

Molly Dunkum

A Generalization of Baer's Lemma

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 59 (2009), No. 1, 241–247

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/140476>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 2009

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

A GENERALIZATION OF BAER'S LEMMA

MOLLY DUNKUM, Kentucky

(Received May 10, 2007)

Abstract. There is a classical result known as Baer's Lemma that states that an R -module E is injective if it is injective for R . This means that if a map from a submodule of R , that is, from a left ideal L of R to E can always be extended to R , then a map to E from a submodule A of any R -module B can be extended to B ; in other words, E is injective. In this paper, we generalize this result to the category q_ω consisting of the representations of an infinite line quiver. This generalization of Baer's Lemma is useful in proving that torsion free covers exist for q_ω .

Keywords: Baer's Lemma, injective, representations of quivers, torsion free covers

MSC 2010: 13D30, 18G05

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most fruitful concepts in the theory of modules and homological algebra is that of an injective object. Recall that a module is defined in the same way as an abstract vector space except that the scalars are permitted to be elements of a ring instead of a field. All rings considered here have a multiplicative identity. They are associative, but not necessarily commutative. Henceforth, the ring R is considered fixed, and modules are unital left R -modules.

By a map φ from one module to another we mean a linear homomorphism, that is, $\varphi(x + y) = \varphi(x) + \varphi(y)$ and $\varphi(cx) = c\varphi(x)$ when c is a scalar. The standard definition of an injective R -module is that an R -module E is injective if any map from an R -module A into E can be extended to a map from B into E whenever B is an R -module containing A . This condition can also be stated by saying that the

following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & B \\ \downarrow \varphi & \nearrow \phi & \\ E & & \end{array}$$

By its very nature, the criterion in the definition of an injective module can be exhaustive to verify since it requires a verification for *all* modules B and submodules A . However, Reinhold Baer [1] succeeded in reducing the criterion to a special case that is much more manageable. The result is widely known as Baer's Lemma [1].

Baer's Lemma. An R -module E is injective if (and only if) every map from a left ideal L of R to E can be extended to R .

We sometimes refer to Baer's Lemma by saying that an R -module E is injective if it is injective for R . This should be interpreted to mean that E is injective if every map from any R -submodule (that is, any left ideal) of R into E can be extended to R itself.

2. THE CATEGORY q_ω

Define q_ω to be the category of representations of the quiver

$$\bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \dots$$

Specifically, objects in q_ω have the form

$$A_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} A_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} A_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

where for all i , it is understood that A_i is an R -module and $f_i : A_i \rightarrow A_{i+1}$ is a map in $R\text{-Mod}$. A sequence $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \dots)$ of maps in $R\text{-Mod}$ is a map in the category q_ω from the object

$$A_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} A_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} A_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

to the object

$$B_1 \xrightarrow{g_1} B_2 \xrightarrow{g_2} B_3 \xrightarrow{g_3} \dots$$

provided that $\varphi_i : A_i \rightarrow B_i$ is a map in $R\text{-Mod}$ for which the equations $\varphi_{i+1} \circ f_i = g_i \circ \varphi_i$ are satisfied for each i . In other words, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & A_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & A_3 & \xrightarrow{f_3} & \dots \\ \downarrow \varphi_1 & & \downarrow \varphi_2 & & \downarrow \varphi_3 & & \\ B_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & B_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & B_3 & \xrightarrow{g_3} & \dots \end{array}$$

We say that the object

$$A_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} A_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} A_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

is a *subobject* of

$$B_1 \xrightarrow{g_1} B_2 \xrightarrow{g_2} B_3 \xrightarrow{g_3} \dots$$

if A_i is a submodule of B_i and the following diagram commutes where $j : A_i \rightarrow B_i$ denotes the inclusion map:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & A_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & A_3 & \xrightarrow{f_3} & \dots \\ j \downarrow & & j \downarrow & & j \downarrow & & \\ B_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & B_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & B_3 & \xrightarrow{g_3} & \dots \end{array}$$

When the meaning is clear, we will denote the generic object

$$A_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} A_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} A_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

in q_ω simply by \mathbf{A} . Similarly,

$$B_1 \xrightarrow{g_1} B_2 \xrightarrow{g_2} B_3 \xrightarrow{g_3} \dots$$

is denoted by \mathbf{B} .

