HILBERT’S BASIS THEOREM FOR NON-ASSOCIATIVE AND HOM-ASSOCIATIVE ORE EXTENSIONS

PER BÄCK AND JOHAN RICHTER

Abstract. We prove a hom-associative version of Hilbert’s basis theorem, which includes as special cases both a non-associative version and the classical associative Hilbert's basis theorem for Ore extensions. Along the way, we develop hom-module theory, including the introduction of corresponding isomorphism theorems and a notion of being hom-noetherian. We conclude with some examples of both non-associative and hom-associative Ore extensions which are all noetherian by our theorem.

1. Introduction

Hom-associative algebras are not necessarily associative algebras, with the associativity condition replaced by \(\alpha(a) \cdot (b \cdot c) = (a \cdot b) \cdot \alpha(c)\), where \(\alpha\) is a linear map referred to as a twisting map, and \(a, b, c\) arbitrary elements in the algebra. Both associative algebras and non-associative algebras can thus be seen as hom-associative algebras; in the first case, by taking \(\alpha\) equal to the identity map, and in the latter case by taking \(\alpha\) equal to the zero map.

Historically, hom-associative algebras originate in the development of hom-Lie algebras, the latter being introduced by Hartwig, Larsson and Silvestrov as generalizations of Lie algebras, the Jacobi identity now twisted by a vector space homomorphism; the “hom” referring to this homomorphism [6]. The introduction of these generalizations of Lie algebras was motivated by an attempt to study \(q\)-deformations of the Witt and Virasoro algebra within a common framework. Makhlouf and Silvestrov then introduced hom-associative algebras as the natural counterparts to associative algebras; taking a hom-associative algebra and defining the commutator as a new multiplication gives a hom-Lie algebra, just as with the classical relation between associative algebras and Lie algebras [7]. It was later discovered that there existed formally rigid associative algebras that could now be formally deformed when considered as hom-associative algebras [10], this indicating that hom-associative algebras could be useful in studying deformations as well. Since then, many papers have been written in the subject, and other algebraic structures have been discovered to have natural counterparts in the “hom-world” as well, such as e.g. hom-coalgebras, hom-bialgebras, and hom-Hopf algebras [8, 9].

Ore extensions were introduced by Ore as non-commutative polynomial rings [14]. Non-associative Ore extensions were first introduced by Nystedt, Öinert, and Richter in the unital case [12] (see also [13] for a further extension to monoid Ore extensions). The construction was later generalized to non-unital, hom-associative Ore.
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extensions by the authors of the present article and Silvestrov [3]. They give examples, including hom-associative versions of the first Weyl algebra, the quantum plane, and a universal enveloping algebra of a Lie algebra, all of which turned out to be formal deformations of their associative counterparts [1, 2].

In this paper, we prove a hom-associative version of Hilbert’s basis theorem (Theorem 4), including as special cases both a non-associative version (Corollary 7) and the classical associative Hilbert’s basis theorem for Ore extensions (Remark 9). In order to prove this, we develop hom-module theory and a notion of being hom-noetherian (Section 3). Whereas the hom-module theory does not require a multiplicative identity element, the hom-associative Ore extensions in this article will all be assumed to be unital. We conclude with some examples of unital, non-associative and hom-associative Ore extensions which are all noetherian as a consequence of our main theorem. In more detail, the article is organized as follows:

Section 2 provides preliminaries from the theory of hom-associative algebras, and of unital, hom-associative Ore extensions as developed in [3].

Section 3 deals with hom-modules over non-unital, hom-associative rings, including the introduction of corresponding isomorphism theorems and a notion of being hom-noetherian. Whereas hom-modules were first defined in [10] for algebras over a field, the theory we develop here is new as far as we can tell.

Section 4 contains the proof of a hom-associative version of Hilbert’s basis theorem, including as special cases a non-associative and the classical associative version.

Section 5 contains examples of unital, non-associative and hom-associative Ore extensions which are all noetherian by the aforementioned theorem.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, by non-associative algebras we mean algebras which are not necessarily associative, including in particular associative algebras by definition. We also follow the convention of calling a non-associative algebra $A$ unital if there exist an element $1 \in A$ such that for any element $a \in A$, $a \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot a = a$. By non-unital algebras, we mean algebras which are not necessarily unital, including unital algebras as well.

2.1. Hom-associative algebras. This section is devoted to restating some basic definitions and general facts concerning hom-associative algebras.

Definition 1 (Hom-associative algebra). A hom-associative algebra over an associative, commutative, and unital ring $R$, is a triple $(M, \cdot, \alpha)$ consisting of an $R$-module $M$, a binary operation $\cdot : M \times M \to M$ linear over $R$ in both arguments, and an $R$-linear map $\alpha : M \to M$ satisfying, for all $a, b, c \in M$, $\alpha(a) \cdot (b \cdot c) = (a \cdot b) \cdot \alpha(c)$.

Since $\alpha$ twists the associativity, we will refer to it as the twisting map, and unless otherwise stated, it is understood that $\alpha$ without any further reference will always denote the twisting map of a hom-associative algebra.

Remark 1. A hom-associative algebra over $R$ is in particular a non-unital, non-associative $R$-algebra, and in case $\alpha$ is the identity map, a non-unital, associative $R$-algebra.

Remark 2. If $R$ is a unital hom-associative algebra, then $\alpha(m) = \alpha(1) \cdot m$ for any $m \in R$. It is also true that $\alpha(1)$ is in the center of $R$ and that $\alpha(1)$ is invertible if
Definition 2 (Morphism of hom-associative algebras). A morphism between two hom-associative algebras $A$ and $A'$ with twisting maps $\alpha$ and $\alpha'$ respectively, is an $R$-algebra homomorphism $f: A \to A'$ such that $f \circ \alpha = \alpha' \circ f$. If $f$ is also bijective, the two are isomorphic, written $A \cong A'$.

Definition 3 (Hom-associative subalgebra). Let $A$ be a hom-associative algebra with twisting map $\alpha$. A hom-associative subalgebra $B$ of $A$ is a subalgebra of $A$ that is also a hom-associative algebra with twisting map given by the restriction of $\alpha$ to $B$.

Definition 4 (Hom-ideal). A right (left) hom-ideal of a hom-associative algebra isomorphic the two are isomorphic, written $A \cong A'$.

Definition 5 (Hom-associative ring). A hom-associative ring is a hom-associative algebra over the ring of integers.

Proposition 1 (Opposite hom-associative ring). If $R$ is a non-unital, hom-associative ring, then the opposite ring, $R^{\text{op}}$, is that as well.

Proof. Right (left) distributivity of $R^{\text{op}}$ follows from left (right) distributivity of $R$. For any elements $r_1, r_2, r_3 \in R^{\text{op}}$, $\alpha(r_1) \cdot_{\text{op}} (r_2 \cdot_{\text{op}} r_3) = (r_3 \cdot r_2) \cdot \alpha(r_1) = \alpha(r_3) \cdot (r_2 \cdot_{\text{op}} r_1) = (r_1 \cdot_{\text{op}} r_2) \cdot_{\text{op}} \alpha(r_3)$. $\square$

2.2. Unital, non-associative Ore extensions. In this section, we recall some basic definitions and results about unital, non-associative Ore extensions. First, by $\mathbb{N}$, we mean the set of non-negative integers, and $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ that of positive integers. If $R$ is a unital, non-associative ring, and $\delta: R \to R$ and $\sigma: R \to R$ are additive maps with $\sigma(1) = 1$ and $\delta(1) = 0$, a unital, non-associative Ore extension of $R$, denoted by $R[X; \sigma, \delta]$, is defined as the set of formal sums $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} a_i X^i$, $a_i \in R$, called polynomials, with finitely many $a_i$ nonzero, endowed with the following addition and multiplication for any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_i, b_i \in R$:

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} a_i X^i + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} b_i X^i = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (a_i + b_i) X^i,$$

$$a X^m \cdot b X^n = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (a \cdot \pi_i^m(b)) X^{i+n}.$$  

Here, $\pi_i^m$, referred to as a $\pi$ function, denotes the sum of all \binom{m}{i} possible compositions of $i$ copies of $\sigma$ and $m - i$ copies of $\delta$ in arbitrary order. For instance, $\pi_1^1 = \sigma \circ \delta + \delta \circ \sigma$, whereas $\pi_0^2 = \text{id}_R$. We also define $\pi_i^m \equiv 0$ whenever $i < 0$, or $i > m$. The unit 1 in $R$ also becomes a unit in $R[X; \sigma, \delta]$ upon identification with $1X^0$. We also think of $X$ as an element of $R[X; \sigma, \delta]$ by identifying it with the monomial $1X$.

At last, defining two polynomials to be equal if and only if their corresponding coefficients are equal and imposing distributivity of the multiplication over addition
makes \( R[X;\sigma,\delta] \) a unital, non-associative, and non-commutative ring. This ring contains \( R \) as a subring by identifying any \( a \in R \) with \( aX^0 \in R[X;\sigma,\delta] \).

**Definition 6** (\( \sigma \)-derivation). Let \( R \) be a unital, non-associative ring where \( \sigma \) is a unital endomorphism and \( \delta \) an additive map on \( R \). Then \( \delta \) is called a \( \sigma \)-derivation if \( \delta(a \cdot b) = \sigma(a) \cdot \delta(b) + \delta(a) \cdot b \) holds for all \( a, b \in R \). If \( \sigma = \text{id}_R \), then \( \delta \) is simply a derivation.

**Remark 4.** If \( \delta \) is a \( \sigma \)-derivation on a unital, non-associative ring \( R \), then \( \delta(1) = 0 \).

**Lemma 1** (Properties of \( \pi \) functions). Let \( R \) be a unital, non-associative ring, \( \sigma \) a unital endomorphism and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation on \( R \). Then, for all \( a, b \in R \) and all \( l, m, n \in \mathbb{N} \), the following hold on \( R[X;\sigma,\delta] \):

\[
\begin{align*}
(i) \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_i^m(a \cdot \pi_i^{-n}(b)) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_i^m(a) \cdot \pi_i^{i+n}(b), \\
(ii) \quad & \pi_i^{m+1}(a) = \pi_{i-1}^m \circ \sigma + \pi_i^m \circ \delta = \pi_{i-1}^m(a) + \delta \circ \pi_i^m.
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof.** A proof of (i) in the associative setting can be found in [11]. However, as the proof actually makes no use associativity, it holds in the non-associative setting as well.

For (ii), we have that since \( \pi_i^m \) consists of the sum of all \( \binom{m}{l} \) possible compositions of \( \delta \) and \( \sigma \), we can split the sum into a part containing \( \sigma \) innermost (outermost) and \( \delta \) innermost (outermost). Using the recursive formula for binomial coefficients, \( \binom{m+1}{l} = \binom{m}{l-1} + \binom{m}{l} \) for any integers \( m \) and \( l \) with \( 1 \leq l \leq m \). By definition, \( \pi_i^m \equiv 0 \) whenever \( l < 0 \) or \( l > m \), and so the result follows immediately by simply counting the terms in each part. \( \square \)

When starting with a unital, hom-associative ring \( R \), it is natural to extend the definition of the twisting map \( \alpha \) of \( R \) to the whole of \( R[X;\sigma,\delta] \) by putting \( \alpha(aX^m) := \alpha(a)X^m \) for any \( aX^m \in R[X;\sigma,\delta] \), imposing additivity. When this is done, we say that \( \alpha \) is extended homogeneously to \( R[X;\sigma,\delta] \).

**Proposition 2** (Sufficient conditions for hom-associativity of \( R[X;\sigma,\delta] \) [3]). Assume \( \alpha : R \rightarrow R \) is the twisting map of a unital, hom-associative ring \( R \), and extend \( \alpha \) homogeneously to \( R[X;\sigma,\delta] \). Assume further that \( \alpha \) commutes with \( \delta \) and \( \sigma \), and that \( \sigma \) is a unital endomorphism and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation. Then \( R[X;\sigma,\delta] \) is a unital, hom-associative Ore extension of \( R \) with twisting map \( \alpha \).

3. Hom-module theory

The purpose of this section is to develop the theory of hom-modules over non-unital, hom-associative rings.

3.1. Basic definitions and theorems.

**Definition 7** (Hom-module). Let \( R \) be a non-unital, hom-associative ring with twisting map \( \alpha_R \), multiplication written with juxtaposition, and \( M \) an additive group with a group homomorphism \( \alpha_M : M \rightarrow M \), also called a twisting map. A right \( R \)-hom-module \( M_R \) consists of \( M \) and an operation \( \cdot : M \times R \rightarrow M \), called scalar multiplication, such that for all \( r_1, r_2 \in R \) and \( m_1, m_2 \in M \), the following hold:

\[
\begin{align*}
(M1) \quad & (m_1 + m_2) \cdot r_1 = m_1 \cdot r_1 + m_2 \cdot r_1 \quad \text{(right-distributivity)}, \\
(M2) \quad & m_1 \cdot (r_1 + r_2) = m_1 \cdot r_1 + m_1 \cdot r_2 \quad \text{(left-distributivity)}, \\
(M3) \quad & \alpha_M(m_1) \cdot (r_1 r_2) = (m_1 \cdot r_1) \cdot \alpha_R(r_2) \quad \text{(hom-associativity)}.
\end{align*}
\]
A left $R$-hom-module is defined analogously and written $RM$.

For the sake of brevity, we also allow ourselves to write $M$ in case it does not matter whether it is a right or a left $R$-hom-module. Furthermore, any two right (left) $R$-hom-modules are assumed to be equipped with the same twisting map $\alpha_R$ on $R$.

**Remark 5.** A hom-associative ring $R$ is both a right $R$-hom-module $R_R$ and a left $R$-hom-module $R_R$.

**Definition 8 (Morphism of hom-modules).** A morphism between two right (left) $R$-hom-modules $M$ and $M'$ is an additive map $f: M \to M'$ such that $f \circ \alpha_M = \alpha_{M'} \circ f$ and $f(m \cdot r) = f(m) \cdot r$, $(f(r \cdot m) = r \cdot f(m)$, respectively) for all $m \in M$ and $r \in R$. If $f$ is also bijective, the two are isomorphic, written $M \cong M'$.

**Remark 6.** Since we are assuming any two right (left) $R$-hom-modules to be endowed with the same twisting map $\alpha_R$ on $R$, a morphism between any two right (left) $R$-hom-modules preserves the right (left) $R$-hom-module structure defined by (M1), (M2), and (M3), just as expected.

**Definition 9 (Hom-submodule).** Let $M$ be a right (left) $R$-hom-module. An $R$-hom-submodule, or just hom-submodule, $N$ of $M$ is an additive subgroup of $M$ that is closed under the scalar multiplication of $M$ and invariant under $\alpha_M$ (i.e. $\alpha_M(N)$ is a subset of $N$), written $N \leq M$ or $M \geq N$, and in case $N$ is a proper hom-submodule, $N < M$ or $M > N$.

In particular, we see that any hom-submodule $N$ of $M$ is a right (left) $R$-hom-module with twisting maps $\alpha_R$ and $\alpha_N$, the latter map being given by restricting $\alpha_M$ to $N$.

**Proposition 3 (Image and preimage under hom-module morphism).** Let $f: M \to M'$ be a morphism of right (left) $R$-hom-modules, $N \leq M$ and $N' \leq M'$. Then $f(N)$ and $f^{-1}(N')$ are hom-submodules of $M'$ and $M$, respectively.

**Proof.** $f(N)$ and $f^{-1}(N')$ are clearly additive subgroups when considering $f$ as a group homomorphism. Let $r \in R$ and $a' \in f(N)$ be arbitrary. Then there is some $a \in N$ such that $a' = f(a)$, so $a' \cdot r = f(a) \cdot r = f(a \cdot r) \in f(N)$ since $a \cdot r \in N$. Moreover, $\alpha_M(a') = \alpha_{M'}(f(a)) = f(\alpha_M(a)) = f(\alpha_N(a)) \in f(N)$. Now, take any $b \in f^{-1}(N')$. Then there is some $b' \in N'$ such that $f(b) = b'$, so $b \cdot r = f(a) \cdot r = f(a \cdot r) \in N'$ since $a \cdot r \in N$, and hence $b \cdot r \in f^{-1}(N')$. At last, $f(\alpha_M(b)) = \alpha_M(f(b)) = \alpha_{M'}(b') = \alpha_{N'}(b') \in N'$, so $\alpha_M(b) \in f^{-1}(N')$. The left case is analogous. 

**Proposition 4 (Intersection of hom-submodules).** The intersection of any set of hom-submodules of a right (left) $R$-hom-module is a hom-submodule.

**Proof.** We show the case of right $R$-hom-modules; the left case is analogous. Let $N = \cap_{i \in I} N_i$ be an intersection of hom-submodules $N_i$ of a right $R$-hom-module $M$, where $I$ is some index set. Take any $a, b \in N$ and $j \in I$. Since $a, b \in N_j$ and $N_j$ is an additive subgroup, $(a - b) \in N_j$, and therefore $(a - b) \in N$. For any $r \in R$, $a \cdot r \in N_j$ since $N_j$ is a hom-submodule, and therefore $a \cdot r \in N$. At last, $\alpha_M(a) = \alpha_{N_j}(a) \in N_j$ for the same reason, so $\alpha_M(N)$ is a subset of $N$. □
**Definition 10** (Generating set of hom-submodule). Let $S$ be a nonempty subset of a right (left) $R$-hom-module $M$. The intersection $N$ of all hom-submodules of $M$ that contain $S$ is called the hom-submodule generated by $S$, and $S$ is called a generating set of $N$. If there is a finite generating set of $N$, then $N$ is called finitely generated.

**Remark 7.** The hom-submodule $N$ of a right (left) $R$-hom-module $M$ generated by a nonempty subset $S$ is the smallest hom-submodule of $M$ that contains $S$ in the sense that any other hom-submodule of $M$ that contains $S$ also contains $N$.

