

Errata for

Algebra in the Stone-Čech Compactification, 2nd Edition,
DeGruyter, Berlin, 2012

by

Neil Hindman and Dona Strauss

Typos

Included here are the typographical errors of which the authors are aware at the time of this writing.

Page 132, line -2. “ $\tilde{\theta}(m) \neq \tilde{\theta}(n)$ ” should be “ $\tilde{\theta}(q_m) \neq \tilde{\theta}(q_n)$ ”.

Page 133, line 5. “ $\langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n \rangle$ ” should be “ $\langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \rangle$ ”

Page 224, line -8. “set of sums of all P -sums” should be “set of all P -sums”.

Page 345, line 20. “ $L = (\{1, 2\}, \{4, 5, 6\}, \{9, 10, 11, 12\}, \{14, 15\})$ ” should be “ $L = (\{1, 2\}, \{4, 5, 6\}, \{10, 11, 12, 13\}, \{15, 16\})$ ”

Section 8.5

Lemma 8.48 is incorrect as stated. Following is a corrected version with its proof.

Lemma 8.48. *Let $a \in G \setminus \{e\}$ and pick $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a < b_r$. Let $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that $b_{m_1} b_{m_2} \cdots b_{m_k}$ and $b_{n_1} b_{n_2} \cdots b_{n_l}$ are P -products such that $ab_{m_1} b_{m_2} \cdots b_{m_k} = b_{n_1} b_{n_2} \cdots b_{n_l}$ and $b_{m_1} \in P_r$. Then $k < l$ and, if $i = l - k$, then $a = b_{n_1} b_{n_2} \cdots b_{n_i}$ and $m_j = n_{i+j}$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.*

Proof. Suppose the conclusion fails and pick a counterexample with $k + l$ a minimum among all counterexamples. Note that $b_{m_1} \in P_r$ and $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_r\} \subseteq F_r$ so $m_1 > r$.

Assume first that $k > 1$ and $l > 1$. If $n_{l-1} \geq m_{k-1}$, we have

$$b_{n_l} = (b_{n_1} \cdots b_{n_{l-1}})^{-1} (ab_{m_1} \cdots b_{m_{k-1}}) b_{m_k}$$

and, since $b_{n_l} \notin F_{n_{l-1}} P$, we must have that $ab_{m_1} \cdots b_{m_{k-1}} = b_{n_1} \cdots b_{n_{l-1}}$ and $b_{n_l} = b_{m_k}$ so there is a smaller counterexample. Similarly, if $n_{l-1} < m_{k-1}$, we get a smaller counterexample because of the equation $b_{m_k} = (ab_{m_1} \cdots b_{m_{k-1}})^{-1} (b_{n_1} \cdots b_{n_{l-1}}) b_{n_l}$.

Therefore we must have $k = 1$ or $l = 1$. Suppose that $l = 1$. Then $b_{m_1} \cdots b_{m_k} = a^{-1} b_{n_1}$. If $k = 1$, this says that $b_{m_1} = a^{-1} b_{n_1} \in F_r P$, a contradiction. If $k > 1$, this says $b_{m_k} = (ab_{m_1} \cdots b_{m_{k-1}})^{-1} b_{n_1}$ so $b_{m_k} \in F_{m_{k-1}} P$ unless $ab_{m_1} \cdots b_{m_{k-1}} = e$. But if

$k - 1 = 1$, the equation $ab_{m_1} = e$ says that $b_{m_1} \in F_r$ while if $k - 1 > 1$, the equation $ab_{m_1} \cdots b_{m_{k-1}} = e$ says that $b_{m_{k-1}} \in F_{m_{k-2}}$.

Thus we must have $k = 1$ and $l > 1$. If $n_{l-1} \leq r$ we get $b_{m_1} = a^{-1}(b_{n_1} \cdots b_{n_{l-1}})b_{n_l}$ so $a^{-1}(b_{n_1} \cdots b_{n_{l-1}}) = e$; that is $a = b_{n_1} \cdots b_{n_{l-1}}$ and $m_1 = n_l$, so this is not a counterexample. If $n_{l-1} > r$, we get $b_{n_l} = (b_{n_1} \cdots b_{n_{l-1}})^{-1}ab_{m_1}$ so $(b_{n_1} \cdots b_{n_{l-1}})^{-1}a = e$ and we again conclude that we don't have a counterexample. \square

The lemmas and the theorem that cited Lemma 8.48 are all correct as stated (except for a typo in the statement of Lemma 8.64), but all need adjustments to their proofs – in the case of Lemma 8.49, the proof needs replacement.

