

1-1-2021

Weak c-ideals of a Lie algebra

ZEKİYE ÇİLOĞLU ŞAHİN

DAVID ANTHONY TOWERS

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dctubitak.researchcommons.org/math>



Part of the [Mathematics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

ŞAHİN, ZEKİYE ÇİLOĞLU and TOWERS, DAVID ANTHONY (2021) "Weak c-ideals of a Lie algebra," *Turkish Journal of Mathematics*: Vol. 45: No. 5, Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.3906/mat-2006-55>

Available at: <https://dctubitak.researchcommons.org/math/vol45/iss5/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. It has been accepted for inclusion in Turkish Journal of Mathematics by an authorized editor of TÜBİTAK Academic Journals.

Weak c-ideals of a Lie algebra

Zekiye ÇİLOĞLU ŞAHİN^{1,*}, David Anthony TOWERS²

¹Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Suleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey

²Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Fylde College, Lancaster University, Lancaster, United Kingdom

Received: 14.06.2020

Accepted/Published Online: 30.06.2021

Final Version: 16.09.2021

Abstract: A subalgebra B of a Lie algebra L is called a weak c-ideal of L if there is a subideal C of L such that $L = B + C$ and $B \cap C \leq B_L$ where B_L is the largest ideal of L contained in B . This is analogous to the concept of weakly c-normal subgroups, which has been studied by a number of authors. We obtain some properties of weak c-ideals and use them to give some characterisations of solvable and supersolvable Lie algebras. We also note that one-dimensional weak c-ideals are c-ideals.

Key words: Weak c-ideal, Frattini ideal, Lie algebras, nilpotent, solvable, supersolvable

1. Introduction

Throughout L , a finite-dimensional Lie algebra over a field F will be denoted. If B is a subalgebra of L we define B_L , the *core* (with respect to L) of B to be the largest ideal of L contained in B . We say that a subalgebra B of L is a *weak c-ideal* of L if there is a subideal C of L such that $L = B + C$ and $B \cap C \leq B_L$. This is a generalisation of the concept of a c-ideal, which was studied in [9]. It is analogous to the concept of weakly c-normal subgroup as introduced by Zhu, Guo and Shum in [15]; this concept has since been further studied by a number of authors, including Zhong and Yang ([14]), Zhong, Yang, Ma and Lin ([13]), Tashtoush ([7]) and Jehad ([4]) who called them c-subnormal subgroups.

The maximal subalgebras of a Lie algebra L and their relationship to the structure of L have been studied extensively. It is well known that L is nilpotent if and only if every maximal subalgebra of L is an ideal of L (see [1]). A further result is that if L is solvable then every maximal subalgebra of L has codimension one in L if and only if L is supersolvable (see [2]). In [9], similar characterisations of solvable and supersolvable Lie algebras were obtained in terms of c-ideals. The purpose here is to generalise these results to ones relating to weak c-ideals.

In Section 2, we give some basic properties of weak c-ideals; in particular, it is shown that weak c-ideals inside the Frattini subalgebra of a Lie algebra L are necessarily ideals of L . In section three we first show that all maximal subalgebras of L are weak c-ideals of L if and only if L is solvable and that L has a solvable maximal subalgebra that is a weak c-ideal if and only if L is solvable. Unlike the corresponding results for c-ideals, it is necessary to restrict the underlying field to characteristic zero, as is shown by an example. Finally, we have that if all maximal nilpotent subalgebras of L are weak c-ideals, or if all Cartan subalgebras of L are weak c-ideals and F has characteristic zero, then L is solvable.

*Correspondence: zekiyeciloglu@sdu.edu.tr

2010 *AMS Mathematics Subject Classification*: 17B05, 17B20, 17B30, 17B50

In Section 4, we show that if L is a solvable Lie algebra over a general field and every maximal subalgebra of each maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L is a weak c -ideal of L , then L is supersolvable. If each of the maximal nilpotent subalgebras of L has dimension at least two, then the assumption of solvability can be removed. Similarly, if the field has characteristic zero and L is not three-dimensional simple, then this restriction can be removed. In the final section, we see that every one-dimensional subalgebra is a weak c -ideal if and only if it is a c -ideal.