**Proposition 5** (Union of hom-submodules in an ascending chain). Let $M$ be a right (left) $R$-hom-module, and consider an ascending chain $N_1 \subseteq N_2 \subseteq \ldots$ of hom-submodules of $M$. Then the union $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} N_i$ is a hom-submodule of $M$.

**Proof.** Denote $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} N_i$ by $N$, and let $a, b \in N$. Then $a \in N_j$ and $b \in N_k$ for some $j, k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, and since $N_j \subseteq N_{\max(j,k)}$ and $N_k \subseteq N_{\max(j,k)}$, we have $a, b \in N_{\max(j,k)}$. Hence $(a - b) \in N_{\max(j,k)} \subseteq N$, so $(a - b) \in N$. Take any $r \in R$. Then, since $a \in N_j$, $a \cdot r \in N_j \subseteq N$, so $a \cdot r \in N$ for the right case, and analogously for the left case. Finally, $\alpha_M(a) = \alpha_{N_j}(a) \in N_j \subseteq N$, so $N$ is invariant under $\alpha_M$. □

**Proposition 6** (Sum of hom-submodules). Let $M$ be a right (left) $R$-hom-module and $N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_k$ any finite number of hom-submodules of $M$. Then the sum $\sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i = N_1 + N_2 + \cdots + N_k$ is a hom-submodule of $M$.

**Proof.** We prove the right case; the left case is analogous. Let $N := \sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i$ and take any $r \in R$, $a_i, b_i \in N_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, k\}$. Then $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i\right) \cdot r = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \cdot r \in N$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k} (a_i - b_i) \in N$. At last, $N$ is invariant under $\alpha_N := \alpha_M|_N$ since $\alpha_M\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_M(a_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{N_i}(a_i) \in N$. □

**Corollary 1** (The modular law for hom-modules). Let $M$ be a right (left) $R$-hom-module, and $M_1, M_2$, and $M_3$ hom-submodules of $M$ such that $M_3 \subseteq M_1$. Then the modular law $(M_1 \cap M_2) + M_3 = M_1 \cap (M_2 + M_3)$ holds.

**Proof.** The modular law holds for $M_1, M_2$ and $M_3$ when considered as additive groups. By Proposition 4 and Proposition 6, the intersection and sum of any two hom-submodules of $M$ are also hom-submodules of $M$, and hence the modular law holds for $M_1, M_2$ and $M_3$ as hom-modules as well. □

**Proposition 7** (Direct sum of hom-submodules). Let $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k$ be any finite number of right $R$-hom-modules. Endowing the usual (external) direct sum $M := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{k} M_i = M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_k$ with the following scalar multiplication and twisting map on $R$, makes it a right $R$-hom-module, where $(m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_k) \in M$ and $r \in R$ are arbitrary:

$\circ: M \times R \to M, \quad (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_k) \cdot r := (m_1 \cdot r, m_2 \cdot r, \ldots, m_k \cdot r)$,

$\alpha_M: M \to M, \quad \alpha_M((m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_k)) := (\alpha_{M_1}(m_1), \alpha_{M_2}(m_2), \ldots, \alpha_{M_k}(m_k))$.

**Proof.** Since $M$ is an additive group, what is left to check is that $\alpha_M$ is a group homomorphism, i.e. an additive map, and that $(M1), (M2)$ and $(M3)$ in Definition 7 holds. This is readily verified by routine calculations. □

An analogous result holds for left $R$-hom-modules.
Corollary 2 (Associativity of the direct sum). For any right (left) \( R \)-hom-modules \( M_1, M_2, \) and \( M_3 \), \( (M_1 \oplus M_2) \oplus M_3 \cong M_1 \oplus (M_2 \oplus M_3) \).

Proposition 8 (Quotient hom-module). Let \( M_R \) be a right \( R \)-hom-module and \( N_R \leq M_R \). Consider the additive groups \( M \) and \( N \) of \( M_R \) and \( N_R \), respectively, and form the quotient group \( M/N \) with elements of the form \( m + N \) for \( m \in M \). Then \( M/N \) becomes a right \( R \)-hom-module when endowed with the following scalar multiplication and twisting map on \( M/N \), where \( m \in M \) and \( r \in R \) are arbitrary:

\[
\bullet: M/N \times R \to M/N, \quad (m + N) \cdot r := m \cdot r + N,
\]

\[
\alpha_{M/N}: M/N \to M/N, \quad \alpha_{M/N}(m + N) := \alpha_M(m) + N.
\]

Proof. First, let us make sure that the scalar multiplication and twisting map are both well-defined. To this end, take two arbitrary elements of \( M/N \), \( (m_1 + N) \) and \( (m_2 + N) \), in \( M/N \). Since \( N_R \) is a right \( R \)-hom-module, \( (m_1 - m_2) \cdot r_1 \in N \) for any \( r_1 \in R \). Then \( (m_1 \cdot r_1 - m_2 \cdot r_1) = (m_1 - m_2) \cdot r_1 \in N \), so \( m_1 \cdot r_1 + N = m_2 \cdot r_1 + N \), and hence \( (m_1 + N) \cdot r_1 = (m_2 + N) \cdot r_1 \), so the scalar multiplication is well-defined. Now, since \( (m_1 - m_2) \in N \), \( \alpha_M(m_1 - m_2) \in N \) due to the fact that \( N_R \leq M_R \). On the other hand, \( \alpha_M(m_1 - m_2) = \alpha_M(m_1) - \alpha_M(m_2) \), so \( \alpha_M(m_1) + N = \alpha_M(m_2) + N \), and therefore \( \alpha_{M/N}(m_1 + N) = \alpha_{M/N}(m_2 + N) \), which proves that \( \alpha_{M/N} \) is well-defined. Furthermore \( \alpha_{M/N} \) is a group homomorphism since for any \( (m_3 + N), (m_4 + N) \in M/N \) where \( m_3, m_4 \in M \),

\[
\alpha_{M/N}((m_3 + N) + (m_4 + N)) = \alpha_{M/N}((m_3 + m_4) + N) = \alpha_{M}(m_3 + m_4) + N
\]

\[
= (\alpha_{M}(m_3) + \alpha_{M}(m_4)) + N = (\alpha_{M}(m_3) + N) + (\alpha_{M}(m_4) + N)
\]

\[
= \alpha_{M/N}(m_3 + N) + \alpha_{M/N}(m_4 + N).
\]

By straightforward calculations, one readily verifies that the three hom-module axioms (M1), (M2), and (M3) in Definition 7 hold. \( \square \)

Again, an analogous result holds for left \( R \)-hom-modules as well.

Corollary 3 (The natural projection). Let \( M \) be a right (left) \( R \)-module with \( N \leq M \). Then the natural projection \( \pi: M \to M/N \) defined by \( \pi(m) = m + N \) for any \( m \in M \) is a surjective morphism of hom-modules.

Corollary 4 (Hom-submodules of quotient hom-modules). Let \( M \) be a right (left) \( R \)-hom-module with \( N \leq M \). If \( L \) is a hom-submodule of \( M/N \), then \( L = K/N \) for some hom-submodule \( K \) of \( M \) that contains \( N \).

Proof. Let \( L \) be a hom-submodule of \( M/N \). Using the natural projection \( \pi: M \to M/N \) from Corollary 3, we know that \( K = \pi^{-1}(L) \) is a hom-submodule of \( M \) since it is the preimage of a morphism of hom-submodules, appealing to Proposition 3. By the surjectivity of \( \pi, \pi(K) = \pi(\pi^{-1}(L)) = L \), so \( L = \pi(K) = K/N \). \( \square \)

Theorem 1 (The first isomorphism theorem for hom-modules). Let \( f: M \to M' \) be a morphism of right (left) \( R \)-hom-modules. Then \( \ker f \) is a hom-submodule of \( M \), \( \im f \) is a hom-submodule of \( M' \), and \( M/\ker f \cong \im f \).

Proof. We show the right case; the proof of the left case is analogous. By definition, \( \ker f \) is the preimage of the hom-submodule 0 of \( M' \), and hence it is a hom-submodule of \( M \) by Proposition 3. Now, \( \im f = \langle f(M) \rangle \), so by the same proposition do we have that \( \im f \) is a hom-submodule of \( M' \). The map \( g: M/\ker f \to \im f \)
Theorem 1, \( N \)
\[ \alpha(\alpha_M(m) + \ker f) = \alpha_M'(f(m)) = \alpha_{im}(f(m + \ker f)), \]
which completes the proof. \( \square \)

**Theorem 2** (The second isomorphism theorem for hom-modules). Let \( M \) be a right (left) \( R \)-hom-module with \( N \leq M \) and \( L \leq M \). Then \( N/(N \cap L) \cong (N + L)/L \).

