

## ATOMICAL GROTHENDIECK CATEGORIES

C. NĂSTĂESCU and B. TORRECILLAS

Received 11 September 2002

Motivated by the study of Gabriel dimension of a Grothendieck category, we introduce the concept of atomical Grothendieck category, which has only two localizing subcategories, and we give a classification of this type of Grothendieck categories.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 18E15, 16S90.

**1. Introduction.** Given a Grothendieck category  $\mathcal{A}$ , we can associate with it the lattice of all localizing categories of  $\mathcal{A}$  and denote it by  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A})$ . We will show (Theorem 3.3) that if  $\mathcal{A}$  has Gabriel dimension, then the lattice  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A})$  is semi-Artinian. Moreover, the Gabriel dimension of  $\mathcal{A}$  is exactly the Loewy length of this lattice. Example 3.4 proves that the converse statement does not hold. (Therefore, the properties of the lattice  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A})$  do not determine the properties of the category  $\mathcal{A}$ .) These facts suggest introducing the concept of atomical Grothendieck category. Precisely,  $\mathcal{A}$  will be called atomical if the lattice  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A})$  has only two elements, that is,  $\mathcal{A}$  has only two localizing subcategories, namely,  $\{0\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ . The classification of atomical Grothendieck categories is given in Section 4.

**2. Preliminaries.** Throughout this paper,  $\mathcal{A}$  will denote a Grothendieck category, that is, an abelian category with a generator, such that colimits exist and direct limits are exact.

It is well known that in a Grothendieck category each object  $X$  has an injective hull, denoted in the sequel by  $E(X)$ .

If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a category, then by a subcategory  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  we will always mean a full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

A subcategory  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  is called *closed* (or hereditary pretorsion class) if it is closed with respect to kernels, cokernels, and direct sums.

By  $\sigma[X]$  we denote the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  whose objects are subobjects of  $X$ -generated objects. These objects are said to be subgenerated by  $X$ , and  $X$  is a subgenerator of  $\sigma[X]$ . This is the smallest closed full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  containing  $X$ .

By definition, the objects of  $\sigma[X]$  form a closed subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$ . On the other hand, every closed subcategory  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  is of the form  $\sigma[X]$  for some object  $X$ ; for example, for  $X$  equals the direct sum of all (nonisomorphic) cyclic objects in  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Following Goldman [2], a functor  $\tau : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is called a kernel functor if

- (1) it is a subfunctor of the identity functor, that is,  $\tau(M) \subseteq M$  and  $f : M \rightarrow M'$  implies  $f(\tau(M)) \subseteq \tau(M')$ ;
- (2)  $N \subseteq M$  implies  $\tau(N) = N \cap \tau(M)$ .

The trivial kernel functors  $0$  and  $\infty$  are defined by setting  $0(X) = 0$ , and  $\infty(X) = X$ , for every object  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ .

For any kernel functor  $\tau$ ,  $X$  is called a  $\tau$ -torsion module if  $\tau(X) = X$ , and a  $\tau$ -torsion-free module if  $\tau(X) = 0$ . The collection of  $\mathcal{T}_\tau$  of all the  $\tau$ -torsion module is a closed subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Conversely, for any closed subcategory  $\mathcal{C}$ , there exists a unique kernel functor  $\tau$  such that  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{T}_\tau$ .

**LEMMA 2.1.** *Let  $G$  be a generator of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  a closed subcategory. Then*

$$\mathcal{C} = \sigma[\oplus \{G/X \mid G/X \in \mathcal{C}\}]. \quad (2.1)$$

**COROLLARY 2.2.** *The closed subcategories (and hence, the kernel functors) form a set.*

**PROPOSITION 2.3.** *The set of all closed subcategories of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a complete lattice. For a family  $\{X_\lambda\}_\Lambda$  of objects of  $\mathcal{A}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee_{\Lambda} \sigma[X_\lambda] &= \sigma[\oplus_{\Lambda} X_\lambda], \\ \bigwedge_{\Lambda} \sigma[X_\lambda] &= \bigcap_{\Lambda} \sigma[X_\lambda]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

**REMARK 2.4.** (1) (cf. [4]). For a coalgebra  $C$ , the lattice of all closed subcategories of the category of comodules over  $C$  is anti-isomorphic to the lattice of subcoalgebras of  $C$ .