If A and B are subalgebras of L for which $L = A + B$ and $A \cap B = 0$, we will write $L = A \oplus B$. The ideals $L^{(k)}$ and L^k are defined inductively by $L^{(1)} = L^1 = L$, $L^{(k+1)} = [L^{(k)}, L^{(k)}]$, $L^{k+1} = [L, L^k]$ for $k \geq 1$. If A is a subalgebra of L , the *centralizer* of A in L is $C_L(A) = \{x \in L : [x, A] = 0\}$.

2. Preliminary results

Definition 2.1 Let I be a subalgebra of L . We call I a subideal of L if there is a chain of subalgebras

$$I = I_0 < I_1 < \dots < I_n = L,$$

where I_j is an ideal of I_{j+1} for each $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$.

Definition 2.2 A subalgebra B of a Lie algebra L is a weak c -ideal of L if there exists a subideal C of L such that

$$L = B + C \text{ and } B \cap C \leq B_L,$$

where B_L , the core of B , is the largest ideal of L contained in B .

Definition 2.3 A Lie algebra L is called weak c -simple if L does not contain any weak c -ideals except the trivial subalgebra and L itself.

Lemma 2.4 Let L be a Lie algebra. Then, the following statements hold:

- (1) Let B be a subalgebra of L . If B is a c -ideal of L , then B is a weak c -ideal of L .
- (2) L is weak c -simple if and only if L is simple.
- (3) If B is a weak c -ideal of L and K is a subalgebra with $B \leq K \leq L$, then B is a weak c -ideal of K .
- (4) If I is an ideal of L and $I \leq B$, then B is a weak c -ideal of L if and only if B/I is a weak c -ideal of L/I .

Proof (1) By the definition every ideal is a c -ideal and every c -ideal is a weak c -ideal so the proof is obvious.

- (2) Suppose first that L is simple and let B be a weak c -ideal with $B \neq L$. Then

$$L = B + C \text{ and } B \cap C \leq B_L$$

where C is a subideal of L . But, since L is simple, B_L must be 0. Moreover, $C \neq 0$ so $C = L$. Hence, $B = 0$ and L is weak c -simple.

Conversely, suppose L is weak c -simple. Then, since every ideal of L is a weak c -ideal, L must be simple.

- (3) If B is a weak c -ideal of L , then there exists a subideal C of L such that

$$L = B + C \text{ and } B \cap C \leq B_L$$

Then $K = K \cap L = K \cap (B + C) = B + (K \cap C)$. Since C is a subideal of L , there exists a chain of subalgebras

$$C = C_0 < C_1 < \dots < C_n = L$$

where C_j is an ideal of C_{j+1} for each $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$. If we intersect this chain with K , we get

$$C \cap K = C_0 \cap K < C_1 \cap K < \dots < C_n \cap K = L \cap K = K$$

and obviously $C_j \cap K$ is an ideal of $C_{j+1} \cap K$ for each $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$. Hence, $C \cap K$ is a subideal of K . Also,

$$B \cap (C \cap K) \leq B_K$$

so that B is a weak c -ideal of L .

(4) Suppose first that B/I is a weak c -ideal of L/I . Then there exists a subideal C/I of L/I such that

$$L/I = B/I + C/I \text{ and } B/I \cap C/I \leq (B/I)_{L/I} = B_L/I$$

It follows that $L = B + C$ and $B \cap C \leq B_L$ where C is a subideal of L .

