DIVISIBILITY OF DIRECT SUMS IN TORSION THEORIES

B. SARATH AND K. VARADARAJAN

Introduction. Given a hereditary torsion theory $(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B})$ on the category Mod R of right R-modules we obtain in this paper necessary and sufficient conditions for the direct sum $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ of a given family $\{M_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in J}$ of R-modules to be divisible for the torsion theory $(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B})$. Using this criterion we show that if $\{M_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in J}$ is a family of R-modules having the property that $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in K} M_{\alpha}$ is divisible for every countable subset K of J then $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ is itself divisible. If $\mathscr{F} = \{I | I \text{ a right ideal in } R \text{ such that } R | I \in \mathscr{A}\}$ is the filter of "dense" right ideals of R associated with the torsion theory $(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B})$, we show that if arbitrary direct sums of divisible modules for the torsion theory $(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B})$ are divisible then the family \mathscr{F} satisfies the ascending chain condition. The results obtained in this paper are generalisations of our earlier results concerning direct sums of injective modules [4]. If $(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B})$ is the hereditary torsion theory for which \mathscr{A} is the class of all R-modules and \mathscr{B} consists only of the module 0, then the notion of a divisible module is the same as that of an injective module and we recover the results obtain in [4].

1. Preliminaries. Throughout this paper R will denote a ring with $1 \neq 0$ and our attention will be confined to the category Mod R of unital right R-modules. In [2] S. E. Dickson defined a torsion theory on Mod R to be a pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ of non-empty classes of modules satisfying the following conditions:

(1) $\mathscr{A} \cap \mathscr{B} = \{0\}$, the set consisting only of the module 0

(2) If $A \to A'' \to 0$ is exact with $A \in \mathscr{A}$ then $A'' \in \mathscr{A}$

(3) If $0 \to B' \to B$ is exact with $B \in \mathscr{B}$ then $B' \in \mathscr{B}$ and

(4) For every module M there is an exact sequence $0 \to A \to M \to B \to 0$ with $A \in \mathscr{A}, B \in \mathscr{B}$.

The modules in \mathscr{A} are called the *torsion modules* for the torsion theory and those in \mathscr{B} are called *torsion free*. If $(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B})$ is a torsion theory, then \mathscr{A} is closed under isomorphic images, factor modules, extensions and arbitrary direct sums, whereas \mathscr{B} is closed under isomorphic images, submodules, extensions and arbitrary direct products [2, Theorem 2.3]. A torsion theory \mathscr{A} is called *hereditary* if \mathscr{A} is closed under submodules or equivalently \mathscr{B} is closed under injective hulls [2, Theorem 2.9]. In [3] J. Lambek refers to a torsion theory in the sense of S. E. Dickson as a pretorsion theory and the term torsion

Received May 28, 1975 and in revised form, August 26, 1975.

The research of the second author was partially supported by NRC grant A8225.

theory is reserved only to a hereditary torsion theory in the sense of S. E. Dickson. We will follow the terminology of Dickson. We now recall the notion of a divisible module introduced by J. Lambek [3] and the dual notion of a codivisible module introduced by P. E. Bland [1].

Definition 1.1. A module M is called *divisible* if given any exact sequence f

 $0 \to L \to N$ with coker $f \in \mathscr{A}$ and any $g: L \to M$, there exists $h: N \to M$ such that $h \circ f = g$.

Dually, *M* is called *codivisible* if given any exact sequence $N \to L \to 0$ with ker $f \in \mathscr{B}$ and any $g: M \to L$, there exists $h: M \to N$ such that $f \circ h = g$.

It is clear that the direct product of any family of divisible modules is divisible and the direct sum of any family of codivisible modules is codivisible. Any direct summand of a divisible (respectively, codivisible) module is divisible (respectively, codivisible). Associated to any hereditary torsion theory $(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B})$ on Mod R there is a unique filter of right ideals

 $\mathscr{F} = \{I | I \text{ right ideal in } R \text{ such that } R | I \in \mathscr{A}\}.$

Each one of the ideals I in \mathscr{F} is dense in R in the sense of [3, page 3]. We will be using the following characterisation of divisible modules, valid for hereditary torsion theories.

LEMMA 1.2. A module M is divisible if and only if given any $f: I \to M$ with $I \in \mathscr{F}$ there exists an extension $h: R \to M$ of f or equivalently there exists an element $m \in M$ satisfying $f(\lambda) = m\lambda$ for all $\lambda \in I$.

