

ON RINGS WITH POLYNOMIAL IDENTITY $x^n - x = 0$

Veselin Perić

Abstract. If $R \neq 0$ is an associative ring with the polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$, where $n > 1$ is a fixed natural number, then it is well known that R is commutative. It is also known that any anti-inverse ring $R(\neq 0)$ satisfies the polynomial identity $x^3 - x = 0$ [1]. The structure of anti-inverse rings was described in [2]: they are exactly subdirect sums of $GF(2)$'s and $GF(3)$'s. In generalizing the last result, we prove here that a ring R with the polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$ (> 1) is a subdirect sum of $GF(p)$'s, where $p^r - 1$ divides $n - 1$. We also prove again some known results about commutative regular rings.

We consider here the associative rings $R \neq 0$. These rings need not be commutative and they can be without identity. In the polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$ we assume n to be a fixed natural number greater than 1.

Following B. Cerović [1], a ring R is called an anti-inverse ring if every element x in R has an anti-inverse x^* in $R : x^*xx^* = x$ and $xx^*x = x^*$. From this definition the following well known lemma is immediately inferred:

LEMMA 1. ([2]). *In any anti-inverse ring R the following identities are valid:*
 $x^2 = x^{*2} = (xx^*)^2 = (x^*x)^2$.

Epecially, any anti-inverse ring R satisfies the polynomial identity $x^5 - x = 0$.

According to the well known Jacobson's Theorem, from the preceding lemma we have also the following well known lemma:

LEMMA 2. *Every ring R with the polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$ is commutative. Especially, any anti-inverse ring R is commutative.*

From the two preceding lemma we obtain the following proposition, already known in the literature:

AMS Subject Classification (1980): Primary 16A38.

Key words and phrases: Anti-inverse rings; polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$; subdirect sum of $GF(p)$'s; commutative regular rings.

This research was supported by SIZ nauke SRBiH.

PROPOSITION 1. ([1, prop. 2.2] and [2]) *A ring R is an anti-inverse ring if and only if it satisfies the polynomial identity $x^3 - x = 0$.*

The anti-inverse rings were characterized in [2] in the following manner:

PROPOSITION 2. ([2]) *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *R is an anti-inverse ring;*
- (2) *R is a subdirect sum of $GF(2)$'s and $GF(3)$'s;*
- (3) *R satisfies the polynomial identity $x^3 - x = 0$*

In generalizing the part of this proposition asserting the equivalence between (2) and (3), we prove here the following theorem:

THEOREM: *For a ring R the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *R is a ring with the polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$;*
- (ii) *R is a subdirect of fields $GF(p^r)$, where $p^r - 1$ divides $n - 1$.*

For the proof of this theorem we need a certain preparation and we start with the following lemma:

LEMMA 3. *Let R be a subdirectly irreducible ring. Then R is without proper zero divisors if and only if R has no nonzero nilpotent elements.*

Proof. If R is without proper zero divisors, then it is clear that R has no nonzero nilpotent elements.

Conversely, let R be without nonzero nilpotent elements. Then for any subset S of R the left annihilating set of S coincides with the right annihilating set of S , and hence it is an ideal of R , the annihilating ideal $\text{ann}_R(S)$ of S in R . Suppose the set A of all proper zero divisors in R is not void. For any a in A the annihilating ideal $\text{ann}_R(a)$ is a singular ideal in R different from (0) and contains no regular elements b in R . By hypothesis $a \notin \text{ann}_R(a)$ for any a in A , and hence $\bigcap_{a \in A} \text{ann}_R(a) = (0)$. Consequently, R would not be a subdirectly irreducible ring.

If R is a ring with the polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$, or a commutative regular ring (a ring with identity having for any x in R an element x' in R with $xx'x = x$), then surely R has no nonzero nilpotent elements. If moreover such a ring is subdirectly irreducible, then R is without proper zero divisors according to the preceding lemma. But in this case R is a field, because it is a finite commutative ring having at most n elements, or according to $x(x'x - 1) = 0$, a commutative ring in which any nonzero element x is invertible.