**Proof.** By Proposition 4, \( N \cap L \) is a hom-submodule of \( N \) and by Proposition 6, \( N + L \) is a hom-module with \( L = (0 + L) \leq (N + L) \), so the expression makes sense. The map \( f \colon N \to (N + L)/L \) defined by \( f(n) = n + L \) for any \( n \in N \) is a group homomorphism. Furthermore, it is surjective since for any \((n+l) + L \in (N + L)/L \), we have \((n+l) + L = (n + L) + (l + L) = n + L + (0 + L) = n + L = f(n)\). For any \( r \in R \), \( f(n \cdot r) = n \cdot r + L = (n + L) \cdot r = f(n) \cdot r \) (similarly for the left case), and moreover, \( f(\alpha_N(n) + L) = (\alpha_N(n) + \alpha_L(0)) + L = \alpha_{N+L}(n + 0) + L = \alpha_{(N+L)/L}(n + L) = \alpha_{(N+L)/L}(f(n)) \). We also see that \( \ker f = N \cap L \), so by Theorem 1, \( N/(N \cap L) \cong (N + L)/L \). \( \square \)

**Theorem 3** (The third isomorphism theorem for hom-modules). Let \( M \) be a right (left) \( R \)-hom-module with \( L \leq N \leq M \). Then \( N/L \) is a hom-submodule of \( M/L \) and \( (M/L)/(N/L) \cong M/N \).

**Proof.** According to Corollary 3, the natural projection \( \pi \colon M \to M/L \) is a morphism of right (left) hom-modules, so in particular are hom-submodules of \( M \) mapped to hom-submodules of \( M/L \). Since \( N \leq M \), \( N/L = \pi(N) \leq \pi(M) = M/L \), using that \( \pi \) is surjective. The map \( f \colon M/L \to M/N \) defined by \( f(m + L) = m + N \) for any \((m + L) \in M/L \) is a well-defined surjective group homomorphism. Moreover, for any \( r \in R \), \( f((m + L) \cdot r) = f(m \cdot r + L) = m \cdot r + N = (m + N) \cdot r = f(m + L) \cdot r \) (analogously for the left case), and \( f(\alpha_{M/L}(m + L)) = f(\alpha_M(m) + L) = \alpha_M(m) + N = \alpha_{M/N}(m + N) = \alpha_{M/N}(f(m + L)) \). We also see that \( \ker f = N/L \), so using Theorem 1, \( (M/L)/\ker f = (M/L)/(N/L) \cong \ker f = M/N \). \( \square \)

3.2. **The hom-noetherian conditions.** Recall that a family \( \mathcal{F} \) of subsets of a set \( S \) satisfies the **ascending chain condition** if there is no properly ascending infinite chain \( S_1 \subset S_2 \subset \ldots \) of subsets from \( \mathcal{F} \). Furthermore, an element in \( \mathcal{F} \) is called a **maximal element** of \( \mathcal{F} \) provided there is no subset of \( \mathcal{F} \) that properly contains that element.

**Proposition 9** (The hom-noetherian conditions for hom-modules). Let \( M \) be a right (left) \( R \)-hom-module. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

\( \text{(NM1)} \) \( M \) satisfies the ascending chain condition on its hom-submodules.
\( \text{(NM2)} \) Any nonempty family of hom-submodules of \( M \) has a maximal element.
\( \text{(NM3)} \) Any hom-submodule of \( M \) is finitely generated.

**Proof.** The following proof is an adaptation of a proof that can be found in [5] to the hom-associative setting.

\( \text{(NM1)} \implies (\text{NM2}) \): Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a nonempty family of hom-submodules of \( M \) that does not have a maximal element and pick an arbitrary hom-submodule \( S_1 \) in \( \mathcal{F} \). Since \( S_1 \) is not a maximal element, there exists \( S_2 \in \mathcal{F} \) such that \( S_1 < S_2 \). Now, \( S_2 \) is not a maximal element either, so there exists \( S_3 \in \mathcal{F} \) such that \( S_2 < S_3 \), and
continuing in this manner we get an infinite chain of hom-submodules $S_1 < S_2 < \ldots$, which proves the contrapositive statement.

$(NM2) \implies (NM3)$: Assume $(NM2)$ holds, let $N$ be an arbitrary hom-submodule of $M$, and $\mathcal{G}$ the family of all finitely generated hom-submodules of $N$. Since the zero module is a hom-submodule of $N$ that is finitely generated, $\mathcal{G}$ is clearly nonempty and thus contains a maximal element $L$ by assumption. If $N = L$, we are done, so assume the opposite and take some $n \in N \setminus L$. Now, let $K$ be the hom-submodule of $N$ generated by the set $L \cup \{n\}$. Then $K$ is finitely generated as well, so $K \in \mathcal{G}$. Moreover, $L < K$, which is a contradiction since $L$ was a maximal element in $\mathcal{G}$, and therefore $N = L$, and $N$ is finitely generated.

$(NM3) \implies (NM1)$: Assume $(NM3)$ holds, let $T_1 \leq T_2 \leq \ldots$ be an ascending chain of hom-submodules of $M$, and $T = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} T_i$. By Proposition 5, $T$ is a hom-submodule of $M$, and hence it is finitely generated by some set $S$ which by Definition 10 is contained in $T$. Moreover, since $S$ is finite, it needs to be contained in $T_j$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. However, $T_j = T$ by Remark 7, so $T_k = T_j$ for all $k \geq j$, and hence the ascending chain condition holds. $\square$

Definition 11 (Hom-noetherian module). A right (left) $R$-hom-module is called hom-noetherian if it satisfies the three equivalent conditions of Proposition 9 on its hom-submodules.

Appealing to Remark 5, all properties that hold for right (left) hom-modules necessarily also hold for hom-associative rings, replacing “hom-submodule” by “right (left) hom-ideal”. Rephrasing Proposition 9 for hom-associative rings, we thus get the following:

Corollary 5 (The hom-noetherian conditions for hom-associative rings). Let $R$ be a non-unital, hom-associative ring. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

$(NR1)$ $R$ satisfies the ascending chain condition on its right (left) hom-ideals.
$(NR2)$ Any nonempty family of right (left) hom-ideals of $R$ has a maximal element.
$(NR3)$ Any right (left) hom-ideal of $R$ is finitely generated.

Definition 12 (Hom-noetherian ring). A non-unital, hom-associative ring $R$ is called right (left) hom-noetherian if it satisfies the three equivalent conditions of Proposition 9 on its right (left) hom-ideals. If $R$ satisfies the conditions on both its right and its left hom-ideals, it is called hom-noetherian.

Remark 8. If the twisting map is either the identity map or the zero map, a right (left) hom-noetherian ring is simply a right (left) noetherian ring due to Remark 3.

Proposition 10 (Surjective hom-noetherian hom-module morphism). The hom-noetherian conditions are preserved by surjective morphisms of right (left) $R$-hom-modules.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that any of the three equivalent conditions $(NM1)$, $(NM2)$, or $(NM3)$ in Proposition 9 holds, so let us choose $(NM2)$. To this end, let $f: M \to M'$ be a surjective morphism of right (left) $R$-hom-modules where $M$ is hom-noetherian. Let $\mathcal{F}'$ be a nonempty family of right (left) hom-submodules of $M'$. Now, consider the corresponding family in $M$, $\mathcal{F} = \{f^{-1}(N') : N' \in \mathcal{F}'\}$. By the surjectivity of $f$, this family is nonempty, and since $M$ is noetherian, it has a maximal element $f^{-1}(N'_0)$ for some $N'_0 \in \mathcal{F}'$. We would like to show that $N'_0$ is a maximal element of $\mathcal{F}'$. Assume there exists an element $N' \in \mathcal{F}'$ such that...
$N_0' < N'$. We know that the operation of taking preimages under any function preserves inclusions on the sets. We also know that the preimage of any hom-submodule is again a hom-submodule by Proposition 3, so taking preimages under a hom-morphism preserves the inclusions on the hom-submodules, and therefore $N_0' < N'$ implies that $f^{-1}(N_0') < f^{-1}(N')$, which contradicts the maximality of $f^{-1}(N_0')$ in $\mathcal{F}$. Hence $N_0'$ is a maximal element of $\mathcal{F}'$, and $M'$ is hom-noetherian. □

**Proposition 11** (Hom-noetherian condition on quotient hom-module). Let $M$ be a right (left) $R$-hom-module, and $N \leq M$. Then $M$ is hom-noetherian if and only if $M/N$ and $N$ are hom-noetherian.

**Proof.** This is again an adaptation of a proof that can be found in [5] to the hom-associative setting.

$(\Rightarrow)$: Assume $M$ is hom-noetherian and $N \leq M$. Then any hom-submodule of $N$ is also a hom-submodule of $M$, and hence it is finitely generated, and $N$ therefore also hom-noetherian. If $L_1 \leq L_2 \leq \ldots$ is an ascending chain of hom-submodules of $M/N$, then from Corollary 4, each $L_i = M_i/N$ for some $M_i$ with $N \leq M_i \leq M$. Furthermore, $M_1 \leq M_2 \leq \ldots$, but since $M$ is hom-noetherian, there is some $n$ such that $M_i = M_n$ for all $i \geq n$. Then $L_i = M_n/N = L_n$ for all $i \geq n$, so $M/N$ is hom-noetherian.