Let $\{M_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in J}$ be a family of modules. We write \bar{x} for the element $(x_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in J}$ in the direct product $\prod_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$. For any $\bar{x} \in \prod_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ we set $I_{\bar{x}} = \{\lambda \in R | \bar{x}\lambda \in \bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}\}$.

Definition 1.3. An element $\bar{x} \in \prod_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ will be called *special* if there exists a finite subset F of J such that $x_{\alpha}\lambda = 0$ for all $\alpha \in J - F$ and $\lambda \in I_{\bar{x}}$.

The right annihilator $\{\lambda \in R | x\lambda = 0\}$ of an element x of a module M will be denoted by r(x). Throughout this paper $(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B})$ denotes a hereditary torsion theory and \mathscr{F} the filter $\{I | I \text{ right ideal of } R \text{ with } R | I \in \mathscr{A}\}$ of dense ideals in R. The sum of all torsion submodules of M is itself in \mathscr{A} and thus for any module M, there exists a largest torsion submodule T(M) of M. T(M) will be referred to as the torsion submodule of M.

Definition 1.4. An element $x \in M$ will be referred to as a torsion element of M if and only if $x \in T(M)$.

It is well-known that $x \in T(M)$ if and only if $r(x) \in \mathscr{F}$ (Lemma 2.1 of [1]).

2. Divisibility of direct sums. Let $\{M_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in J}$ be a given family of modules, N the factor module $(\prod_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha})/(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha})$ and $p : \prod_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha} \to N$ the canonical quotient map.

THEOREM 2.1. $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ is divisible if and only if each M_{α} is divisible and every element $x \in p^{-1}(T(N))$ is a special element.

Proof. Assume each M_{α} divisible and every $\bar{x} \in p^{-1}(T(N))$ special. Let $f: I \to \bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ be any map with $I \in \mathscr{F}$. Since $\prod_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ is divisible there exists an element $\bar{u} \in \prod_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ such that $f(\lambda) = \bar{u}\lambda$ for all $\lambda \in I$. In particular $\bar{u}I \subset \bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$. Hence $I \subset I_{\bar{u}}$. The map $\varphi: R \to N$ defined by $\varphi(\lambda) = p(\bar{u})\lambda = p(\bar{u}\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in R$ satisfies $\varphi(I) = 0$. If $\eta: R \to R/I$ denotes the canonical quotient map, it follows that φ factors through η . If $\bar{\varphi}: R/I \to N$ denotes the induced map, we have $\bar{\varphi}(R/I) = p(\bar{u})R$. Since $R/I \in \mathscr{A}$ by condition (2) in the definition of a torsion theory we get $p(\bar{u}) R \in \mathscr{A}$. Thus $p(\bar{u}) \in T(N)$ or $\bar{u} \in p^{-1}(T(N))$. Hence by assumption, \bar{u} is a special element. Hence $u_{\alpha}I_{\bar{u}} = 0$ for almost all α . Since $I \subset I_{\bar{u}}$ we get $u_{\alpha}I = 0$ for almost all α . Let $\bar{v} \in \bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ be the element whose α -component is u_{α} or 0 according as $u_{\alpha}I \neq 0$ or $u_{\alpha}I = 0$. Then it is clear that $\bar{u}\lambda = \bar{v}\lambda$ for all $\lambda \in I$. The map $h: R \to \bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ defined by $h(\lambda) = \bar{v}\lambda(\lambda \in R)$ extends f. From Lemma 1.2 it follows that $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ is divisible. This proves sufficiency.

Conversely, assume $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ is divisible. Being a direct summand of $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ it follows that each M_{α} is divisible. Let $\bar{x} \in p^{-1}(T(N))$. Clearly $I_x = r(p(\bar{x}))$. Since $p(\bar{x}) \in T(N)$ it follows that $I_x \in \mathscr{F}$. Consider the map $f : I_x \to \bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ given by $f(\lambda) = \bar{x}\lambda$. The divisibility of $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ now implies that there exists an extension $h : R \to \bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ of f. If $\bar{y} = h(1) \in \bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ we have $y_{\alpha} = 0$ for almost all α and $x_{\alpha}I_{\bar{x}} = y_{\alpha}I_{\bar{x}} = 0$ for almost all α . Thus \bar{x} is a special element. This proves necessity.

THEOREM 2.2. Suppose $\{M_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in J}$ is a family of *R*-modules such that for every countable subset *K* of *J*, $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in K} M_{\alpha}$ is divisible. Then $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ is itself divisible.

