Note on rings in which every proper left-ideal is cyclic

by

F. A. Szász (Debrecen)

We shall call an arbitrary ring R cyclic if the additive group R^+ is cyclic. The ring J of rational integers is obviously cyclic. Starting from the fundamental property of the ring J we introduce the following

Definition. An arbitrary ring R is called a ring with property P, if every proper left-ideal L of R is cyclic. For example any cyclic ring and any skew-field have the property P.

THEOREM. An arbitrary ring R has the property P if and only if R is a skew-field, or a cyclic ring, or a zero-ring of type p^{∞} or else an arbitrary ring of order p^2 (where p is a prime).

Remark. A skew-field, as a ring without proper left-ideals, can have an arbitrary infinite cardinal, but the order of a finite ring with property P is necessarily p^2 . For example $R(p) = \{x,y\}$ is a non-commutative ring with property P and of order p^2 where p is a prime number and $px = py = x^2 = xy = yx - x = y^2 - y = 0$. We remark that the theorem is a generalization of Lemma 1 (see [7]). The notions of modern algebra can be found in the books [1], [3], [4] and [5], therefore we omit terminological remarks. Now we verify five Lemmas.

LEMMA 1. A ring without proper left-ideals is a skew-field or else a zero-ring of prime-number-order.

Proof. If there exists an element $0 \neq a \in R$ for which $Ra \neq R$, then Ra = 0, and thus the zero-ring $\{a\} \neq 0$, being a left-ideal, coincides with R and O(R) = p. But if for any $0 \neq a \in R$ the element Ra = R holds, then R has no divisors of zero and by the single equation ea = a we see that $e \in R$ is the unity of R. The solvability of all equations yb = e trivially implies by the associativity law the skew-field behaviour of R.

Remarks. From this short proof we see that only the rings of order p are without proper subrings; moreover the solvability of all equations yb=a in a ring implies the solvability of all equations bx=a in the same ring $(b\neq 0)$; and finally we observe that we can similarly prove that if in a ring R there exists an element $a\neq 0$ which is not a right an-

nihilator of R and if for this element with any $0 \neq b \in R$ the element Rab = Ra holds, then R is a skew-field (see [6]).

LEMMA 2. A ring R with mixed group R^+ cannot have the property P. Proof. We assume that R is a ring with property P and with mixed group R^+ . Let T be the cyclic torsion ring of order $n \in J$ in R. Since $(nR) \cdot T = T \cdot (nR) = 0$ and $nR \cap T = 0$, there exists a non-cyclic two-sided ideal D = nR + T (as a ring-theoretical direct sum) in R, which by property P implies R = nR + T (without the use of the fundamental theorem of [8]). Then n^2R is likewise a cyclic ideal in R, consequently $n^2R + T = R$. If $nR = \{nr\}$, where naturally $O(r) = \infty$, we obtain $nr = k(n^2r) + t$ $(k \in J, t \in T)$, i. e., $n = kn^2$ and n = 1, T = 0.

LEMMA 3. A ring R with property P but without divisors of zero is a skew-field or else an infinite cyclic ring.

Proof. If $0 \neq a \in R$, then $Ra \neq 0$. If for every $0 \neq a \in R$ it is Ra = R, thus, by Lemma 1, R is a skew-field. In the case $Ra \neq R$ the ring R is itself cyclic by the property P and by $(Ra)^+ \sim R^+$, and obviously $O(R) = \infty$.

LEMMA 4. A ring with property P, containing divisors of zero and being of characteristic 0, cannot have an algebraically closed additive group.

Proof. We suppose that R, being a ring with divisors of zero and having an algebraically closed additive group R^+ , is of characteristic 0. Then $(Rb)^+$ cannot be simultaneously cyclic and algebraically closed, and therefore Rb=0 or else Rb=R. By Lemma 1 and by our hypothesis there exists a $z\neq 0$ right-annihilator of R, i. e., Rz=0. Then the set $Z\neq 0$ of all right-annihilators of R is a two-sided ideal in R, whose additive group Z^+ is a serving subgroup in R^+ . The ideal Z cannot be cyclic, since Z^+ is likewise algebraically closed, therefore Z^+ and Z^+ is a zero-ring. But in an algebraically closed group there exists a subgroup which is not cyclic, and this contradiction proves our Lemma.