Suppose conversely that I is an ideal of L with $I \leq B$ and B is a weak c -ideal of L . Then there exists a C subideal of L such that

$$L = B + C \text{ and } B \cap C \leq B_L.$$

Since I is an ideal and $I \leq B$ the factor algebra

$$L/I = (B + C)/I = B/I + (C + I)/I$$

where $(C + I)/I$ is a subideal of L/I and

$$(B/I) \cap (C + I)/I = (B \cap (C + I))/I = (I + B \cap C)/I \leq B_L/I = (B/I)_{L/I}$$

so B/I is a weak c -ideal of L/I . □

The *Frattini subalgebra* of L , $F(L)$, is the intersection of all of the maximal subalgebras of L . The *Frattini ideal*, $\varphi(L)$, of L is $F(L)_L$. The next result is a generalisation of [9, Proposition 2.2]. The same proof works, but we will include it for completeness.

Proposition 2.5 Let B, C be subalgebras of L with $B \leq F(C)$. If B is a weak c -ideal of L , then B is an ideal of L and $B \leq \varphi(L)$.

Proof Suppose that $L = B + K$ where K is a subideal of L and $B \cap K \leq B_L$. Then $C = C \cap L = C \cap (B + K) = B + C \cap K = C \cap K$ since $B \leq F(C)$. Hence, $B \leq C \leq K$, giving $B = B \cap K \leq B_L$ and B is an ideal of L . It then follows from [8, Lemma 4.1] that $B \leq \varphi(L)$. □

An ideal A is *complemented* in L if there is a subalgebra U of L such that $L = A + U$ and $A \cap U = 0$. We adapt this to define a complemented weak c -ideal as follows.

Definition 2.6 Let L be a Lie algebra and B is a weak c -ideal of L . A weak c -ideal B is complemented in L if there is a subideal C of L such that $L = B + C$ and $B \cap C = 0$.

Then we can give the following lemma:

Lemma 2.7 If B is a weak c -ideal of a Lie algebra L , then B/B_L has a subideal complement in L/B_L , i.e. there exists a subideal subalgebra C/B_L of L/B_L such that L/B_L is semidirect sum of C/B_L and B/B_L . Conversely, if B is a subalgebra of L such that B/B_L has a subideal complement in L/B_L , then B is a weak c -ideal of L .

Proof Let B be a weak c -ideal of L . Then there exists a subideal C of L such that $B + C = L$ and $B \cap C \leq B_L$. If $B_L = 0$, then $B \cap C = 0$ and so that C is a subideal complement of B in L . Assume that $B_L \neq 0$, then we can construct the factor algebras B/B_L and $(C + B_L)/B_L$. If we intersect these two factor algebras, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{B}{B_L} \cap \frac{C + B_L}{B_L} &= \frac{B \cap (C + B_L)}{B_L} \\ &= \frac{B_L + (B \cap C)}{B_L} \\ &= \frac{B_L}{B_L} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(C + B_L)/B_L$ is a subideal complement of B/B_L in L/B_L . Conversely, if K is a subideal of L such that K/B_L is a subideal complement of B/B_L in L/B_L , then we have that

$$L/B_L = (B/B_L) + (K/B_L) \text{ and } (B/B_L) \cap (K/B_L) = 0$$

Then $L = B + K$ and $B \cap K \leq B_L$. Therefore, B is a weak c -ideal of L . □

3. Some characterisations of solvable algebras

We will use the following Lemma, which is due to Stewart [6, Lemma 4.2.5]

Lemma 3.1 Let L be a Lie algebra over any field having two subideals H and K such that K is simple and not abelian. Suppose that $H \cap K = 0$. Then $[H, K] = 0$

Theorem 3.2 Let L be a Lie-algebra over a field F of characteristic zero and let B be an ideal of L . Then B is solvable if and only if every maximal subalgebra of L not containing B is a weak c -ideal of L .

