Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal

Ladislav Bican

Pure closures

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 22 (1972), No. 1, 78–82

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/101078

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, 22 (97) 1972, Praha

PURE CLOSURES

LADISLAV BICAN, Praha

(Received June 29, 1970)

The purpose of this note is to give some sufficient conditions for the existence of ω-pure closures of any submodule of an arbitrary Λ-module B.

First of all we shall give basic definitions. In this paper Λ stands for an associative ring with unity. We shall say that in the category of (all) Λ-modules a purity ω is given if in any Λ-module B, some set of submodules called ω-pure in B is taken (the fact that A is ω-pure in B being denoted by $A \subseteq {}_\omega B$) such that:

P0: Any direct summand of B is ω-pure in B,
P1: $A \subseteq {}_\omega B,\ B \subseteq {}_\omega C \Rightarrow A \subseteq {}_\omega C$,
P2: $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ [1]), $A \subseteq {}_\omega C \Rightarrow A \subseteq {}_\omega B$,
P3: $A \subseteq {}_\omega B,\ K \subseteq A \Rightarrow A/K \subseteq {}_\omega B/K$,
P4: $K \subseteq A \subseteq B,\ K \subseteq {}_\omega B,\ A/K \subseteq {}_\omega B/K \Rightarrow A \subseteq {}_\omega B$.

Let $\mathscr{E}$ be any set of (left) ideals of Λ, $A \subseteq B$ Λ-modules. We say that A is $\mathscr{E}$-pure in B if for any commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I & \xrightarrow{\ \chi\ } & \Lambda \\ {\scriptstyle\varphi}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\eta} \\ A & \xrightarrow{\ i\ } & B \end{array}$$

where $I \in \mathscr{E}$ and χ, i are canonical injections there exists $\psi : \Lambda \to A$ such that $\chi\psi = \varphi$. It can be shown that all the properties P0–P4 are satisfied in this case. A Λ-module A is called ω-divisible if it is ω-pure in any of its extensions. It is easy to see that any projective module is ω-divisible (for any purity ω). An extension B of A will be called an ω-divisible closure of A if B is ω-divisible and no proper submodule of B containing A is ω-divisible (such a B need not exist and need not be unique). Similarly, a Λ-module C with $A \subseteq C \subseteq B$ will be called an ω-pure closure of A in B if $C \subseteq {}_\omega B$ and no proper submodule of C containing A is ω-pure in B (again, such a C need not exist

[1]) Throughout this paper $A \subseteq B$ means that A is a submodule of B.

and need not be unique). Finally, a Λ-module C is called ω-flat if, for any epimorphism $\varphi : B \to C$, Ker φ is ω-pure in B.

1. Throughout this section let $\mathscr{E}$ be some set of maximal left ideals of Λ and let ω denote the $\mathscr{E}$-purity. For any Λ-module G and any $I \in \mathscr{E}$ we put $G(I) = \{g \in G; \lambda g = 0 \text{ for any } \lambda \in I\}$.

Lemma 1.1. *Let G be a Λ-module, $\hat{G}$ its injective closure, $I \in \mathscr{E}$. Then $G(I) = \hat{G}(I)$.*

Proof. It clearly suffices to show $\hat{G}(I) \subseteq G(I)$. Proving this relation indirectly, let us suppose the existence of $g \in \hat{G}(I) \dot{-} G(I)$ and let us consider the module Λg. In view of $g \neq 0$ and $g = 1g$ there is $\Lambda g \neq 0$. To any $\mu \notin I$ there exists $\varrho \in \Lambda$ and $\sigma \in I$ with $\varrho\mu + \sigma = 1$ for I being maximal. Then $g = \varrho\mu g \notin G$, hence $\mu g \notin G$ which implies $\Lambda g \cap G = 0$ – a contradiction with the essentiallity of G in $\hat{G}$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be a Λ-module and $\hat{G}$ its injective closure. If $D \subseteq {}_\omega\hat{G}$, then $D \cap G \subseteq {}_\omega G$.*

Proof. For any $I \in \mathscr{E}$ let us consider the following two diagrams

$$(*)\quad \begin{array}{ccc} I & \xrightarrow{\ \chi\ } & \Lambda \\ {\scriptstyle\varphi}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\eta} \\ D \cap G & \xrightarrow{\ i\ } & G \end{array} \qquad\qquad (**)\quad \begin{array}{ccc} I & \xrightarrow{\ \chi\ } & \Lambda \\ {\scriptstyle\vartheta}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\theta} \\ D & \xrightarrow{\ j\ } & \hat{G} \end{array}$$

