

ON MODULES M FOR WHICH ALL FINITELY GENERATED MODULES IN $\sigma[M]$ ARE LIFTING

Mai Quy Nam

University of Qui nhon

Abstract. *A module L is called a lifting module if for any submodule K of L there is a direct summand X of L such that $X \subset K$ and K/X is small in L/X . In this paper we show that for a finitely generated, self-projective module M , if all finitely generated modules in $\sigma[M]$ are lifting then M has a decomposition $M = M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_n$, where each M_i is simple or is local with $\text{Soc}(M_i) = \text{Rad}(M_i)$.*

In particular, a ring R is semiprimary with $J(R)^2 = 0$ if all finitely generated right R -modules are lifting.

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

Throughout, we consider associative rings with identity and all modules are unitary. For a module M over a ring R we write M_R to indicate that M is a right R -module. The Socle and the Jacobson radical of M are denoted by $\text{Soc}(M)$ and $\text{Rad}(M)$, respectively. The Jacobson radical of a ring R is denoted by $J(R)$.

For a module M_R , we denote by $\sigma[M]$ the subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$ whose objects are submodules of M -generated modules (cf. Wisbauer [10]).

Let M be a right R -module. We consider following conditions:

(*alE*) All modules in $\sigma[M]$ are extending.

(*fE*) All finitely generated modules in $\sigma[M]$ are extending.

(*alL*) All modules in $\sigma[M]$ are lifting.

(*fL*) All finitely generated modules in $\sigma[M]$ are lifting.

It is well known that, all modules in $\sigma[M]$ are extending if and only if every module in $\sigma[M]$ is a direct sum of modules of length at most 2, if and only if all modules in $\sigma[M]$ are lifting (cf. [2, 13.3], [3] and [9]). Recently, Dinh Van Huynh and others [4] showed that a finitely generated module M is noetherian if all finitely generated modules in $\sigma[M]$ are extending.

In this note we consider a finitely generated self-projective module M for which all finitely generated modules in $\sigma[M]$ are lifting. We also discuss the following: When are the conditions (*alL*) and (*fL*) equivalent?

Recall that a module M is called an extending module or *CS*-module if every submodule of M is essential in a direct summand of M . A submodule A of M is called

all in M , written $A \ll M$, if $A + B \neq M$ for every proper submodule B of M . Module M is called a lifting module if every submodule K of M lies above a direct summand X of M , i.e. there is a direct summand X of M such that $X \subset K$ and K/X is small in M/X . It is clear that, M is lifting if and only if for any submodule K of M , there exists a decomposition $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ where $M_1 \subset K$, $M_2 \cap K$ is small in M_2 . For characterizations of the lifting property refer to [10, 41.11 and 41.12] or to [6]. We call a non-zero R -module M hollow if every proper submodule is small in M . A module M is called a local module if M has the largest proper submodule, i.e. a proper submodule which contains all other proper submodules. In this case, the largest submodule has to be equal to the Jacobson radical of M and $Rad(M)$ is small in M (cf. [10, 41.3; 41.4] or [6, Definition 4.1]).

The results

A. Condition (fL): All finitely generated modules in $\sigma[M]$ are lifting.

For convenience, we say that a module M satisfies the condition (fL) if all finitely generated modules in $\sigma[M]$ are lifting.

Remark 1. Let M_R be a finitely generated, self-projective module. Assume that M is lifting. Then every submodule of M has a supplement by [6, Proposition 4.8]. According to Proposition 4.39 in [6], M is discrete. By [6, Theorem 4.15] therefore M has a decomposition $M = \oplus_{i=1}^n H_i$, where each H_i is hollow. Since M is finitely generated, self-projective, each H_i is self-projective local, hence the endomorphism ring $End_R(H_i)$ is local by [10, 41.19].

Now we consider modules with local endomorphism rings. We first prove the following result.