Proof Suppose every maximal subalgebra of L not containing B is a weak c -ideal of L . Then we need to show B is solvable. Assume that this is false and let L be a minimal counter-example. Let A be a minimal ideal of L and assume that M/A is a maximal subalgebra of L/A such that $(B + A)/A \not\subseteq M/A$. Then M is a maximal subalgebra of L with $B \not\subseteq M$, so M is a weak c -ideal of L . It follows that M/A is a weak c -ideal of L/A , and, hence, that $(B + A)/A$ is solvable. If $B \cap A = 0$, then $B \cong B/B \cap A \cong (B + A)/A$ is solvable. So, we can assume that every minimal ideal of L is contained in B . Moreover, B/A is solvable for each such minimal ideal. If L has two distinct minimal ideals A_1 and A_2 , then $B \cong B/A_1 \cap A_2$ is solvable, so L is monolithic with monolith A , say.

If A is abelian, then B is solvable, so we must have that A is simple. Clearly, $B \not\subseteq \varphi(L)$, since $\varphi(L)$ is nilpotent, so there is a maximal subalgebra M of L such that $B \not\subseteq M$. Then M must be a weak c -ideal of L , so there is a subideal C of L such that $L = M + C$ and $M \cap C \subseteq M_L$. Since $B \not\subseteq M_L$ we have that $M_L = 0$.

It follows that L is primitive of type 2 and, hence, that $C_L(A) = 0$, by [10, Theorem 1.1]. But $[C, A] = 0$ by Lemma 3.1, so $C = 0$, a contradiction. Hence, B is solvable. So, suppose now that B is solvable and let M be a maximal ideal of L not containing B . Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $B^{(k+1)} \subseteq M$, but $B^{(k)} \not\subseteq M$. Clearly $L = M + B^{(k)}$ and $B^{(k)} \cap M$ is an ideal of L , so $B^{(k)} \cap M \subseteq M_L$. It follows that M is a c -ideal and, hence, a weak c -ideal of L . \square

Corollary 3.3 Let L be a Lie algebra over a field F of characteristic zero. Then L is solvable if and only if every maximal subalgebra of L is a weak c -ideal of L .

Unlike the corresponding results for c -ideals, the above two results do not hold in characteristic $p > 0$, as the following example shows.

Example 3.4 Let $L = sl(2) \otimes \mathcal{O}_1 + 1 \otimes F(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + x\frac{\partial}{\partial x})$, where $\mathcal{O}_1 = F[x]$ with $x^p = 0$ is the truncated polynomial algebra in 1 indeterminate and the ground field, F , is algebraically closed of characteristic $p > 2$. Then $A = sl(2) \otimes \mathcal{O}_1$ is the unique minimal ideal of L . Put $S = sl(2) = Fu_{-1} + Fu_0 + Fu_1$ with $[u_{-1}, u_0] = u_{-1}$, $[u_{-1}, u_1] = u_0$, $[u_0, u_1] = u_1$ and let $M = (Fu_0 + Fu_1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_1 + 1 \otimes F(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + x\frac{\partial}{\partial x})$. This is a maximal subalgebra of L , which doesn't contain A . Suppose that it is a weak c -ideal of L . Then there is a subideal C of L such that $L = C + M$ and $C \cap M \subseteq M_L = 0$.

Let

$$C = C_0 < C_1 < \dots < C_n = L$$

where C_j is an ideal of C_{j+1} for each $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$. Then $A \subseteq C_{n-1}$, so $A = C_{n-1}$ or $C_{n-1} = A + 1 \otimes F\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$. In the latter case it is straightforward to check that $C_{n-2} \subseteq A$. In either case, C must be inside a proper ideal of A and, hence, inside $S \oplus \mathcal{O}_1^+$, where \mathcal{O}_1^+ is spanned by x, x^2, \dots, x^{p-1} . But now $u_{-1} \otimes 1 \notin C + M$. Hence, M is not a weak c -ideal of L .

Lemma 3.5 Let $L = U + C$ be a Lie algebra, where U is a solvable subalgebra of L and C is a subideal of L . Then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L^{(n_0)} \subseteq C$.