(2) The Serre subcategories of  $\mathcal{A}$  (i.e., the subcategories  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying that for any exact sequence from  $\mathcal{A}$ ,

$$0 \rightarrow X'' \rightarrow X \rightarrow X' \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $X$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$  if and only if  $X'$  and  $X''$  are in  $\mathcal{S}$ ) do not form a set. For example, we consider the Grothendieck category  $\mathcal{V}$  of vector spaces over a division ring. For any cardinal  $\alpha$ , the subcategory of all vector spaces of dimension less than or equal to  $\alpha$  is a Serre subcategory. Thus, the Serre subcategories of  $\mathcal{V}$  are not a set.

We now recall the notion of semi-Artinian lattice. Let  $L$  be an upper continuous and modular lattice. An atom of  $L$  is a nonzero element  $a \in L$  such that whenever  $b \in L$  and  $b < a$ , then  $b = 0$ , that is, the interval  $[0, a]$  has exactly two elements,  $0$  and  $a$ . If  $a, b \in L$  and  $x < y$ , then the interval  $[x, y]$  is simple if  $y$  is an atom in the sublattice  $[x, y]$  of  $L$ . The lattice is called semiatomic if  $1$  is a joint of atoms, and  $L$  is called *semi-Artinian* if for every  $x \in L$ ,  $x \neq 1$ , the sublattice  $[x, 1]$  of  $L$  contains an atom.

The (ascending) Loewy series of  $L$ ,

$$s_0(L) < s_1(L) < \cdots < s_{\lambda(L)}(L), \tag{2.4}$$

is defined recursively as follows:  $s_0(L) = 0$ ,  $s_1(L)$  is the socle  $\text{Soc}(L)$  of  $L$  (i.e., the join of all atoms of  $L$ ), and if the elements  $s_\beta(L)$  of  $L$  have been defined for all ordinals  $\beta < \alpha$ , then  $s_\alpha(L) = \bigvee_{\beta < \alpha} s_\beta(L)$  if  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal and  $s_\alpha = \text{Soc}([s_\gamma(L), 1])$  if  $\alpha = \gamma + 1$ .

The Loewy length  $\lambda(L)$  of  $L$  is the least ordinal such that  $s_\lambda(L) = s_{\lambda+1}(L)$ .

**3. Gabriel dimension and localizing subcategories.** A subcategory  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is a localizing subcategory if it is closed under subobjects, quotient objects, extensions, and coproducts. If  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is an arbitrary subcategory, we denote by  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{B})$  the smallest localizing subcategory containing  $\mathcal{B}$ .

**EXAMPLES 3.1.** (i) An object  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  is *singular* if there exists a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow A'' \rightarrow A' \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where the monomorphism is essential.

In any Grothendieck category, we can always consider the *Goldie localizing subcategory*, denoted by  $\mathcal{G}$ , as the smallest localizing subcategory containing the singular objects.

(ii) We can associate to any injective object  $E \in \mathcal{A}$  a localizing subcategory

$$\mathcal{T}_E = \{A \in \mathcal{A} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, E) = 0\}. \tag{3.2}$$

This localizing subcategory is said to be cogenerated by  $E$ .

(iii) For a projective object  $P \in \mathcal{A}$ , we can define

$$\mathcal{T}_P = \{A \in \mathcal{A} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(P, A) = 0\}. \tag{3.3}$$

It is clear that  $\mathcal{T}_P$  is a localizing subcategory closed under direct product.

(iv) If  $S$  is a simple object in  $\mathcal{A}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{A}_S$  the smallest localizing subcategory containing  $S$ . In fact,

$$\mathcal{A}_S = \{M \in \mathcal{A} \mid N \subset M, M/N \text{ contains a simple object isomorphic to } S\}. \tag{3.4}$$

The objects in this localizing subcategory are called  $S$ -primary.

Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a localizing subcategory. The corresponding torsion functor or idempotent kernel functor is denoted by

$$t_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}. \tag{3.5}$$

This functor assigns to an object  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  the maximal subobject  $t_{\mathcal{T}}(A) \subseteq A$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . An object  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathcal{T}$ -torsion-free (resp.,  $\mathcal{T}$ -torsion) if  $t_{\mathcal{T}}(X) = 0$  (resp.,

$t_{\mathcal{T}}(X) = X$ ). Let  $H^1 t_{\mathcal{T}}$  denote the first higher derived functor of the left exact functor  $t_{\mathcal{T}}$ . A  $\mathcal{T}$ -torsion-free object  $E \in \mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathcal{T}$ -closed if  $H^1 t_{\mathcal{T}} = 0$ .

