PROCEEDINGS OF THE
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Volume 120, Number 1, January 1994

ENDOMORPHISM RINGS OF NONDEGENERATE MODULES

ZHOU ZHENGPING

(Communicated by Maurice Auslander)

ABSTRACT. Let ${}_RM$ be a left R-module whose Morita context is nondegenerate, $S = \mathrm{End}({}_RM)$, and $N = \mathrm{Hom}({}_RM, R)$. If ${}_RM$ is also nonsingular, then the main results of Khuri (Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **96** (1986), 553–559) are the following: (1) S is left (right) strongly modular if and only if any element of S which has zero kernel in ${}_RM(N_R)$ has essential image in ${}_RM(N_R)$; (2) S is a left (right) Utumi ring if and only if every submodule ${}_RU$ of ${}_RM$ (U_R^* of N_R) such that $U^\perp = 0$ (${}^\perp U^* = 0$) is essential in ${}_RM(N_R)$. In this paper, we show that the same results hold in any nondegenerate Morita context without ${}_RM$ being nonsingular and that S is right nonsingular if and only if N_R is nonsingular.

1. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper, R and S are associative rings with identity. The left and right annihilators in S of a subset K of S will be denoted by $l(K)$ and $r(K)$, respectively. The notation $l_M(K)$, $r_N(K)$, $r_S(U)$, $l_S(U^*)$ will be used for annihilators in ${}_RM$ of $K \subseteq S$, in N_R of $K \subseteq S$, in S of $U \subseteq {}_RM$, and in S of $U^* \subseteq N_R$, respectively. The notation $U \subseteq_e {}_RM$ will be used to indicate that U is an essential R-submodule of ${}_RM$. Recall that ${}_RM$ is said to be nonsingular if, for $m \in {}_RM$, $\mathrm{ann}_R(m) \subseteq_e R$, then $m = 0$.

Recall that a Morita context (R, M, N, S) consists of two rings R and S, two bimodules ${}_RM_S$ and ${}_SN_R$, and two bimodule homomorphisms $(-,-)$: $M \otimes_S N \to R$ and $[-,-]$: $N \otimes_R M \to S$ satisfying $m[n, m'] = (m, n)m'$ and $n(m, n') = [n, m]n'$ for all $m, m' \in M$ and $n, n' \in N$ with the images being I and J, respectively. I and J are both ideals and are called the trace ideals of the context.

(R, M, N, S) is said to be nondegenerate if the four modules ${}_RM$, M_S, ${}_SN$, N_R and the two pairings are faithful (the latter leading to the fact that $(m, N) = 0$ implies $m = 0$ and three analogous implications).

This is equivalent to the eight natural maps associated with the Morita context being injective (e.g., two of these maps are $m \mapsto (m, -)$ and $r \mapsto (n \mapsto nr) \in \mathrm{End}(N_R)$ for $m \in M$, $n \in N$, and $r \in R$). The standard context $(R, M, N = \mathrm{Hom}({}_RM, R), S = \mathrm{End}({}_RM))$ is nondegenerate if and only if ${}_RM$ is torsionless and faithful and ${}_RR$ is I-free; that is, $Ir \neq 0$ whenever

Received by the editors January 24, 1992 and, in revised form, May 5, 1992.
1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 16D80; Secondary 16D15.

$0 \neq r \in R$ [2]. In this case, the module ${}_RM$ is called nondegenerate; however, we will consistently work on a general Morita context instead of a standard one from a module.

Proposition 1. *(R, M, N, S) is nondegenerate if and only if all R-modules and all S-modules associated are I-free, resp., J-free.*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$ If $m \in M$ and $\mathrm{I}m = 0$, then $\mathrm{I}m = (M, N)m = M[N, m] = 0 \Rightarrow [N, m] = 0$ since M_S is faithful $\Rightarrow m = 0$ since $[N, -]$ is faithful. Similarly we can show that ${}_RR$, R_R, N_R are I-free and M_S, ${}_SN$, ${}_SS$, and S_S are J-free.

$\Leftarrow$ If $r \in R$ and $rM = 0$, then $(rM, N) = r(M, N) = 0 \Rightarrow r = 0$ since R_R is I-free $\Rightarrow {}_RM$ is faithful. If $s \in S$, $sN = 0$, then $[sN, M] = s[N, M] = 0 \Rightarrow s = 0$ since S_S is J-free $\Rightarrow {}_SN$ is faithful.

