

On Classical Prime Near-ring Modules

P. Djagba *

S. Juglal †

Abstract

In 2005, M. Behboodi introduced the notion of a classical prime ring module, which he showed is, in general, nonequivalent to a (Dauns) prime ring module. In this paper, we extended the idea of classical primeness to near-ring module. However, unlike in the ring case, we were able to define and distinguish between various types of classical prime modules. We investigate four of them here. We also prove some properties about the annihilator. Finally we characterize the classical m -systems of R -ideals of near-ring modules.

MSC: 16Y30,12K05

Key-words: Near-ring modules, classical prime.

1 Introduction

In 2005, Mahood Behboodi [1] defined the notion of classical prime submodule of a ring module, M , as follows: A proper submodule, P of M , is called classical prime if for all ideals, $A, B \subseteq R$ and for all submodules $N \subseteq M$, $ABN \subseteq P$ implies that $AN \subseteq P$ or $BN \subseteq P$.

He went on to demonstrate that, in the case $M = R_R$ where R is a commutative ring, classical prime submodules coincide with prime submodules but there may exist a left ideal L in a noncommutative ring R such that it is a classical prime submodule of R but not a prime submodule of R .

Now suppose that R is a near-ring and let P be an R -ideal of a faithful R -module, M . Then we utilize the above definition to define what is meant by P being classical prime and hence define a classical prime module. However, due to the lack of one of the distributive properties as well as the fact that addition is, in general, non-commutative in a near-ring, we were able to define and distinguish between various types of classical primes module. We investigate four of them here, and show, by means of examples that these four types are nonequivalent within the class of all classical prime near-ring. Hence, in the near-ring case, we rename the notion of being classical prime as being prime 0-classical prime, and the other two as being 2-classical prime, 3-classical prime. It also turn out that for $v = 0, 2, 3, c$, any v -prime R -ideal (R -module) is also v -classical prime but the reverse implication is, in general, not true.

In near-ring theory, v -prime ideals are closely linked to m_v -system sets. These sets are defined in ([4], Definition 1.30). We conclude this paper by defining the concepts of classical m_v -system ($v = 0, 2, 3, c$) and show that an R -ideal P of M is v -classical prime if and only if its complement is a classical m_v -system.

Throughout this paper, R will denote a zero-symmetric right near-ring (with identity only if specified) and M is faithful R -module.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 offers essential background definitions and results concerning near-rings, near-ring modules, and prime near-ring modules. These are necessary to introduce the concept of classical prime near-ring modules. In Section 3, we present the primary contribution of the paper, defining the notion of classical prime near-ring modules and providing several characterizations. Additionally, we demonstrate through examples the importance of this generalization from prime near-ring modules. Finally, in the last section, we conclude and propose potential avenues for future research.

*NMU, Port Elizabeth. prudence@aims.ac.za

†NMU, Port Elizabeth. Suresh.Juglal@mandela.ac.za

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Near-rings and near-ring modules

For basic concepts related to near-rings, we refer the readers to [8] for a more detailed presentation.

Definition 1 (Near-ring). Let $(R, +, \cdot)$ be a triple such that $(R, +)$ is a group, (R, \cdot) is a semigroup, and $(a + b) \cdot c = a \cdot c + b \cdot c$ for all $a, b, c \in R$. Then $(R, +, \cdot)$ is called a (*right*) *near-ring*.

Let $(R, +, \cdot)$ be a near-ring. By distributivity it is easy to see that for all $r \in R$ we have $0 \cdot r = 0$. However, it is not true in general that $r \cdot 0 = 0$ for all $r \in R$. Define $R_0 = \{r \in R : r \cdot 0 = 0\}$ to be the zero-symmetric part of R . A near-ring is called *zero-symmetric* if $R = R_0$ i.e., $0 \cdot r = r \cdot 0 = 0$ for all $r \in R$. We will denote $R^* = R \setminus \{0\}$.

Definition 2 (Near-field). Let $(R, +, \cdot)$ be a near-ring. If in addition (R^*, \cdot) is a group, then $(R, +, \cdot)$ is called a (*right*) *near-field*.

We will call a near-field R *proper* if it is not a skew-field, that is if there exist $a, b, c \in R$ such that $a \cdot (b + c) \neq a \cdot b + a \cdot c$.

It is known that the additive group of a near-field is abelian [8]. The assumption that R is zero-symmetric is only needed to exclude a degenerate case of $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +)$ with multiplication defined as $a \cdot b = b$ (see Proposition 8.1 in [8]).

Definition 3 (R -Module). A triple $(M, +, \circ)$ is called a (*left*) *near-ring module* over a (*right*) near-ring R if $(M, +)$ is a group and $\circ : R \times M \rightarrow M$ such that $(r_1 + r_2) \circ m = r_1 \circ m + r_2 \circ m$ and $(r_1 \cdot r_2) \circ m = r_1 \cdot (r_2 \circ m)$ for all $r_1, r_2 \in R$ and $m \in M$.

We write M_R to denote that M is a (*left*) near-ring module over a (*right*) near-ring R .

As is usual, from now on we will use \cdot or simply concatenation for both near-ring multiplication and vector-scalar multiplication. We also define the R -module R^n (for some fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$) with element-wise addition and element-wise scalar multiplication $R \times R^n \rightarrow R^n$ given by $r \cdot (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) = (rv_1, rv_2, \dots, rv_n)$.

Definition 4 (R -subgroup). Let R be a near-ring. A subset H of R is called a (*two sided* or *invariant*) *R -subgroup* of R if:

- (a) H is a subgroup of $(R, +)$,
- (b) $RH \subseteq H$,
- (c) $HR \subseteq H$.

If in the above definition, (a) and (b) are satisfied, the H is called a *left R -subgroup* whereas if (a) and (c) are satisfied, then H is called a *right R -subgroup*. If H is a subgroup of R , this will be denoted by $H \leq R$.

Remark 5. An R -subgroup H of R is called a *normal subgroup* if for all $r \in R$ and for all $h \in H$, we have $r + h - r \in H$.

Definition 6 (Ideal). Let R be a near-ring. A subset I of R is called a (*two sided*) *ideal* of R if:

- (a) I is a normal subgroup of $(R, +)$,
- (b) $IR \subseteq I$,
- (c) $r_1(r_2 + i) - r_1r_2 \in I$ for all $r_1, r_2 \in R$ and $i \in I$.

If in the above definition, (a) and (b) are satisfied, the I is called a *right ideal* of R whereas if (a) and (c) are satisfied, then I is called *left ideal* of R . If H is a subgroup of R , this will be denoted by $H \leq R$. An ideal I of R will be denoted by $I \triangleleft R$.

Definition 7 (R -submodule). A subset H of a near-ring module M_R is called an R -submodule of M if H is a subgroup of $(M, +)$ and $RH = \{rh : h \in H, r \in R\} \subseteq H$. (We denote this by $H \leq_R M$

Definition 8 (R -ideal). Let M_R be a near-ring module. N is an R -ideal of M_R if $(N, +)$ is a normal subgroup of $(M, +)$, and $r(m + n) - rm \in N$ for all $m \in M, n \in N$ and $r \in R$. (We will denote this by $P \triangleleft_R M$).

Definition 9. An R -module M is called:

- (a) monogenic if there exists an $m \in M$ (called generator of M) such that $Rm = M$.
- (b) faithful if $r \in R$ and $rM = 0$ implies $r = 0$.