Proof. Assume if possible that $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ is not divisible. Write N_J for the factor module $(\prod_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha})/(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha})$ and $p_J: \prod_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha} \to N_J$ for the canonical quotient map. From Theorem 2.1, there exists an element $\bar{x} \in P_J^{-1}(T(N_J))$ which is not special. Then $x_{\alpha}I_{\bar{x}} \neq 0$ for infinitely many $\alpha \in J$. Let K be an infinite countable subset of $\{\alpha \in J | x_{\alpha}I_{\bar{x}} \neq 0\}$. Let $N_K = (\prod_{\alpha \in K} M_{\alpha})/(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in K} M_{\alpha})$ and $p_K: \prod_{\alpha \in K} M_{\alpha} \to N_K$ the quotient map. Let $\bar{y} \in \prod_{\alpha \in K} M_{\alpha}$ be defined by $y_{\alpha} = x_{\alpha}$ for all $\alpha \in K$. Then clearly $I_{\bar{x}} \subset I_{\bar{y}}$ and $I_{\bar{y}} = r(p_K(y))$. From $I_{\bar{x}} = r(p_J(x)) \in \mathscr{F}$ we see that $I_{\bar{y}} \in \mathscr{F}$. Hence $r(p_K(y)) \in \mathscr{F}$. This implies that $p_K(\bar{y}) \in T(N_K)$. Clearly $y_{\alpha}I_{\bar{y}} \supseteq x_{\alpha}I_{\bar{x}} \neq 0$ for all $\alpha \in K$. By Theorem 2.1, this implies that $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in K} M_{\alpha}$ is not divisible, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2.

THEOREM 2.3. If arbitrary direct sums of divisible modules are divisible, then \mathcal{F} satisfies the ascending chain condition.

Proof. Suppose \mathscr{F} does not satisfy the ascending chain condition. Then there exists an infinite sequence $I_1 \subset I_2 \subset I_3 \subset \ldots$ of right ideals $I_j \in \mathscr{F}$ with $I_j \neq I_{j+1}$ for every $j \geq 1$. Let $A_j = R/I_j$, $\eta_j : R \to A_j$ the canonical projection and $x_j = \eta_j(1) \in A_j$. Let M_j be the divisible hull of A_j [3, Proposition 0.7, page 10]. Consider the element $\bar{x} = (x_j)_{j\geq 1}$ of $\prod_{j\geq 1} M_j$. Let $N = (\prod_{j\geq 1} M_j)/(\bigoplus_{j\geq 1} M_j)$ and $p: \prod_{j\geq 1} M_j \to N$ the canonical quotient map. For any $\lambda \in I_j$ we have $x_k \lambda = 0$ whenever $k \geq j$. Hence $I_j \subset I_x$ for all $j \geq 1$. In particular we get $r(p(\bar{x})) = I_{\bar{x}} \in \mathscr{F}$. Hence $p(\bar{x}) \in T(N)$. Let λ_j be any element of I_{j+1} which is not in I_j . Then $x_j \lambda_j \neq 0$ and $\lambda_j \in I_{\bar{x}}$. Hence $x_j I_{\bar{x}} \neq 0$ for each $j \geq 1$. It follows that \bar{x} is not a special element in $\prod_{j\geq 1} M_j$ and hence by Theorem 2.1, $\bigoplus_{j\geq 1} M_j$ is not divisible. This proves Theorem 2.3.

Remarks 2.4. (1) In case $(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B})$ is the hereditary torsion theory with $\mathscr{A} =$ the class of all *R*-modules and $\mathscr{B} = \{0\}$, the notion of a divisible module agrees with that of an injective module. Then Theorem 2.1 gives necessary and sufficient conditions for a direct sum $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ to be injective. It then asserts that $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ is injective if and only if each M_{α} is injective and every element $\bar{x} \in \prod_{\alpha \in J} M_{\alpha}$ is special. This is equivalent to Theorem 3 of [4]. Also Theorem 2.2 in this case reduces to Theorem 4 of [4].

(2) We do not know whether the converse of Theorem 2.3 is true.

References

- 1. P. E. Bland, Divisible and codivisible modules, Math. Scand. 34 (1974), 153-161.
- S. E. Dickson, A torsion theory for abelian categories, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 21 (1966), 223-235.
- 3. J. Lambek, Torsion theories, additive semantics, and rings of quotients, Lecture notes in Mathematics 177 (Springer-Verlag, 1971).
- 4. B. Sarath and K. Varadarajan, Injectivity of direct sums, Comm. Algebra 1 (1974), 517-530.

The University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta