

WEAKLY PRIME LEFT IDEALS IN NEAR-SUBTRACTION SEMIGROUPS

P. DHEENA AND G. SATHEESH KUMAR

ABSTRACT. In this paper we introduce the notion of weakly prime left ideals in near-subtraction semigroups. Equivalent conditions for a left ideal to be weakly prime are obtained. We have also shown that if (M, L) is a weak m^* -system and if P is a left ideal which is maximal with respect to containing L and not meeting M , then P is weakly prime.

1. Introduction

Schein [7] considered systems of the form $(\phi; \circ, \setminus)$ where ϕ is a set of functions closed under the composition “ \circ ” of functions (and hence $(\phi; \circ)$ is a function semigroup) and the set theoretic subtraction “ \setminus ” (and hence $(\phi; \setminus)$ is a subtraction algebra in the sense of [1]). Zelinka [8] discussed a problem proposed by Schein concerning the structure of multiplication in a subtraction semigroup. Eun Hwan Roh, Kyung Ho Kim, and Jong Geol Lee [6] obtained significant results in subtraction semigroups. The notion of near-subtraction semigroup was studied in [2]. We introduce the notion of weakly prime left ideals in near-subtraction semigroup which is a generalization of prime left ideals and give some characterizations of weakly prime left ideals. In this process the concept of weak m^* -system has been introduced which plays the same part as the m -system plays for prime ideals in ring and near-ring theory.

2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. A nonempty set X together with a binary operation “ $-$ ” is said to be a subtraction algebra if it satisfies the following identities:

- (1) $x - (y - x) = x$.
- (2) $x - (x - y) = y - (y - x)$.
- (3) $(x - y) - z = (x - z) - y$ for every $x, y, z \in X$.

The subtraction determines an order relation on X : $a \leq b \Leftrightarrow a - b = 0$, where $a - a = 0$ is an element that does not depend on the choice of $a \in X$.

Received November 26, 2007; Revised February 21, 2008.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 06F35.

Key words and phrases. subtraction semigroup, near-subtraction semigroup, prime left ideal, weakly prime left ideal.

Example 2.2. Let A be any nonempty set. Then $(P(A), \setminus)$ is a subtraction algebra, where " $P(A)$ " denotes the power set of A and " \setminus " denotes the set theoretic subtraction.

In a subtraction algebra the following holds:

- (1) $x - 0 = x$ and $0 - x = 0$.
- (2) $(x - y) - x = 0$.
- (3) $(x - y) - y = x - y$.
- (4) $(x - y) - (y - x) = x - y$.

Following [4], we have the following definition of subtraction semigroup.

Definition 2.3. A nonempty set X together with two binary operations " $-$ " and " \cdot " is said to be a subtraction semigroup if it satisfies the following:

- (1) $(X; -)$ is a subtraction algebra.
- (2) $(X; \cdot)$ is a semigroup.
- (3) $x(y - z) = xy - xz$ and $(x - y)z = xz - yz$ for every $x, y, z \in X$.

Note that it is clear that $0x = 0$ and $x0 = 0$ for every $x \in X$.

Example 2.4. Let Γ be a subtraction algebra. Then the set $M_h(\Gamma)$ of all homomorphisms of Γ into Γ is a subtraction semigroup under point wise subtraction and composition of mappings.

Definition 2.5. Let $(X, -, \cdot)$ be a subtraction semigroup. A nonempty subset I of X is called a left (right) ideal if $x - y \in I$, for every $x \in I, y \in X$ and $XI \subseteq I$ ($IX \subseteq I$). If I is both a left and right ideal then I is an ideal, denoted by $I \trianglelefteq X$, where $AB = \{ab \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$ for any nonempty subsets A, B of X .

Remark 2.6. Let X be a subtraction algebra and $I \subseteq X$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $(\forall x \in I, y \in X) x - y \in I$.
- (ii) $x \leq y$ and $y \in I \Rightarrow x \in I$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Let $y \in I$ and $x \in X$ such that $x \leq y$. Hence $x - y = 0$. Then $x = x - (x - y) = y - (y - x) \in I$ by (i).