Let M be near-ring module. Then note that every R -ideal of M is an R -submodule but the converse is not true in general. In the case of a ring module the concept of R -ideal and R -submodule coincide.

Definition 10 ([3]). Let P be a proper two-sided ideal of the near-ring R . Then P is called:

- (a) 0-prime if for all two-sided ideals A, B of R , $AB \subseteq P$ implies $A \subseteq P$ or $B \subseteq P$.
- (b) 1-prime if for all left ideals A, B of R , $AB \subseteq P$ implies $A \subseteq P$ or $B \subseteq P$.
- (c) 2-prime if for all R -subgroups A, B of R , $AB \subseteq P$ implies $A \subseteq P$ or $B \subseteq P$.
- (d) 3-prime if $(aRb) \subseteq P$ implies $a \in P$ or $b \in P$ for all $a, b \in R$.
- (e) c -prime if $ab \in P$ implies $a \in P$ or $b \in P$ for all $a, b \in R$. (Here c -prime means completely prime).

The near-ring R is said to be i -prime for $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, c\}$ if the zero ideal $\{0\}$ is i -prime.

2.2 Near-vector spaces of the form R^n

Definition 11 (Near-vector space). Let M_R be a near-ring module and R a near-field. M_R is called a (Beidleman) near-vector space if M_R is a near-ring module which is a direct sum of submodules that have no proper R -subgroups. We say that a near-vector space is finite dimensional if it is such a finite direct sum.

Definition 12 (R -module isomorphism). Let M_R and N_R be two modules. A function $\Phi : M \rightarrow N$ is a R -module isomorphism if it is a bijection that respects $\Phi(m + n) = \Phi(m) + \Phi(n)$ and $\Phi(mr) = \Phi(m)r$ for every $m, n \in M$ and $r \in R$.

Theorem 13 ([5, 7]). Let R be a (right) near-field and M_R a (left) near-ring module. M_R is a finite dimensional near-vector space if and only if M_R is isomorphic to R^n for some positive integer n .

In [6, 7, 10, 11], R -submodules of finite dimensional near vector spaces have been classified using the Expanded Gaussian Elimination (EGE) algorithm. This algorithm is used to construct the smallest R -submodules containing given finite set of vectors. (Such R -submodules exist since any intersection of R -submodules is a R -submodule.)

Definition 14. Let V be a set of vectors. Define $\text{gen}(V)$ to be the intersection of all R -submodules containing V .

Let M_R be a near-ring module. Let $V \subseteq M_R$ and let T be an R -subgroup of M_R .

Definition 15 (Seed set). We say that V generates T if $\text{gen}(V) = T$. In that case we say that V is a seed set of T . We also define the seed number $\text{seed}(T)$ to be the cardinality of a smallest seed set of T .

In [7] it was proved that each R -subgroup is a direct sum of modules $u_i R$ of a special kind:

Theorem 16 (Theorem 5.12 in [7]). *Let R be a proper near-field and $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ be vectors in R^n . Then, $\text{gen}(v_1, \dots, v_k) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i$, where the u_i are rows of some matrix $U = (u_{ij}) \in R^{\ell \times n}$ such that each of its columns has at most one non-zero entry.*

In particular, basis vectors u_1, \dots, u_{ℓ} from Theorem 18 have mutually disjoint supports. Theorem 18 was proved by analyzing an explicit procedure termed ‘‘Expanded Gaussian Elimination (EGE)’’. This procedure takes v_1, \dots, v_k and outputs u_1, \dots, u_{ℓ} . Later on we will make use of the following corollary:

Theorem 17 (Corollary 15 in [9]). *Let R be a proper near-field and $T \subseteq R^n$. Then, T is an R -submodule if and only if $T = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i$ for some nonzero vectors u_1, \dots, u_{ℓ} with mutually disjoint supports.*

Theorem 18 (Corollary 6.3 in [7]). *The subspaces (or R -ideals) of R^n are all of the form $S_1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_n$ where $S_i = \{0\}$ or $S_i = R$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

2.3 Prime near-ring modules

Let’s denote $\tilde{P} = (P : M)_R = \{r \in R : rM \subseteq P\}$.

Lemma 19. ([3]) *If $P \triangleleft_R M$, then \tilde{P} is an ideal of R .*

Definition 20 ([3]). Let $P \triangleleft R$. Then P is called:

- (a) 0-prime if for all ideals A, B of R , $AB \subseteq P$ implies $A \subseteq P$ or $B \subseteq P$.
- (b) 2-prime if for all left R -subgroups A, B of R , $AB \subseteq P$ implies $A \subseteq P$ or $B \subseteq P$.
- (c) 3-prime if for all $a, b \in R$, and $aRb \subseteq P$ implies $a \in P$ or $b \in P$.
- (d) (completely) c -prime if for all $a, b \in R$, and $aRb \subseteq P$ implies $a \in P$ or $b \in P$.

Dauns defined v -prime as follows:

Definition 21 (Dauns [2]). Let $P \triangleleft_R M$ such that $RM \not\subseteq P$. Then P is called:

- (a) 0-prime (Dauns prime) if $AB \subseteq P$ implies $AM \subseteq P$ or $B \subseteq P$ for all ideals A of R and for all R -submodules, B of M .
- (b) 2-prime if $AB \subseteq P$ implies $AM \subseteq P$ or $B \subseteq P$ for all left R -subgroups A of R and for all R -submodules, B of M .
- (c) 3-prime if $aRm \subseteq P$ implies $aM \subseteq P$ or $m \in P$ for all $a \in R$ and $m \in M$.
- (d) (completely) c -prime if $rm \in P$ implies $rM \subseteq P$ or $m \in P$ for all $r \in R$ and $m \in M$.

In [?] S. Juglal defined v -prime as follows

Definition 22 ([3]). Let $P \triangleleft_R M$ such that $RM \not\subseteq P$. Then P is called:

- (a) 0-prime if $AB \subseteq P$ implies $AM \subseteq P$ or $B \subseteq P$ for all ideals A of R and for all R -ideals, B of M .
- (b) 2-prime if $AB \subseteq P$ implies $AM \subseteq P$ or $B \subseteq P$ for all left R -subgroups A of R and for all R -submodules, B of M .
- (c) 3-prime if $aRm \subseteq P$ implies $aM \subseteq P$ or $m \in P$ for all $a \in R$ and $m \in M$.
- (d) (completely) c -prime if $rm \in P$ implies $rM \subseteq P$ or $m \in P$ for all $r \in R$ and $m \in M$.

Note that Definition 22 implies Definition 21. But in general, Daun’s definition does not necessarily imply S. Juglal’s definition since every R -submodule of M is not always an R -ideal. In general, it is true that every R -ideal of M is an R -submodule.

Lemma 23. *Let $P \triangleleft_R M$ such that $RM \not\subseteq P$ and let $v = 0, 2, 3, c$. If P is a v -prime R -ideal of M , then \tilde{P} is a v -prime ideal of R .*

Proof.

- $v = 0$: Let A, B be ideals of R such that $AB \subseteq \tilde{P}$. Then $ABM \subseteq P$, so that for all $m \in M$, $A(Bm) \subseteq P$. Since P is a 0-prime R -ideal and Bm is an R -submodule of M , we have that $AM \subseteq P$ or $Bm \subseteq P$ for all $m \in M$. If $AM \subseteq P$, then $A \subseteq (P : M) = \tilde{P}$ and we are done. If $Bm \subseteq P$ for all $m \in M$, then $BM \subseteq P$ and hence $B \subseteq (P : M) = \tilde{P}$. Therefore, \tilde{P} is a 0-prime ideal of R .
- $v = 2$: Similar to the previous case.
- $v = 3$: Let $x, y \in R$ such that $xRy \subseteq \tilde{P}$. Suppose that $y \notin \tilde{P}$. Then $yM \not\subseteq P$ implies that there exists an $m \in M$ such that $ym \notin P$. Now $xRy \subseteq \tilde{P}$ implies that $xRym \subseteq P$. Since P is a 3-prime R -ideal and $ym \notin P$, we must have that $xM \subseteq P$ ie. $x \in \tilde{P}$. Thus \tilde{P} is a 3-prime ideal of R .

□

3 Classical prime near-ring module

To extend the idea of classical primeness to near-ring module, we now introduce the notion of classical prime ideals as follows

Definition 24. Let $P \triangleleft R$. Then P is called:

- (a) 0-classical prime if for all ideals A, B of R , and for all ideals I of R , $ABI \subseteq P$ implies $AI \subseteq P$ or $BI \subseteq P$.
- (b) 2-classical prime if for all left R -subgroups A, B of R , and for all ideals I of R , $ABI \subseteq P$ implies $AI \subseteq P$ or $BI \subseteq P$.
- (c) 3- classical prime if $(aR)(bR)I \subseteq P$ implies $aI \in P$ or $bI \in P$ for all $a, b \in R$, and and for all ideals I of R .
- (d) (completely) c -classical prime if $(aRb)I \subseteq P$ implies $aI \in P$ or $bI \in P$ for all $a, b \in R$, and and for all ideals I of R .

We also introduce the concept of classical prime near-ring module as follow

Definition 25. Let $P \triangleleft_R M$ such that $RM \not\subseteq P$. Then P is called:

- (a) 0-classical prime if $ABN \subseteq P$ implies $AN \subseteq P$ or $BN \subseteq P$ for all ideals A, B of R and for all R -submodules, N of M .
- (b) 2-classical prime if $ABN \subseteq P$ implies $AN \subseteq P$ or $BN \subseteq P$ for all left R -subgroups A, B of R and for all R -submodules, N of M .
- (c) 3-classical prime if $(aR)(bR)N \subseteq P$ implies $aN \subseteq P$ or $bN \in P$ for all $a, b \in R$ and for all R -submodules, N of M .
- (c) (completely) c -classical prime if $(aRb)N \subseteq P$ implies $aN \subseteq P$ or $bN \in P$ for all $a, b \in R$ and for all R -submodules, N of M .

Let P be a v -classical prime R -ideal of M for $v = 0, 2, 3, c$. Then, to simplify, we can say that P is a v -classical prime.

Proposition 26. *Let $P \triangleleft_R M$ such that $RM \not\subseteq P$. Let $v = 0, 2, 3, c$. If P is v -classical prime R -ideal of M , then \tilde{P} is v -classical prime ideal of R .*

Proof.

- ($v = 2$) : Suppose P is 2-classical prime R -ideal of R . Let A, B be left R -subgroups of R and I ideal of R . Suppose that $ABI \subseteq \tilde{P}$. It follows that $ABIR \subseteq \tilde{P} \implies AB(IR) \subseteq P \implies ABI \subseteq P$ since P is 2-classical prime R -ideal of R . Then we have $AI \subseteq P$ or $BI \subseteq P$. It follows that $A(IR) \subseteq P \implies (AI)R \subseteq P$ or $(BI)R \subseteq P$. Hence $AI \subseteq \tilde{P}$ or $BI \subseteq \tilde{P}$.
- The proof goes similarly for $v = 0, 3, c$.

□

Definition 27. M is said to be $v = 0, 2, 3, c$ -classifcal prime R -module if $RM \neq 0$ and $\{0\}$ is a v -classical prime R -ideal of M .

Proposition 28. Let $P \triangleleft_R M$ such that $RM \not\subseteq P$. For $v = 0, 2, 3, c$ $\frac{M}{P}$ is v -classical prime R -module if and only if P v -classical prime ideal of R -ideal.

Proof.

- ($v = 0$): P is 0-classical prime \iff for ideals, A and B of R , and R -submodule, N of M , such that $ABN \subseteq P$, it follows that, $AN \subseteq P$ or $BN \subseteq P \iff \frac{ABN}{P} = 0$ implies $\frac{AN}{P} = 0$ or $\frac{BN}{P} = 0 \iff \{0\}$ is 0-classical prime R -ideal of $\frac{M}{P} \iff \frac{M}{P}$ is 0-classical prime R -module.
- ($v = 2$): Similar to the previous but by choosing A and B to be left R -subgroups of R .
- ($v = 3$): P is 3-classical prime $\iff (aR)(bR)N \subseteq P$ implies $aN \subseteq P$ or $bN \subseteq P$ for all $a, b \in R$ and for all R -submodules, N of $M \iff \frac{(aR)(bR)N}{P} = 0$ implies $\frac{aN}{P} = 0$ or $\frac{bN}{P} = 0 \iff \{0\}$ is 3-classical prime R -ideal of $\frac{M}{P} \iff \frac{M}{P}$ is 3-classical prime R -module.
- ($v = c$): It follows similarly with $v = 3$.

□

Theorem 29. Let M be an R -module and $P \triangleleft_R M$. Consider the following:

- P is c -classical prime,
- P is 3-classical prime,
- P is 2-classical prime,
- P is 0-classical prime.

We have (a) \implies (b) \implies (c) \implies (d).

Proof.

- ((a) \implies (b)) Suppose P is c -classical prime. Let $a, b \in R$ and for any R -submodule N of M , we assume that $(aR)(bR)N \subseteq P$. If $aN \subseteq P$ then we are done. Now, suppose $aN \not\subseteq P$. We have $(aR)(bR)N = (aRb)RN \subseteq P$. But $RN \subseteq N$, so $(aRb)RN \subseteq (aRb)N \subseteq P$. Since P is c -classical prime then $aN \not\subseteq P$ for $bN \not\subseteq P$.
- ((b) \implies (c)) Suppose P is 3-classical prime. Let A, B be left R -subgroups of R and N be an R -submodule of M such that $ABN \subseteq P$. If $AN \subseteq P$, then we are done. Suppose $AN \not\subseteq P$. Then there exists $a \in A$ such that $aN \not\subseteq P$. Now, for all $b \in B$, $(aR)(bR)N = a(Rb)(RN) \subseteq ABN \subseteq P$. Since P is 3-classical prime, we have $aN \subseteq P$ or $bN \subseteq P$. But $aN \not\subseteq P$; hence it follows that $bN \subseteq P$ and this is true for every $b \in B$. Hence, $BN \subseteq P$.

- ((c) \implies (d)) Now suppose that P is 2-classical prime. Let A and B be ideals of R and N be an R -submodule of M such that $ABN \subseteq P$. Clearly, A and B are left R -subgroups of R . Since P is 2-classical prime, $AN \subseteq P$ or $BN \subseteq P$ and we are done.

□

Corollary 30. *Let M be an R -module.*

- (a) M is c -classical prime,
- (b) M is 3-classical prime,
- (c) M is 2-classical prime,
- (d) M is 0-classical prime,

We have (a) \implies (b) \implies (c) \implies (d).