where χ, i, j are canonical injections, φ, η arbitrary homomorphisms making (*) commutative and ϑ, θ are defined as follows: If $1\eta = g$ then θ is determined by $1\theta = g$ and $\vartheta = \theta/I$. Now the diagram (**) is commutative because for any $\lambda \in I$ it is $\lambda\vartheta = \lambda\theta = \lambda g = \lambda\eta = \lambda\varphi \in D \cap G \subseteq D$. By hypothesis there exists $\varrho : \Lambda \to D$ with $\chi\varrho = \vartheta$. Denoting $1\varrho = d$ we have $\lambda\chi\varrho = \lambda d = \lambda\vartheta = \lambda g$ for any $\lambda \in I$ which implies $\lambda(d - g) = 0$, i.e. $d - g \in \hat{G}(I)$. From Lemma 1.1 we get $d - g \in G(I) \subseteq G$, hence $d \in G$. Now we can define a homomorphism $\psi : \Lambda \to D \cap G$ by putting $1\psi = d$. Then for any $\lambda \in I$ there is $\lambda\chi\psi = \lambda d$ and $\lambda\varphi = \lambda\chi\eta = \lambda g = \lambda d$ so that $\chi\psi = \varphi$ and the proof is finished.

The following example shows that the maximality of ideals from $\mathscr{E}$ is essential.

Example 1.3. For $\Lambda = Z$ (the ring of integers), $G = \{a\} \dot{+} \{b\}$, $p^3a = pb = 0$, $N = \{pa + b\}$, $\mathscr{E} = \{(p^2)\}$ we have $\hat{N} \subseteq_\omega \hat{G}$, $N = \hat{N} \cap G$ (for the proof see e.g. [1] § 28, h) and for the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (p^2) & \xrightarrow{\ \chi\ } & Z \\ {\scriptstyle\varphi}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\eta} \\ N & \xrightarrow{\ i\ } & G \end{array}$$

where χ, i are canonical injections and $1\eta = a$, $\varphi = \eta \mid (p^2)$ it is $p^2\eta = p^2 a = p(pa + b) \in N$, but no $\psi : Z \to N$ with $\chi\psi = \varphi$ exists, because for $1\psi = \alpha(pa + b)$ we have $p^2\psi = 0$ while $p^2\varphi = p^2 a \neq 0$. (This example is essentially that from [1] p. 92).

Theorem 1.4. *Let us suppose that the following condition holds:*

$$(1) \qquad N \subseteq {}_\omega G \Rightarrow \exists D\,, \quad D \subseteq {}_\omega \hat{G}\,, \quad N = D \cap G\,.$$

Then any Λ-module A has an ω-pure closure in any of its extensions if and only if A has an ω-divisible closure.

Proof. a) If A has an ω-pure closure in any of its extensions then, particularly, A has an ω-pure closure A^ω in its injective closure. A^ω is ω-divisible by 1,7 from [2]. In fact, A^ω is an ω-divisible closure of A.

b) Conversely, let B be any extension of A and A^ω an ω-divisible closure of A• We can assume $\hat{A} \subseteq \hat{A}^\omega$ owing to $A \subseteq A^\omega$ and Lemma 11.1 from [3]. Then clearly $\hat{A} \subseteq {}_\omega\hat{A}^\omega$ and by Theorem 1.2 $\hat{A} \cap A^\omega \subseteq {}_\omega A^\omega$. $\hat{A} \cap A^\omega$ contains A and is ω-divisible by 1,8 from [2], hence $\hat{A} \cap A^\omega = A^\omega$ in view of the minimality of A^ω. Thus we have $A^\omega \subseteq \hat{A}$ and $\hat{A} = \hat{A}^\omega$.

Further, we can assume $\hat{A} \subseteq \hat{B}$. It is $A^\omega \subseteq {}_\omega\hat{A} \subseteq {}_\omega\hat{B}$ so that Theorem 1.2 implies $A^\omega \cap B \subseteq {}_\omega B$. It remains to show that $A^\omega \cap B$ is a minimal Λ-module ω-pure in B and containing A. Let us suppose $A \subseteq A' \subseteq {}_\omega A^\omega \cap B \subseteq {}_\omega B$. By (1) there exists a Λ-module D with $D \subseteq_\omega \widehat{A^\omega \cap B}$ and $A' = A^\omega \cap B \cap D$. It can be assummed that $\widehat{A^\omega \cap B} \subseteq \hat{A}$ since $A^\omega \cap B \subseteq A^\omega \subseteq \hat{A}$. Then $D \subseteq {}_\omega A^\omega \cap B \subseteq {}_\omega\hat{A} = \hat{A}^\omega$ and by Theorem 1.2 $D \cap A^\omega \subseteq {}_\omega A^\omega$. The same arguments as above lead to $D \cap A^\omega = A^\omega$, hence $A' = B \cap A^\omega \cap D = B \cap A^\omega$.