Similarly we can show that M_S, N_R, and the two pairings are faithful.

2. Main results

First we need the following useful lemma.

Lemma 2. *If ${}_RM$ is I-free and ${}_SS$ is J-free, then*:

(a) $K \subseteq_e H \subseteq {}_SS \Leftrightarrow MK \subseteq_e MH$.
(b) $U \subseteq_e U_1 \subseteq {}_RM \Leftrightarrow [N, U] \subseteq_e [N, U_1]$.
(c) $U \subseteq_e {}_RM \Leftrightarrow [N, U] \subseteq_e {}_SS$.

If N_R is I-free and S_S is J-free, then:

(a′) $K \subseteq_e H \subseteq S_S \Leftrightarrow KN \subseteq_e HN$.
(b′) $U^* \subseteq_e U_1^* \subseteq N_R \Leftrightarrow [U^*, M] \subseteq_e [U_1^*, M]$.
(c′) $U^* \subseteq_e N_R \Leftrightarrow [U^*, M] \subseteq_e S_S$.

Proof. We only prove (a′) and (b′); the rest of the proof is similar.

(a′) $\Rightarrow$ First we note that under the assumption, we have $[n, M] \neq 0$ whenever $0 \neq n \in N$ and ${}_SN$ is faithful. In fact, $[n, M] = 0 \Rightarrow [n, M]N = n(M, N) = 0 \Rightarrow n = 0$ since N_R is I-free, and $sN = 0 \Rightarrow [sN, M] = s[N, M] = 0 \Rightarrow s = 0$ since S_S is J-free. Now assume that $K \subseteq_e H \subseteq S_S$ and $0 \neq n = \sum_{i=1}^m h_i n_i \in HN$ with $h_i \in H$, $n_i \in N$. Then $0 \neq [n, M] = \sum_{i=1}^m h_i[n_i, M] \subseteq H \Rightarrow K \cap [n, M] \neq 0 \Rightarrow 0 \neq (K \cap [n, M])N \subseteq KN \cap [n, M]N = KN \cap n(M, N) \subseteq KN \cap nR \Rightarrow KN \subseteq_e HN$.

$\Leftarrow$ If $0 \neq h \in H$, then $0 \neq hN \Rightarrow 0 \neq KN \cap hN \Rightarrow 0 \neq [KN \cap hN, M] \subseteq [KN, M] \cap [hN, M] = K[N, M] \cap h[N, M] \subseteq K \cap hS \Rightarrow K \subseteq_e H$.

(b′) $\Rightarrow$ Let $0 \neq s \in [U_1^*, M]$. Then $0 \neq sN \subseteq [U_1^*, M]N \subseteq U_1^*(M, N) \subseteq U_1^* \Rightarrow 0 \neq U^* \cap sN \Rightarrow 0 \neq [U^* \cap sN, M] \subseteq [U^*, M] \cap [sN, M] = [U^*, M] \cap s[N, M] \subseteq [U^*, M] \cap sS \Rightarrow [U^*, M] \subseteq_e [U_1^*, M]$.

$\Leftarrow$ Let $0 \neq u \in U_1^*$. Then $[u, M] \neq 0 \Rightarrow [U^*, M] \cap [u, M] \neq 0 \Rightarrow 0 \neq ([U^*, M] \cap [u, M])N \subseteq [U^*, M]N \cap [u, M]N = U^*(M, N) \cap u(M, N) \subseteq U^* \cap uR \Rightarrow U^* \subseteq_e U_1^*$.

It is known that if (R, M, N, S) is nondegenerate and one of ${}_RR$, ${}_RM$, ${}_SN$, ${}_SS$ is nonsingular, then all of them are nonsingular [2, Proposition 14]. It seems unsure in [1] whether S_S nonsingular implies that N_R is nonsingular (see [1, §1]), since ${}_SS$ is, in general, only a proper subring of $\mathrm{End}(N_R)$. But, in fact, by the symmetry of a Morita context and the condition of nondegeneracy, the following is also true.