In the case of a ring, the three classical prime definitions above coincide. However, in the case of a near-ring the four types of classical primes are non-equivalent. We demonstrate this by the following examples:

Example 31. *Let R be the Klein-4-group, $K = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ with multiplication given by*

$$r \circ b = \begin{cases} r & \text{if } b = 3 \\ 0 & \text{if } b \in \{0, 1, 2\} \end{cases}$$

Table 1: Table of multiplication for $(K, +, \cdot)$

\cdot	0	1	2	3
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	1
2	0	0	0	2
3	0	0	0	3

Consider the R -module $M = R_R$. The non-zero R -submodules of M are $\{0, 1\}$, $\{0, 2\}$ and $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. Now, R has no non-zero proper ideals. So considering the three possibilities, we note that:

- (i) $R^2M \neq \{0\}$
- (ii) $R^2\{0, 1\} \iff R\{0, 1\} = \{0\}$
- (iii) $R^2\{0, 2\} \iff R\{0, 2\} = \{0\}$.

So, $\{0\}$ is a 0-classical prime R -ideal and hence M is 0-classical prime. However, $\{0, 2\}$ is a left R -subgroup of R with $\{0, 2\} \cdot \{0, 2\} \cdot \{0, 1, 2, 3\} = \{0\}$ but $\{0, 2\} \cdot \{0, 1, 2, 3\} \neq \{0\}$. M is not 2-classical prime. Also note that M is not c -classical prime since $3R^2M = 0$ but, $2M \neq 0$ and $3M \neq 0$.

Example 32. *Let R be a near-ring defined on $Z_3 = \{0, 1, 2\}$ by*

Table 2: Table of multiplication for $(R, +, \cdot)$

\cdot	0	1	2
0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1
2	0	0	2

Consider the R -module $M = R_R$. Then M has no proper R -submodules; hence R has no proper R -subgroups. Since $RRM \neq \{0\}$, so 0-classical prime R -ideal implies that M is 2-classical prime. However, $(1R)(1R)M = 0$ but $1M = 1R \neq \{0\}$. Therefore, $\{0\}$ is not 3-classical prime R -ideal, and hence M is not 3-classical prime. Also note that M is not c -classical prime since $1R1M = 0$ but $1M \neq 0$ and $1M \neq 0$. Furthermore, $RRR \neq \{0\}$, so $\{0\}$ is a 0-classical prime of R . Note that R is not c -classical prime ideal of R .

Example 33. ([8]) We refer $GF(3^2)$ as the Galois field of order 3^2 . Let R be a finite near-field. Consider the field $(GF(3^2), +, \cdot)$ with

$$GF(3^2) := \{0, 1, 2, x, 1+x, 2+x, 2x, 1+2x, 2+2x\},$$

where x is a zero of $x^2 + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_3[x]$ with the new multiplication defined as

$$a \circ b := \begin{cases} a \cdot b & \text{if } a \text{ is a square in } (GF(3^2), +, \cdot) \\ a \cdot b^3 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This gives the smallest finite Dickson near-field $R = DN(3, 2) := (GF(3^2), +, \circ)$, which is not a field. Here is the table of the new operation \circ for $DN(3, 2)$.

\circ	0	1	2	x	$1+x$	$2+x$	$2x$	$1+2x$	$2+2x$
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	2	x	$1+x$	$2+x$	$2x$	$1+2x$	$2+2x$
2	0	2	1	$2x$	$2+2x$	$1+2x$	x	$2+x$	$1+x$
x	0	x	$2x$	2	$1+2x$	$1+x$	1	$2+2x$	$2+x$
$1+x$	0	$1+x$	$2+2x$	$2+x$	2	$2x$	$1+2x$	x	1
$2+x$	0	$2+x$	$1+2x$	$2+2x$	x	2	$1+x$	1	$2x$
$2x$	0	$2x$	x	1	$2+x$	$2+2x$	2	$1+x$	$1+2x$
$1+2x$	0	$1+2x$	$2+x$	$1+x$	$2x$	1	$2+2x$	2	x
$2+2x$	0	$2+2x$	$1+x$	$1+2x$	1	x	$2+x$	$2x$	2

Since R is a near-field, R has no proper R -submodules. Therefore, has no proper R -subgroups. Hence the non-zero R -submodules and R -subgroup of R is R . Note that for every $a, b \in R$ we have $(aRb)R \neq \{0\}$. It follows that $\{0\}$ is a c -classical prime R -ideal. Thus R_R is a c -classical prime R -module.

Example 34. Let R be a near-ring defined on $Z_6 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ by

Table 3: Table of multiplication for $(R, +, \cdot)$

\cdot	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	3	5	1	3	5	1
2	0	4	2	0	4	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	0	2	4	0	2	4
5	3	1	5	3	1	5

Let $M = R_R$. Then, the non-zero R -submodules of M are $\{0, 3\}$ and $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Note that in the Definition 25 (d) does not imply (c) in general. To see this, consider the R -submodules $N = \{0, 3\}$. We have that for all $a, b \in R$ $(aR)(bR) = \{0\} \implies aN = \{0\}$ or $bN = \{0\}$. Hence the (c) is satisfied. But, (d) is not satisfied. In fact there exist $a = 3$ and $b = 3$ such that $aRb = 0$ but $aN \neq 0$ and $bN \neq 0$.

Remark 35. Let $v = 0, 2, 3, c$. When we consider the near-ring modules R_R . The examples of v -classical R -modules work similarly for v -classical prime ideals of near-ring R .

Proposition 36. *Let R be a near-field. Any proper R -ideal of R^n is a c -classical prime R -ideals of R^n .*

Proof. Let P be any proper R -ideals of R^n . Then, by Theorem 18 P is of the form $S_1 \times S_2 \times \cdots \times S_n$ where $S_i = \{0\}$ or $S_i = R$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Assume without loss of generality that $S_j = \{0\}$ for some fixed j where $1 \leq i < j < n$. Let N be any R -submodule of R^n . Then by Theorem 17, we have $N = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i$ for some non-zero vectors u_1, \dots, u_{ℓ} with mutually disjoint supports. Let $a, b \in R$. Suppose $a(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i) \not\subseteq P$ and $b(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i) \not\subseteq P$. We have $a(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i) \not\subseteq P$ implies there exists $r \in R$ at the j -component of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i$ such that $(ar)_j \neq 0$. Similarly $b(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i) \not\subseteq P$ implies there exists $s \in R$ at the j -component of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i$ such that $(bs)_j \neq 0$. It follows that $(arbs)_j \neq 0$. Thus $(aRb) \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i \not\subseteq P$. \square

Corollary 37. *Let R be a near-field. R^n is a c -classical prime R -module.*

Proof. It follows from the previous Proposition. \square

Proposition 38. *Let R be a near-ring with identity 1, and let P be an R -ideal of M . Then P is 2-classical prime if and only if P is 3-classical prime.*

Proof. The fact that if P is 3-classical prime implies that it is 2-classical prime has already been proven in Theorem 29. Now suppose that P is a 2-classical prime R -ideal. Let $a, b \in R$ be an R -submodule of M such that $(aR)(bR)N \subseteq P$. Then, for every $n \in N$, we have that $(Ra)(Rb)(Rn) = R(aR)(bR)n \subseteq RP \subseteq P$. Since, Ra and Rb are left R -subgroups of R and Rn is an R -submodule of M , it follows from the fact that P is 2-classical, that $(Ra)(Rn) \subseteq P$ or $(Rb)(Rn) \subseteq P$. In particular, since $1 \in R$, it follows $1.a.1.n = an \in P$ or $1.b.1.n = bn \in P$ for every $n \in N$. So $aN \subseteq P$ or $bN \subseteq P$. Therefore P is 3-classical prime. \square

Theorem 39. *Let $v = 0, 2, 3, c$. Every v -prime near-ring module is a v -classical near-ring module.*

In general, for $v = 0, 2, 3, c$ every v -classical prime near-ring module need not be v -prime. We demonstrate this with the following examples.