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Let $x \in I$ and $y \in X$. Since $(x - y) - x = 0$, $(x - y) \leq x$. Hence by (ii) $x - y \in I$. \square

Definition 2.7 ([2]). A nonempty set X together with two binary operations " $-$ " and " \cdot " is said to be a near-subtraction semigroup if

- (1) $(X; -)$ is a subtraction algebra,
- (2) $(X; \cdot)$ is a semigroup and
- (3) $(x - y)z = xz - yz$ for every $x, y, z \in X$.

Example 2.8. Let Γ be a subtraction algebra. Then the set $M(\Gamma)$ of all mappings of Γ into Γ is a near-subtraction semigroup under point wise subtraction and composition of mappings. $M(\Gamma)$ is not a subtraction semigroup, because

if $f_\delta : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ is given by $f_\delta(\gamma) = \delta$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ (f_δ is a constant map), then for any $g, h \in M(\Gamma)$, $f_\delta = f_\delta \circ (g - h) \neq f_\delta \circ g - f_\delta \circ h = 0$.

Example 2.9. Let $\Gamma = \{0, 1\}$ in which “ $-$ ” is defined by

$$\begin{array}{c|cc} - & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{array}$$

Then Γ is a subtraction algebra. Now $M(\Gamma) = \{0, a, b, 1\}$ where $0, a, b, 1$ are all functions from Γ to Γ . $M(\Gamma)$ is a near-subtraction semigroup under point wise subtraction and composition and we have

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc} - & 0 & a & b & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & a & 0 & 1 & b \\ b & b & 0 & 0 & b \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c|cccc} \cdot & 0 & a & b & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & a & a & a & a \\ b & a & 0 & 1 & b \\ 1 & 0 & a & b & 1 \end{array}$$

Definition 2.10 ([2]). A near-subtraction semigroup X is said to be zero-symmetric if $x0 = 0$ for every $x \in X$.

Example 2.11. Let Γ be a subtraction algebra. Then $M_0(\Gamma) = \{f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma | f(0) = 0\}$ is a zero-symmetric near-subtraction semigroup under pointwise subtraction and composition of mappings.

Now we introduce the notion of a ideal which is different from that of [2].

Definition 2.12. Let $(X, -, \cdot)$ be a near-subtraction semigroup. A nonempty subset I of X such that $x - y \in I$ for every $x \in I, y \in X$ is called

- (1) a left ideal if $xi - x(x' - i) \in I$ for all $x, x' \in X$ and $i \in I$ denoted by $I \leq_l X$.
- (2) a right ideal if $IX \subseteq I$ denoted by $I \leq_r X$.
- (3) an ideal if I is both a left and right ideal denoted by $I \leq X$.

Note:

- (1) Suppose if X is a subtraction semigroup and I is a left ideal of X , then for $i \in I$ and $x, x' \in X$, we have $xi - x(x' - i) = xi - (xx' - xi) = xi \in I$ by Property 1 of subtraction algebra. Thus we have $XI \subseteq I$.
- (2) If X is a zero-symmetric near-subtraction semigroup and I is a left ideal of X , then for $i \in I$ and $x \in X$, we have $xi - x(0 - i) = xi - 0 = xi \in I$.

Remark 2.13. Let X be a zero-symmetric near-subtraction semigroup. Let I be a subset of X such that $x - y \in I$ for every $x \in I, y \in X$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $XI \subseteq I$.
- (ii) $xi - x(x' - i) \in I$ for all $x, x' \in X$ and $i \in I$.

Proof. (i)⇒(ii) Let $i \in I$, $x, x' \in X$. By (i) $xi \in I$. Since I is a subset of X such that $x - y \in I$ for every $x \in I, y \in X$, we have $xi - x(x' - i) \in I$ for all $x, x' \in X$ and $i \in I$.

