

NOTES ON WEAKLY-SEMISIMPLE RINGS

YIQIANG ZHOU

Responding to a question on right weakly semisimple rings due to Jain, Lopez-Permouth and Singh, we report the existence of a non-right-Noetherian ring R for which every uniform cyclic right R -module is weakly-injective and every uniform finitely generated right R -module is compressible. We show that a ring R is a right Noetherian ring for which every cyclic right R -module is weakly R -injective if and only if R is a right Noetherian ring for which every uniform cyclic right R -module is compressible if and only if every cyclic right R -module is compressible. Finally, we characterise those modules M for which every finitely generated (respectively, cyclic) module in $\sigma[M]$ is compressible.

0. INTRODUCTION AND NOTATION

All rings R are associative with identity and all modules are unitary right R -modules. For a module M and a submodule N , $N \leq_e M$ denotes that N is essential in M . As usual, $E(M)$ and $Z(M)$ indicate the injective hull and the singular submodule of M respectively. The module M is said to be tight (respectively, R -tight) if every finitely generated (respectively, cyclic) submodule of $E(M)$ is embeddable in M , while M is defined to be weakly-injective (respectively, weakly R -injective) if for any finitely generated (respectively, cyclic) submodule Y of $E(M)$ there exists a submodule X of $E(M)$ such that $Y \subseteq X \cong M$ (see [3] and [5]). A module is called a compressible module if it is embeddable in each of its essential submodules [9]. Rings for which all modules are weakly-injective, called right weakly semisimple rings, were introduced by Jain, Lopez-Permouth and Singh [7] and studied in [1, 6, 7, 11, 12].

The following characterisations of right weakly-semisimple rings were obtained in [7].

THEOREM 0. *The following are equivalent for a ring R :*

- (i) R is a right weakly-semisimple ring;
- (ii) Every finitely generated R -module is weakly-injective and R is right Noetherian;
- (iii) Every cyclic R -module is weakly-injective and R is right Noetherian;

Received 9th March, 1995

Copyright Clearance Centre, Inc. Serial-fee code: 0004-9729/96 \$A2.00+0.00.

- (iv) Every uniform cyclic R -module is weakly-injective and R is right Noetherian;
- (v) Every uniform finitely generated R -module is compressible and R is right Noetherian.

It is open whether or not one may remove the Noetherian condition from any of the equivalent statements (ii) through (v) in the above theorem (see [6] or [7]). Here we shall report an example of a ring R which is not a right Noetherian ring but for which every uniform cyclic module is weakly-injective and every uniform finitely generated module is compressible. Motivated by Theorem 0, we characterise the right Noetherian rings R for which every cyclic R -module is weakly R -injective and the right Noetherian rings R for which every uniform cyclic R -module is compressible. These rings are also mentioned as worthy of study in [7]. We shall show that the two classes of rings coincide and each can be characterised as being those rings for which every cyclic module is compressible. We shall call a ring R a right CC -ring if R satisfies one of these equivalent conditions. [This terminology has been used differently in [8].] In Section 3, we consider analogues of right weakly semisimple rings and right CC -rings to modules. For any module M , we denote by $\sigma[M]$ the full subcategory of $\text{Mod } R$, whose objects are the submodules of M -generated modules, and by $E_M(N)$ the M -injective hull of a module N which is the trace of M in $E(M)$, that is, $E_M(N) = \sum \{f(M) : f \in \text{Hom}(M, E(N))\}$ (see [14]). We present characterisations for those modules M for which every finitely generated (respectively, cyclic) module in $\sigma[M]$ is compressible. These characterisations extend naturally the corresponding results of right weakly semisimple rings and right CC -rings.

1. THE EXAMPLE

EXAMPLE 1. Let $Q = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$, where each $F_i = Z_2 = \{\bar{0}, \bar{1}\}$, be the full product of rings Z_2 , R the subring of Q generated by $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$ and 1_Q , and I an arbitrary right ideal of R . Then R is not a right Noetherian ring and

- (a) $\text{Soc}(R_R) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$ is the only proper essential right ideal of R and $R/\text{Soc}(R_R)$ is a two-element field;
- (b) R/I is R -injective if $I \subseteq \text{Soc}(R_R)$ and $\text{Soc}(R)/I$ is finitely generated;
- (c) R/I is R -injective if $I \not\subseteq \text{Soc}(R)$;
- (d) R/I is R -injective and simple if R/I is uniform. Therefore every uniform R -module is simple and compressible.