Proof Let $C = C_0 < C_1 < \dots < C_k = L$ where C_i is an ideal of C_{i+1} for $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$. Then L/C_{k-1} is solvable, and so there exists n_{k-1} such that $L^{(n_{k-1})} \subseteq C_{k-1}$. Suppose that $L^{(n_i)} \subseteq C_i$ for some $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$. Now C_i/C_{i-1} is solvable, and so there is r_i such that $C_i^{(r_i)} \subseteq C_{i-1}$. Hence, $L^{(n_i+r_i)} = (L^{(n_i)})^{(r_i)} \subseteq C_{i-1}$. Put $n_{i-1} = n_i + r_i$. The result now follows by induction. \square

Theorem 3.6 Let L be a Lie algebra over a field F of characteristic zero. Then L has a solvable maximal subalgebra that is a weak c -ideal of L if and only if L is solvable.

Proof Suppose first that L has a solvable maximal subalgebra M that is a weak c -ideal of L . We show that L is solvable. Let L be a minimal counter-example. Then there is a subideal K of L such that $L = M + K$ and $M \cap K \subseteq M_L$. If $M_L \neq 0$, then L/M_L is solvable, by the minimality assumption, and M_L is solvable, whence L is solvable, a contradiction. It follows that $M_L = 0$ and $L = M + K$. If R is the solvable radical of L then $R \subseteq M_L = 0$, so L is semisimple. But now, for all $n \geq 1$, $L = L^{(n)} \subseteq K \neq L$, by Lemma 3.5, a contradiction. The result follows. The converse follows from Corollary 3.3. \square

Theorem 3.7 Let L be a Lie algebra over a field of characteristic zero such that all maximal nilpotent subalgebras are weak c -ideals of L . Then L is solvable.

Proof Suppose that L is not solvable but that all maximal nilpotent subalgebras of L are weak c -ideals of L . Let $L = R \oplus S$ be the Levi decomposition of L , where $S \neq 0$. Let B be a maximal nilpotent subalgebra of S and U be a maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L containing it. Then there is a subideal C of L such that $L = U + C$ and $U \cap C \subseteq U_L$. It follows from Lemma 3.5 that $S = S^{(n_0)} \subseteq L^{(n_0)} \subseteq C$, and so $B \subseteq U \cap C \subseteq U_L$, whence $S \cap U_L \neq 0$. But $S \cap U_L$ is an ideal of S and so is semisimple. Since U is nilpotent, this is a contradiction. \square

Theorem 3.8 Let L be a Lie algebra, over a field F of characteristic zero in which every Cartan subalgebra of L is a weak c -ideal of L . Then L is solvable.

Proof Suppose that every Cartan subalgebra of L is a weak c -ideal of L and that L has a non-zero Levi factor S . Let H be a Cartan subalgebra of S and let B be a Cartan subalgebra of its centralizer in the solvable radical of L . Then $C = H + B$ is a Cartan subalgebra of L (see [3]), and there is a subideal K of L such that $L = C + K$ and $C \cap K \subseteq C_L$. Now there is an $r \geq 2$ such that $L^{(r)} \subseteq K$, by Lemma 3.5. But $S \leq L^{(r)} \subseteq K$, so $C \cap S \subseteq C \cap K \subseteq C_L$ giving $C \cap S \subseteq C_L \cap S = 0$, a contradiction. It follows that $S = 0$ and, hence, that L is solvable. \square

4. Some characterisations of supersolvable algebras

The following is proved in [9, Lemma 4.1]

Lemma 4.1 Let L be a Lie algebra over any field F , let A be an ideal of L and let U/A be a maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L/A . Then $U = C + A$, where C is a maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L .

We will also need the following result.

Lemma 4.2 Let L be a Lie algebra over any field F and suppose that $L = B + K$, where B is a nilpotent subalgebra and K is a subideal of L . Then there exists $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L^s \subseteq K$. Moreover, if A is a minimal ideal of L then either $A \subseteq K$ or $[L, A] = 0$.