$(\Leftarrow)$: Assume $M/N$ and $N$ are hom-noetherian. Let $S_1 \leq S_2 \leq \ldots$ be an ascending chain of hom-submodules of $M$. By Proposition 4, $S_i \cap N$ is a hom-submodule of $N$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, and furthermore $S_i \cap N \leq S_{i+1} \cap N$. We thus have an ascending chain $S_1 \cap N \leq S_2 \cap N \leq \ldots$ of hom-submodules of $N$. By Proposition 6, $S_i + N$ is a hom-submodule of $M$, and moreover, $N = 0 + N$ is a hom-submodule of $S_i + N$, so we can consider $(S_i + N)/N$. Now, $(S_i + N)/N \leq (S_{i+1} + N)/N$ by Corollary 4, so we have an ascending chain $(S_1 + N)/N \leq (S_2 + N)/N \leq \ldots$ of hom-submodules of $M/N$. Since both $N$ and $M/N$ are hom-noetherian, there is some $k$ such that $S_j \cap N = S_k \cap N$ and $(S_j + N)/N = (S_k + N)/N$ for all $j \geq k$. The latter equation implies that for any $s_j \in S_j$ and $n \in N$, there are $s_k \in S_k$ and $n' \in N$ such that $(s_j + n) + N = (s_k + n') + N$. Hence $x := ((s_j + n) - (s_k + n')) \in N$, and therefore $s_j + n = (s_k + (x + n')) \in (S_k + N)$, so that $(S_j + N) \leq (S_k + N)$, and by a similar argument, $(S_k + N) \leq (S_j + N)$, so $S_j + N = S_k + N$ for all $j \geq k$. Using this and the modular law for hom-modules (Corollary 1), $S_k = (S_k \cap N) + S_k = (S_j \cap N) + S_k = S_j \cap (N + S_k) = S_j \cap (S_j + N) = S_j$ for all $j \geq k$, and hence is $M$ hom-noetherian. □

**Corollary 6** (Finite direct sum of hom-noetherian modules). Any finite direct sum of hom-noetherian modules is hom-noetherian.

**Proof.** We prove this by induction.

Base case (P(2)): Let $M_1$ and $M_2$ be two hom-noetherian modules and consider the direct sum $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$, which is a right (left) $R$-hom-module by Proposition 7. Moreover, $M_1 \cong M_1 \oplus 0$ as additive groups, and for any $r \in R$, $f((m_1, 0) \ldots r) = f((m_1 \cdot r, 0 \cdot r)) = f((m_1 \cdot r, 0)) = m_1 \cdot r = f((m_1, 0)) \cdot r$. Now, $f(\alpha_{M_1 \oplus 0}(m_1, 0)) = f((\alpha_{M_1}(m_1), 0)) = \alpha_{M_1}(m_1) = \alpha_{M_1}(f(m_1, 0))$, so as right (left) $R$-hom-modules, $M_1 \cong M_1 \oplus 0 \leq M$. Similarly, the projection $g: M \rightarrow M_2$ is a surjective morphism of right (left) $R$-hom-modules with $\ker g = M_1 \oplus 0$, so by Theorem 1, $M/(M_1 \oplus 0) \cong M_2$. Due to Proposition 10, $M_1 \oplus 0$ and $M/(M_1 \oplus 0)$ are both hom-noetherian, and so by Proposition 11, $M$ is hom-noetherian.
by assumption, and \( \sigma \) and \( \delta \) sets, these are defined as
\[
\text{defined by } (\sigma, \delta) \cdot R = \{ a \in R : \text{associates with arbitrary monomials} \}.
\]

The right nucleus of \( R \) being denoted by \( N_l(R) \), \( N_m(R) \), and \( N_r(R) \), respectively. As sets, these are defined as
\[
N_l(R) := \{ r \in R : (r, s, t) = 0, s, t \in R \}, \quad N_m(R) := \{ s \in R : (r, s, t) = 0, r, s \in R \}, \quad N_r(R) := \{ t \in R : (r, s, t) = 0, r, s \in R \}.
\]

The nucleus of \( R \), written \( N(R) \), is defined as the set
\[
N(R) := N_l(R) \cap N_m(R) \cap N_r(R).
\]

By the associator identity \( u \cdot (r, s, t) + (u, r, s) \cdot t + (u, r, s, t) = (u \cdot r, s, t) + (u, r, s, t) \), holding for all \( r, s, t, u \in R \), the sets \( N_r(R), N_m(R), N_l(R) \), and hence also \( N(R) \), are all associative subrings of \( R \).

**Proposition 12** (Associator of \( X^k \)). If \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \) is a unital, non-associative Ore extension of a unital, non-associative ring \( R \), where \( \sigma \) is a unital endomorphism and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation on \( R \), then \( X^k \in N(R[X; \sigma, \delta]) \) for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \).

**Proof.** By identifying \( X^0 \) with \( 1 \in R \), \( X^0 \in N(R[X; \sigma, \delta]) \). We now wish to show that \( X \in N(R[X; \sigma, \delta]) \). In order to do so, we must show that \( X \) associates with all polynomials in \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \). Due to distributivity, it is however sufficient to prove that \( X \) associates with arbitrary monomials \( aX^m \) and \( bX^n \) in \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \). To this end, first note that
\[
(aX^m \cdot X) \cdot bX^n = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (a \cdot \pi_i^m(b)) X^{i+n} = aX^{m+1} + bX^n \cdot X
\]
so \( X \in N_l(R[X; \sigma, \delta]) \). Also, by using (ii) in Lemma 1,
\[
(aX^m \cdot X) \cdot bX^n = aX^{m+1} \cdot bX^n = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (a \cdot \pi_i^{m+1}(b)) X^{i+n}
\]
\[
= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (a \cdot (\pi_i^m \circ \sigma(b) + \pi_i^m \circ \delta(b))) X^{i+n}
\]
\[
= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (a \cdot \pi_i^m(\sigma(b))) X^{i+n} + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (a \cdot \pi_i^m(\delta(b))) X^{i+n}
\]
\[
= aX^m \cdot \sigma(b) X^{n+1} + aX^m \cdot \delta(b) X^n = aX^m \cdot (\sigma(b)X^{n+1} + \delta(b)X^n)
\]

4. A hom-associative Hilbert’s basis theorem

In the following section, we will consider unital, non-associative Ore extensions \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \) over some unital, non-associative ring \( R \). Recall from Proposition 2 that in case \( R \) is hom-associative, a sufficient condition for \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \) to be hom-associative as well is that \( \sigma \) is a unital endomorphism and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation that both commute with the twisting map \( \alpha \) of \( R \), the latter extended homogeneously to the whole of \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \). Also recall that the associator is the map \( (\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) : R \times R \times R \rightarrow R \) defined by \( (r, s, t) = (r \cdot s) \cdot t - r \cdot (s \cdot t) \) for any \( r, s, t \in R \). The left, middle, and right nucleus of \( R \) being denoted by \( N_l(R) \), \( N_m(R) \), and \( N_r(R) \), respectively. As sets, these are defined as \( N_l(R) := \{ r \in R : (r, s, t) = 0, s, t \in R \}, \quad N_m(R) := \{ s \in R : (r, s, t) = 0, r, s \in R \}, \quad N_r(R) := \{ t \in R : (r, s, t) = 0, r, s \in R \} \).
maps and the latter is clearly an element of \( M \). Any element in \( M \) defined above, let us denote this map when restricted to the elements are of the form \( X \). Then, by using the additivity of \( M \), the latter identification also allows us to write the multiplication in \( R \). Since \( N(R[X; \sigma, \delta]) \) is a ring it also contains all powers of \( X \), so \( X^k \in N(R[X; \sigma, \delta]) \) for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \).

\[ \square \]

Proposition 13 (Hom-modules of \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \)). Assume \( \alpha : R \to R \) is the twisting map of a unital, right (left) hom-noetherian ring \( R \), and extend the map homogeneously to \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \). Assume further that \( \alpha \) commutes with \( \delta \) and \( \sigma \), and that \( \sigma \) is a unital endomorphism and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation on \( R \). Then, for any \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i R \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m} RX^i \right) \) is a hom-noetherian right (left) \( R \)-hom-module.

Proof. Let us prove the right case; the left case is similar, but slightly simpler. Put \( M = \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i R \). First note that \( M \) really is a subset of \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \), where the elements are of the form \( \sum_{i=0}^{m} 1X^i \cdot r_i X^0 \) with \( r_i \in R \), which upon identifying \( 1X^i \) with \( X^i \) and \( r_i \) with \( r_i X^0 \) gives us elements of the form \( \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot r_i \). Using the latter identification also allows us to write the multiplication in \( R \), which in Definition 7 is done by juxtaposition, by \( \cdot \) instead, with the purpose of being consistent with previous notation used for hom-associative Ore extensions.