Example 40. *Let R be a near-ring defined on $Z_4 = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ by*

Table 4: Table of multiplication for $(R, +, \cdot)$

\cdot	0	1	2	3
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	0	0
2	0	0	0	0
3	0	1	0	1

Let $M = R_R$. Then, the non-zero R -submodules of M are $\{0, 1\}, \{0, 2\}$ and M . Checking all the possibilities according to the Definition of a 3-classical prime module, we have the following observations:

- *The following are all non-zero products: $1R1R\{0, 1\}, 1R1RM, 1R3R\{0, 1\}, 1R3RM, 3R3R\{0, 1\}, 3R3RM, 3R1R\{0, 1\}$ and $3R1RM$.*
- *$1R2R\{0, 1\} = 2R2R\{0, 1\} = 2R1R\{0, 1\} = 2R3R\{0, 1\} = 3R2R\{0, 1\} = \{0\}$ and in each case $2.\{0, 1\} = \{0\}$.*
- *$1R1R\{0, 2\} = 1R2R\{0, 2\} = 2R3R\{0, 2\} = 2R2R\{0, 2\} = 2R1R\{0, 2\} = 2R3R\{0, 2\} = 3R3R\{0, 2\} = 3R2R\{0, 2\} = 3R1R\{0, 2\} = 0$ and in each case, any one of $1.\{0, 2\} = \{0\}$ or $2.\{0, 2\} = \{0\}$ or $2.\{0, 2\} = \{0\}$ is satisfied.*
- *$1R2RM = 2R2RM = 2R1RM = 2R3RM = 3R2RM = \{0\}$ and in all cases $2.M = \{0\}$.*

Hence M is 3-classical prime R -module. However, M is not 3-prime since $1R2 = \{0\}$ but $1M \neq \{0\}$ and $2 \notin \{0\}$.

In the same way, we show that M is a c -classical prime R -module.

- The following are all non-zero products: $1R1\{0, 1\}, 1R1M, 1R3R\{0, 1\}, 1R3M, 3R3\{0, 1\}, 3R3M, 3R1\{0, 1\}$ and $3R1M$.
- $1R2\{0, 1\} = 2R2\{0, 1\} = 2R1\{0, 1\} = 2R3\{0, 1\} = 3R2\{0, 1\} = \{0\}$ and in each case $2.\{0, 1\} = \{0\}$.
- $1R1\{0, 2\} = 1R2\{0, 2\} = 2R3\{0, 2\} = 2R2\{0, 2\} = 2R1\{0, 2\} = 2R3\{0, 2\} = 3R3\{0, 2\} = 3R2\{0, 2\} = 3R1\{0, 2\} = 0$ and in each case, any one of $1.\{0, 2\} = \{0\}$ or $2.\{0, 2\} = \{0\}$ or $2.\{0, 2\} = \{0\}$ is satisfied.
- $1R2M = 2R2M = 2R1M = 2R3M = 3R2M = \{0\}$ and in all cases $2.M = \{0\}$.

Hence M is a c -classical prime R -module. However, M is not c -prime since $1.2 = 0$ but $1M \neq \{0\}$ and $2 \neq 0$.

Example 41. If R is a near-ring with identity, then we know that a 2-prime module and a 3-prime module are equivalent. From Proposition 38, the same is also true for 2- and 3-classical prime modules. So, if R has identity and since the previous examples demonstrate that a 3-classical prime module need not be 3-prime, it follows that a 2-classical prime module need not be 2-prime.

Example 42. In the Example 40, we have a near-ring module, $M = R_R$, which is 3-classical prime. By Corollary 30, it is 0-classical prime. However, in the same example, $\{0, 1\}$ is an ideal and $\{0, 2\}$ is an R -submodule such that $\{0, 1\}\{0, 2\} = 0$ but neither $\{0, 1\}M = 0$ nor $\{0, 2\} \subseteq \{0\}$. So M is not 0-prime.

The following theorem provides the characterization of 0-classical prime R -ideal of M .

Theorem 43. Let M be an R -module and let $P \triangleleft_R M$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) P is 0-classical prime
- (ii) For all ideals, A and B of R , and every $m \in M$ such that $AB(Rm) \subseteq P$, it follows that $A(Rm) \subseteq P$ or $B(Rm) \subseteq P$.
- (iii) For every $0 \neq \overline{m} \in \frac{M}{P}$, $(0 : R\overline{m})$ is a 0-prime ideal of R .
- (iv) For every $m \in M \setminus P$, $(P : Rm)$ is a 0-prime ideal of R , and $(P : M)$ is a 0-prime ideal of R .

Proof.

- (i) \implies (ii) Let A and B be ideals of R , and let $m \in M$ such that $AB(Rm) \subseteq P$. Since P is 0-classical prime and Rm is an R -submodule of M , by definition it follows that $A(Rm) \subseteq P$ or $B(Rm) \subseteq P$.
- (ii) \implies (iii) Suppose that $0 \neq \overline{m} \in \frac{M}{P}$. Let A and B be ideals of R such that $AB \subseteq (0 : R\overline{m}) = \{a \in R : aR\overline{m} = 0\}$. Then $AB(R\overline{m}) = 0 \implies AB(Rm) \subseteq P$. From (ii), it follows that $A(Rm) \subseteq P$ or $B(Rm) \subseteq P$. Hence $A(R\overline{m}) = 0$ or $B(R\overline{m}) = 0 \implies A \subseteq (0 : R\overline{m})$ or $B \subseteq (0 : R\overline{m})$.
- (iii) \implies (iv) The first part of (iv) is simply a restatement of (iii). Now let A and B be ideals of R such that $AB \subseteq (P : M)$ which implies that $ABM \subseteq P$. We need to show that $AM \subseteq P$ or $BM \subseteq P$. Suppose that $BM \not\subseteq P$. Since $Plhd_R M$, we know that $AP \subseteq P$ and $BP \subseteq P$. So consider $n \in M \setminus P$ such that $Bn \not\subseteq P$. Now $AB(Rn) \subseteq ABM \subseteq P$ implies that $AB \subseteq (P : Rn)$. Since $(P : Rn)$ is 0-prime ideal of R , it follows that $A \subseteq (P : Rn)$ or $B \subseteq (P : Rn)$ whence $A(Rn) \subseteq P$ or $B(Rn) \subseteq P$. But, $Bn \not\subseteq P$ implies $B(Rn) \not\subseteq P$. So, $A(Rn) \subseteq P$.

Now let $m \in M \setminus P$ where $m \neq n$. Then, either $(P : Rn) \subseteq (P : Rm)$ or $(P : Rm) \subseteq (P : Rn)$. If $(P : Rn) \subseteq (P : Rm)$, then, since $A \subseteq (P : Rn)$, we have $A \subseteq (P : Rm)$ implying that $Am \subseteq A(Rm) \subseteq P$.