Proposition 3. (1) *If* (R, M, N, S) *is a Morita context and* N_R *is* I*-free and* S_S *is* J*-free, then* N_R *is nonsingular if and only if* S_S *is nonsingular.*

(2) *If* (R, M, N, S) *is nondegenerate, and if one of* R_R, M_S, N_R, S_S *is nonsingular, then all of them are nonsingular.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ If $s \in S$, $K \subseteq_e S_S$ such that $sK = 0$, then $sKN = 0$, but $KN \subseteq_e N$ by Lemma 2(a$'$) $\Rightarrow sN = 0$ since N_R is nonsingular $\Rightarrow s = 0$, i.e., S_S is nonsingular.

$\Leftarrow$ We show that if N_R is not nonsingular, then neither is S_S. If $0 \neq n \in N$ such that $nP = 0$, $P \subseteq_e R_R$, then $[n, m] \neq 0$ for some $m \in M$ (since $[n, M] \neq 0$ from the proof of Lemma 2). If $n' \in N$ such that $[n, m]n' \neq 0$, then $0 \neq n(m, n') \Rightarrow (m, n') \neq 0 \Rightarrow P \cap (m, n')R \neq 0 \Rightarrow$ there is an $r \in R$ such that $(m, n')r \neq 0$, but $n(m, n')r = 0 \Rightarrow [n, m]n'r = 0$ but $n'r \neq 0$; otherwise, $(m, n')r = 0$, which means $U^* = \{n' \in N,\ [n, m]n' = 0\} \subseteq_e N_R \Rightarrow [U^*, M] \subseteq_e S_S$, but $[n, m][U^*, M] = 0 \Rightarrow S_S$ is not nonsingular.

(2) The proof is the same as Proposition 14 of [2].

Corollary 4. *Let* (R, M, N, S) *be nondegenerate. Then the following are equivalent*:

(1) S_S *is nonsingular.*
(2) N_R *is nonsingular.*
(3) *For any* $U^* \subseteq_e N_R \Rightarrow l_S(U^*) = 0$.

Proof. Combine [1, Proposition 5] and our previous proposition.

A ring S is called left strongly modular if, for $s \in S$, $l(s) = 0 \Rightarrow Ss \subseteq_e {}_SS$, and right strongly modular if $r(s) = 0 \Rightarrow sS \subseteq_e S_S$ [1]. Now we have

Theorem 5. *Let* (R, M, N, S) *be nondegenerate. Then*

(1) S *is left strongly modular if and only if, for each* $s \in S$, $l_M(s) = 0 \Rightarrow Ms \subseteq_e {}_RM$.
(2) S *is right strongly modular if and only if, for each* $s \in S$, $r_N(s) = 0 \Rightarrow sN \subseteq_e N_R$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ If $l_M(s) = 0$ and $s's = 0$, then $Ms's = (Ms')s = 0 \Rightarrow Ms' = 0 \Rightarrow s' = 0$ since M_S is faithful $\Rightarrow l(s) = 0 \Rightarrow Ss \subseteq_e {}_SS$ by the assumption $\Rightarrow Ms = MSs \subseteq_e MS = M$ by Lemma 2(a).

$\Leftarrow$ If $l(s) = 0$ and $ms = 0$, $m \in M$, $s \in S$, then $[N, ms] = [N, m]s = 0 \Rightarrow [N, m] = 0 \Rightarrow m = 0$ since $[N, -]$ is faithful $\Rightarrow l_M(s) = 0 \Rightarrow Ms \subseteq_e {}_RM \Rightarrow [N, Ms] = [N, M]s \subseteq_e {}_SS$ by Lemma 2(c) $\Rightarrow Ss \subseteq_e {}_SS$.

(2) Similarly.

Recall that a ring S is called left Utumi if $K \subseteq {}_SS$ and $r(K) = 0 \Rightarrow K \subseteq_e {}_SS$; S is called right Utumi if $H \subseteq S_S$ and $l(H) = 0 \Rightarrow H \subseteq_e S_S$ [1]. If $U \subseteq {}_RM$, $U^* \subseteq N_R$, let $U^\perp = \{n \in N,\ (U, n) = 0\}$, ${}^\perp U^* = \{m \in M,\ (m, U^*) = 0\}$.

Lemma 6. *Let* (R, M, N, S) *be nondegenerate. Then*:

(1) $r_S(U) = r([N, U])$, $l_S(U^*) = l([U^*, M])$.
(2) $r_S(U) = 0 \Leftrightarrow U^\perp = 0$, $l_S(U^*) = 0 \Leftrightarrow {}^\perp U^* = 0$.
(3) $r(K) = r_S(MK)$, $l(K) = l_S(KN)$.