Since distributivity follows from that in \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \), it suffices to show that the multiplication in \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \) is also a scalar multiplication, and that we have twisting maps \( \alpha_M \) and \( \alpha_R \) that give us hom-associativity. To this end, for any \( r \in R \) and any element in \( M \) (which is of the form described above), by using Proposition 12,

\[
\left( \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot r_i \right) \cdot r = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \left( X^i \cdot r_i \right) \cdot r = \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot (r_i \cdot r),
\]

and the latter is clearly an element of \( M \). Now, we claim that \( M \) is invariant under the homogeneously extended twisting map on \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \). To follow the notation in Definition 7, let us denote this map when restricted to \( M \) by \( \alpha_M \), and that of \( R \) by \( \alpha_R \). Then, by using the additivity of \( \alpha_M \) and \( \alpha_R \), as well as the fact that the latter commutes with \( \delta \) and \( \sigma \), we get

\[
\alpha_M \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot r_i \right) = \alpha_M \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_j^i (r_i) X^j \right) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_M \left( \pi_j^i (r_i) X^j \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_R \left( \pi_j^i (r_i) \right) X^j = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_j^i (\alpha_R (r_i)) X^j = \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot \alpha_R (r_i),
\]

which again is an element of \( M \). At last, let \( r, s \in R \) be arbitrary. Then,

\[
\alpha_M \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot r_i \right) \cdot (r \cdot s) \overset{\text{(1)}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{m} \left( X^i \cdot \alpha_R (r_i) \right) \cdot (r \cdot s) \overset{\text{(2)}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot (\alpha_R (r_i) \cdot (r \cdot s))
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot ((r_i \cdot r) \cdot \alpha_R (s)) \overset{\text{(1)}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot (r_i \cdot r) \cdot \alpha_R (s) \overset{\text{(1)}}{=} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot r_i \right) \cdot r \cdot \alpha_R (s),
\]
which proves hom-associativity. What is left to prove is that $M$ is hom-noetherian. Now, let us define $f: \bigoplus_{i=0}^{m} R \to M$ by $(r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_m) \mapsto \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot r_i$ for any $(r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_m) \in \bigoplus_{i=0}^{m} R$. We see that $f$ is additive, and for any $r \in R$, we have $f(r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_m) \cdot r = f((r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_m)) \cdot r$. A similar argument gives $f((\alpha \bigoplus_{i=0}^{m} R)((r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_m))) = \alpha M(f((r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_m)))$, which shows that $f$ is a morphism of two right $R$-hom-modules. Moreover, $f$ is surjective, so by Proposition 10, $M$ is hom-noetherian.

\[ \square \]

**Lemma 2** (Properties of $R[X; \sigma, \delta]^{\text{op}}$). Assume $\alpha: R \to R$ is the twisting map of a unital, hom-associative ring $R$, and extend the map homogeneously to $R[X; \sigma, \delta]$.

Assume further that $\alpha$ commutes with $\delta$ and $\sigma$, and that $\sigma$ is an automorphism and $\delta$ a $\sigma$-derivation on $R$. Then the following hold:

(i) $\sigma^{-1}$ is an automorphism on $R^{\text{op}}$ that commutes with $\alpha$.

(ii) $-\delta \circ \sigma^{-1}$ is a $\sigma^{-1}$-derivation on $R^{\text{op}}$ that commutes with $\alpha$.

(iii) $R[X; \sigma, \delta]^{\text{op}} \cong R^{\text{op}}[X; \sigma^{-1}, -\delta \circ \sigma^{-1}]$.

**Proof.** That $\sigma^{-1}$ is an automorphism and $-\delta \circ \sigma^{-1}$ a $\sigma^{-1}$-derivation on $R^{\text{op}}$ is an exercise in [5] that can be solved without any use of associativity. Now, since $\alpha$ commutes with $\delta$ and $\sigma$, for any $r \in R^{\text{op}}$, $\sigma(\alpha(\sigma^{-1}(r))) = \alpha(\sigma^{-1}(r)) = \alpha(r)$, so by applying $\sigma^{-1}$ to both sides, $\alpha(\sigma^{-1}(r)) = \sigma^{-1}(\alpha(r))$. From this, it follows that $-\delta(\sigma^{-1}(r)) = -\delta(\alpha(\sigma^{-1}(r))) = \alpha(-\delta(\sigma^{-1}(r)))$, which proves the first and second statement.

For the third statement, let us start by putting $S := R^{\text{op}}[X; \sigma^{-1}, -\delta \circ \sigma^{-1}]$ and $S' := R[X; \sigma, \delta]^{\text{op}}$, and then define a map $f: S \to S'$ by $\sum_{i=0}^{n} r_i X^i \mapsto \sum_{i=0}^{m} r_i^{\text{op}} X^i$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We claim that $f$ is an isomorphism of hom-associative rings. First note that an arbitrary element of $S'$ by definition is of the form $p := \sum_{i=0}^{m} a_i X^i$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_i \in R^{\text{op}}$. Then,

\[
\begin{align*}
p &= \frac{X^m \cdot \sigma^{-m}(a_m) + b m, X^{m-1} + \cdots + b_0 + \cdots + X \cdot \sigma^{-1}(a_1) + \delta(\sigma^{-1}(a_1)) + a_0}{a_1 X} \\
&= X^m \cdot \sigma^{-m}(a_m) + X^{m-1} \cdot a_{m-1} + \cdots + X \cdot a_1 + a_0 \\
&= \sigma^{-m}(a_m)^{\text{op}} X^m + a_{m-1}^{\text{op}} X^{m-1} + \cdots + a_1^{\text{op}} X + a_0^{\text{op}} \in \text{im } f,
\end{align*}
\]

for some $a_{m-1}, a_{m-1}^{\text{op}}, \ldots, a_0, a_0^{\text{op}} \in R^{\text{op}}$, so $f$ is surjective. The second last step also shows that $\sum_{i=0}^{m} RX^i \subseteq \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i R$ as sets, and a similar calculation shows that $\sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i R \subseteq \sum_{i=0}^{m} RX^i$, so that as sets, $\sum_{i=0}^{m} RX^i = \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i R$. Hence, if $\sum_{i=0}^{m} r_i^{\text{op}} X^i = \sum_{j=0}^{n} r_j^{\text{op}} X^i$ for some $r_i, r_j \in R^{\text{op}}$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, then there are $s_i, s_j' \in R^{\text{op}}$ such that $\sum_{i=0}^{m} s_i X^i = \sum_{i=0}^{n} r_i^{\text{op}} X^i = \sum_{j=0}^{n} r_j^{\text{op}} X^j$. This implies that $m = m'$ and that $s_i = s_j'$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Continuing,

\[
0 = \sum_{i=0}^{m} (s_i - s_i') X^i = \sum_{i=0}^{m} (r_i - r_j')^{\text{op}} X^i = \sum_{i=0}^{m} X^i \cdot (r_i - r_j') = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_j^{\text{op}} X^j (r_i - r_j') X^j
\]

(3)

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m} \pi_j^{\text{op}} (r_i - r_j') X^j \implies 0 = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \pi_j^{\text{op}} (r_i - r_j') X^j \quad \text{for all } j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, m\},
\]

where the implication comes from comparing coefficients with the left-hand side, being equal to zero. Let us prove, by using induction, that $r_j = r_j'$ for arbitrary
j \in \{0,1,\ldots,m\}. Put k = m - j, where m is fixed, and consider the statement
\[ P(k) : r_{m-k} = r_{m-k}' \quad \text{for all } k \in \{0,1,\ldots,m\}. \]
Base case \((P(0)) \): \(k = 0 \iff j = m\), so using that \(\sigma\) is an automorphism,

\[
0 \overset{\text{base case}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{m} \pi^i_{m}(r_i - r_i')X^m = \sigma^m(r_m - r'_m)X^m \implies 0 = r_m - r'_m.
\]
Induction step \((\forall k \in \{0,1,\ldots,m\}) \ (P(k) \implies P(k+1))\): By putting \(j = m - (k+1)\)
and then using the induction hypothesis,

\[
0 \overset{\text{induction step}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{m} \pi^i_{m-(k+1)}(r_i - r_i')X^{m-(k+1)} = \sigma^{m-(k+1)}(r_{m-(k+1)} - r'_{m-(k+1)}),
\]
which implies \(0 = r_{m-(k+1)} - r'_{m-(k+1)}\). Hence \(r_j = r'_j\) for all \(j \in \{0,1,\ldots,m\}\), so that
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{m} r_i \cdot_{\text{op}} X^i = \sum_{i=0}^{m} r'_i \cdot_{\text{op}} X^i \implies \sum_{i=0}^{m} r_i^{}X^i = \sum_{i=0}^{m} r'_i^{}X^i,
\]
proving that \(f\) is injective. Additivity of \(f\) follows immediately from the definition by
using distributivity. Using additivity also makes it sufficient to consider only two
arbitrary monomials \(aX^m\) and \(bX^n\) in \(S\) when proving that \(f\) is multiplicative. To
this end, let us use the following notation for multiplication in \(S\):
\(aX^m \bullet bX^n := \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} (a \cdot_{\text{op}} \pi^i_{m}(b)) X^{i+n}\), and then use induction over \(n\) and \(m\):
Base case \((P(0))\) : \(f(a \bullet b) = f(a \cdot_{\text{op}} b) = a \cdot_{\text{op}} b = f(a) \cdot_{\text{op}} f(b)\).
Induction step over \(n\) \((\forall (m,n) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} (P(m,n) \implies P(m,n+1)))\): We know that
\(X \in N(S')\) by Proposition 12, and so by a straightforward calculation, we have
\(f(aX^m \bullet bX^{n+1}) = f(aX^m) \cdot_{\text{op}} f(bX^{n+1})\).
Induction step over \(m\) \((\forall (m,n) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} (P(m,n) \implies P(m+1,n)))\): We know that
\(X \in N(S'^{\text{op}}) \cap N(S)\) by Proposition 12, and so again by a straightforward calculation,
\(f(aX^m+1 \bullet bX^n) = f(aX^{m+1}) \cdot_{\text{op}} f(bX^n)\). Now, according to Definition 2
with \(R[X;\sigma,\delta]\) considered as a hom-associative algebra over the integers, we are
done if we can prove that \(f \circ \alpha = \alpha \circ f\) for the homogeneously extended map \(\alpha\). Both
\(\alpha\) and \(f\) being additive, it again suffices to prove that \(f((\alpha(aX^m)) = \alpha(f(aX^m))\)
for some arbitrary monomial \(aX^m\) in \(R[X;\sigma,\delta]\), which can be done by a straightforward
calculation.

**Theorem 4** (Hilbert’s basis theorem for hom-associative rings). Let \(\alpha : R \to R\) be
the twisting map of a unital, hom-associative ring \(R\), and extend the map homogeneously
in \(R[X;\sigma,\delta]\). Assume further that \(\alpha\) commutes with \(\delta\) and \(\sigma\), and that \(\sigma\) is
an automorphism and \(\delta\) a \(\sigma\)-derivation on \(R\). If \(R\) is right (left) hom-noetherian,
then so is \(R[X;\sigma,\delta]\).

**Proof.** This proof is an adaptation of a proof of the associative version that can
be found in [5]. Let us begin with the right case, and therefore assume that \(R\) is
right hom-noetherian. We wish to show that any right hom-ideal of \(R[X;\sigma,\delta]\)
is finitely generated. Since the zero ideal is finitely generated, it is sufficient to
show that any nonzero right hom-ideal \(I\) of \(R[X;\sigma,\delta]\) is finitely generated. Let
\(J := \{r \in R : rX^d + r_{d-1}X^{d-1} + \cdots + r_1X + r_0 \in I, r_{d-1}, \ldots, r_0 \in R\}\), i.e. \(J\)
consists of the zero element and all leading coefficients of polynomials in \(I\). We
claim that \(J\) is a right hom-ideal of \(R\): First, one readily verifies that \(J\) is an
additive subgroup of \(R\). Now, let \(r \in J\) and \(a \in R\) be arbitrary. Then there
is some polynomial \(p := rX^d + \text{[lower order terms]}\) in \(I\). Moreover,
\(p \cdot \sigma^{-d}(a) = rX^d + \sigma^{-d}(a) + \text{[lower order terms]} = (r \cdot \sigma^d(\sigma^{-d}(a)))X^d + \text{[lower order terms]} = (r \cdot a)X^d + \text{[lower order terms]},\) which is an element of \(I\) since \(p\) is. Therefore,
Right ideals are also right hom-ideals by using Remark 2.

Since \( R \) is right hom-Noetherian and \( J \) is a right ideal of \( R \), \( J \) is finitely generated, say by \( \{r_1, \ldots, r_k\} \subseteq J \). All the elements \( r_1, \ldots, r_k \) are assumed to be nonzero, and moreover, each of them is a leading coefficient of some polynomial \( p_i \in I \) of degree \( n_i \). Put \( n = \max(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \). Then each \( r_i \) is the leading coefficient of \( p_i \cdot X^{n-n_i} = r_iX^{n_i} \cdot X^{n-n_i} + \text{[lower order terms]} = r_iX^n + \text{[lower order terms]} \), which is an element of \( I \) of degree \( n \).

Let \( N := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} RX^i \). Then calculations similar to those in the proof of the third statement of Lemma 2 show that as sets, \( N = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} RX^i = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} X^i R \). By Proposition 13, \( N \) is then a hom-Noetherian right \( R \)-hom-module. Now, since \( I \) is a right ideal of the ring \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \) which contains \( R \), in particular, it is also a right \( R \)-hom-module. By Proposition 4, \( I \cap N \) is then a hom-submodule of \( N \), and since \( N \) is a hom-Noetherian right \( R \)-hom-module, \( I \cap N \) is finitely generated, say by the set \( \{q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_t\} \).

Let \( I_0 \) be the right hom-ideal of \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \) generated by

\[ \{p_1 \cdot X^{n-n_1}, p_2 \cdot X^{n-n_2}, \ldots, p_k \cdot X^{n-n_k}, q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_t\} \]

Since all the elements in this set belong to \( I \), we have that \( I_0 \subseteq I \). We claim that \( I \subseteq I_0 \). In order to prove this, pick any element \( p' \in I \).

Base case (\( P(n) \)): If \( \deg p' < n \), \( p' \in N = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} RX^i \), so \( p' \in I \cap N \). On the other hand, the generating set of \( I \cap N \) is a subset of the generating set of \( I_0 \), so \( I \cap N \subseteq I_0 \), and therefore \( p' \in I_0 \).

Induction step (\( \forall m \geq n \) (\( P(m) \rightarrow P(m+1) \))): Assume \( \deg p' = m \geq n \) and that \( I_0 \) contains all elements of \( I \) with \( \deg < m \). Does \( I_0 \) contain all elements of \( I \) with \( \deg < m+1 \) as well? Let \( r' \) be the leading coefficient of \( p' \), so that we have \( p' = r'X^m + \text{[lower order terms]} \). Since \( p' \in I \) by assumption, \( r' \in J \). We then claim that \( r' = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{k'} c_{ij} (r_i \cdot X^{n_i}) \cdot \sigma^{-n}(a_{ij1}) \cdot \sigma^{-n}(a_{ij2}) \cdot \ldots \cdot \sigma^{-n}(a_{ijk'}) \) for some \( k', k'' \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \) and some \( a_{ij1}, a_{ij2}, \ldots, a_{ijk''} \in R \); first, we note that since \( J \) is generated by \( \{r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k\} \), it is necessary that \( J \) contains all elements of that form. Secondly, we see that subtracting any two such elements or multiplying any such element from the right with one from \( R \) again yields such an element, and hence the set of all elements of this form is not only a right ideal containing \( \{r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k\} \), but also the smallest such to do so. Since \( J \) is a right ideal in a unital hom-associative ring, it is also a right hom-ideal.

Recalling that \( p_i \cdot X^{n-n_i} = r_iX^n + \text{[lower order terms]} \), \( (p_i \cdot X^{n-n_i}) \cdot \sigma^{-n}(a_{ij1}) = (r_i \cdot a_{ij1})X^n + \text{[lower order terms]} \), and by iterating this multiplication from the right, we set \( c_{ij} := (\ldots (((p_i \cdot X^{n-n_i}) \cdot \sigma^{-n}(a_{ij1})) \cdot \sigma^{-n}(a_{ij2})) \cdot \ldots \cdot \sigma^{-n}(a_{ijk''})) \). Since \( p_i \cdot X^{n-n_i} \) is a generator of \( I_0 \), \( c_{ij} \) is an element of \( I_0 \) as well, and therefore also \( q := \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{k'} c_{ij} \cdot X^{n-n_i} = r'X^m + \text{[lower order terms]} \). However, as \( I_0 \subseteq I \), we also have that \( q \in I \), and since \( p' \in I \), \( (p' - q) \in I \). Now, \( p' = r'X^m + \text{[lower order terms]} \), so \( \deg(p' - q) < m \), and therefore \( (p' - q) \in I_0 \). This shows that \( p' = (p' - q) + q \) is an element of \( I_0 \) as well, and thus \( I = I_0 \), which is finitely generated.

For the left case, first note that any hom-associative ring \( S \) is right (left) hom-Noetherian if and only if \( S^{op} \) is left (right) hom-Noetherian, due to the fact that any right (left) hom-ideal of \( S \) is a left (right) hom-ideal of \( S^{op} \), and vice versa. Now, assume that \( R \) is left hom-Noetherian. Then, \( R^{op} \) is right hom-Noetherian, and using (i) and (ii) in Lemma 2, \( \sigma^{-1} \) is an automorphism and \( -\delta \circ \sigma^{-1} \) a
Example 2. Let \( H \) be a right extension of \( \sigma^{-1} \)-derivation on \( R^{\varnothing} \) that commute with \( \alpha \). Hence, by the previously proved right case, \( R^{\varnothing}[X; \sigma^{-1}, -\delta \circ \sigma^{-1}] = R[X; \sigma, \delta]^{\varnothing} \) is right hom-noetherian. By (iii) in Lemma 2, \( R^{\varnothing}[X; \sigma^{-1}, -\delta \circ \sigma^{-1}] \cong R[X; \sigma, \delta]^{\varnothing} \). One verifies that surjective morphisms between hom-associative rings preserve the hom-noetherian conditions (NR1), (NR2), and (NR3) in Corollary 5 by examining the proof of Proposition 10, changing the module morphism to that between rings instead, and “submodule” to “ideal”. Therefore, \( R[X; \sigma, \delta]^{\varnothing} \) is right hom-noetherian, so \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \) is left hom-noetherian.

\[ \square \]

Remark 9. By putting \( \alpha = \text{id}_R \) in Theorem 4, we recover the classical Hilbert’s basis theorem for Ore extensions.