(ii)⇒(i) Since X is zero-symmetric and I is a left ideal of X by Note (2), we have $XI \subseteq I$. □

Definition 2.14. Let X be a near-subtraction semigroup. For $S \subseteq X$, $\langle S \rangle$ denotes the ideal of X generated by S which is the intersection of all ideals of X containing S and hence is the smallest ideal of X containing S .

$\langle S \rangle$ denotes the left ideal of X generated by S which is the intersection of all left ideals of X containing S and hence is the smallest left ideal of X containing S .

3. Weakly prime left ideals

Unless stated otherwise throughout this paper X stands for a zero-symmetric near-subtraction semigroup.

Definition 3.1. A left ideal P of X is said to be prime if $L_1L_2 \subseteq P$ implies $L_1 \subseteq P$ or $L_2 \subseteq P$ for any left ideals L_1, L_2 of X .

Definition 3.2. A left ideal P of X is said to be weakly prime if $L_1L_2 \subseteq P$ implies $L_1 = P$ or $L_2 = P$ for any left ideals L_1, L_2 of X containing P .

A prime left ideal is always weakly prime. But the converse need not be true as the following example shows.

Example 3.3. Consider the following near-subtraction semigroup.

-	0	a	b	c	·	0	a	b	c
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
a	a	0	c	b	a	0	a	b	c
b	b	0	0	b	b	0	0	0	0
c	c	0	c	0	c	0	a	b	c

Here the left ideal $\{0, c\}$ is weakly prime but not prime since $\{0, b\}$ is a left ideal such that $\{0, b\}\{0, b\} \subseteq \{0, c\}$.

Lemma 3.4. Let X be a near-subtraction semigroup. Then

$$\text{for } A, B \trianglelefteq_l X, (A : B) = \{x \in X | xB \subseteq A\} \text{ is an ideal of } X.$$

Proof. Let $i \in (A : B)$ and $x \in X$. Then for $b \in B$, $(i - x)b = ib - xb \in A$, since A is a left ideal and $ib \in A, \forall b \in B$. Hence $(i - x)B \subseteq A$. Thus $i - x \in (A : B)$ for all $i \in (A : B)$ and $x \in X$. Now let $i \in (A : B)$, $x, x' \in X$, and $b \in B$. Then $iB \subseteq A$ and hence $ib = a$ for some $a \in A$. Now $(xi - x(x' - i))b = xib - x(x'b - ib) = xa - x(x' - a) \in A$ since A is a left ideal. Thus $xi - x(x' - i) \in (A : B)$ for every $i \in (A : B)$, $x, x' \in X$. Now let $i \in (A : B)$, $x \in X$ and $b \in B$. Then $ixb = ib'$ for some $b' \in B$ as X is zero symmetric and B is a left ideal. Since $iB \subseteq A, ixb \in A$. Hence $ix \in (A : B)$ for every $i \in (A : B)$, $x \in X$. Thus $(A : B)X \subseteq (A : B)$. □

Theorem 3.5. *The following are equivalent for a left ideal P of X .*

- (i) P is weakly prime.
- (ii) $\forall L_1, L_2 \triangleleft_l X : (P \cup L_1)(P \cup L_2) \subseteq P$ implies $L_1 \subseteq P$ or $L_2 \subseteq P$.
- (iii) $\forall L_1, L_2 \triangleleft_l X : L_1 \supseteq P$ and $L_1 L_2 \subseteq P$ imply $L_1 = P$ or $L_2 \subseteq P$.
- (iv) $\forall L_1, L_2 \triangleleft_l X : (P \cup L_1)L_2 \subseteq P$ implies $L_1 \subseteq P$ or $L_2 \subseteq P$.
- (v) $\forall a, b \in X : (a \cup P)(\langle b \rangle \cup P) \subseteq P$ implies $a \in P$ or $b \in P$, where $\langle b \rangle$ denotes the left ideal of X generated by b .