PROOF: It is easy to check (a). We let $\pi_i(\alpha)$ denote the i th component of the element α in Q . Note that, for $\alpha \in Q$, $\alpha \in R$ if and only if $\pi_i(\alpha) = a$ for all but finitely many i 's with $a = \bar{0}$ or $\bar{1}$.

(b) Suppose that $I \subseteq Soc(R_R)$ and $Soc(R)/I$ is finitely generated. We can write $I = \bigoplus_{i \in V} F_i$, where V is a subset of N . Let $f : Soc(R_R) \rightarrow R/I$ be an R -homomorphism. Clearly $I \subseteq Ker(f)$, and we may write $Ker(f) = \bigoplus_{i \in W} F_i$, where $V \subseteq W \subseteq N$. It can be easily checked that the restriction of f on $\bigoplus_{i \in N \setminus W} F_i$ coincides with $\pi \circ \varepsilon$, where ε is the identity map on $\bigoplus_{i \in N \setminus W} F_i$ and $\pi : R \rightarrow R/I$ is the canonical homomorphism. Let β be in Q satisfying $\pi_i(\beta) = \bar{0}$ for precisely $i \in W$, and $= \bar{1}$ if $i \in N \setminus W$. Since $Soc(R)/I$ is finitely generated, the set $N \setminus V$ and hence the set $N \setminus W$ is finite. Therefore, β is in R . Define $g : R \rightarrow R/I$ by $g(1) = \beta + I$. Then g extends f .

(c) Suppose that $I \not\subseteq Soc(R_R)$. Then there exists a finite subset U of N such that $\alpha \in I$ if and only if $\pi_i(\alpha) = 0$ for every $i \in U$. So we have $R = I \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{i \in U} F_i \right)$ and $R/I \cong \bigoplus_{i \in U} F_i$. Therefore, to show R/I is R -injective, it suffices to show that each F_i is R -injective. Let $f : Soc(R_R) \rightarrow F_i$ be a nonzero R -homomorphism. Then $Ker(f) = \bigoplus_{j \neq i} F_j$ and $f|_{F_i} = 1$. Define $g : R \rightarrow F_i$ by $\pi_j(g(1)) = \bar{0}$ if $j \neq i$ and $\pi_i(g(1)) = \bar{1}$. Then g extends f .

(d) Suppose that R/I is uniform. Case 1: $I \not\subseteq Soc(R_R)$. As above, we have $R = I \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{i \in U} F_i \right)$, where U is a finite subset of N . Then $R/I \cong \bigoplus_{i \in U} F_i$. Since R/I is uniform, $|U| = 1$ and hence R/I is simple. It follows from (c) that R/I is injective. Case 2: $I \subseteq Soc(R_R)$. Since R/I is uniform, $Soc(R_R)/I$ must be zero or simple, and hence finitely generated. By (b), R/I is injective. If $I = Soc(R)$, then $R/I = R/Soc(R)$ is simple. If $I \subset Soc(R)$, then $Soc(R)/I$ is uniform. Thus $I = \bigoplus_{i \neq j} F_i$ for some j . Then $R/I = [Soc(R)/I] \oplus (J/I)$, where $J = \{\alpha \in R : \pi_j(\alpha) = \bar{0}\}$. This contradicts the uniformness of R/I . □

2. RINGS WHOSE CYCLICS ARE COMPRESSIBLE

A module M is called a V -module if every simple R -module is M -injective. The following lemma is an easy corollary of Shock [13, Theorem 3.8].