LEMMA 5. Let F be a (finite or infinite) elementary p-ring for which $F^2 \neq 0$ and $O(F) \geqslant p^2$, and let moreover \mathcal{F} be a two-sided ideal of order p in a ring R. If $R/\mathcal{F} \simeq F$, then R is without property P.

Proof. We shall assume that R has the property P and we shall show a contradiction. The complete endomorphism ring of \mathcal{I}^+ has the order p, an byd the endomorphism $j \sim j_{\mathcal{I}_r} = j_{\mathcal{I}^r}$ ($j \in \mathcal{I}, r \in R$) of \mathcal{I}^+ we have a ring-theoretical homomorphism $r \sim r_r$ of R into the complete endomorphism ring of \mathcal{I}^+ . The kernel of this mapping $r \sim r_r$ is an ideal N, for which RN = 0 and $O(R/N) \leq p$ holds. Consequently by $O(R) \geq p^2$ and by property P obviously R = N; therefore R is a zero-ring. But then likewise $R/\mathcal{I} \sim F$ is a zero ring, which contradicts our hypothesis.

Now we give an elementary

g

g

g

R

ь**П**,

5h. u∽

61,

m

ra

۰۰.

180

611

 $rac{R}{R}$

ıat

 \mathbf{lly}

or-

na-

in.

oye an-

Proof of Theorem. Let R be a ring with property P. By Lemma 3 we can suppose the existence of divisors of zero. If R contains an element of infinite order, then by Lemma 2 and 4 there exists a number $n \in J$ for which $0 \subseteq nR \subseteq R$. But by $R^+ \simeq (nR)^+$ and by property P, R is

eyelic. If R^\pm is a torsion group, then a ring theoretical direct decomposition $R = \sum R_p$ holds, where the ideal R_p is generated by all elements of p power order of R. If $R \neq R_p$, then R is a finite cyclic ring. Now let R be a p-ring in which R' is generated by all elements of order p of R. If $R' \neq R$, then R is cyclic or else of type p^{∞} because in both cases R' is cyclic [2]. Finally we assume that R'=R. By the existence of divisors of zero, by pR=0, by Lemma 1 and by property P the existence of a left-ideal L of order p of R is necessarily ensured. Now we show the impossibility of $O(R) \geqslant p^3$. It is clear that Lr is a left-ideal in R $(r \in R)$. If there exists an element $0 \neq r \in R$ for which $Lr \neq 0$ and $L \cap Lr = 0$ holds, then for the left-ideal $D = \{L, Lr\}$ it is R = D, i. e., $O(R) = p^2$. But if $Lr \subseteq L$ for all $r \in R$, the subring L is a two-sided ideal in R. Then R/L has the property P and consequently has no proper left-ideals. By $O(R) > p^3$ we can assume that R/L is a skew-field, and thus not a zero-ring, but has the property P. By $O(R/L) > p^2$ and by Lemma 5 we have obtained a contradiction, which completes the proof.

References

[1] N. Jacobson, Lectures in abstract algebra, New York 1951.

[2] A. Kertész, On fully decomposable abelian torsion groups, Acta Math. Acad. Sei, Hung. 3 (1952), p. 225-232.

[3] A. G. Kurosh, Theory of groups, Moscow 1953.

[4] G. Pickert, Einführung in die höhere Algebra, Göttingen 1951.

[5] L. Rédei, Algebra I, Budapest 1954.

- [6] T. Szele, Eine kennzeichnende Eigenschaft der Schiefkörper, Comment. Math. Helv. 22 (1949), p. 115-116.
 - [7] Die Ringe ohne Linksideale, Bulotin Stii, Bucuresti I (1950), p. 783-789.
- [8] On direct decomposition of abelian groups, J. London Math. Soc. 28 (1953), р. 55-58.

Regu par la Rédaction le 12,9,1956