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Since $(P \cup L_1)$ and $(P \cup L_2)$ are left ideals containing P , $L_1 \subseteq P$ or $L_2 \subseteq P$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii). Let $L_1 \supseteq P$ and $L_1 L_2 \subseteq P$. Clearly $(P \cup L_1)(P \cup L_2) \subseteq P$. Hence $L_1 = P$ or $L_2 \subseteq P$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv). It is obvious.

(iv) \Rightarrow (v). Let $(a \cup P)(\langle b \rangle \cup P) \subseteq P$. Then $a(\langle b \rangle \cup P) \subseteq P$ and $P(\langle b \rangle \cup P) \subseteq P$. Now $\langle a \rangle \subseteq (P : \langle b \rangle \cup P)$ and hence $\langle a \rangle(\langle b \rangle \cup P) \cup P(\langle b \rangle \cup P) \subseteq P$. Thus $(\langle a \rangle \cup P)(\langle b \rangle \cup P) \subseteq P$ and hence by (iv) $a \in P$ or $b \in P$.

(v) \Rightarrow (i). Let L_1, L_2 be left ideals of X containing P such that $L_1 L_2 \subseteq P$. If $L_1 \neq P$, choose $a \in L_1 \setminus P$. Clearly $a \cup P \subseteq L_1$. Now for any $b \in L_2$, $\langle b \rangle \cup P \subseteq L_2$. Hence $(a \cup P)(\langle b \rangle \cup P) \subseteq L_1 L_2 \subseteq P$. Hence by (v) $L_2 \subseteq P$. \square

Theorem 3.6. *For a left ideal P of X which is not two sided the following are equivalent.*

- (i) P is weakly prime.
- (ii) $PL \subseteq P$ for a left ideal L implies $L \subseteq P$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Let $PL \subseteq P$ for some left ideal L of X . Then $P \subseteq (P : L)$. Hence $\langle P \rangle \supseteq (P : L)$ so that $\langle P \rangle \supseteq L \subseteq P$. By Theorem 3.5 (iii), $\langle P \rangle = P$ or $L \subseteq P$. Since P is not a two sided ideal, $\langle P \rangle \neq P$. Hence $L \subseteq P$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i). Let L_1, L_2 be left ideals of X such that $(P \cup L_1)L_2 \subseteq P$. Then $PL_2 \cup L_1 L_2 \subseteq P$, which implies $PL_2 \subseteq P$. Hence $L_2 \subseteq P$. By Theorem 3.5 (iv), P is weakly prime. \square

Definition 3.7. A non empty subset M of X is said to be an m^* -system if for any $m_1, m_2 \in M$, there exists $m'_1 \in \langle m_1 \rangle$ and $m'_2 \in \langle m_2 \rangle$ such that $m'_1 m'_2 \in M$.

Clearly every m^* -system is an m -system.

Definition 3.8. A weak m^* -system in X is a pair (M, L) where L is a left ideal in X and M is a non empty subset of X such that $L \cap M = \phi$ and $((m \cup L)(\langle n \rangle \cup L)) \cap M \neq \phi$ for all $m, n \in M$.

A weak m^* -system need not be an m^* -system. In Example 3.3, let $M = \{a, b\}$ and $L = \{0, c\}$, then (M, L) is a weak m^* -system but not an m^* -system since for $b, a \in M$, $\langle b \rangle \langle a \rangle \cap M = \phi$.

Theorem 3.9. *A left ideal P is weakly prime if and only if $(X \setminus P, P)$ is a weak m^* -system.*

Proof. Assume that P is a weakly prime ideal. Let $X \setminus P = M$ and $m, n \in M$. We claim that $(m \cup P)(\langle n \rangle \cup P) \not\subseteq P$. Suppose not. Then by Theorem 3.5 (v), we have $m \in P$ or $n \in P$, which is a contradiction to $M \cap P = \phi$. Hence $((m \cup P)(\langle n \rangle \cup P)) \cap M \neq \phi$. Thus (M, P) is a weak m^* -system.