If  $\mathcal{T}$  is a localizing subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ , we can consider the quotient category  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{T}$ . We denote by  $T_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{T}$  the canonical functor and by  $S_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  the right adjoint functor of  $T_{\mathcal{T}}$ .

It is well known that the category  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{T}$  is equivalent to the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathcal{T}$ -closed objects.

It is well known that  $\mathcal{A}$  has a set of localizing subcategories  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A})$ . Given a family of localizing subcategories  $(\mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I}$ , we define the meet by  $\bigwedge_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i = \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i$ , and the join by  $\bigvee_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i$ , as the smallest localizing subcategory containing the union of the  $\mathcal{C}_i$ . Notice that  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A})$  is not a sublattice of the lattice of all closed subcategories of  $\mathcal{A}$ . It is also known that this set is a frame (i.e., it is a complete lattice  $L$  such that  $a \wedge (\bigvee X) = \bigvee \{a \wedge x \mid x \in X\}$  for each element  $a$  and subset  $X$  of  $L$ ). Frames are also known as local lattices, complete Heyting algebras, or complete Brouwerian lattices. The lattice of closed subcategories is not a frame in general.

We need the following preliminary result.

**PROPOSITION 3.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a Grothendieck category and let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a localizing subcategory. There exists a bijective correspondence between the localizing subcategories of  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}$  and the localizing subcategories  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  containing  $\mathcal{C}$ . Moreover,  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C})$  is a subframe of  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A})$*

**PROOF.** Let  $T : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}$  be the canonical functor. Consider  $\mathcal{B}$ , a localizing subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  containing  $\mathcal{C}$ , then  $T(\mathcal{B}) = \{Z \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C} \mid Z \cong T(X), X \in \mathcal{B}\}$  is a localizing subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}$ . In fact, it is clear that  $T(\mathcal{B})$  is closed under subobjects, quotients, and direct sums. It remains to show that  $T(\mathcal{B})$  is closed under extensions. First, we observe that  $T(\mathcal{B}) = \{Z \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C} \mid S(Z) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ . To see this, consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } f \rightarrow X \rightarrow ST(X) \cong S(Z) \rightarrow \text{Coker } f \rightarrow 0, \tag{3.6}$$

where  $\text{Ker } f, \text{Coker } f \in \mathcal{C}$ . Therefore,  $\text{Ker } f, \text{Coker } f \in \mathcal{B}$ , and  $X \in \mathcal{B}$  if and only if  $S(Z) \in \mathcal{B}$ . Now if

$$0 \rightarrow Z' \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Z'' \rightarrow 0 \tag{3.7}$$

is an exact sequence in  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}$ , with  $Z', Z'' \in T(\mathcal{B})$ , we apply the functor  $S$  to obtain

$$0 \rightarrow S(Z') \rightarrow S(Z) \rightarrow S(Z''). \tag{3.8}$$

Thus,  $S(Z) \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $Z \in T(\mathcal{B})$ .

Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a localizing subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}$ . we define  $T^{-1}\mathcal{D} = \{X \in \mathcal{A} \mid T(X) \in \mathcal{D}\}$ . Since  $T$  is an exact functor which commutes with direct sums, then  $T^{-1}(\mathcal{D})$  is a localizing subcategory which contains  $\mathcal{C}$ . It is not difficult to see that these

two operations establish a bijection between the localizing subcategories of  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}$  and the localizing subcategories  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  containing  $\mathcal{C}$ .  $\square$

We now recall the notion of Gabriel dimension of a Grothendieck category  $\mathcal{A}$ . For any ordinal  $\alpha$ , we will denote by  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$  the localizing subcategory defined in the following way:  $\mathcal{C}_0$  is the zero subcategory;  $\mathcal{C}_1$  is the smallest localizing subcategory containing all simple objects; if  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ , an object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  will be contained in  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$  if and only if  $T_\beta(X) \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}_\beta)_1$ , where  $T_\beta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}_\beta$  is the canonical functor; and if  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal, then  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$  is the localizing subcategory generated by all localizing subcategories  $\mathcal{C}_\beta$ , with  $\beta < \alpha$ .