Lemma 1. *Let L be a right R -module with the local endomorphism ring $End_R(L)$ and S be a simple right R -module. Assume $L \oplus S$ is lifting. Then for any diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & S & \\ & \downarrow h & \\ L & \xrightarrow{p} & L/K, \end{array}$$

which K is a submodule of L , p is natural epimorphism, h is a non-zero homomorphism and it is not epimorphism, there exists a homomorphism $\tilde{h} : S \rightarrow L$ such that $p\tilde{h} = h$.

Proof. Assume that $h(S) = C/K$ with a submodule C of L , $K \subset C$. Since h is not epimorphism, $C \neq L$. Denote $L \oplus S$ by M and set

$$N := \{(x, y) / x \in C, y \in S, p(x) = h(y)\}.$$

It is clear that N is a submodule of $L \oplus S$, $N \cap S = 0$ and $N \cap L = K$. Let π_s denote the projection of $M = L \oplus S$ onto S and π_ℓ denote the projection of M onto L .

Then we easily see that $\pi_s(N) = S$; $\pi_\ell(N) = C$. By the hypothesis, M is lifting, hence M has a decomposition $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ with $M_1 \subset N$ and $M_2 \cap N \ll M_2$.

If $M_1 = 0$ then $N \ll M$. By [5, 51.3 Lemma], $\pi_s(N) \ll S$. On the other hand $\pi_s(N) = S$, a contradiction. This argument shows that $M_1 \neq 0$.

Consider the decomposition $M = L \oplus S$. Note that L and S has local endomorphism rings. By [1, 12.7 Corollary], the decomposition $M = L \oplus S$ complements direct summand. Then, for direct summand M_1 , M must have decomposition $M = M_1 \oplus L$ or $M = M_1 \oplus S$.

Suppose that $M = M_1 \oplus S$. Consider the projection $\pi_\ell : M = L \oplus S \longrightarrow L$. We have $\pi_\ell(M_1) \subset \pi_\ell(N) = C \neq L$. On the other hand, $L = \pi_\ell(M) = \pi_\ell(M_1 \oplus S) = \pi_\ell(M_1)$ a contradiction. Thus M has the decomposition $M = M_1 \oplus L$. Consider the projection $\pi_s : M = L \oplus S \longrightarrow S$. Since $M_1 \cap L = 0$, $g := \pi_s|_{M_1} : M_1 \longrightarrow S$ is an isomorphism. Set

$$\eta := \pi_\ell|_{M_1} : M_1 \longrightarrow L \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h} = \eta g^{-1} : S \longrightarrow L.$$

Let y be any element in S . Assume $y = g(m)$ for an $m \in M_1 \subset N$. By the definition of η and g , we have $m = (x, y)$ with an $x \in C$ such that $h(y) = p(x)$. Since $\tilde{h}(y) = \eta(g^{-1}(y))$ and $\eta(m) = \eta(x, y) = x$, $(p\tilde{h})(y) = p(x) = h(y)$. Thus $p\tilde{h} = h$. The proof of Lemma 2.1 is complete. \square

Now, we consider a module M_R satisfying the Condition (fL). We have the first result.

Proposition 2. *Let M be a right R -module satisfying the Condition (fL). Assume that L is a self-projective local module in $\sigma[M]$. Then L is simple or $\text{Soc}(L) = \text{Rad}(L)$.*

Proof. By [10, 41.19], the endomorphism ring $\text{End}_R(L)$ is local. We proceed in two steps.

Step 1. First we prove that $\text{Soc}(L)$ is essential in L . Since L is local, $\text{Soc}(L) = \text{Rad}(L)$ if $\text{Soc}(L) \not\subset \text{Rad}(L)$. In this case, L is simple.

Assume $\text{Soc}(L) \subset \text{Rad}(L)$. This implies that $\text{Rad}(L) \neq 0$. Let x be any non-zero element in $\text{Rad}(L)$ and set $L_1 := xR$. Then L_1 has a maximal submodule, say K , such that the factor module L_1/K is simple. Consider the module $L \oplus (L_1/K)$, which is a finitely generated module in $\sigma[M]$. By hypothesis for M , the module $L \oplus (L_1/K)$ is lifting.

Consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & L_1/K & \\ & \downarrow h & \\ L & \xrightarrow{p} & L/K, \end{array}$$

in which p is natural epimorphism, h is inclusion homomorphism. Apply Lemma 1, it follows that there exists a homomorphism $\tilde{h} : L_1/K \longrightarrow L$ such that $p\tilde{h} = h$. Therefore L contains a simple submodule $S_1 = \tilde{h}(L_1/K)$ such that $(S_1 + K)/K = L_1/K$. We easily

see that $L_1 = S_1 \oplus K$. This argument shows that $Soc(L)$ is essential in $Rad(L)$, hence is essential in L .

Step 2. We will show next that L is simple or $Soc(L) = Rad(L)$.

Suppose that L is not simple. Then $Soc(L) \subset Rad(L)$. We show that $Soc(L) = Rad(L)$.

Note that L is self-projective. Hence, by [10, 18.2(4) and 21.2], the factor module $L/SocL$ is also a self-projective module. By the same argument as in the Step 1, $Soc(L/Soc(L))$ is essential in $L/Soc(L)$.

If $L/Soc(L)$ is simple then $Soc(L) = Rad(L)$.

Suppose that $L/Soc(L)$ is not simple. Let T be a simple submodule of $L/Soc(L)$. Then the inclusion homomorphism $q : T \rightarrow L/Soc(L)$ is not epimorphism. By the Condition (fL) for M , module $T \oplus L$ is lifting. Consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & T & \\ & \downarrow q & \\ L & \xrightarrow{p} & L/Soc(L), \end{array}$$

where p is natural projection. From Lemma 1 we conclude that there exists a homomorphism $g : T \rightarrow L$ such that $pg = q$. Then $g(T)$ is a simple submodule of L . It implies $ng = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore $L/Soc(L)$ is simple, and thus $Soc(L) = Rad(L)$. \square

Theorem 3. Let M be a finitely generated, self-projective right R -module. Assume that M satisfies the Condition (fL). Then M has a decomposition

$$M = M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_n,$$

where each M_i is simple or local with $Soc(M_i) = Rad(M_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Proof. By assumption, M is lifting. According to Remark 1, the module M has a decomposition $M = M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_n$, where every M_i is a self-projective local module in $\tau[M]$ for which the endomorphism ring $End_R(M_i)$ is local. By Proposition 2, each M_i is simple or local with $Soc(M_i) = Rad(M_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. \square

Now, putting $M_R = R_R$, then we need only to assume that all finitely generated right R -modules are lifting to obtain following result.

Theorem 4. Let R be any ring for which all finitely generated right R -modules are lifting. Then R is a semiprimary ring with $J(R)^2 = 0$.

Proof. We recall that a ring R is called semiprimary if the factor ring $R/J(R)$ is semi-simple and the Jacobson radical $J(R)$ is nilpotent, i.e., $J(R)^k = 0$ with a positive integer k . \square

Applying Theorem 3, the module R_R has a decomposition $R_R = R_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus R_n$, where each R_i is either a simple right R -module or a self-projective local right R -module

with $Soc(R_i) \cong Rad(R_i)$. Then

$$J(R) = Rad(R_R) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n Rad(R_i) \subset Soc(R_R).$$

It is clear that the right R -module $R_R/J(R)$ is semi-simple. From this, the factor ring $R/J(R)$ is semi-simple. Because $J(R) \subset Soc(R_R)$, $J(R)^2 = 0$ by [5, 9.3.5]. It follows that R is semiprimary. \square

Remark 2. For the module M in Theorem 3, $Soc(M)$ is finitely generated if and only if M_R has finite uniform dimension. In this case, M_R is of finite length. For a ring R , we get the following Corollary from Theorem 4.

