$, then the question arises whether the determinant function is actually additive on R .

In this section we tackle that problem. We already know from Corollary 8.8 that the answer to the question above is positive for $n \in \{1, 2\}$, and that we then get full addability of R . In Theorem 10.1 we will verify that this is also the case provided R contains at least n scalar matrices with invertible differences, further establishing full addability of R . Finally, in Theorem 10.3 we will verify that this is also the case for $n = 3$ (however we could not prove full addability in that case).

Theorem 10.1. *Let n be a positive integer and let K a commutative ring. Denote by $\mathbf{1}$ the identity matrix in $M_n(K)$ and let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in K$ such that $\lambda_i - \lambda_j$ is invertible in K whenever $i \neq j$. If a subring R of $M_n(K)$ contains $\{\lambda_i \mathbf{1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $\det(\mathbf{1} + a) = 1 + \det(a)$ whenever $a \in R$, then a^n is central whenever $a \in R$. In particular, R is an addable ring, so the equation $\det(a + b) = \det(a) + \det(b)$ holds whenever $a, b \in R$.*

For a similar result, with weaker assumptions, assuming $n = 3$, see Theorem 10.3.

Proof. Let us denote the characteristic polynomial of any $a \in M_n(K)$ as

$$p_a(t) = \det(t\mathbf{1} - a) = t^n + \sum_{0 < k < n} (-1)^k \tau_k(a) t^{n-k} + (-1)^n \det(a), \quad (10.1)$$

where t is an indeterminate over K and each τ_k is a polynomial in the entries of K over the integers. (It is well known that each $\tau_k(a)$ is the trace of the k th exterior power of a .) Our assumption means that the assignment $a \mapsto \det(a)$ defines a brachymorphism from R to K . By Corollary 6.3, every central element of R is addable, thus

$$p_a(\lambda) = \det(\lambda\mathbf{1} - a) = \lambda^n + (-1)^n \det(a), \quad \text{whenever } \lambda \in K \text{ and } \{\lambda\mathbf{1}, a\} \subseteq R.$$

Comparing with (10.1) (evaluated at λ_i), it follows that

$$\sum_{0 < k < n} (-1)^k \tau_k(a) \lambda_i^{n-k} = 0 \quad \text{whenever } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } a \in R. \quad (10.2)$$

Now our assumption implies that the Vandermonde determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & \lambda_1 & \cdots & \lambda_1^{n-1} \\ 1 & \lambda_2 & \cdots & \lambda_2^{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \lambda_n & \cdots & \lambda_n^{n-1} \end{vmatrix} = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (\lambda_j - \lambda_i)$$

is invertible in K . By (10.2), it follows that $\tau_k(a) = 0$ whenever $0 < k < n$. Due to (10.1), this means that

$$p_a(t) = \det(t\mathbf{1} - a) = t^n + (-1)^n \det(a) \quad \text{whenever } a \in R.$$

By the Cayley-Hamilton Theorem, it follows that

$$a^n + (-1)^n \det(a)\mathbf{1} = 0 \quad \text{whenever } a \in R.$$

In particular, a^n is central. The conclusion then follows from Corollary 7.8. \square

Set $(a \mid b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_2(a+b) - \tau_2(a) - \tau_2(b)$, for all square matrices a and b of the same order over any commutative ring. The following lemma is the special case where $n = 2$ of the main result of Reutenauer and Schützenberger [31]. It can also easily be checked by a direct computation.

Lemma 10.2. *The equation $\tau_1(a)\tau_1(b) = \tau_1(ab) + (a \mid b)$ holds whenever a and b are square matrices of the same order over any commutative ring.*

The next instance of the main result of Reutenauer and Schützenberger [31], obtained by letting $n = 3$, states that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_3(a+b) &= \tau_3(a) + \tau_3(b) - \tau_1(ab)\tau_1(a+b) \\ &\quad + \tau_1(a)\tau_2(b) + \tau_2(a)\tau_1(b) + \tau_1(a^2b) + \tau_1(ab^2), \end{aligned} \quad (10.3)$$

for any square matrices a and b of the same order over any commutative ring. In what follows we will focus on 3×3 matrices, in which case τ_3 is the determinant function.

Theorem 10.3. *Let R be a ring of 3×3 matrices over a commutative ring. If $\det(\mathbf{1} + a) = 1 + \det(a)$ whenever $a \in R$, then $\det(a+b) = \det(a) + \det(b)$ whenever $a, b \in R$.*

Proof. For any $x \in R$, we get, evaluating the characteristic polynomial of x at 1,

$$\det(\mathbf{1} - x) = p_x(1) = 1 - \tau_1(x) + \tau_2(x) - \det(x),$$

so our assumption means that

$$\tau_2(x) = \tau_1(x) \quad \text{whenever } x \in R. \quad (10.4)$$

Since $-x \in R$, (10.4) also holds at $-x$, that is, $\tau_2(x) = -\tau_1(x)$. It follows that

$$2\tau_1(x) = 0 \quad \text{whenever } x \in R. \quad (10.5)$$

By substituting $x + y$ to x in (10.4), then using the additivity of τ_1 and canceling out $\tau_1(x) + \tau_1(y)$, we obtain

$$(x \mid y) = 0 \quad \text{whenever } x, y \in R. \quad (10.6)$$

By (10.3) combined with the identity $\tau_1(xy) = \tau_1(yx)$, it suffices to prove that for all $a, b \in R$, the scalar

$$\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_1(ab)\tau_1(a+b) - \tau_1(a)\tau_2(b) - \tau_2(a)\tau_1(b) - \tau_1(ab(a+b))$$

vanishes. Since, by (10.4) and (10.5), τ_1 and τ_2 agree on R , it follows from (10.5) that

$$\delta = \tau_1(u)\tau_1(v) - \tau_1(uv)$$

where we set $u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ab$ and $v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a + b$. By Lemma 10.2, this means that $\delta = (u \mid v)$. Since u and v both belong to R and by (10.6), it follows that $\delta = 0$, as desired. \square

11. EXPANDING THE CONTEXT

In order to keep our context consistent our discussion has been so far limited to (associative, unital) rings. However, the concept of brachymorphism makes sense for more general structures, giving rise to non-trivial additional results and problems.

In what follows we will still be dealing with structures with signature $(0, 1, +, \cdot)$. Brachymorphisms will be defined by the rules $f(0) = 0$ (which may no longer follow from the others), $f(1 + x) = 1 + f(x)$, and $f(xy) = f(x)f(y)$. A *brachy-automorphism* will be defined as a bijective brachymorphism. All counterexamples in this section were produced *via* the **Mace4** software (cf. McCune [25]).

11.1. Semirings. Recall that a structure $(R, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ is a *semiring* if $(R, +, 0)$ is a commutative monoid, $(R, \cdot, 1)$ is a monoid, and \cdot is distributive on $+$. For example, every ring, and also every bounded distributive lattice, is a semiring. In the latter case, the addition is determined by the multiplication. The semiring and brachy-automorphism represented in Table 11.1 show that in general, the addition of a commutative semiring may not be determined by its multiplication and successor function. This example can be described as the 4-element chain $0 < a < b < 1$, with $x + y = \max\{x, y\}$ for all elements x, y , whereas $xy = 0$ unless $1 \in \{x, y\}$.

11.2. Near-rings. A *right near-ring* is defined the same way as a ring, except that the addition is not assumed to be commutative (it still remains a group) and the multiplication is not assumed to be left distributive on the addition (we keep the right distributivity $(x + y)z = xz + yz$).