LEMMA 2. *For a V -module M , M is Noetherian if and only if every factor module of M has finitely generated socle.*

THEOREM 3. *The following are equivalent for a ring R :*

- (a) *Every R -module is weakly R -injective (or R -tight);*
- (b) *R is right Noetherian and every finitely generated R -module is weakly R -injective (or R -tight);*

- (c) R is right Noetherian and every cyclic R -module is weakly R -injective (or R -tight);
- (d) R is right Noetherian and every uniform cyclic R -module is weakly R -injective (or R -tight);
- (e) R is right Noetherian and every uniform cyclic R -module is compressible;
- (f) Every cyclic R -module is compressible.

PROOF: (f) \Rightarrow (e). For any simple R -module M , each $xR \subseteq E(M)$ is embeddable in M since $M \cap xR \leq_e xR$. This implies that $E(M)$ is simple. Thus $M = E(M)$ is injective. Therefore, R_R is a V -module. Next we show that every cyclic R -module has finitely generated socle. For a cyclic R -module N , we have a submodule X of N maximal with respect to $Soc(N) \cap X = 0$ and hence $Soc(N)$ is essentially embeddable in N/X . Since N/X is compressible, we have an embedding $N/X \hookrightarrow Soc(N)$, implying that N/X is a semisimple module. This shows that $Soc(N) \cong N/X$ is finitely generated. Therefore, by Lemma 2, R is a right Noetherian ring.

(e) \Rightarrow (f). Let $M = xR$ be a cyclic module and $N \leq_e M$. Since R is right Noetherian, M has finite Goldie dimension. Then there exist cyclic uniform submodules x_iR ($i = 1, \dots, n$) of M such that $x_1R + \dots + x_nR = x_1R \oplus \dots \oplus x_nR \leq_e N \subseteq M$. Therefore, $E(M) \stackrel{f}{\cong} E(x_1R) \oplus \dots \oplus E(x_nR)$. Write $f(x) = y_1 + \dots + y_n$ with $y_i \in E(x_iR)$. Note that each $y_i \neq 0$. Then $M \cong f(M) = (y_1 + \dots + y_n)R \subseteq y_1R \oplus \dots \oplus y_nR$. Since $x_iR \cap y_iR \leq_e y_iR$ and y_iR is uniform, we have $y_iR \stackrel{g_i}{\cong} x_iR$. Define $g : y_1R \oplus \dots \oplus y_nR \rightarrow x_1R \oplus \dots \oplus x_nR$ by $g(y_1r_1 + \dots + y_nr_n) = g_1(y_1)r_1 + \dots + g_n(y_n)r_n$ (all $r_i \in R$). Then g is one-to-one and we have $M \stackrel{g \circ f}{\cong} N$, showing that M is compressible.

To complete the proof, we note two facts. First, it is straightforward to verify that every cyclic (respectively, uniform cyclic) R -module is compressible if and only if every R -module (respectively, uniform R -module) is R -tight. Next, from [6, 2.8], we see that for a ring R for which every cyclic R -module has finitely generated socle, an R -module M is tight (respectively, R -tight) if and only if M is weakly-injective (respectively, weakly R -injective). Therefore, the remaining equivalences follow from these facts and the equivalence (e) \Leftrightarrow (f). □

From now on, we call a ring R a right CC -ring if R satisfies any one of the equivalent conditions in Theorem 3.

It is known that, for a semiprime right Goldie ring R , R is left Goldie if and only if every finitely generated non-singular R -module is embeddable in a free module [10] if and only if every finitely generated non-singular R -module is compressible [9, 2.2.15]. We need the following proposition for the next characterisation of right CC -rings.

PROPOSITION 4. *The following are equivalent for a semiprime right Goldie ring*

R :

- (a) Every cyclic non-singular R -module is embeddable in a free module;
- (b) Every cyclic non-singular R -module is compressible;
- (c) R_R is R -tight.

PROOF: The implication (a) \Rightarrow (b) follows from [15, Theorem 5], while (b) \Rightarrow (c) is obvious.