Conversely let $(X \setminus P, P)$ be a weak m^* -system. Let L_1, L_2 be left ideals of X containing P such that $L_1 L_2 \subseteq P$. Suppose $L_1 \neq P$. Choose $a \in L_1 \setminus P$. We claim that $L_2 = P$. Suppose not. Then choose $b \in L_2 \setminus P$. Now $a, b \in X \setminus P$. Since $a \in L_1$ and $P \subseteq L_1$, we have $a \cup P \subseteq L_1$. Similarly $\langle b \rangle \cup P \subseteq L_2$. Hence $(a \cup P)(\langle b \rangle \cup P) \subseteq L_1 L_2 \subseteq P$. Thus $(a \cup P)(\langle b \rangle \cup P) \cap X \setminus P = \phi$, which is a contradiction to $(X \setminus P, P)$ is a weak m^* -system. Hence $L_2 = P$. \square

Theorem 3.10. *Let (M, L) be a weak m^* -system. If P is a left ideal which is maximal with respect to containing L and not meeting M , then P is weakly prime.*

Proof. Suppose there exist left ideals L_1, L_2 of X properly containing P such that $L_1 L_2 \subseteq P$. Since L_1, L_2 are left ideals properly containing P , by the maximality of P we have $L_1 \cap M \neq \phi$ and $L_2 \cap M \neq \phi$. Let $m_1 \in L_1 \cap M$ and $m_2 \in L_2 \cap M$. Since $P \subseteq L_1$ and $L \subseteq P$ we have $L \subseteq L_1$. Hence $m_1 \cup L \subseteq L_1$. Again since $P \subseteq L_2$ and $L \subseteq P$ we have $L \subseteq L_2$. Hence $\langle m_2 \rangle \cup L \subseteq L_2$. Now $(m_1 \cup L)(\langle m_2 \rangle \cup L) \cap M = \phi$ which is a contradiction to the fact that (M, L) is a weak m^* -system. Hence $L_1 L_2 \not\subseteq P$. Thus P is weakly prime. \square

Lemma 3.11. *For any left ideal L of X , $B(L) = \{y \in L \mid yX \subseteq L\}$ is the largest two-sided ideal of X contained in L .*

Proof. Let $x \in B(L)$ and $z \in X$. Then $(x - z)r = xr - zr \in L$ for every $r \in X$. Hence $x - z \in B(L)$. Let $r, r' \in X$ and $i \in B(L)$. Then $(ri - r(r' - i))x = rix - r(r'x - ix) \in L$ as $ix \in L$ and L is a left ideal. Hence $B(L)$ is a left ideal. Clearly $B(L)X \subseteq B(L)$. Suppose that there is a two-sided ideal A which is contained in L such that $B(L) \subseteq A$. Now for $y \in A$, $yX \subseteq A \subseteq L$. Hence $B(L) = A$. \square

Theorem 3.12. *A left ideal P is prime if and only if there is an m^* -system M such that P is a maximal left ideal not meeting M and $B(P)$ is the maximal two-sided ideal not meeting M .*

Proof. Suppose P is a prime left ideal of X . Let $M = X \setminus P$ and $x_1, x_2 \in M$. Since P is prime we have $\langle x_1 \rangle \langle x_2 \rangle \not\subseteq P$. Hence there exist $x'_1 \in \langle x_1 \rangle \subseteq \langle x_1 \rangle$ and $x'_2 \in \langle x_2 \rangle$ such that $x'_1 x'_2 \in M$. Hence M is an m^* -system. Now we claim that P is a maximal left ideal not meeting M . If there is a left ideal L such that $L \cap M = \phi$, then $L \subseteq X \setminus M$ so that $L \subseteq P$. Hence P is the maximal left ideal not meeting M . Suppose A is any two-sided ideal not meeting M , then $A \subseteq X \setminus M$. Hence $A \subseteq P$. But $B(P)$ is the largest two-sided ideal contained in P . Hence $A \subseteq B(P)$. Thus $B(P)$ is the maximal two-sided ideal not meeting M .