If $(P : Rm) \subseteq (P : Rn)$, then $AB(Rm) \subseteq ABM \subseteq P \implies AB \subseteq (P : Rm)$. Since $(P : Rm)$ is 0-prime, we have $A \subseteq (P : Rm)$ or $B \subseteq (P : Rm)$. But, $B \subseteq (P : Rm) \implies B \subseteq (P : Rn) \implies B(Rn) \subseteq P$ is a contradiction. So $A(Rm) \subseteq P \implies Am \subseteq P$. Hence $AM \subseteq P$.

- (iv) \implies (i) Let A and B be ideals of R and N be an R -submodule of M such that $ABN \subseteq P$. Then $AB(RN) \subseteq ABN \subseteq P$. So, for all $n \in N$, $AB(Rn) \subseteq P$ implies $AB \subseteq (P : Rn)$. If $n \in P$, then we know that $An \subseteq P$ and $Bn \subseteq P$. If $n \notin P$, then from (iv), $(P : Rn)$ is 0-prime. So $AB \subseteq (P : Rn) \implies A \subseteq (P : Rn)$ or $B \subseteq (P : Rn) \implies A(Rn) \subseteq P$ or $B(Rn) \subseteq P \implies An \subseteq P$ or $Bn \subseteq P$. Hence, for all $n \in N$, $An \subseteq P$ or $Bn \subseteq P$. So $AN \subseteq P$ or $BN \subseteq P$ and we are done.

□

Similarly, the following result gives the characterization of 2-classical prime R -ideal of M .

Proposition 44. *Let M be an R -module and let $P \triangleleft_R M$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) P is 2-classical prime.
- (ii) For all left R -subgroups, A and B of R , and every $m \in M$ such that $AB(Rm) \subseteq P$, it follows that $A(Rm) \subseteq P$ or $B(Rm) \subseteq P$.
- (iii) For every $0 \neq \overline{m} \in \frac{M}{P}$, $(0 : R\overline{m})$ is a 2-prime ideal of R .
- (iv) For every $m \in M \setminus P$, $(P : Rm)$ is a 2-prime ideal of R , and $(P : M)$ is a 2-prime ideal of R .

The proof is similar to the proof of the previous theorem.

Proposition 45. *Let M be an R -module and let $P \triangleleft_R M$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) P is 3-classical prime.
- (ii) For all $a, b \in R$ and every R -submodule N of M such that $aRb(N) \subseteq P$, it follows that $aN \subseteq P$ or $bN \subseteq P$.
- (iii) For all $a, b \in R$ and every $m \in M$ such that $(aR)(bR)m \subseteq P$, it follows that $aRm \subseteq P$ or $bRm \subseteq P$.
- (iv) For every $0 \neq \overline{m} \in \frac{M}{P}$, $(0 : R\overline{m})$ is a 3-prime ideal of R .
- (v) For every $m \in M \setminus P$, $(P : Rm)$ is a 3-prime ideal of R , and $(P : M)$ is a 2-prime ideal of R .

Proof.

- (i) \implies (ii) Let $a, b \in R$ and let N be a R -submodule of M such that $aRb(N) \subseteq P$. Then $(aR)(bR)N \subseteq aRb(N) \subseteq P$. Since, P is 3-classical prime, $aN \subseteq P$ or $bN \subseteq P$.
- (ii) \implies (iii) Let $a, b \in R$ and let $m \in M$ such that $(aR)(bR)m \subseteq P$ which implies $(aRb)(Rm) \subseteq P$. Then, from (ii), it follows that $aRm \subseteq P$ or $bRm \subseteq P$.
- (iii) \implies (iv) Let $0 \neq \overline{m} \in \frac{M}{P}$ and let $a, b \in R$ such that $aRb \subseteq (0 : R\overline{m})$. Then $(aRb)(R\overline{m}) = 0 \implies (aRbR)m \subseteq P$. From (iii), it follows that $aRm \subseteq P$ or $bRm \subseteq P$. Hence $a(R\overline{m}) = 0$ or $b(R\overline{m}) = 0 \implies a \in (0 : R\overline{m})$ or $b \in (0 : R\overline{m})$.
- (iv) \implies (v) The first part of (v) is simply a restatement of iv. Now, let $a, b \in R$ such that $aRb \subseteq (P : M)$ which implies that $(aRb)M \subseteq P$. We need to show that $aM \subseteq P$ or $bM \subseteq P$. The rest of the proof is simply an adaptation of the third part in the proof of Theorem 43.
- (v) \implies (i) It is similar to the fourth of part of the proof of Theorem 43.

□

Proposition 46. *Let M be an R -module and let $P \triangleleft_R M$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) P is c -classical prime.

- (ii) For all $a, b \in R$ and every R -submodule N of M such that $aRb(N) \subseteq P$, it follows that $aN \subseteq P$ or $bN \subseteq P$.
- (iii) For all $a, b \in R$ and every $m \in M$ such that $(aRb)m \subseteq P$, it follows that $aRm \subseteq P$ or $bRm \subseteq P$.
- (iv) For every $0 \neq \bar{m} \in \frac{M}{P}$, $(0 : R\bar{m})$ is a c -prime ideal of R .
- (v) For every $m \in M \setminus P$, $(P : Rm)$ is a c -prime ideal of R , and $(P : M)$ is a 2-prime ideal of R .

The proof is similar to the proof of the previous Proposition.

Proposition 47. Let $v = 0, 2, 3, c$ and suppose that P is a v -classical prime R -ideal of an R -module M . Then, for any R -ideal, N of M , $(P : N)$ is v -prime ideal of R .

Proof.

- ($v = 0$) : Let A and B be ideals of R such that $AB \subseteq (P : N)$. Then $ABN \subseteq P$, and since P is 0-classical prime, we have that $AN \subseteq P$ or $BN \subseteq P$. So, $A \subseteq (P : N)$ or $B \subseteq (P : N)$.
- ($v = 2$) : Similar to the case $v = 0$, but by choosing A and B to be left R -subgroups of R .
- ($v = 3$) : Let $a, b \in R$ such that $aRb \subseteq (P : N)$. Then, $(aRb)N \subseteq P$. Now $(aR)(bR)N = (aRb)(RN) \subseteq (aRb)N \subseteq P$. Since, P is 3-classical prime. It follows that $aN \subseteq P$ or $bN \subseteq P$; whence $a \in (P : N)$ or $b \in (P : N)$.
- ($v = c$) : Similar to the case $v = 3$.

□

Proposition 48. Let $v = 0, 2, 3, c$ and suppose that P is v -prime R -ideal of an R -module M . Then, P is v -classical R -ideal of M .

Proof.

- ($v = 0$) : Let A and B be ideals of R and N be an R -submodule of M such that $ABN \subseteq P$. Then, for each $n \in N$, $A(Bn) \subseteq ABN \subseteq P$. Since, Bn is a submodule of M and P is 0-prime, it follows that $AM \subseteq P$ or $Bn \subseteq P$, and hence $AN \subseteq P$ or $BN \subseteq P$.
- ($v = 2$) : Let A and B be left R -subgroups of R and N be an R -submodule of M such that $ABN \subseteq P$. The rest of the proof follows as in the previous case.
- ($v = 3$) : Let $a, b \in R$ and N be an R -submodule of M such that $(aR)(bR)N \subseteq P$. Then for each $n \in bRN$, we have $aRn \subseteq (aR)(bRN) \subseteq P$. Since, P is 3-prime, we have that $aM \subseteq P$ or $n \in P$. If $aM \subseteq P$, then $aN \subseteq P$ and we are done. If $n \in P$, then $bRN \subseteq P$. So for each $m \in N$, $bRm \subseteq P$. Again, since P is 3-prime, we get $bM \subseteq P$ or $m \in P$. If $bM \subseteq P$ then $bN \subseteq P$. If $m \in P$, then $N \subseteq P$. But, $bN \subseteq N$. So, in either case $bN \subseteq P$.
- ($v = c$) : Similar to the case $v = 3$.