It is clear that if  $\alpha \leq \alpha'$ , then  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\alpha'}$ . Hence, there exists an ordinal  $\tau$  such that  $\mathcal{C}_\tau = \mathcal{C}_\alpha$  for any ordinal  $\alpha \geq \tau$ . We define  $\mathcal{C}_\tau = \cup_{\alpha} \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ .

The set of localizing subcategories  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$  is called the *Gabriel filtration* of  $\mathcal{A}$ . We say that an object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  has *Gabriel dimension* if  $X$  is in  $\mathcal{C}_\tau$ . Then the smallest ordinal  $\alpha$  verifying  $X \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$  is called the Gabriel dimension of  $X$ .

We say that  $\mathcal{A}$  has Gabriel dimension if  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C}_\tau$  or, equivalently, any object of  $\mathcal{A}$  has Gabriel dimension. We are now ready for the main result of this section.

**THEOREM 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be Grothendieck category. If  $\mathcal{A}$  has Gabriel dimension  $\alpha$ , then  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A})$  is a semi-Artinian lattice with Loewy length  $\alpha$ .*

**PROOF.** We will show this result by transfinite induction. If  $G\text{-dim } \mathcal{A} = 1$ , then  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C}_1$ , the localizing subcategory generated by the simple objects of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{A} = \bigvee \mathcal{C}_S$ .

Now, we assume that the result is true for any Grothendieck category of Gabriel dimension  $\beta < \alpha$ . If  $\alpha = \gamma + 1$  is not a limit ordinal, then any object  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$  or, equivalently,  $T_\gamma(X) \in (\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}_\gamma)_1$ . Now,  $\mathcal{C}_\gamma = s_\gamma(\text{Tors}(\mathcal{C}_\gamma))$ . If  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  satisfies that  $T_\gamma(X)$  is a simple object in  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}_\gamma$ , then  $(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}_\gamma)_{T_\gamma(X)}$  is an atom in  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}_\gamma)$ . By Proposition 3.2,  $T_\gamma^{-1}((\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}_\gamma)_{T_\gamma(X)})$  is an atom in  $[\mathcal{C}_\gamma, \mathcal{A}]$ . We will see that  $\mathcal{A} = \bigvee T_\gamma^{-1}((\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}_\gamma)_{T_\gamma(X)})$ . Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and consider  $A \rightarrow A' \rightarrow 0$ , with  $A' \neq 0$ . Applying the functor  $T_\gamma$ , we obtain  $T_\gamma(A) \rightarrow T_\gamma(A') \rightarrow 0$ . If  $T_\gamma(A') = 0$ , the proof is finished; otherwise  $T_\gamma(A')$  contains a simple object  $T_\gamma(X)$ . Therefore, we have  $K \rightarrow X \rightarrow A'$  and  $A'$  contains  $X/K$  which is in  $T_\gamma^{-1}((\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{C}_\gamma)_{T_\gamma(X)})$ . If  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{C}_\beta$ , then  $\mathcal{A} = \bigvee_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{C}_\beta$ .  $\square$

The next example shows that the converse of Theorem 3.3 is not true.

**EXAMPLE 3.4.** Let  $R$  be a commutative nondiscrete valuation domain of Krull dimension 1, with maximal ideal  $M$ . Then

- (i)  $M^2 = M$ ,
- (ii) if  $x \in M$ , then  $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} Rx^n = 0$ ,
- (iii)  $\text{Tors}(R\text{-Mod})$  has four elements:

$$\{0\} \subseteq (R\text{-Mod})_{R/M} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \subseteq R\text{-Mod}, \tag{3.9}$$

where  $\mathcal{T}$  is the usual torsion theory in a domain and  $(R\text{-Mod})_{R/M}$  is a semisimple category,

- (iv) the quotient category  $R\text{-Mod}/(R\text{-Mod})_{R/M}$  has no simple objects,
- (v)  $R\text{-Mod}$  has no Gabriel dimension.

**PROOF.** (i) Take  $x \in M$ . Since the valuation is not discrete, we can find an element  $y \in M$  such that  $v(y^2) = 2v(y) < v(x)$ . Hence,  $x \in (y^2) \subseteq M^2$  and  $M = M^2$ .