Table 11.2 represents a right near-ring with commutative addition, with a brachy-automorphism $f = \begin{pmatrix} 6 & 8 \\ 7 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$ and elements $a = 2$, $b = 4$ such that $f(a) = a$, $f(b) = b$, but $f(a + b) \neq a + b$; hence in this example, the addition is not determined by the multiplication and the successor function. This near-ring

$+$	0	a	b	1	\cdot	0	a	b	1
0	0	a	b	1	0	0	0	0	0
a	a	a	b	1	a	0	0	0	a
b	b	b	b	1	b	0	0	0	b
1	1	1	1	1	1	0	a	b	1

TABLE 11.1. A commutative semiring with elements a, b and a brachy-automorphism $f = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \end{pmatrix}$ such that $f(a+b) \neq f(a) + f(b)$

satisfies the identity $2x = 0$, so its additive group is $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^4$. It also satisfies the identity $x0 = 0$ (which does not hold in all right near-rings).

11.3. Cancellative semirings. In contrast to the example given in Subsection 11.1, the context of cancellative semirings (i.e., $x + z = y + z \Rightarrow x = y$) allows for many addability results, originally formulated for rings, to extend to cancellative semirings. A sample of such extensions is given as follows:

- (1) **Lemma 3.3** (first-order characterization of summable tuples): change “ring” to “semiring” (or “cancellative semiring”, or anything reasonable), same proof.
- (2) **Proposition 5.2** (summability is preserved under homomorphic image and finite direct product): change “ring” to “cancellative semiring”, same proof.
- (3) **Lemma 6.2** (summability formula for $xyx = x^2y$): change “ring” to “cancellative semiring”, modify the proof *mutatis mutandis* (e.g., change $(x+y-z)z = 0$ to $(x+y)z = z^2$). Corollary 6.3 remains valid for cancellative semirings.
- (4) **Theorem 7.5** (integral closedness of $\text{Add } R$ in R): change “ring” to “cancellative semiring”, extend the definition of “right integral over A ” by enabling

$$x^n + \sum_{k < n} b_k x^k = \sum_{k < n} a_k x^k$$

with all $a_k, b_k \in A$. Change the equation $zx^n = \sum_{k < n} a_k x^k + (a_n + y)x^n$ to $\sum_{k < n} b_k x^k + zx^n = \sum_{k < n} a_k x^k + (a_n + y)x^n$. The rest of the proof goes along the same lines as in the ring case.

- (5) **Section 7.** Owing to (4) above, all other results of Section 7 can be extended the same way, with the exceptions of Corollaries 7.8 and 7.10, for it is not clear whether regular implies addable in that more general cancellative semiring context. For the desired extension of Corollary 7.9, note that every brachynomial $t(x, y)$ has a unique monomial of largest degree d , and that $d > 0$ in all non-trivial cases. Evaluating $t(n \cdot 1, n \cdot 1)$ for a large enough integer n , it follows that $m \cdot 1 = 0$ for some positive integer m ; thus our semiring is in fact a ring.
- (6) **Theorem 8.4** ($f(1+x) = 1+f(x)$ and $f(z+xzy) = f(z) + f(x)f(z)f(y)$ together entail additivity): change “ring” to “cancellative semiring”, modify the proof *mutatis mutandis*.

11.4. More open problems. We know from Corollary 7.10 (see also Remark 7.11) that every brachymorphism from a finite ring is additive. For (finite or infinite) non-associative rings we do not know the answer.

Problem 1. Is every brachymorphism, from a non-associative ring, additive?

We stated at the beginning of the paper the basic unsolved problem, whether every brachymorphism, between rings, is additive. By Proposition 5.2(1), this is equivalent to saying that the pair (x, y) is summable in the free associative

