

A RESULT ON SIMPLE ACCESSIBLE RINGS

By

K. Suvarna and K. Subhashini

Department of Mathematics, S.K. University,
Anatapur-515 003, Andhra Pradesh, India

(Received : July 10, 1999)

ABSTRACT

In this paper we show that a simple accessible ring is either a $(-1,1)$ ring or a commutative ring.

1. Introduction. Accessible rings were introduced by Kleinfeld [1]. A non-associative ring R is called accessible in case the following two identities hold :

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

$$(2) \quad ((w,x), y,z) = 0$$

for all w,x,y,z in R , where the associator (x,y,z) is defined by $(x,y,z) = (xy)z - x(yz)$ and the commutator (x,y) is defined by $(x,y) = xy - yx$. An accessible ring is defined to be simple if it has no proper two sided ideals.

A $(-1,1)$ ring is a non-associative ring in which the following identities hold :

$$(3) \quad (x,y,z) + (x,z,y) = 0,$$

$$(4) \quad (x,y,z) + (y,z,x) + (z,x,y) = 0.$$

In [4] it is proved that a simple non-associative ring of char $\neq 2$ satisfying the identity $((x,y,z),w) = 0$ is either commutative or associative, Kleinfeld [2] proved that the same result still valid when this identity is replaced by more general conditions. The identity $((x,y,z) \nu, w) = 0$ holds in accessible rings under the assumption that the rings are without nilpotent elements in the center [1]. Without this assumption we show that $((x,y,y) \nu, w) = 0$ holds in accessible rings. Using this identity we show that a simple accessible ring is either $(-1,1)$ or commutative.

2. Preliminaries. By substituting $z = x$ in (1) we obtain the flexible law $(x,y,x) = 0$. The following identities hold in accessible rings

$$(5) \quad (x,y,z) = -(z,y,x),$$

$$(6) \quad (x,y,z) = x(y,z) + (x,z)y,$$

$$(7) \quad (x,y,z) + (y,z,x) + (z,x,y) = 0,$$

$$(8) \quad ((w,x,y),z) = 0.$$

The nucleus N of R is defined as the set of all elements n in R with the property $(n,R,R) = 0$. If n is an element of the nucleus N of R , then because

of the flexible law $(R, R, n) = 0$, Finally because of (1) it follows that also $(R, n, R) = 0$.

The following identity holds in an arbitrary ring :

$$(wx, y, z) - (w, xy, z) + (w, x, yz) = w(x, y, z) + (w, x, y)z.$$

If $w = n$ in the above equation, then it becomes

$$(9) \quad (nx, y, z) = n(x, y, z), \quad n \text{ in } N.$$

From (9) and from the fact that every commutator is in the nucleus, we get

$$(v, x)(x, y, z) = ((v, x)x, y, z).$$

It follows from (6) that $(v, x)x = (v, x, x)$. Consequently

$$((v, x)x, y, z) = ((vx, x), y, z) = 0, \text{ Thus}$$

$$(10) \quad (v, x)(x, y, z) = 0.$$

3. Main Result

Lemma 1. In an accessible ring $R, ((x, y, y)v, w) = 0$.

Proof. Linearization of (10) becomes

$$(11) \quad (v, w)(x, y, z) = -(v, x)(w, y, z)$$

$$\text{By using (5), (11), (7) and (10),}$$

$$= (v, y)(w, y, x)$$

$$= (v, y)[-(y, x, w) - (x, w, y)]$$

$$= -(v, y)(y, x, w) + (v, y)(y, w, x)$$

$$= 0.$$

That is,

$$(12) \quad (v, w)(x, y, y) = 0.$$

Now from (6), (12) and (8), we get $((x, y, y)v, w) = (x, y, y)(v, w) + ((x, y, y), w)v = 0$

Lemma 2. Let R be an accessible ring, then $U = \{u \in R / (u, r) = 0 = (uR, R)\}$ is an ideal of R .

Proof. If we put $w = u$ in (8), then $((u, x, y), z) = 0$. From this it follows that $(ux, y, z) - (u, xy, z) = 0$. Then $(ux, y, z) = 0$ by the definition of U . Thus $ux \in U$. So U is a right ideal of R . Since $(u, R) = 0$, $(u, x) = 0$. That is $ux = xu \in U$. So U is a left ideal of R . Hence U is an Ideal of R .

Theorem. If R is a simple accessible ring, then R is either a $(-1, 1)$ ring or a commutative ring.

Proof. From (8) and lemma 1 (x, y, y) is in U . Since U is an ideal of R and R is simple, we have either $U = 0$ or $U = R$. If $U = 0$, then R is right alternative, that is $(x, y, y) = 0$.

Linearization of this yields $(x, y, z) + (x, z, y) = 0$. From this and (7) it follows that R is a $(-1, 1)$ ring. If $U = R$ then R is a commutative ring.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Kleinfeld, Standard and accessible rings, *Canad. J. Math.* 8 (1956), 335-340.
- [2] E. Kleinfeld, On rings with alternators in the commutative center, *Port. Math.* 50 (1993), 297-304
- [3] Yash Paul, A note on $(-1, 1)$ rings, *Jñānābha* 11 (1981), 107-109
- [4] A Thedy, On rings satisfying $((a, b, c), d) = 0$, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 29 (1971), 213-218.