Lemma 8.49. *The expression for an element of T as a P -product is unique.*

Proof. Assume that there are P -products $b_{m_1}b_{m_2} \cdots b_{m_k}$ and $b_{n_1}b_{n_2} \cdots b_{n_l}$ such that $b_{m_1}b_{m_2} \cdots b_{m_k} = b_{n_1}b_{n_2} \cdots b_{n_l}$ but $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k) \neq (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_l)$ and pick such products with $k + l$ a minimum. As in the proof of Lemma 8.48 above, if $k > 1$ and $l > 1$, then $b_{n_k} = b_{n_l}$ and so the equation $b_{m_1}b_{m_2} \cdots b_{m_{k-1}} = b_{n_1}b_{n_2} \cdots b_{n_{l-1}}$ provides a smaller example.

Thus we can assume without loss of generality that $k = 1$. If also $l = 1$, then $b_{m_1} = b_{n_1}$, so we must have $l > 1$. But then $(b_{n_1} \cdots b_{n_{l-1}})^{-1}b_{m_1} = b_{n_l}$ and so $b_{n_l} \in F_{n_{l-1}}P$, a contradiction. \square

For the proof of Lemma 8.57, the sentence “For each $a \in G$, the set $X_a = \{b_n : n \in Q, b_n > a, \text{ and } b_n > a^{-1}\} \in x$.” should be replaced by “For each $a \in G$, pick $r_a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a < b_{r_a}$ and let $X_a = \{b_n : n \in Q \text{ and } b_n \in P_{r_a}\}$. Note that $X_a \in x$.”

For the proof of Lemma 8.59, the sentence “For each $a \in G$, let Q_a denote the set of P -products $b_{n_1}b_{n_2} \cdots b_{n_k}$ with $b_{n_1} > a$ and $b_{n_1} > a^{-1}$.” should be replaced by “For each $a \in G$, pick $r_a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a < b_{r_a}$ and let Q_a denote the set of P -products $b_{n_1}b_{n_2} \cdots b_{n_k}$ such that $b_{n_1} \in P_{r_a}$.”

For the proof of Theorem 8.63, the sentence “If we choose n such that $a < b_n$ and $a < b_n^{-1}$, it follows from Lemma 8.48 that $aT_n \cap T_m = \emptyset$.” should be replaced by “If we choose $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a < b_r$ and choose n such that $b_n \in P_r$, it follows from Lemma 8.48 that $aT_n \cap T_m = \emptyset$.”

Finally, the statement of Lemma 8.64 needs to specify that $x \neq e$ and the proof needs revision.

Lemma 8.64. *Let G be a countably infinite discrete group and let p be a right cancelable element of G^* . Suppose that $x \in \beta G \setminus \{e\}$, $y \in T_\infty$, and $xy \in \bar{T}$. Then $x \in \bar{T}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x \notin \overline{T}$ and let $X = G \setminus (T \cup \{e\})$. For each $a \in X$, pick $r_a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a < r_a$. Let Z be the set of all products of the form $ab_{n_1}b_{n_2}\cdots b_{n_k}$ where $b_{n_1}b_{n_2}\cdots b_{n_k}$ is a P -product, $a \in X$, and $b_{n_i} \in P_{r_a}$. By Theorem 4.15, $Z \in xy$. Since $T \in xy$, pick $a \in X$ and a P -product $b_{n_1}b_{n_2}\cdots b_{n_k}$ such that $b_{n_i} \in P_{r_a}$ and $ab_{n_1}b_{n_2}\cdots b_{n_k} \in T$. Then by Lemma 8.48, $a \in T$, a contradiction. \square

Section 14.4

In the proof of Theorem 14.14.4, we neglected to show that $J(S) \neq \emptyset$. This is most easily accomplished by moving Theorem 14.14.4 to after Lemma 14.14.6 and then invoking Theorem 3.11.