By definition, an object

$$\mathbf{E} = E_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} E_2 \xrightarrow{\delta_2} E_3 \xrightarrow{\delta_3} \dots$$

is injective in the category q_ω if every map from \mathbf{A} into \mathbf{E} can be extended to a map from \mathbf{B} to \mathbf{E} whenever \mathbf{A} is a subobject of \mathbf{B} .

3. THE GENERALIZATION OF BAER'S LEMMA

The object

$$R \xrightarrow{j} R \xrightarrow{j} R \xrightarrow{j} \dots$$

in q_ω , where j is the identity map, is denoted by \mathbf{R} . As in the case of $R\text{-Mod}$, we say that an object \mathbf{E} in q_ω is injective for \mathbf{R} if each mapping from a subobject \mathbf{S} of \mathbf{R} to \mathbf{E} can be extended to \mathbf{R} .

Theorem 3.1. *Let*

$$\mathbf{E} = E_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} E_2 \xrightarrow{\delta_2} E_3 \xrightarrow{\delta_3} \dots$$

be an object in the category q_ω . Then \mathbf{E} is injective in the category q_ω if and only if \mathbf{E} is injective for \mathbf{R} .

P r o o f. Clearly the condition is necessary since it is a special case of the criterion stated in the definition of an injective object in q_ω . Conversely, assume now that \mathbf{E} is injective for \mathbf{R} . That is, assume that whenever

$$\mathbf{L} = L_1 \subseteq L_2 \subseteq L_3 \subseteq \dots$$

is an ascending sequence of left ideals of the ring R , any map in q_ω from \mathbf{L} into \mathbf{E} can be extended to \mathbf{R} .

To verify that \mathbf{E} is injective, let

$$\mathbf{B} = B_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} B_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} B_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

be an arbitrary object in q_ω and let let

$$\mathbf{A} = A_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} A_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} A_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

be a subobject of \mathbf{B} . Let π be a map in q_ω from \mathbf{A} to \mathbf{E} . We want to show that π can be extended to a map in q_ω from \mathbf{B} to \mathbf{E} . Toward this end, suppose that π has been extended to a maximal subobject

$$\mathbf{C} = C_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} C_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} C_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

of

$$\mathbf{B} = B_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} B_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} B_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

that contains

$$\mathbf{A} = A_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} A_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} A_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

It suffices to prove that $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{B}$.

Assume, by way of contradiction, that $\mathbf{C} \neq \mathbf{B}$. Then there must be a $k > 0$ such that C_k is a proper submodule of B_k . Choose an element $b_k \in B_k$ not in C_k . We will use this element b_k to construct another subobject of

$$\mathbf{B} = B_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} B_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} B_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

Specifically, the object is

$$\mathbf{D} = 0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow Rb_k \rightarrow Rf_k(b_k) \rightarrow Rf_{k+1}(b_{k+1}) \rightarrow \dots$$

where $b_{n+1} = f_n(b_n)$ for all $n > k$. For each n , define a submodule S_n of R by $S_n = Rb_n + C_n$ and consider the subobject

$$\mathbf{S} = S_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} S_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} S_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

The proof will be completed if we can show that π can be extended to \mathbf{S} since \mathbf{S} is a subobject of \mathbf{B} properly containing \mathbf{C} , which was chosen maximal. We will show that indeed π can be extended to \mathbf{S} by finding a mapping $\gamma = \{\gamma_n\}$ in q_ω from the subobject \mathbf{D} of \mathbf{B} to \mathbf{E} that agrees with π on \mathbf{C} . Let $L_n = \{r \in R : rb_n \in C_n\}$. Observe that if $rb_n = c_n \in C_n$, then $rb_{n+1} = rf_n(b_n) = f_n(rb_n) = f_n(c_n) \in C_{n+1}$. So $L_n \subseteq L_{n+1}$. Define $\phi_n : L_n \rightarrow E_n$ by $\phi_n(x) = \pi_n(xb_n)$ if $x \in L_n$. Then we have a map $\phi = \{\phi_n\}$ in q_ω from

$$\mathbf{L} = L_1 \subseteq L_2 \subseteq L_3 \subseteq \dots$$

to

$$\mathbf{E} = E_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} E_2 \xrightarrow{\delta_2} E_3 \xrightarrow{\delta_3} \dots$$

represented by the following commutative diagram with j denoting the inclusion map:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} L_1 & \xrightarrow{j} & L_2 & \xrightarrow{j} & L_3 & \xrightarrow{j} & \dots \\ \phi_1 \downarrow & & \phi_2 \downarrow & & \phi_3 \downarrow & & \\ E_1 & \xrightarrow{\delta_1} & E_2 & \xrightarrow{\delta_2} & E_3 & \xrightarrow{\delta_3} & \dots \end{array}$$