Proof. We only prove (2); the rest is straightforward.

If $r_S(U) = 0$ and $(U, n) = 0 \Rightarrow (U, n)M = 0 \Rightarrow U[n, M] = 0 \Rightarrow [n, M] = 0 \Rightarrow n = 0 \Rightarrow U^\perp = 0$. On the other hand, $U^\perp = 0$ and $Us = 0 \Rightarrow [N, Us] =$

$0 \Rightarrow [N, Us]N = N(Us, N) = N(U, sN) = 0 \Rightarrow (U, sN) = 0 \Rightarrow sN = 0 \Rightarrow s = 0 \Rightarrow r_S(U) = 0$.

If $l_S(U^*) = 0$ and $(m, U^*) = 0 \Rightarrow N(m, U^*) = [N, m]U^* = 0 \Rightarrow [N, m] = 0 \Rightarrow m = 0 \Rightarrow {}^{\perp}U^* = 0$. On the other hand, if ${}^{\perp}U^* = 0$ and $sU^* = 0 \Rightarrow (M, sU^*) = (Ms, U^*) = 0 \Rightarrow Ms = 0 \Rightarrow s = 0 \Rightarrow l_S(U^*) = 0$.

Theorem 7. *Let (R, M, N, S) be nondegenerate. Then the following are equivalent*:

(a) *S is left Utumi.*
(b) *For any $U \subseteq {}_RM$, $U^{\perp} = 0 \Rightarrow U \subseteq_{\mathrm{e}} {}_RM$.*
(c) *For any $U \subseteq {}_RM$, $r_S(U) = 0 \Rightarrow U \subseteq_{\mathrm{e}} {}_RM$.*

The following are also equivalent:

(a′) *S is right Utumi.*
(b′) *For any $U^* \subseteq N_R$, ${}^{\perp}U^* = 0 \Rightarrow U^* \subseteq_{\mathrm{e}} N_R$.*
(c′) *For any $U^* \subseteq N_R$, $l_S(U^*) = 0 \Rightarrow U^* \subseteq_{\mathrm{e}} N_R$.*

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) By Lemma 6(1), (2), $U^{\perp} = 0 \Rightarrow r_S(U) = 0 \Rightarrow r([N, U]) = 0 \Rightarrow [N, U] \subseteq_{\mathrm{e}} {}_SS$ since S is left Utumi $\Rightarrow U \subseteq_{\mathrm{e}} {}_RM$ by Lemma 2(c).

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) By Lemma 6(3), if $K \subseteq {}_SS$ and $r(K) = 0 \Rightarrow r_S(MK) = 0 \Rightarrow MK \subseteq_{\mathrm{e}} {}_RM \Rightarrow K \subseteq_{\mathrm{e}} y_SS$ by Lemma 2(a).

(b) $\Leftrightarrow$ (c) follows from Lemma 6(2).

(a′) $\Leftrightarrow$ (b′) $\Leftrightarrow$ (c′) come from the symmetry.

In [3, Theorem 3.3], it is shown that a right and left nonsingular ring S has isomorphic maximal left and right quotient rings if and only if S is both right and left Utumi. Therefore, we have the following:

Corollary 8. *Let (R, M, N, S) be nondegenerate and ${}_RM$, N_R nonsingular. Then S has isomorphic maximal left and right quotient rings if and only if one of* (a), (b), (c) *and one of* (a′), (b′), (c′) *in Theorem* 7 *hold.*

Finally, we observe that there is no difference between the roles of R and S in a nondegenerate Morita context in the situation under consideration, so we can have all versions related to R, M_S, and ${}_SN$ of all the results in this paper simply from symmetry.

Acknowledgment

The author is greatly indebted to Professor Kent R. Fuller for his encouragement and help during the preparation of this paper.

References

1. S. M. Khuri, *Properties of endomorphism rings of modules and their duals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **96** (1986), 553–559.
2. B. J. Müller, *The quotient category of a Morita context*, J. Algebra **28** (1974), 389–407.
3. Y. Utumi, *On rings of which any one-sided quotient ring is two-sided*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (1963), 141–147.

Department of Mathematics, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242
E-mail address: zhou@math.uiowa.edu