Proof Since K is a subideal of L , there exists $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L(\text{ad } K)^r \subseteq K$. As B is nilpotent, there exists $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L^s = (B + K)^s \subseteq K$. Now $[L, A] = A$ or $[L, A] = 0$, and the former implies that $A \subseteq L^s \subseteq K$. \square

Lemma 4.3 Let L be a Lie algebra over any field F in which every maximal subalgebra of each maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L is a weak c -ideal of L and let A be a minimal abelian ideal of L . Then every maximal subalgebra of each maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L/A is a weak c -ideal of L/A .

Proof Suppose that U/A is a maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L/A . Then $U = C + A$ where C is a maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L by Lemma 4.1. Let B/A be a maximal subalgebra of U/A . Then $B = B \cap (C + A) = B \cap C + A = D + A$ where D is a maximal subalgebra of C with $B \cap C \subseteq D$. Now D is a weak c -ideal of L so there is a subideal K of L with $L = D + K$ and $D \cap K \subseteq D_L$.

If $A \leq K$ we have

$$\frac{L}{A} = \frac{D+K}{A} = \frac{D+A}{A} + \frac{K}{A} = \frac{B}{A} + \frac{K}{A},$$

and

$$\frac{B}{A} \cap \frac{K}{A} = \frac{B \cap K}{A} = \frac{(D+A) \cap K}{A} = \frac{D \cap K + A}{A} \leq \frac{D_L + A}{A} \leq \left(\frac{B}{A}\right)_{L/A}.$$

So suppose that $A \not\leq K$. Then Lemma 4.2 shows that $[L, A] = 0$. It follows that $A \leq C$ and $B = D$. We have $L = B + K$ and $B \cap K \leq B_L$, so

$$\frac{L}{A} = \frac{B}{A} + \frac{K+A}{A}$$

and

$$\frac{B}{A} \cap \frac{K+A}{A} = \frac{B \cap (K+A)}{A} = \frac{B \cap K + A}{A} \leq \frac{B_L + A}{A} \leq \left(\frac{B}{A}\right)_{L/A}.$$

□

Lemma 4.4 Let L be a Lie algebra over any field F , in which every maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L is a weak c-ideal of L , and suppose that A is a minimal abelian ideal of L and M is a core-free maximal subalgebra of L . Then A is one dimensional.

Proof We have that $L = A \dot{+} M$ and A is the unique minimal ideal of L , by [10, Theorem 1.1]. Let C be a maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L with $A \leq C$. If $A = C$, choose B to be a maximal subalgebra of A , so that $A = B + Fa$ and $B_L = 0$. Then B is a weak c-ideal of L . So there is a subideal of K of L with $L = B + K$ and $B \cap K \leq B_L = 0$. Now $L = B + K = B + K^L = K^L$, since $B \leq A \leq K^L$. It follows that $K = L$, whence $B = 0$ and $A = Fa$ is one dimensional.

So suppose that $C \neq A$. Then $C = A + M \cap C$. Let B be a maximal subalgebra of C containing $M \cap C$. Then B is a weak c-ideal of L , so there is a subideal K of L with $L = B + K$ and $B \cap K \leq B_L$. If $A \leq B_L \leq B$, we have $C = A + M \cap C \leq B$, a contradiction. Hence, $B_L = 0$ and $L = B \dot{+} K$. Now, $C = B + C \cap K$ and $B \cap C \cap K = B \cap K = 0$. As C is nilpotent, this means that $\dim(C \cap K) = 1$. If $A \subseteq K$, we have that $A \leq C \cap K$, so $\dim A = 1$, as required. Otherwise, $[L, A] = 0$, by Lemma 4.2 and again $\dim A = 1$. □

We can now prove our main result.