+	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
0	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	1	0	3	2	5	4	7	6	9	8	11	10	13	12	15	14
2	2	3	0	1	6	7	4	5	10	11	8	9	14	15	12	13
3	3	2	1	0	7	6	5	4	11	10	9	8	15	14	13	12
4	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3	12	13	14	15	8	9	10	11
5	5	4	7	6	1	0	3	2	13	12	15	14	9	8	11	10
6	6	7	4	5	2	3	0	1	14	15	12	13	10	11	8	9
7	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8
8	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	9	8	11	10	13	12	15	14	1	0	3	2	5	4	7	6
10	10	11	8	9	14	15	12	13	2	3	0	1	6	7	4	5
11	11	10	9	8	15	14	13	12	3	2	1	0	7	6	5	4
12	12	13	14	15	8	9	10	11	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3
13	13	12	15	14	9	8	11	10	5	4	7	6	1	0	3	2
14	14	15	12	13	10	11	8	9	6	7	4	5	2	3	0	1
15	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
3	0	3	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	3
4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
5	0	5	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	11
6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
7	0	7	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	7
8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
9	0	9	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	9
10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
11	0	11	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5
12	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
13	0	13	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13
14	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
15	0	15	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	1

TABLE 11.2. A right near-ring with commutative addition, with elements $a = 2$, $b = 4$ and a brachy-automorphism $f = (6 \ 8)(7 \ 9)$ satisfying $f(a) = a$, $f(b) = b$, and $f(a + b) \neq a + b$

ring $\mathbb{Z}\langle x, y \rangle$. A strong negative solution to that problem would be provided by a positive solution to the following problem.

Problem 2. Let \mathbb{k} be a field. Does there exist a brachymorphism $f: \mathbb{k}\langle x, y \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ such that $f(x) = f(y) = 0$ whereas $f(x + y) = 1$?

Problem 2 seems to be somehow related to the “resistance problem for free associative algebras” (cf. Bergman [4]), asking whether a nonconstant element, in a free associative algebra $\mathbb{k}\langle \Sigma \rangle$, can generate the whole $\mathbb{k}\langle \Sigma \rangle$ as a two-sided ideal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author thanks George Bergman, Ken Goodearl, and Hannes Thiel for instructive comments on an earlier version of this preprint, which led to a number of improvements.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hazar Abu-Khuzam, Hisao Tominaga, and Adil Yaqub, *Equational definability of addition in rings satisfying polynomial identities*, Math. J. Okayama Univ. **22** (1980), no. 1, 55–57. MR 573671
- [2] Gorô Azumaya, *Strongly π -regular rings*, J. Fac. Sci. Hokkaido Univ. Ser. I. **13** (1954), 34–39. MR 0067864
- [3] George M. Bergman, *Some examples in PI ring theory*, Israel J. Math. **18** (1974), 257–277. MR 357488
- [4] ———, *Which group algebras cannot be made zero by imposing a single non-monomial relation?*, Comm. Algebra **49** (2021), no. 9, 3760–3776. MR 4290109
- [5] George S. Boolos, John P. Burgess, and Richard C. Jeffrey, *Computability and Logic*, fifth ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007. MR 2420547
- [6] Matej Brešar, *Characterizing homomorphisms, derivations and multipliers in rings with idempotents*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **137** (2007), no. 1, 9–21. MR 2359769
- [7] ———, *Functional identities and their applications*, Bull. Math. Sci. **13** (2023), no. 3, Paper No. 2330002. MR 4679473
- [8] Matej Brešar, Mikhail A. Chebotar, and Wallace S. Martindale, III, *Functional Identities*, Frontiers in Mathematics, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007. MR 2332350
- [9] Paul M. Cohn, *Rings with a weak algorithm*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **109** (1963), 332–356. MR 153696
- [10] Jean Dhombres, *Relations de dépendance entre les équations fonctionnelles de Cauchy*, Aequationes Math. **35** (1988), no. 2-3, 186–212. MR 954240
- [11] Friedrich Dischinger, *Sur les anneaux fortement π -réguliers*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B **283** (1976), no. 8, A571–A573. MR 422330
- [12] Alfred L. Foster, *Ring-logics and p -rings*, Univ. California Publ. Math. (N.S.) **1** (1951), 385–395. MR 44503
- [13] Eusebio Gardella and Hannes Thiel, *Zero-product balanced algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl. **670** (2023), 121–153. MR 4579922
- [14] Roman Ger and Ludwig Reich, *A generalized ring homomorphisms equation*, Monatsh. Math. **159** (2010), no. 3, 225–233. MR 2600910
- [15] Melvin Henriksen, *Two classes of rings generated by their units*, J. Algebra **31** (1974), 182–193. MR 349745
- [16] Israel N. Herstein, *Power maps in rings*, Michigan Math. J. **8** (1961), 29–32. MR 118741
- [17] ———, *Topics in Ring Theory*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.-London, 1969. MR 271135
- [18] Eugene C. Johnsen, David L. Outcalt, and Adil Yaqub, *An elementary commutativity theorem for rings*, Amer. Math. Monthly **75** (1968), 288–289. MR 225825
- [19] Richard E. Johnson, *Rings with unique addition*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1958), 57–61. MR 95868
- [20] Irving Kaplansky, *Topological representation of algebras. II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **68** (1950), 62–75. MR 32612
- [21] Hiroaki Komatsu, *On the equational definability of addition in rings*, Math. J. Okayama Univ. **24** (1982), no. 2, 133–136. MR 680186
- [22] T. Y. Lam, *A First Course in Noncommutative Rings*, second ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 131, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001. MR 1838439
- [23] Wallace S. Martindale, III, *When are multiplicative mappings additive?*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **21** (1969), 695–698. MR 240129
- [24] Neal H. McCoy, *Generalized regular rings*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **45** (1939), no. 2, 175–178. MR 1563934
- [25] William McCune, *Prover9 and Mace4 [computer software]*, 2005–2010.

- [26] Lajos Molnár, *On isomorphisms of standard operator algebras*, *Studia Math.* **142** (2000), no. 3, 295–302. MR 1792612
- [27] Hal G. Moore and Adil Yaqub, *Equational definability of addition in certain rings*, *Pacific J. Math.* **74** (1978), no. 2, 407–417. MR 472904
- [28] Claudio Procesi, *A formal inverse to the Cayley-Hamilton theorem*, *J. Algebra* **107** (1987), no. 1, 63–74. MR 883869
- [29] Mohan S. Putcha and Adil Yaqub, *Equational definability of addition in certain noncommutative rings*, *J. Algebra* **92** (1985), no. 1, 1–8. MR 772467
- [30] Robert M. Raphael, *Rings which are generated by their units*, *J. Algebra* **28** (1974), 199–205. MR 342554
- [31] Christophe Reutenauer and Marcel-Paul Schützenberger, *A formula for the determinant of a sum of matrices*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **13** (1987), no. 4, 299–302. MR 895292
- [32] Charles E. Rickart, *One-to-one mappings of rings and lattices*, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **54** (1948), 758–764. MR 26039
- [33] David M. Riley, *When is a power of the Frobenius map on a noncommutative ring a homomorphism?*, *J. Algebra* **479** (2017), 159–172. MR 3627280
- [34] David M. Riley and Mark C. Wilson, *Associative rings satisfying the Engel condition*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **127** (1999), no. 4, 973–976. MR 1473677
- [35] Ashish K. Srivastava, *A survey of rings generated by units*, *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math.* (6) **19** (2010), no. Fascicule Spécial, 203–213. MR 2675727
- [36] Adil Yaqub, *On the theory of ring-logics*, *Canadian J. Math.* **8** (1956), 323–328. MR 78970
- [37] ———, *Equational definability of addition in rings generated by idempotents*, *Math. J. Okayama Univ.* **23** (1981), no. 2, 203–204. MR 638144

NORMANDIE UNIVERSITÉ, UNICAEN, CNRS UMR 6139, LMNO, 14000 CAEN, FRANCE

Email address: friedrich.wehrung01@unicaen.fr

URL: <https://wehrungf.users.lmno.cnrs.fr>