□

Corollary 49. Let $v = 0, 2, 3, c$ and P is a v -prime R -ideal of an R -module M . Then, for any R -ideal, N of M , $(P : N)$ is v -classical prime ideal of R

Definition 50. Let R be a near-ring and M be an R -module. Then a non-empty set $S \subseteq M \setminus \{0\}$ is called a:

- (a) classical m_0 -system if for all ideals, A and B of R , and all R -submodules K and L of M such that $(K + AL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $(K + BL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$, it follows that $(K + ABL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

- (b) classical m_2 -system if for all left R -subgroups, A and B of R , and all R -submodules K and L of M such that $(K + AL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $(K + BL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$, it follows that $(K + ABL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$.
- (c) classical m_3 -system if for all $a, b \in R$, and all R -submodules K and L of M such that $(K + aL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $(K + bL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$, it follows that $(K + (aR)(bR)L) \cap S \neq \emptyset$.
- (d) classical m_c -system if for all $a, b \in R$, and all R -submodules K and L of M such that $(K + aL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $(K + bL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$, it follows that $(K + abL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

Theorem 51. *Let R be a near-ring and M be an R -module. Then for $v = 0, 2, 3, c$ we have $P \triangleleft_R M$ is v -classical prime if and only if $M \setminus P$ is a classical m_v -system.*

Proof.

- ($v = 0$) : Suppose P is 0-classical prime and let $S = M \setminus P$. Let A and B be ideals of R , and K and L be R -submodules of M such that $(K + AL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $(K + BL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$. If $(K + AL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$, then $ABL \subseteq P$. Since P is 0-classical prime, $AL \subseteq P$ or $BL \subseteq P$. Hence, it follows that $(K + AL) \cap S = \emptyset$ or $(K + BL) \cap S = \emptyset$ which is a contradiction. So, $M \setminus P$ is a classical m_0 -system.

On the other hand, let $S = M \setminus P$ be a classical m_0 -system. Suppose $ABL \subseteq P$ where A and B are ideals of R and L is an R -submodule of M . If $AL \not\subseteq P$ and $BL \not\subseteq P$, then $AL \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $BL \cap S \neq \emptyset$. However, since $ABL \subseteq P$, we have $ABL \cap S = \emptyset$ which contradicts that S is an m_0 -system. Hence $AL \subseteq P$ or $BL \subseteq P$ implies that P is 0-classical prime.

- ($v = 2$) : Similar to the case $v = 0$.
- ($v = 3$) : Suppose P is 3-classical prime and let $S = M \setminus P$. Let $a, b \in R$ and K and L be R -submodules of M such that $(K + aL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $(K + bL) \cap S \neq \emptyset$. If $(K + (aR)(bR)L) \cap S = \emptyset$ then $(aR)(bR)L \subseteq P$. Since P is 3-classical prime, $aL \subseteq P$ or $bL \subseteq P$. Hence, it follows that $(K + aL) \cap S = \emptyset$ or $(K + bL) \cap S = \emptyset$ which is a contradiction. So, $M \setminus P$ is a classical m_3 -system. Conversely, let $S = M \setminus P$ be a classical m_3 -system. Suppose $(aR)(bR)L \subseteq P$ where $a, b \in R$ and L is an R -submodule of M . If $aL \not\subseteq P$ and $bL \not\subseteq P$, then $aL \cap S \neq \emptyset$. However, since $(aR)(bR)L \subseteq P$, we have $(aR)(bR)L \cap S = \emptyset$, which contradicts that S is an m_3 -system. Hence $aL \subseteq P$ or $bL \subseteq P$ implies that P is 3-classical prime.
- ($v = c$) : Similar to the case $v = 3$.

□

In what follows, we would like to discuss few properties of the annihilator.

Definition 52. Let $P \subseteq M$. The left annihilator of P in R is defined by $\text{Ann}(P) = \{r \in R : rP = 0\}$

It is clear that $\text{Ann}(P)$ is a left ideal of R . It is shown that if $P \leq_R R$ then $\text{Ann}(P) \triangleleft R$.

Proposition 53. *Let $v = 0, 2, 3, c$. If P is v -classical R -ideals of R_R then $\text{Ann}(P)$ is a v -classical prime ideal of R .*

Proof.

- For $v = 2$: Assume $0 \neq P \triangleleft_R M$ such that P is 2-classical prime. Let A, B be left R -subgroups of R and I ideals of R . We have $ABI \subseteq \text{Ann}(P)$. Then $ABIP = 0$ implies $AB(IP) = 0$, which implies $AB = 0$. Since P is 2-classical prime R -ideal of R_R , $ABI = 0 \implies AI = 0$ or $BI = 0 \implies (AI)P = 0$ or $(BI)P = 0 \implies AI \subseteq l(P)$ or $BI \subseteq \text{Ann}(P)$.
- For $v = 3$: Similar to the case $v = 3$.

□

Proposition 54. *Let M be 3-prime R -module. M is faithful near-ring module if and only if $\text{Ann}(\text{gen}(m)) = 0$ for all $0 \neq m \in M$.*

Proof. Suppose M is 3-prime, so $\{0\}$ is 3-prime. By definition $\text{Ann}(\text{gen}(m)) = \{r \in R : r \text{gen}(m) = 0\}$. Let $r \in R$ such that $r \text{gen}(m) = 0$. It follows that $rRm = 0$ since $\text{gen}(m) = Rm$. Hence we have $rM = 0$ or $m = 0$ since $\{0\}$ is 3-prime. Since $m \neq 0$ then we have $rM = 0$. This implies that $r = 0$ because M is faithful. Thus $\text{Ann}(\text{gen}(m)) = 0$. Conversely suppose that $r \in \text{Ann}(\text{gen}(m)) = 0$ and $rM = 0$. We have $\text{Ann}(\text{gen}(m)) = 0 \implies r \text{gen}(m) = 0 \implies rRm = 0$. Since M is 3-prime we have $rM = 0$ and since $\text{Ann}(\text{gen}(m)) = 0$ then $r = 0$. \square

Proposition 55. *If M is 0,2-classical prime. Then for all faithful R -submodules A and B of M where $\text{Ann}(B)A \neq 0$ we have $\text{Ann}(A) = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose M is 2-classical prime and let $0 \neq A, B \leq_R M$. Then $\text{Ann}(A)A = 0$ and $\text{Ann}(B)B = 0$. Since M is 2-classical prime and $\text{Ann}(B)A \neq 0$ then $\text{Ann}(A)A = 0$. It follows that $\text{Ann}(A) = 0$ because A is faithful. \square

Proposition 56. *Let R be a near-field. Consider the R -module R^n . Let $0 \neq S \triangleleft_R R^n$. Then $\text{Ann}(S) = 0$.*