Theorem 4.5 Let L be a solvable Lie algebra over any field F in which every maximal subalgebra of each maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L is a weak c-ideal of L . Then L is supersolvable.

Proof Let L be a minimal counter-example and let A be a minimal abelian ideal of L . Then L/A satisfies the same hypothesis by Lemma 4.3 We, thus, have that L/A is supersolvable, and it remains to show that $\dim A = 1$.

If there is another minimal ideal I of L , then

$$A \cong (A + I) / I \leq L / I$$

which is supersolvable and so $\dim A = 1$. So, we can assume that A is the unique minimal ideal of L . Also, if $A \leq \varphi(L)$, we have that $L/\varphi(L)$ is supersolvable, whence L is supersolvable by [2, Theorem 7]. We, therefore,

further assume that $A \not\subseteq \varphi(L)$. It follows that $L = A + M$, where M is a core-free maximal subalgebra of L . The result now follows from Lemma 4.4. \square

If L has no one-dimensional maximal nilpotent subalgebras, we can remove the solvability assumption from the above result provided that F has characteristic zero.

Corollary 4.6 Let L be a Lie algebra over a field F of characteristic zero in which every maximal nilpotent subalgebra has dimension at least two. If every maximal subalgebra of each maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L is a weak c -ideal of L , then L is supersolvable.

Proof Let N be the nilradical of L , and let $x \notin N$. Then $x \in C$ for some maximal nilpotent subalgebra C of L . Since $\dim C > 1$, there is a maximal subalgebra B of C with $x \in B$. Then there is a subideal K of L such that $L = B + K$ and $B \cap K \subseteq B_L \leq C_L \leq N$. Clearly, $x \notin K$, since otherwise $x \in B \cap K \leq N$. Moreover, $L^r \subseteq K$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$, by Lemma 4.2. We have shown that if $x \notin N$ there is a subideal K of L with $x \notin K$ and $L^r \subseteq K$.

Suppose that L is not solvable. Then there is a semisimple Levi factor S of L . Choose $x \in S$. Then $x \in S = S^r \subseteq K$, a contradiction. Thus, L is solvable, and the result follows from Theorem 4.5. \square

If L has a one-dimensional maximal nilpotent subalgebra, then we can also remove the solvability assumption from Theorem 4.4, provided that underlying field F has again characteristic zero and L is not three-dimensional simple.

Corollary 4.7 Let L be a Lie algebra over a field F of characteristic zero. If every maximal subalgebra of each maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L is a weak c -ideal of L , then L is supersolvable or three dimensional simple.

Proof If every maximal nilpotent subalgebra of L has dimension at least two, then L is supersolvable by Corollary 4.6. So we need only to consider the case where L has a one-dimensional maximal nilpotent subalgebra, say Fx . Suppose first that L is semisimple, so $L = S_1 \oplus \dots \oplus S_n$, where S_i is a simple ideal of L for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $n > 1$. If $x \in S_i$, then choosing $s \in S_j$ with $j \neq i$, we have that $Fx + Fs$ is a two dimensional abelian subalgebra, which contradicts the maximality of Fx . If $x \notin S_i$, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, then x has nonzero projections in at least two of the S_k 's, say $s_i \in S_i$ and $s_j \in S_j$. But then $Fx + Fs_i$ is a two-dimensional abelian subalgebra, a contradiction again. It follows that L is simple. But then Fx is a Cartan subalgebra of L , which yields that L has rank one and, thus, is three dimensional.

So now let L be a minimal-counter example. We have seen that L is not semisimple, so it has a minimal abelian ideal A . By Lemma 4.3, L/A is supersolvable or three-dimensional simple. In the former case, L is solvable and so is supersolvable by Theorem 4.5.