(c) \Rightarrow (a). Let $M = xR$ be non-singular. We let Q be the right classical quotient ring of R . Then Q is a semisimple ring. Consider the right Q -module $M \otimes_R Q$. Clearly $M \otimes_R Q = (x \otimes 1)Q$ is cyclic. Since Q is a semisimple ring, $M \otimes_R Q$ is a semisimple Q -module, implying that $M \otimes_R Q$ is of finite length as a Q -module. By [4, Exercise 6E, p.104], M has finite Goldie dimension and so there exist uniform cyclic submodules $x_i R$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) of M such that $x_1 R + \dots + x_n R = x_1 R \oplus \dots \oplus x_n R \leq_e M$. Then $E(M) \cong^f E(x_1 R) \oplus \dots \oplus E(x_n R)$. Write $f(x) = y_1 + \dots + y_n$ with $y_i \in E(x_i R)$. We have $M \cong f(x)R = (y_1 + \dots + y_n)R \subseteq y_1 R \oplus \dots \oplus y_n R$. Therefore, to show (a) it suffices to show that every uniform cyclic non-singular right R -module is embeddable in a free module. So we may assume that $M = xR$ is uniform. Since xR is non-singular, x^\perp is not essential in R . Thus, $x^\perp \cap I = 0$ for some $0 \neq I \subseteq R_R$, implying $I \hookrightarrow xR$. Then $E(I) \cong E(xR)$ since xR is uniform. Now it follows from (c) that xR is embeddable in R . \square

Let R be a right Ore-domain but not a left Ore-domain and $T = M_2(R)$ be the 2×2 matrix ring over R . Then T is a semiprime right Goldie ring, T_T is not T -tight [6, Remark 3.7], and R_R is R -tight.

THEOREM 5. *The following are equivalent for a ring R :*

- (a) R is a right CC -ring;
- (b) R is a right QI -ring, R_R is R -tight, and every singular cyclic R -module is compressible;
- (c) R is semiprime right Goldie, R_R is R -tight, and every singular cyclic R -module is compressible.

PROOF: (a) \Rightarrow (b). By Boyle [2], right QI -rings can be characterised as being those right Noetherian rings for which every uniform cyclic module is strongly-prime, where a module M is called strongly-prime if M is contained in every nonzero quasi-injective submodule of $E(M)$. Note that every uniform cyclic module being compressible implies every uniform cyclic module being strongly-prime. Therefore, the implication follows from Theorem 3.

(b) \Rightarrow (c). Obvious.

(c) \Rightarrow (a). Let $M = xR$ be a cyclic module and $N \leq_e M$. There exists a non-singular submodule K of N such that $Z(N) \oplus K \leq_e N \subseteq M$. Then $E(M) = E(Z(N)) \oplus E(K)$. Write $x = a + b$, where $a \in E(Z(N))$ and $b \in E(K)$. Since R is right non-singular, aR is singular. Then, by (c), we have $aR \hookrightarrow Z(N)$ since $Z(N) \cap aR \leq_e aR$. Note that bR is non-singular and hence is compressible by Proposition 4. It follows that $bR \hookrightarrow K$ since $K \cap bR \leq_e bR$. Therefore, we have $aR \oplus bR \hookrightarrow Z(N) \oplus K \subseteq N$, implying $xR \hookrightarrow N$. Therefore, M is compressible. \square

3. MODULE ANALOGUES OF RIGHT WEAKLY SEMISIMPLE RINGS AND RIGHT CC-RINGS

DEFINITION 6: Let M and N be R -modules. N is said to be tight (respectively, R -tight) with respect to M , if every finitely generated (respectively, cyclic) submodule of $E_M(N)$ is embeddable in N . N is said to be weakly-injective (respectively, weakly R -injective) with respect to M , if for every finitely generated (respectively, cyclic) submodule Y of $E_M(N)$ there exists $X \subseteq E_M(N)$ such that $Y \subseteq X \cong N$.

REMARKS 7. (1) For any generator M in $\text{Mod} - R$, a module N is tight (or R -tight, or weakly-injective, or weakly R -injective, respectively) with respect to M if and only if N is tight (or R -tight, or weakly-injective, or weakly R -injective, respectively).

(2) A tight (respectively, R -tight) module N is tight (respectively, R -tight) with respect to M for any $M \in \text{Mod} - R$. But if $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $M = \mathbb{Z}_2$ then $E(M) = \mathbb{Z}_2(\infty)$ and $E_M(M) = \mathbb{Z}_2$. Therefore, M is tight with respect to M but not R -tight.