Proof. We have $\text{Ann}(S)S = 0$. By Theorem 18 all the subspaces (or R -ideals) of R^n are all of the form $S_1 \times S_2 \times \dots \times S_n$ where $S_i = \{0\}$ or $S_i = R$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Suppose, without loss of generality, that at the position j , $S_j = R$. So $\text{Ann}(S)R = 0$ implies that $\text{Ann}(S) = 0$. \square

Proposition 57 (Corollary 15 in [9]). *Let R be a proper near-field and $T \subseteq R^n$. Then, T is an R -submodule if and only if $T = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i$ for some nonzero vectors u_1, \dots, u_{ℓ} with mutually disjoint supports. Furthermore, $T = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i$ implies that $T = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i$ and $x_i + x_j = x_j + x_i$ for all $x_i \in Ru_i$ and $x_j \in Ru_j$.*

Proof. Assume that $T = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} Ru_i$ where $\{Ru_i : i = 1, \dots, k\}$ are ideals of R^{ℓ} . Let $x_i \in Ru_i$ and $x_j \in Ru_j$ such that $i \neq j$. Indeed $x_i + x_j - x_i - x_j \in Ru_i$ since $x_j - x_i - x_j \in Ru_i$ since $(Ru_i, +)$ is a normal subgroup of $(R^{\ell}, +)$. Also $x_i + x_j - x_i - x_j \in Ru_j$ since $x_i + x_j - x_i \in Ru_j$. It follows that $x_i + x_j - x_i - x_j \in Ru_i \cap Ru_j \subseteq Ru_j \cap \sum_{i \in I, i \neq j} Ru_i = \{0\}$. But $Ru_i \cap Ru_j \neq \emptyset$ since $0 \in Ru_i \cap Ru_j$, so $Ru_i \cap Ru_j = \{0\}$. It follows that $x_i + x_j - x_i - x_j \in Ru_j \cap Ru_j = \{0\}$. Hence $x_i + x_j = x_j + x_i$. \square

Proposition 58. *Let R be a proper near-field. For any $u_i, r_j \in R$ such that $r_j Ru_i = 0$ for all $j \neq i$, we have $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \text{Ann}(Ru_i) = \text{Ann}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k Ru_i)$*

Proof. Let $x \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \text{Ann}(Ru_i)$. Then there exist $r_i \in \text{Ann}(Ru_i)$ such that $x = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k r_i$. In fact, $r_i \in \text{Ann}(Ru_i)$ implies $r_i Ru_i = 0$. Let's first show that $x(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k Ru_i) = x(\sum_{i=1}^k Ru_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k (xRu_i)$.

Suppose $I = \{1, \dots, k\}$ where $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We proceed by induction on k . For $k = 2$, let $T = Ru_1 \oplus Ru_2$. So $T = Ru_1 + Ru_2$ and $Ru_1 \cap Ru_2 = \{0\}$ where Ru_1 and Ru_2 are R -idea of R^k . Let $m \in T$. Then $m = x_1 + x_2$ for $x_1 \in Ru_1$ and $x_2 \in Ru_2$. We need to show that $x(x_1 + x_2) = xx_1 + xx_2$. It suffices to show that $x(x_1 + x_2) - xx_1 - xx_2 \in Ru_1 \cap Ru_2$. Since Ru_2 is R -ideals of T , $x(x_1 + x_2) - xx_1 \in Ru_2$. Then $x(x_1 + x_2) - xx_1 - xx_2 \in Ru_2$. Also we have $x(x_2 + x_1) - xx_2 \in Ru_1$. So $x(x_2 + x_1) - xx_2 - xx_1 \in Ru_1$. By Proposition 57 we have $x(x_2 + x_1) - xx_2 - xx_1 \in Ru_1 \cap Ru_2$.

Assume that if $m = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i$ where $x_i \in Ru_i$, then $xm = x(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (xx_i)$. Let $m \in T$, $x \in R$ and suppose $m = x_1 + \dots + x_k$ where $x_i \in Ru_i$. By Proposition 57 we have $x(x_1 + \dots + x_k) - xx_1 - xx_2 - \dots - xx_k = x(x_2 + \dots + x_k + x_1) - x(x_2 + x_3 + \dots + x_k) - xx_1 \in Ru_1$. Also, $x(x_1 + x_3 + \dots + x_k + x_2) - x(x_1 + x_3 + \dots + x_k) - xx_2 \in Ru_2$. By the same process, we also have $x(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_{k-1} + x_k) - x(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_{k-1}) - xx_k \in Ru_k$.

It follows that, $x(x_1 + \dots + x_k) - xx_1 - xx_2 - \dots - xx_k \in \bigcap_{j=1}^k Ru_j \subseteq Ru_1 \cap \sum_{j=2}^k Ru_j = \{0\}$. Thus $xm = x(\sum_{i=1}^k x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k (xx_i)$. Thus $x(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k Ru_i) = x(\sum_{i=1}^k Ru_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k (\sum_{j=1}^k r_j) Ru_i$ and since for all $j \neq i$ such that $r_j Ru_i = 0$ then $x(\sum_{i=1}^k Ru_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k (r_j Ru_i) = 0$. Thus $x \in \text{Ann}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k Ru_i)$.

For the other inclusion, let $x \in \text{Ann}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k Ru_i)$. We have $x \bigoplus_{i=1}^k Ru_i = 0$. Since we know that $xRu_i = 0$. So $x \in \text{Ann}(Ru_i)$ for all i . Thus $x \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \text{Ann}(Ru_i)$. \square

4 Concluding comments

In this article, for $v = 0, 2, 3, c$ we generalize the concept of v -prime R -module to the notion of v -classical prime R -module. We proved some few properties about the characterization of classical prime near-ring modules. We recommend as future work to investigate the radical of classical prime near-ring modules.

Acknowledgments This work was supported by the Council-funded from the Office of Research Development funding at Nelson Mandela University.

References

- [1] M. BEHBOODI, A generalization of Baer's lower nilradical for modules, *Journal of Algebra and Its Applications*, 6 (2007), 337-353.
- [2] J. DAUNS, Prime modules, *J. Reine Angew. Math*, 298 (1978), 156-181.
- [3] S. JUGLAL, Prime near-ring modules and their links with the generalized group near-ring, *PhD thesis, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University*, 2008.
- [4] N.J. GROENEWALD, S. JUGLAL AND K.S. E. LEE, Different prime R -ideals *Algebra Colloq*, 17 (2010), 887-904.
- [5] JAMES C. BEIDLEMAN, On near-rings and near-ring modules, PhD thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1966.
- [6] P. DJAGBA, Contributions to the theory of Beidleman near-vector spaces, *PhD thesis, Stellenbosch University*, 2019.
- [7] P.DJAGBA AND K-T. HOWELL, The subspace structure of finite dimensional Beidleman near-vector spaces, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 2019.
- [8] PILZ, GÜNTER, Near-rings: the theory and its applications *North-Holland Publishing Company*, 23 (1983)
- [9] P. DJAGBA AND J. HAZLA, Combinatorics of subgroups of Beidleman near-vector spaces *preprint arXiv:2306.16421*, 2023.
- [10] P. DJAGBA AND A.L. PRINS, On Linear Maps and Seed Sets of Beidleman Near-Vector Spaces *preprint arXiv:2310.05948*, 2023.
- [11] P. DJAGBA , On the generalized distributive set of a finite nearfield, *Journal of Algebra*, 542 (2020), 130-161.