So, for commutative regular rings we have the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 3. *A commutative regular ring R is subdirectly irreducible if and only if it is a field.*

This proposition is implicitly contained in [2].

PROPOSITION 4. *R is a subdirectly irreducible ring with polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$ if and only if $R = GF(p^r)$, where $p^r - 1$ divides $n - 1$.*

Proof. Let $R = GF(p^r)$; $p^r - 1$ divides $n - 1$. Then R is surely a subdirectly irreducible ring. Moreover (R, \cdot) is a cyclic group of order $p^r - 1$, and hence $x^{p^r - 1} = 1 (x \in R)$. Since $p^r - 1$ divides $n - 1$ we have $x^{n-1} = 1 (x \in R)$, which means $x^n = x (x \in R)$.

Conversely, let R be a subdirectly irreducible ring with polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$. According to the remark following Lemma 3, R is a finite field having at most n elements; hence, $R = GF(p^r)$. The generating element g of the cyclic group (R, \cdot) of order $p^r - 1$ has the same order, and because $g^n - g = 0$, i.e., $g^{n-1} = 1$, $p^r - 1$ must divide $n - 1$.

We can now prove our theorem.

(i) *implies* (ii): As it is known, R is a subdirect sum of subdirectly irreducible rings $R_i (i \in I)$. The ring R satisfies the polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$, and since any R_i is an epimorphic image of R , it satisfies that identity too. According to Proposition 4, any R_i has form $GF(p^r)$, where $p^r - 1$ divides $n - 1$.

(ii) *implies* (i): According to Proposition 4, any of the rings $GF(p^r)$, where $p^r - 1$ divides $n - 1$ satisfies the polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$; hence, the subdirect sum R of these rings itself satisfies that identity.

As the implication “(i) implies (ii)” is proved using Proposition 4, we can prove again the following proposition using Proposition 3:

PROPOSITION 5. *Any commutative regular ring R is a subdirect sum of fields.*

This proposition is not new and is implicitly contained in [3] (see later). We observe that the converse of this proposition need not be true. Indeed, a subdirect sum of fields need not have an identity (for instance the direct sum of infinitely many fields has no identity). But also when a subdirect sum of (infinitely many) fields has an identity, it need not be a (commutative) regular ring. Namely, if $f : R \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} R_i$ is the monomorphism defining R as a subdirect sum of the fields $R_i (i \in I)$ and $f(x) = (x_i)_{i \in I}$, then for x' in R with $x^2 x' = x$ we could have $f(x') = (x'_i)_{i \in I}$ where $x'_i = x_i^{-1}$ for $x_i \neq 0$. But, such an element $(x'_i)_{i \in I}$ need not belong to $f(R)$.

Moreover, it is well known that a commutative ring R with identity is a subdirect sum of fields if and only if the Jacobson radical of R is equal to (0) ([3], Coroll. 2.11). But in such a ring any prime ideal need not be maximal, and hence such a ring need not be a (commutative) regular ring ([3, Prop. 2.2.3 and 2.2.4]).

We remark finally that having in mind Proposition 1 (whose proof as we have seen is simple), our theorem contains Proposition 2, as a special case. Indeed, for $n = 3$, from the condition $p^r - 1$ divides $n - 1$ it follows that $p = 2, r = 1$, or $p = 3, r = 1$, and conversely. Proposition 2, was proved by Tominaga [2] and it covers all results of [1] related to anti-inverse ring. Our theorem covers also these results of [1] related to the rings with polynomial identity $x^n - x = 0$.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Cerović, *Anti-inverse rings*, Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.) **29 (33)** (1981), 45–48.
- [2] H. Tominaga, *On anti-inverse rings*, Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S) **33 (47)** (1983), 225.
- [3] J. Lamberk, *Lectures on Rings and Modules*, Waltham, Massachusetts-Toronto-London, 1966. (Russ. transl.: *Kol'ca i moduli*, Mir, Moskva, 1971).

Odsjek za matematiku
Prirodno-matematički fakultet
71000 Sarajevo
Jugoslavija

(Received 21 10 1982)