**Corollary 7** (Hilbert’s basis theorem for non-associative rings). Let \( R \) be a unital, non-associative ring, \( \sigma \) an automorphism and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation on \( R \). If \( R \) is right (left) noetherian, then so is \( R[X; \sigma, \delta] \).

**Proof.** Put \( \alpha \equiv 0 \) in Theorem 4. \[ \square \]

## 5. Examples

Here we provide some examples of unital, non-associative and hom-associative Ore extensions which are all noetherian by the above theorem. First, recall that there are, up to isomorphism, only four (possibly infinite-dimensional) normed, unital division algebras over the real numbers: the real numbers themselves, the complex numbers, the quaternions (\( \mathbb{H} \)), and the octonions (\( \mathbb{O} \)) [15]. The largest of the four are the octonions, and while sharing the property of not being commutative with the quaternions, the octonions are the only ones that are not associative. All of the four algebras above are noetherian, and hence also all iterated Ore extensions of them: let \( D \) be any unital division algebra, and \( I \) any nonzero right ideal of \( D \). If \( a \in D \) is an arbitrary nonzero element, then \( 1 = a \cdot a^{-1} \in I \), so \( I = D \), and analogously for the left case. As an ideal of itself, \( D \) is finitely generated (by 1, for instance), as is the zero ideal.

Do also recall that given a unital and associative algebra \( A \) with product \( \cdot \) over a field of characteristic different from two, one may define a unital and non-associative algebra \( A^+ \) by using the Jordan product \( \{\cdot, \cdot\} : A^+ \rightarrow A^+ \) given by \( \{a, b\} := \frac{1}{2}(a \cdot b + b \cdot a) \) for any \( a, b \in A \). \( A^+ \) is then a Jordan algebra, i.e. a commutative algebra where any two elements \( a \) and \( b \) satisfy the Jordan identity, \( \{\{a, b\}, a\} = \{a, \{a, b\}\} \). Since inverses on \( A \) extends to inverses on \( A^+ \), one may infer that if \( A = \mathbb{H} \), then \( A^+ \) is also noetherian. Using the standard notation \( i, j, k \) with the defining relation \( i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = ijk = -1 \) in \( \mathbb{H} \), one can note that \( \mathbb{H}^+ \) is not associative as e.g. \( \{i, i, j\}_{\mathbb{H}^+} := \{\{i, i\}, j\} - \{i, \{i, j\}\} = -j \).

**Example 1.** Let \( \sigma \) be the automorphism on \( \mathbb{H} \) defined by \( \sigma(i) = -i \), \( \sigma(j) = k \), and \( \sigma(k) = j \). Any automorphism on \( \mathbb{H} \) is also an automorphism on \( \mathbb{H}^+ \), and hence \( \mathbb{H}^+ [X; \sigma, 0_H] \) is a unital, non-associative Ore extension where e.g. \( X \cdot i = -iX, \) \( X \cdot j = kX, \) and \( X \cdot k = jX \). \( \mathbb{H}^+ [X; \sigma, 0_H] \) is then noetherian by Corollary 7.

**Example 2.** Let \( \{j, \cdot\}_H \) be the inner derivation on \( \mathbb{H} \) induced by \( j \). Any derivation on \( \mathbb{H} \) is also a derivation on \( \mathbb{H}^+ \), and so we may form the unital, non-associative Ore extension \( \mathbb{H}^+ [X; \text{id}_H, \{j, \cdot\}_H] \) which is noetherian due to Corollary 7. Here, \( X \cdot i = iX - 2k, \) \( X \cdot j = jX, \) and \( X \cdot k = kX + 2i \).
Example 3. From the Jordan identity one may infer that a map \( \delta_{a,c} : J \to J \)
defined by \( \delta_{a,c}(b) := (a, b, c)_J \) for any \( a, b, c \in J \) where \( J \) is a Jordan algebra, is
a derivation called an inner derivation. On \( \mathbb{H}^+ \) one could for instance take \( a = i \)
and \( c = j \), resulting in \( \delta_{i,j}(b) = \{(i, b), j\} - \{i, \{b, j\}\} \) for any \( b \in \mathbb{H}^+ \). Then
\( \mathbb{H}^+ [X; \text{id}_{\mathbb{H}}, \delta_{i,j}] \) is a unital, non-associative Ore extension which is noetherian by
Corollary 7. In \( \mathbb{H}^+ [X; \text{id}_{\mathbb{H}}, \delta_{i,j}], X \cdot i = iX - j, X \cdot j = jX + 2i, \) and \( X \cdot k = kX \).

Example 4. For \( R \) any non-associative ring, the \textit{non-associative Weyl algebra} over \( R \)
was introduced in [12] as the iterated, unital, non-associative Ore extension \( R[Y][X; \text{id}_R, \delta] \) where \( \delta : R[Y] \to R[Y] \)
is an \( R \)-linear map such that \( \delta(1) = 0 \). This is indeed a generalization of the classical first Weyl algebra over some field \( K \),
\( K(X, Y)/(XY - YX - 1) \), since the classical first Weyl algebra may be regarded as
the unital (and associative) Ore extension \( K[Y][X; \text{id}_K[Y], \delta] \) with \( \delta \) the standard
derivation on \( K[Y] \). The unital, non-associative Ore extension of \( \mathbb{O} \) in the indeterminate \( Y \) is the unital and non-associative polynomial ring \( \mathbb{O}[Y; \text{id}_\mathbb{O}, 0_\mathbb{O}] \), for which
we write \( \mathbb{O}[Y] \). Let \( \delta : \mathbb{O}[Y] \to \mathbb{O}[Y] \) be the \( \mathbb{O} \)-linear map defined on monomials
by \( \delta(aY^m) = maY^{m-1} \) for arbitrary \( a \in \mathbb{O} \) and \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), with the interpretation that \( 0aY^{-1} = 0 \). One readily verifies that \( \delta \) is an \( \mathbb{O} \)-linear derivation on \( \mathbb{O}[Y] \), and
by Remark 4, \( \delta(1) = 0 \). We thus define the \textit{Weyl algebra over the octonions}, or the
\textit{octonionic Weyl algebra}, as \( \mathbb{O}[Y][X; \text{id}_\mathbb{O}[Y], \delta] \), where \( \delta \) is the aforementioned
derivation. Hence, in \( \mathbb{O}[Y][X; \text{id}_\mathbb{O}[Y], \delta], X \cdot Y = YX - 1 \). By using Corollary 7
twice, the octonionic Weyl algebra is noetherian.

Example 5. This example is adapted from an example in [4]. Let \( K \) be a field and
\( A = K[Y] \). Let \( U \) be a finite-dimensional \( K \)-algebra that is not associative and not
necessarily unital. One could, for example, take a Lie algebra. We make \( U \) into an
\( A \)-module by defining \( au = a_0 u \) for any \( a \in A, u \in U \), where \( a_0 \) is the constant term of \( a \). Any \( K \)-morphism of \( U \) is automatically also an \( A \)-morphism. Set \( B = A \times U \)
and define a multiplication on \( B \) by \((a_1, u_1) \cdot (a_2, u_2) = (a_1a_2, a_1u_2 + a_2u_1 + u_1u_2)\)
for any \( (a_1, u_1), (a_2, u_2) \in B \). Further set \( \alpha(au) := (Ya, Yu) = (Ya, 0) \). With \( \alpha \) as twisting map, \( B \) is a unital, hom-associative algebra which is noetherian, but not
associative. Let \( \beta \) be any automorphism of \( U \) and define \( \sigma(au) := (a, \beta(u)) \). Then \( \sigma \)
is an automorphism of \( B \) commutes with \( \alpha \), and so by Theorem 4, \( B[X; \sigma, 0] \) is
noetherian.

We here include a proof that \( B \) is noetherian. Suppose we have an ascending chain of left ideals,
\( I_1 \subseteq I_2 \subseteq \ldots, \) in \( B \). (The case of right ideals is dealt with in
an analogous fashion.) Define \( I_j = \{a \in A \mid \exists u \in U : (a, u) \in I_j\} \). This is an ideal
in \( A \). Also define \( H_j = \{u \in U \mid (0, u) \in I_j\} \). This is a left \( A \)-algebra ideal in \( U \).
We thus have two ascending chains, \( J_1 \subseteq J_2 \subseteq \ldots \) and \( H_1 \subseteq H_2 \subseteq \ldots, \) in \( A \) and
\( U \), respectively. Since \( A \) and \( U \) are noetherian there is some integer \( n \) such that
if \( k > n \) then \( J_k = J_n \) and \( H_k = H_n \). We claim that in fact also \( I_k = I_n \). Let
\( (a, u) \in I_k \). Then \( a \in J_k = J_n \) so there is \( v \in U \) such that \( (a, v) \in I_n \). It follows that
\( u - v \in H_k = H_n \), which implies that \( (0, u - v) \in I_n \). Hence \( (a, u) = (a, v) + (0, u - v) \)
is a sum of two elements in \( I_n \) and therefore belongs to \( I_n \).
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