Corollary 5. *Let R be any ring for which every finitely generated right R -module is lifting. Assume R has finite right uniform dimension. Then R is right artinian with $J(R)^2 = 0$.*

B. When are Conditions (fL) and (alL) equivalent?

Recall that for a ring R , every right R -module is extending if and only if R is a generalized uniserial ring with $J(R)^2 = 0$, if and only if every right R -module is lifting (cf. [2, 13.5] and [9, 2.5]). On the other hand, K. Oshiro [8] obtained a characterization for a generalized uniserial ring: A ring R is a generalized uniserial ring if and only if every extending right R -module is lifting. From this and above results we have following result.

Proposition 6. *Let R be a generalized uniserial ring. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) Every finitely generated right R -module is extending;
- (2) Every finitely generated right R -module is lifting;
- (3) Every right R -module is lifting;
- (4) Every right R -module is extending.

Proof. Straightforward. \square

Now we generalize above result for a finitely generated self-projective right R -module to obtain the following

Theorem 7. *Let M be a finitely generated self-projective right R -module. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) M satisfies Conditions (fL) and (fE);
- (2) M satisfies Condition (fL) and every finitely generated, indecomposable module in $\sigma[M]$ is extending;
- (3) M satisfies Condition (alL);
- (4) M satisfies Condition (alE).

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). It is clear.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). By the assumption and Theorem 3, M has a decomposition $M = M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_n$, where each M_i is simple or local with $Soc(M_i) = Rad(M_i)$. Since M_i is extending, M_i is uniform and hence $Soc(M_i)$ is simple. Then M is of finite length.

Consider a finitely generated, indecomposable module K in $\sigma[M]$. Then K is lifting and extending. This implies that $Soc(K)$ is simple and K is local, hence $K/Rad(K)$ is simple. By [10, 55.14], every module in $\sigma[M]$ is serial, in particular, every indecomposable module in $\sigma[M]$ is uniserial.

Let N be any indecomposable module in $\sigma[M]$. Then the M -injective hull \widehat{N} of N is uniserial. Suppose that N is not simple and $\widehat{N} \neq N$. This implies that in \widehat{N} , there exists a composition serial:

$$0 \subset Soc(N) \subset N_1 \subset N_2,$$

where N_1 and N_2 are finitely generated submodules of \widehat{N} . According to [10, 55.14], N_2 is self-injective hence the endomorphism ring $End(N_2)$ is local. By assumption, $N_2 \oplus N_1/Soc(N)$ is lifting.

Consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N_1/Soc(N) & & \\ \downarrow h & & \\ N_2 \xrightarrow{p} N_2/Soc(N), & & \end{array}$$

where h is the inclusion homomorphism, p is natural epimorphism. Applying Lemma 1, there exists a homomorphism $\tilde{h} : N_1/Soc(N) \rightarrow N_2$ such that $p\tilde{h} = h$. Since N_2 is uniserial, $p\tilde{h} = 0$, a contradiction.

Therefore, if N is not simple then $N = \widehat{N}$ and N is a module of length 2.

Now, from this, the module M is a direct sum of simple modules and modules of length 2, which are M -injective and M -projective. Thus every module in $\sigma[M]$ is extending, also is lifting by [2, 13.3] and [9, 2.5].

(3) \Rightarrow (1). From [2, 13.3] and [9, 2.5], it is clear. □

Put $M_R = R_R$, we have the following.

Corollary 8. *The following statements are equivalent for a ring R :*

- (1) *Every finitely generated right R -module is lifting and is extending;*
- (2) *Every finitely generated right R -module is lifting and every finitely generated, indecomposable right R -module is extending;*
- (3) *Every right R -module is lifting;*
- (4) *Every right R -module is extending.*

In following theorem, the module M is not necessary self-projective.

Theorem 9. *Let M be a finitely generated module. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) M satisfies Conditions (fE) and (fL);
 (2) M satisfies Conditions (fE) and every finitely generated, indecomposable module in $\sigma[M]$ is lifting;
 (3) M satisfies Conditions (alE);
 (4) M satisfies Conditions (alL).

