

ENDOMORPHISMS OF THE QUASI-INJECTIVE HULL OF A MODULE

BY
EDWARD T. WONG

R is a ring and M is a right R -module for which $R^l = \{m \in M \mid mR = 0\}$ is the zero submodule. Let \hat{M} and \bar{M} be the injective hull and the quasi-injective hull of M respectively. Then $\bar{M} = KM$ where $K = \text{Hom}_R(\hat{M}, \hat{M})$ [1]. The ring $D = \text{Hom}_R(\bar{M}, \bar{M})$ plays an important role, in many cases, in the studying of R especially when D is a division ring. For $x \in M$, we denote the annihilator of x in R by $x^r = \{r \in R \mid xr = 0\}$, whereas $x^{yl} = \{m \in M \mid mx^y = 0\}$. If N is a submodule of M and $x \in M$, $x^{-1}(N)$ is the right ideal in R consisting of elements r in R where $xr \in N$.

LEMMA. *D is a division ring, if and only if, $k \in K$ either $kM = 0$ or k is one-to-one.*

Proof. $k \in K$, Let T_k be the kernel of k . If D is a division ring and $kM \neq 0$. Since $k\bar{M} \subset \bar{M}$, k is one-to-one on \bar{M} . $T_k = 0$ follows \hat{M} is an essential extension of \bar{M} .

Suppose for each $k \in K$ either $kM = 0$ or $T_k = 0$. Let $d \in D$ and $d \neq 0$. There exist $k \in K$ and $m \in M$ such that $d(km) = (dk)m \neq 0$. Let \bar{d} be an extension of d in K . $\bar{d}kM \neq 0$. Hence $\bar{d}k$ is one-to-one on \hat{M} . Since $kM \cap M \neq 0$. It implies $\bar{d}M \neq 0$ and $T_{\bar{d}} = 0$. Consequently d is one-to-one on \bar{M} . D is a division ring follows the definition of \bar{M} .

THEOREM. *D is a division ring, if and only if,*

- (1) every nonzero submodule of M is large,
- (2) x, y in M , $x^y > y^y$ (properly) then $x = 0$.

Proof. If D is a division ring then condition (1) must be satisfied. Otherwise D would have nonzero element with nonzero kernel. Suppose x, y in M such that $x^y > y^y$. Then the mapping $f: yR \rightarrow xR$ where $f(yr) = xr$ can be extended to an element in D . Since the kernel of f is nonzero, f must be identically zero. Hence $x = 0$.

Suppose M satisfies conditions (1) and (2). Let $k \in K$ and $kM \neq 0$. There exist n, n' in M such that $kn = n' \neq 0$. $(n')^y = n^{-1}(T_k) \supset n^y$. If $T_k \neq 0$, then there exists $r \in R$ such that $nr \in T_k$ and $nr \neq 0$. This means $(n')^y > n^y$ and $n' = 0$. Contradiction. Hence $T_k = 0$. By the lemma, D is a division ring.

COROLLARY. *If D is a division ring. Then for any $x \in M$ and any nonzero submodule N of M , if $x^{-1}(N) \supset y^y, y \neq 0$, then $x^{-1}(N) > y^y$.*

Proof. If $x = 0$ then there is nothing to prove. So we assume $x \neq 0$. If $Dx = Dy$

then $x^y = y^y$. But $xR \cap N \neq 0$. $x^{-1}(N) > x^y = y^y$. If $Dx \neq Dy$ then x and y are linearly independent. By Theorem 2.3 [1], there exists $r \in R$ such that $xr = 0$ and $yr \neq 0$. Again $x^{-1}(N) > y^y$.

REFERENCE

1. R. E. Johnson and E. T. Wong, *Quasi-injective modules and irreducible rings*, J. London Math. Soc. **36** (1961), 260–268.

OBERLIN COLLEGE,
OBERLIN, OHIO