(ii) Let  $\mathfrak{Q} = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} Rx^n$ . We claim that  $\mathfrak{Q}$  is a prime ideal. Let  $a, b \in R$  with  $a \notin \mathfrak{Q}$  and  $b \notin \mathfrak{Q}$ . Hence, there exist  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $a \notin Rx^n$  and  $b \notin Rx^m$ . Thus,  $Rx^n \subset Ra$  and  $Rx^m \subset Rb$ . Then  $Rx^{n+m} \subset Rx^n b \subset Rab$  and  $ab \notin \mathfrak{Q}$ . Therefore,  $\mathfrak{Q} = 0$ .

(iii) Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a localizing subcategory properly containing  $(R\text{-Mod})_{R/M}$  and let  $I$  be a nonzero ideal. We take  $J \subsetneq M$  with  $R/J \in \mathcal{C}$ . Thus, there exist  $x \in M \setminus J$ . By (ii),  $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} Rx^n = 0$ , and it follows that  $Rx^n \subseteq I$  for some  $n$  and  $R/I \in \mathcal{C}$ .

(iv) Any simple object of  $R\text{-Mod}/(R\text{-Mod})_{R/M}$  is given by an  $(R\text{-Mod})_{R/M}$ -critical ideal, but this kind of ideals is prime. This prime is 0. So the cocritical module is isomorphic to  $R$ . Therefore,  $R/I$  is semisimple for every nonzero ideal  $I$  of  $R$ —a contradiction.

(v) The proof follows from (iv). □

**4. Atomical Grothendieck categories.** We have proved in [Theorem 3.3](#) that if a Grothendieck category has Gabriel dimension, then the lattice of localizing subcategories is semi-Artinian. [Example 3.4](#) shows that the converse is not true. This fact suggests the study of Grothendieck categories  $\mathcal{A}$  with the property that the category  $\mathcal{A}$  is an atom in the lattice  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A})$ , that is,  $\mathcal{A}$  has only two localizing subcategories  $\{0\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**DEFINITION 4.1.** A Grothendieck category  $\mathcal{A}$  is called *atomical* if it has only two localizing subcategories, namely,  $\{0\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ .

A maximal localizing category  $\mathcal{T}$  is a maximal element of  $\text{Tors}(\mathcal{A}) - \mathcal{A}$ . By [Proposition 3.2](#),  $\mathcal{A}$  is a maximal localizing category of  $\mathcal{A}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{T}$  is an atomical Grothendieck category.

Recall that an object  $C$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  is called a *cogenerator* if for each nonzero morphism  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , there exists a morphism  $g : Y \rightarrow C$  such that  $gf \neq 0$ . This is equivalent to the existence of a monomorphism  $A \rightarrow C^I$  for some index set  $I$ , for every object  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . It is clear that an injective object  $E$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a cogenerator if and only if for each nonzero object  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , there exists a nonzero morphism  $f : A \rightarrow E$ .

**PROPOSITION 4.2.** *If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a Grothendieck category, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is an atomical category if and only if every nonzero injective object of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a cogenerator.*

*Moreover, if the category has enough projectives, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is an atomical category if and only if every nonzero projective object of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a generator.*

**PROOF.** Assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is atomical, then any nonzero injective object generates a nonzero torsion-free class. Hence, this torsion-free class must be

the whole category and this injective is a cogenerator. Since any localizing subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  is cogenerated by an injective object, the converse is clear.  $\square$

It is clear that for an atomical Grothendieck category  $\mathcal{A}$ , we have that the Goldie torsion theory has to be either  $\{0\}$  or  $\mathcal{A}$ . In the first case, we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a nonsingular Grothendieck category and we characterize this type of simple Grothendieck categories. Recall that a Grothendieck category  $\mathcal{A}$  is called spectral if any short exact sequence splits and a spectral Grothendieck category is called discrete if every object is semisimple.

**PROPOSITION 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a Grothendieck category. The category  $\mathcal{A}$  is nonsingular atomical if and only if  $\mathcal{A}$  is a spectral category which is equivalent to  $R\text{-Mod}/\mathcal{G}$ , where  $R$  is a regular prime self-injective ring and  $\mathcal{G}$  is the Goldie localizing subcategory. Moreover,  $\mathcal{A}$  contains a simple object if and only if  $R$  is isomorphic to the ring of all linear transformations of a left vector space over a division ring.*

**PROOF.** Suppose  $\mathcal{A}$  is nonsingular and atomical. Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is nonsingular, then  $\mathcal{G} = 0$ . Hence,  $X \subseteq' E(X)$  with  $E(X)/X$  singular, a matter which implies that  $X = E(X)$  and any object is injective. Thus,  $\mathcal{A}$  is a spectral Grothendieck category.

Let  $U$  be a generator of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $R = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(U, U)$ , by the Gabriel-Oberst theorem [5, Chapter XII, Theorem 1.3]  $\mathcal{A}$  is equivalent to  $R\text{-Mod}/\mathcal{G}$ , where  $R$  is a regular self-injective ring and  $\mathcal{G}$  is the Goldie's localizing subcategory. Since  $R\text{-Mod}/\mathcal{G}$  is atomical, then  $\mathcal{G}$  is maximal. Hence, by [1, Theorem 2.2],  $0 = t_{\mathcal{G}}(R)$  is a prime ideal.

Conversely, assume that  $R$  is a prime self-injective regular ring. Since  $R$  is prime, then it is nonsingular. Thus,  $t_{\mathcal{G}}(R) = 0$  is a prime ideal, where  $\mathcal{G}$  is a maximal localizing subcategory by [1, Theorem 2.2]. Therefore,  $R\text{-Mod}/\mathcal{G}$  is an atomical Grothendieck category.

Assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  contains a simple object, then  $\mathcal{A}$  coincides with the localizing subcategory generated by this simple object. Hence, as an object in  $R\text{-Mod}/\mathcal{G}$ ,  $R$  contains a simple object. Therefore, there exists a  $\mathcal{G}$ -cocritical left ideal  $C$  of  $R$ . If  $C$  is not simple as a left  $R$ -module, then we can find a finitely generated left ideal  $I \neq 0$  contained in  $C$ . Since  $R$  is regular, there exists a left ideal  $J$  such that  $I \oplus J = R$ . Thus,  $C = I \oplus (J \cap C)$ , which is a contradiction since  $I$  is essential in  $C$ . Therefore,  $C$  is a simple left ideal and  $\text{Soc}(R) \neq 0$ . By [3, Theorem 9.12],  $R$  is the ring of all linear transformations of any left vector space over a division ring.

Conversely, if  $R$  is the ring of all linear transformations of any left vector space over a division ring, then  $\text{Soc}(R)$  is not zero. Any simple left ideal will produce a simple object in the quotient category.  $\square$

We will now consider the case where the Goldie torsion theory coincides with the whole category. When the Grothendieck category contains simple objects,

we have the following characterization. Recall that a Grothendieck category  $\mathcal{A}$  is called semi-Artinian if every nonzero object of  $\mathcal{A}$  contains a simple object.

**PROPOSITION 4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a singular Grothendieck category. If  $\mathcal{A}$  is atomical, and it has simple objects, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is a semi-Artinian Grothendieck category with a unique isomorphic class of simple objects.*

**PROOF.** Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is atomical, the localizing subcategory generated by a simple object coincides with category  $\mathcal{A}$ . Hence, the result follows.  $\square$

**PROPOSITION 4.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a locally finitely generated Grothendieck category. Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is atomical if and only if any object of  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $S$ -primary, and  $\mathcal{A}$  is semisimple or singular.*

We now specialize our discussion to the module category  $R\text{-Mod}$ . In this case, we have the following result.

**PROPOSITION 4.6.**  *$R\text{-Mod}$  is an atomical category if and only if the ring  $R$  is local right perfect.*

**PROOF.** If  $R$  is local right perfect, then  $R\text{-Mod}$  is clearly atomical. Conversely, if  $R\text{-Mod}$  is atomical and  $R$  is nonsingular, then the Goldie torsion theory is trivial. Hence, any module is injective and  $R$  is semisimple. Since there is only an isomorphic class of simple modules,  $R$  is simple Artinian. We only need to consider the case when  $R$  is singular. But then  $R\text{-Mod} = (R\text{-Mod})_S$  for some simple left  $R$ -module  $S$  and there is only an isomorphic class of left simple  $R$ -modules. Thus,  $R$  is semi-Artinian and  $J = \text{ann}(S)$ . We will see that  $R/J$  is a simple Artinian ring. In fact, consider  $\text{Soc}(R/J) = A/J \neq 0$ . If  $A \neq R$ , then  $A \subseteq M$  for some maximal left ideal  $M$ . Therefore,  $A(R/M) = 0$  and  $A \subseteq \text{ann}(S) = J$ , a contradiction. Hence,  $A = R$  and  $R/J$  is simple Artinian. Since  $R$  is semi-Artinian,  $J$  is  $T$ -nilpotent. Since  $R/J$  is simple Artinian and  $J$  is  $T$ -nilpotent, then  $R$  is a local right perfect ring.  $\square$

Now, we consider the case of closed subcategories of  $R\text{-Mod}$ .

**COROLLARY 4.7.** *Let  $M$  be a left  $R$ -module. Then  $\sigma[M]$  is an atomical category if and only if either  $M$  is semisimple or  $M$  is  $S$ -primary with  $S$  a simple singular left  $R$ -module.*

Finally, we present an example of a singular atomical Grothendieck category without simple objects.

**EXAMPLE 4.8.** We consider the same ring as in [Example 3.4](#). Then the quotient category  $\mathcal{T}/(R\text{-Mod})_{(R/M)}$  is an atomical singular Grothendieck category without simple objects.

**PROOF.** We have proved that  $R\text{-Mod}/(R\text{-Mod})_{(R/M)}$  has no simple objects, then  $\mathcal{T}/(R\text{-Mod})_{(R/M)}$  has no simple objects. We also know from [Example 3.4](#) that this category is atomical. We will denote by  $T : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}/(R\text{-Mod})_{(R/M)}$  the



canonical functor. Let  $0 \neq I \subset M$  be an ideal of  $R$  such that  $I \neq M$ . It is clear that  $R/I \in \mathcal{T}$ , and  $R/I \notin (R\text{-Mod})_{(R/M)}$ . Let  $J/I$  be the torsion part of  $R/I \in (R\text{-Mod})_{(R/M)}$ . Since  $M^2 = M$ , then  $J \subset M$  and  $J \neq M$ . By the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow J/I \rightarrow R/I \rightarrow R/J \rightarrow 0, \tag{4.1}$$

it follows that  $T(R/I) \simeq T(R/J)$ . Since  $R$  is a valuation ring, we have that  $R/J$  is a uniform (coirreducible)  $R$ -module, so  $T(R/J)$  is still uniform in the quotient category. Denote  $X = T(R/J) \simeq T(R/I)$ . Then  $X$  is uniform and contains no simple objects (because the category does not have nonzero simple objects). Then we can consider  $Y$  as a nonzero subobject of  $X$  such that  $Y \neq X$ . It is clear that  $X/Y$  belongs to the Goldie torsion theory (of the quotient category) and  $X/Y \neq 0$ . As the quotient category is an atomical category, it must be the same as the Goldie torsion theory.  $\square$

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT.** The research of the second author was partially supported by Grant BFM2002-02717 from MCT.

**REFERENCES**

[1] J. A. Beachy, *On maximal torsion radicals*, *Canad. J. Math.* **25** (1973), 712-726.  
 [2] O. Goldman, *Rings and modules of quotients*, *J. Algebra* **13** (1969), 10-47.  
 [3] K. R. Goodearl, *Von Neumann Regular Rings*, *Monographs and Studies in Mathematics*, vol. 4, Pitman, Massachusetts, 1979.  
 [4] C. Năstăsescu and B. Torrecillas, *Torsion theories for coalgebras*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **97** (1994), no. 2, 203-220.  
 [5] B. Stenström, *Rings of Quotients*, *An Introduction to Methods of Ring Theory*, vol. 217, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975.

C. Năstăsescu: Faculty of Mathematics, University of Bucharest, RO 70109 Bucharest 1, Romania  
*E-mail address:* [cnastase@al.math.unibuc.ro](mailto:cnastase@al.math.unibuc.ro)

B. Torrecillas: Departamento de Álgebra y Análisis Matemático, Universidad de Almería, 04071 Almería, Spain  
*E-mail address:* [btorrecci@ual.es](mailto:btorrecci@ual.es)



# Hindawi

Submit your manuscripts at  
<http://www.hindawi.com>