To see that the diagram is commutative and that ϕ is actually a map in q_ω , observe that for every $x \in L_n$ we have

$$\delta_n \phi_n(x) = \delta_n \pi_n(xb_n) = \pi_{n+1} f_n(xb_n) = \pi_{n+1}(xb_{n+1}) = \phi_{n+1}(x) = \phi_{n+1}(j(x))$$

because $\pi = \{\pi_n\}$ is a map in q_ω from \mathbf{A} to \mathbf{E} .

By hypothesis, the map $\phi = \{\phi_n\}$ in q_ω from

$$\mathbf{L} = L_1 \subseteq L_2 \subseteq L_3 \subseteq \dots$$

to \mathbf{E} can be extended to a map from \mathbf{R} to \mathbf{E} since we are assuming that \mathbf{E} is injective for \mathbf{R} . Therefore, we can now define a map $\gamma = \{\gamma_n\}$ where $\gamma_n : Rb_n \rightarrow E_n$ is defined by $\gamma_n(rb_n) = \phi_n(r)$ for every $r \in R$.

It is crucial to our argument that γ_n agrees with π_n on $Rb_n \cap C_n$. Suppose $x \in Rb_n \cap C_n$ and let $rb_n = x = c_n$, where $r \in R$ and $c_n \in C_n$. Then

$$\gamma_n(x) = \gamma_n(rb_n) = \phi_n(r) = \pi_n(c_n).$$

Because of the agreement of γ_n and π_n , it follows that the mapping ϱ_n from S_n to E_n defined by

$$\varrho_n(c_n + rb_n) = \pi_n(c_n) + \gamma_n(rb_n)$$

is well defined. Therefore, the mapping $\varrho = \{\varrho_n\}$ from

$$\mathbf{S} = S_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} S_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} S_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots$$

extends $\pi = \{\pi_n\}$ in q_ω from \mathbf{C} to \mathbf{E} to a mapping in q_ω from \mathbf{S} to \mathbf{E} . Since \mathbf{C} was chosen as a maximal extension, we conclude that $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{B}$, and we have shown that \mathbf{E} is an injective object in q_ω . \square

4. AN APPLICATION

For an R -module M , a morphism $\phi : C \rightarrow M$ where C is torsion free is called a torsion free precover of M if for any $\psi : C' \rightarrow M$ where C' is torsion free, there is a map $f : C' \rightarrow C$ such that $\phi \circ f = \psi$. That is, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & C' & \\ f \swarrow & \downarrow \psi & \\ C & \xrightarrow{\phi} & M \end{array}$$

If $\phi : C \rightarrow M$ is a torsion free precover and if every $f : C' \rightarrow C$ such that $\phi \circ f = \phi$ is an automorphism, then ϕ is a torsion free cover of M :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & C' & \\ f \swarrow & \downarrow \phi & \\ C & \xrightarrow{\phi} & M \end{array}$$

In [2], E. Enochs proved that torsion free covers exist for integral domains. That is, he showed that any module over an integral domain has a torsion free cover. Enochs' proof uses injectives and their properties in $R\text{-Mod}$ in a fundamental way, and therefore Baer's Lemma for $R\text{-Mod}$ comes into play. For example, Enochs uses the well-known fact that every torsion-free module over an integral domain can be imbedded in a torsion free injective module.

In [3], the question was raised whether objects in the category q_ω have torsion free covers. By using the above generalization of Baer's Lemma, we will show in a forthcoming paper that torsion free covers exist for the category q_ω .

References

- [1] *R. Baer*: Abelian groups that are direct summands of every containing abelian group. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. *46* (1940), 800–806.
- [2] *E. Enochs*: Torsion free covering modules. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. *14* (1963), 884–889.
- [3] *M. Dunkum Wesley*: Torsion free covers of graded and filtered modules. Ph.D. thesis, University of Kentucky, 2005.

Author's address: Molly Dunkum, Department of Mathematics, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY 42101, e-mail: molly.dunkum@wku.edu.