In the latter case, $L = A \oplus S$ where S is three-dimensional simple, and so a core-free maximal subalgebra of L . It follows from Lemma 4.4 that $\dim A = 1$. But now $C_L(A) = A$ or L . In the former case, $S \cong L/A = L/C_L(A) \cong Inn(A)$, a subalgebra of $Der(A)$, which is impossible. Hence, $L = A \oplus S$, where A and S are both ideals of L and again L has no one-dimensional maximal nilpotent subalgebras. \square

5. One dimensional weak c -ideals

Lemma 5.1 Let L be a Lie algebra over any field F . Then the one-dimensional subalgebra Fx of L is a weak c -ideal of L if and only if it is a c -ideal of L .

Proof Let Fx be a weak c -ideal of L . Then there is a subideal K of L such that $L = Fx + K$ and $Fx \cap K \leq (Fx)_L$. Since either $K = L$ or K has codimension one in L , it is an ideal of L and Fx is a c -ideal of L . \square

We say that L is *almost abelian* if $L = L^2 \oplus Fx$, where L^2 is abelian and $[x, y] = y$ for all $y \in L^2$. Then the following result follows from Lemma 5.1 and [9, Theorem 5.2].

Theorem 5.2 Let L be a Lie algebra over any field F . Then all one-dimensional subalgebras of L are weak c -ideals of L if and only if:

- (i) $L^3 = 0$; or
- (ii) $L = A \oplus B$, where A is an abelian ideal of L and B is an almost abelian ideal of L .

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the referees for their valuable comments.

References

- [1] Barnes, DW. Nilpotency of Lie algebras. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 1962, 79: 237-238.
- [2] Barnes, DW. On the cohomology of soluble Lie algebras. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 1967, 101: 343-349.
- [3] Dixmier, J. Sous-algèbres de Cartan et décompositions de Levi dans les algèbres de Lie (French). *Proceedings and transactions of the Royal Society of Canada Section III* (3) 1956; 50: 17-21.
- [4] Jehad, J. Some conditions for solubility. *Mathematics Journal of Okayama University* 2000; 42: 1-5.
- [5] Skiba, AN. A note on c -normal subgroups of finite groups. *Algebra and Discrete Mathematics* 2005; 3: 85-95
- [6] Stewart, IN. Subideals of Lie Algebras. University of Warwick institutional repository Ph.D. thesis 1969.
- [7] Tashtoush, M. Weakly c -normal and cs -normal subgroups of finite groups. *Jordan Journal of Mathematics and Statistics* 2008; 1: 123-132
- [8] Towers, DA. A Frattini theory for algebras. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* 1973; 27(3): 440-462
- [9] Towers, DA. C -ideals of Lie algebras. *Communications in Algebra* 2009; 37: 4366-4373. doi: 10.1080/00927870902829023
- [10] Towers, DA. Maximal subalgebras and chief factors of Lie algebras. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 2016; 220: 482-493. doi: 10.1016/j.jpaa.2015.07.005
- [11] Towers, DA. The generalised nilradical of a Lie algebra. *Journal of Algebra* 2017; 470: 197-218. doi: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2016.08.037
- [12] Wang, Y. C -normality of groups and its properties. *Journal of Algebra* 1996; 180: 954-965.
- [13] Zhong G, Yang L, Ma X, Lin S. On s -permutably embedded and weakly c -normal subgroups of finite groups. *International Electronic Journal of Algebra* 2013; 14: 44-52.
- [14] Zhong G, Yang L. Finite groups with weakly c -normal subgroups. *Southeast Asian Bulletin of Mathematics* 2013; 37: 297-305.
- [15] Zhu L, Guo W, Shum KP. Weakly c -normal subgroups of finite groups and their properties. *Communications in Algebra* 2002; 30: 5505-5512. doi: 10.1081/AGB-120015666
- [16] Zusmanovich, P. Deformations of $W_1(n) \otimes A$ and modular semisimple Lie algebras with a solvable maximal subalgebra. *Journal of Algebra* 2003; 268: 603-635. doi: 10.1016/S0021-8693(03)00295