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) is clear.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) By the assumption and [4, Theorem 5], M is extending noetherian. Hence M has a decomposition

$$M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_i, \text{ where each } M_i \text{ is a finitely generated uniform module.}$$

Let N be any finitely generated uniform module in $\sigma[M]$. Then N is lifting, hence is local. This implies that every uniform module in $\sigma[M]$ is uniserial by [10, 55.1]. Since M is noetherian, N is noetherian and every submodule of N is too. Set

$$N_0 := N, N_1 = \text{Rad}(N), N_2 = \text{Rad}(N_1), \dots$$

We have a descending chain

$$N_0 = N \supset N_1 \supset N_2 \supset N_3 \supset \dots,$$

where each N_k/N_{k+1} is simple, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

If $N_2 \neq 0$ then we have following composition series

$$(N/N_3) \supset (N_1/N_3) \supset (N_2/N_3) \supset 0.$$

Note that N/N_3 is uniserial. Now, according to [2, 7.4 Corollary], $(N/N_3) \oplus (N_1/N_2)$ is not an extending module. This is contrary to the assumption (2). Thus $N_2 = 0$ and hence N is a module of length at most 2.

From this, M is of finite length. By [10, 55.14], every module in $\sigma[M]$ is a serial module. By above argument for the module N , we conclude that every uniserial module in $\sigma[M]$ is a module of length at most 2. Now, all modules in $\sigma[M]$ are extending by [2, 13.3].

(3) \Rightarrow (1) follows from [2, 13.3] and [9, 2.5]. □

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Prof. Dinh Van Huynh for his useful suggestion during the preparation of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anderson and Fuller. *Rings and Categories of Modules*. Springer-Verlag, 1974.
- [2] N.V. Dung, D.V. Huynh, P.F. Smith and R. Wisbauer. *Extending Modules*. Pitman London 1994.

- [3] N.V. Dung and P.F. Smith. Rings for which certain modules are CS , *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **102**(1995), p 273-287.
- [4] D.V. Huynh, S.T. Rizvi and M.F. Yousif. Rings whose finitely generated modules are extending, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **111**(1996), p 325-328.
- [5] F. Kasch. *Modules and Rings*. Academic Press, 1982.
- [6] S.H. Mohamed and B.J. Müller. Continuous and Discrete Modules, *London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes* **147**(1990).
- [7] K. Oshiro. Lifting modules, extending modules and their applications to QF -rings, *Hokkaido Math. J.*, **13**(1984), p 310-338.
- [8] K. Oshiro. Lifting modules, extending modules and their applications to generalized uniserial rings, *Hokkaido Math. J.*, **13**(1984), p 339-346.
- [9] K. Oshiro and R. Wisbauer. Modules with every subgenerated module lifting, *Osaka Math. J.*, **32**(1995), p 513-519.
- [10] R. Wisbauer. *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory*. Gordon and Breach, Reading (1991).

FAP CHÍ KHOA HỌC ĐHQGHN, KHTN, t.XVI, n^o2 - 2000

VỀ CÁC MÔĐUN M CÓ MỌI MÔĐUN HỮU HẠN SINH TRONG $\delta[M]$ LÀ LIFTING

Mai Quý Năm

Khoa Toán, Đại học Sư phạm Quy Nhơn

Một môđun L được gọi là lifting nếu với môđun con tùy ý K của L có một hạng tử trực tiếp X của L sao cho $X \subset K$ và K/X là môđun con nhỏ trong L/X . Trong bài này, chúng tôi chứng minh rằng với một môđun hữu hạn sinh tự xạ ảnh M , nếu mọi môđun hữu hạn sinh trong $\delta[M]$ là lifting thì M có một sự phân tích $M = M_1 \oplus \dots \oplus M_n$, trong đó mỗi một M_i là đơn hoặc là địa phương với $Soc(M_i) = Rad(M_i)$.

Nói riêng, một vành R là nửa nguyên so với $J(R)^2 = 0$ nếu mọi R -môđun phải hữu hạn sinh là lifting