(3) A weakly-injective R -module may not be weakly R -injective with respect to some module M . For instance, consider $R = \mathbb{Z}_4$ and $M = 2R$. Then $E(R_R) = R$ and $E_M(R) = M$. Therefore R_R is weakly-injective. Obviously there does not exist $X \subseteq E_M(R)$ such that $M \subseteq X \cong R$. Thus, R_R is not weakly R -injective with respect to M .

THEOREM 8. *The following are equivalent for a module M :*

- (a) Every module in $\sigma[M]$ is weakly R -injective (or R -tight) with respect to M ;
- (b) M is locally Noetherian and every finitely generated module in $\sigma[M]$ is weakly R -injective (or R -tight) with respect to M ;
- (c) M is locally Noetherian and every cyclic module in $\sigma[M]$ is weakly R -injective (or R -tight) with respect to M ;
- (d) M is locally Noetherian and every uniform cyclic module in $\sigma[M]$ is weakly R -injective (or R -tight) with respect to M ;
- (e) M is locally Noetherian and every uniform cyclic module in $\sigma[M]$ is compressible;
- (f) Every cyclic module in $\sigma[M]$ is compressible.

PROOF: (a) \Rightarrow (b). Let N be any cyclic submodule of M . For any simple module $X \in \sigma[M]$, we have $X \leq_e E_M(X)$. By (a), every cyclic submodule of $E_M(X)$ is embeddable in X , and so $X = E_M(X)$ is M -injective. Therefore, X is N -injective. Note that any simple module which is not in $\sigma[M]$ is trivially N -injective. This shows that N is a V -module. By using the same argument in the proof that (f) \Rightarrow (e) of Theorem 3, we can show that every factor module of N has finitely generated socle. By Lemma 2, N is Noetherian. Therefore, M is locally Noetherian.

(b) \Rightarrow (c) \Rightarrow (d) \Rightarrow (e). Clear.

(e) \Rightarrow (f). Let N be a cyclic module in $\sigma[M]$. Note that N is embeddable in a factor module of a finite direct sum of cyclic submodules of M . Since M is locally Noetherian, N is Noetherian and hence has finite Goldie dimension. Now as in the proof that (e) \Rightarrow (f) of Theorem 3, N is compressible.

(f) \Rightarrow (a). First we note that every cyclic in $\sigma[M]$ is compressible if and only if every module in $\sigma[M]$ is R -tight with respect to M . In particular, by the implication (a) \Rightarrow (b), M is locally Noetherian. Let N be a module in $\sigma[M]$ and Y a cyclic submodule of $E_M(N)$. Since $N \cap Y \leq_e Y$, we have an embedding $Y \xrightarrow{f} N \cap Y$ since Y is compressible. Note that $E_M(Y)$ is quasi-injective. There exists a homomorphism $g : E_M(Y) \rightarrow E_M(Y)$ which extends f . Since M is locally Noetherian, Y is Noetherian and hence has finite Goldie dimension. It follows that g is an isomorphism. Note that $E_M(N) = E_M(Y) \oplus Z$ for some $Z \subseteq E_M(N)$. If we define $h : E_M(N) \rightarrow E_M(N)$ by $h(a + b) = g(a) + b$ for all $a \in E_M(Y)$ and $b \in Z$, then h is an isomorphism which extends g . Let $X = h^{-1}(N)$. Then $Y \subseteq X \cong N$. Therefore, N is weakly R -injective. □

THEOREM 9. *The following are equivalent for a module M :*

- (a) *Every module in $\sigma[M]$ is weakly-injective (or tight) with respect to M ;*
- (b) *M is locally Noetherian and every finitely generated module in $\sigma[M]$ is weakly-injective (or tight) with respect to M ;*
- (c) *M is locally Noetherian and every cyclic module in $\sigma[M]$ is weakly injective (or tight) with respect to M ;*
- (d) *M is locally Noetherian and every uniform cyclic module in $\sigma[M]$ is weakly injective (or tight) with respect to M ;*
- (e) *M is locally Noetherian and every uniform finitely generated module in $\sigma[M]$ is compressible;*
- (f) *Every finitely generated module in $\sigma[M]$ is compressible.*

PROOF: (a) \Rightarrow (b). By Theorem 8.

(b) \Rightarrow (c) \Rightarrow (d) \Rightarrow (e). Clear.

(e) \Rightarrow (f). Let N be a finitely generated module in $\sigma[M]$ and $P \leq_e N$. Since M is

locally Noetherian, N is Noetherian and hence has finite Goldie dimension. Then there exist cyclic uniform submodules $x_i R$ of N ($i = 1, \dots, n$) such that $x_1 R + \dots + x_n R = x_1 R \oplus \dots \oplus x_n R \leq_e P$. Then $E_M(N) \stackrel{f}{\cong} E_M(x_1 R) \oplus \dots \oplus E_M(x_n R)$. Since N is finitely generated, there exist finitely generated submodules Y_i of $E_M(x_i R)$ such that $f(N) \subseteq Y_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Y_n$. Each Y_i is a finitely generated uniform module and hence compressible by (e). Therefore, we have an embedding $Y_i \xrightarrow{g^i} Y_i \cap x_i R$. Define $g : Y_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Y_n \rightarrow x_1 R \oplus \dots \oplus x_n R$ by $g(y_1 + \dots + y_n) = g_1(y_1) + \dots + g_n(y_n)$ for all $y_i \in Y_i$. Then g is one-to-one and we have $N \xrightarrow{g \circ f} P$, showing that N is compressible. $(f) \Rightarrow (a)$. Similar to the proof that $(f) \Rightarrow (a)$ in Theorem 8. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Al-Huzali, S.K. Jain and S.R. Lopez-Permouth, 'On the weak relative-injectivity of rings and modules', in *Noncommutative ring theory*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1448 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1990), pp. 93–98.
- [2] A.K. Boyle, 'Injectives containing no proper quasi-injective submodules', *Comm. Algebra* 4 (1976), 775–785.
- [3] J.S. Golan and S.R. Lopez-Permouth, 'QI-filters and tight modules', *Comm. Algebra* 19 (1991), 2217–2229.
- [4] K.R. Goodearl and R.B. Warfield Jr., *An introduction to noncommutative Noetherian rings* (London Math. Soc., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1989).
- [5] S.K. Jain and S.R. Lopez-Permouth, 'Rings whose cyclics are essentially embeddable in projective modules', *J. Algebra* 128 (1990), 257–269.
- [6] S.K. Jain and S.R. Lopez-Permouth, 'A survey on the theory of weakly-injective modules', in *Computational Algebra*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. 151 (Marcel Dekker, New York, 1994), pp. 205–232.
- [7] S.K. Jain, S.R. Lopez-Permouth and S.Singh, 'On a class of QI-rings', *Glasgow Math. J.* 34 (1992), 75–81.
- [8] S.K. Jain and S. Mohamed, 'Rings whose cyclic modules are continuous', *J. Indian Math. Soc.* 42 (1978), 197–202.
- [9] A.V. Jategaonkar, *Localization in Noetherian rings* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London, New York, 1986).
- [10] L. Levy, 'Torsion-free and divisible modules over non-integral-domains', *Canad. J. Math.* 15 (1963), 132–151.
- [11] S.R. Lopez-Permouth, 'Rings characterized by their weakly-injective modules', *Glasgow Math. J.* 34 (1992), 349–353.
- [12] S.R. Lopez-Permouth, S.T. Rizvi and M.F. Yousif, 'Some characterizations of semiprime Goldie rings', *Glasgow Math. J.* 35 (1993), 357–365.
- [13] R.C. Shock, 'Dual generalizations of the Artinian and Noetherian conditions', *Pacific J. Math.* 54 (1974), 227–235.
- [14] R. Wisbauer, 'Generalized co-semisimple modules', *Comm. Algebra* 8 (1990), 4235–4253.

- [15] Y. Zhou, 'Strongly compressible modules and semiprime right Goldie rings', *Comm. Algebra* **21** (1993), 687–698.

Department of Mathematics
University of British Columbia
Vancouver BC
V6T 1Z2 Canada

Current address:
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's, NF
A1C 5S7 Canada