Conversely, let M be any m^* -system. Let P be a maximal left ideal not meeting M and let $B(P)$ be a maximal two-sided ideal not meeting M . We show that P is prime. Suppose that there exist left ideals L_1 and L_2 in X such that $L_1L_2 \subseteq P$ with $L_1 \not\subseteq P$, $L_2 \not\subseteq P$. Now $L_1L_2 \subseteq P$ implies $L_1 \subseteq (P : L_2)$. Since $(P : L_2)$ is an ideal, $\langle L_1 \rangle \subseteq (P : L_2)$ and thus $\langle L_1 \rangle L_2 \subseteq P$. Hence $(\langle L_1 \rangle \cup B(P))(P \cup L_2) \subseteq P$. Since $L_1 \not\subseteq P$ and $L_1 \subseteq \langle L_1 \rangle$, we have $\langle L_1 \rangle \not\subseteq P$. Now since $B(P)$ is the largest two-sided ideal contained in P and since $\langle L_1 \rangle \not\subseteq P$, $\langle L_1 \rangle \cup B(P)$ is a two-sided ideal properly containing $B(P)$. Hence by the maximality of $B(P)$, there is an $m_1 \in (\langle L_1 \rangle \cup B(P)) \cap M$. Also since $L_2 \not\subseteq P$, $P \cup L_2$ is a left ideal properly containing P . Hence by the maximality of P there is an $m_2 \in (P \cup L_2) \cap M$. Since $m_1, m_2 \in M$ and M is an m^* -system, there exist $m'_1 \in \langle m_1 \rangle$ and $m'_2 \in \langle m_2 \rangle$ such that $m'_1m'_2 \in M$. But $m'_1 \in \langle m_1 \rangle \subseteq \langle L_1 \rangle \cup B(P)$ and $m'_2 \in \langle m_2 \rangle \subseteq P \cup L_2$. Hence $m'_1m'_2 \in (\langle L_1 \rangle \cup B(P))(P \cup L_2) \subseteq P$. Thus $m'_1m'_2 \in P \cap M$, a contradiction. Therefore $L_1L_2 \not\subseteq P$. Hence P is a prime ideal. \square

References

- [1] J. C. Abbott, *Sets, Lattices and Boolean Algebras*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1969.
- [2] P. Dheena and G. Satheesh Kumar, *On strongly regular near-subtraction semigroups*, Commun. Korean Math. Soc. **22** (2007), no. 3, 323–330.
- [3] Y. B. Jun, H. S. Kim, and E. H. Roh, *Ideal theory of subtraction algebras*, Scientiae Mathematicae Japonicae **61** (2005), no. 3, 459–464.
- [4] K. H. Kim, *On Subtraction Semigroups*, Scientiae Mathematicae Japonicae **62** (2005), no. 2, 273–280.
- [5] K. H. Kim, E. H. Roh, and Y. H. Yon, *A note on a subtraction semigroup*, Scientiae Mathematicae Japonicae, **60** (2004), no. 3, 451–459.
- [6] E. H. Roh, K. H. Kim, and J. G. Lee, *On Prime and Semiprime ideals in Subtraction Semigroups*, Scientiae Mathematicae Japonicae, **61** (2005), no. 2, 259–266.
- [7] B. M. Schein, *Difference Semigroups*, Communications in algebra **20** (1992), 2153–2169.
- [8] B. Zelinka, *Subtraction Semigroups*, Math. Bohemica **120** (1995), 445–447.

P. DHEENA
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY
ANNAMALAINAGAR-608 002, INDIA
E-mail address: dheenap@yahoo.com

G. SATHEESH KUMAR
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY
ANNAMALAINAGAR-608 002, INDIA
E-mail address: gskumarau@gmail.com