2. In this section we shall give a sufficient condition for the existence of ω-pure closures.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathscr{E} = \{\Lambda\mu,\ \mu \in M\}$ be any set of maximal principal left ideals of Λ and let ω denote the $\mathscr{E}$-purity. Then any Λ-module has an ω-divisible closure.*

Proof. First of all let us note that

$$(2) \qquad A \subseteq {}_\omega B \Leftrightarrow \mu B \cap A = \mu A \quad \text{for any} \quad \mu \in M\,.$$

The proof of this fact we omit because it is given in [2], Prop. 1, 52. Now we shal construct an ω-divisible closure for any Λ-module A. Let us put $D_0 = A$ and if D_n is constructed then D_{n+1} is a submodule of $\hat{A}$ (the injective closure of A) generated by D_n and all $d \in \hat{A}$ satisfying $\mu d \in D_n$ for some $\mu \in M$. Thus $D = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} D_n$ is a submodule of $\hat{A}$ containing A. For $d \in \mu\hat{A} \cap D$, $d = \mu\bar{a}$, $\bar{a} \in \hat{A}$ and $d \in D_n$ we have $\bar{a} \in D_{n+1}$ owing to the definition of D_{n+1}, hence $d \in \mu D$. Thus $D \subseteq {}_{\omega}\hat{A}$ by (2), which implies the ω-divisibility of D (by 1,7 from [2]). We are going to show the minimality of D. Let us suppose $A \subseteq Q \subseteq D$, Q ω-divisible. We have $D_0 \subseteq Q$. If $D_n \subseteq Q$ and $d \in D_{n+1}$ is an arbitrary generator of D_{n+1} (not belonging to D_n) then there exists $\mu \in M$ with $\mu d \in D_n \subseteq Q$. Since Q is ω-divisible, we have $Q \subseteq {}_{\omega}D$ and $\mu d \in \mu D \cap \cap Q = \mu Q$ by (2). Then $\mu(d - q) = 0$ for a suitable $q \in Q$. In view of Lemma 1.1 and $A \subseteq Q \subseteq D \subseteq \hat{A}$ we have $d - q \in \hat{A}(\Lambda\mu) = A(\Lambda\mu) \subseteq Q$ and hence $d \in Q$. Thus $D_{n+1} \subseteq Q$ and finally $D = Q$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\mathscr{E} = \{\Lambda\mu, \mu \in M\}$ be any set of maximal principal left ideals of Λ such that $\mu\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda\mu$ for any $\mu \in M$. Then the $\mathscr{E}$-purity satisfies the condition* (1).

Proof. Let us assume $N \subseteq {}_{\omega}G$ and let $N \subseteq D \subseteq \hat{N}$ be the ω-divisible closure constructed in the preceding proof. It is obvious that $N \subseteq D \cap G$. On the other hand it is clear that $D_0 \cap G \subseteq N$. Let us assume we have proved $D_n \cap G \subseteq N$ and let $d \in D_{n+1} \cap G$ be an arbitrary element. Then we can write $d = d' + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i d_i$, $d' \in D_n$, $\mu_i d_i \in D_n$ for suitable $\mu_i \in M$. Then $\mu_1\mu_2 \ldots \mu_r d = \mu_1\mu_2 \ldots \mu_r d' + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mu_1\mu_2 \ldots \ldots \mu_r \lambda_i d_i = \mu_1\mu_2 \ldots \mu_r d' + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mu_1\mu_2 \ldots \mu_{i-1}\lambda'_i\mu_i d_i$ by hypothesis (λ'_i are suitable elements from Λ) and therefore $\mu_1\mu_2 \ldots \mu_r d \in D_n \cap G \subseteq N$. Hence $\mu_1(\mu_2 \ldots \mu_r d) \in \in \mu_1 G \cap N = \mu_1 N$ in view of $N \subseteq {}_{\omega}G$ and (2). For a suitable element $t \in N$ we have $\mu_1(\mu_2 \ldots \mu_r d - t) = 0$ which implies $\mu_2 \ldots \mu_r d - t \in \hat{N}(\Lambda\mu_1) = N(\Lambda\mu_1) \subseteq N$ (by Lemma 1.1) so that $\mu_2 \ldots \mu_r d \in N$. Similar arguments for $\mu_2, \ldots, \mu_r$ lead to $d \in N$ which finishes the proof.

3. In this section we shall prove a theorem on the existence of ω-pure closures concerning ω-flat modules. We start with the following

Lemma 3.1. *Let B be an ω-flat Λ-module, $K \subseteq {}_{\omega}B$, $L \subseteq {}_{\omega}B$. If $\{K, L\}$ is ω-flat, then $K \cap L \subseteq {}_{\omega}B$.*

Proof. From $L \subseteq {}_{\omega}B$ it follows $L \subseteq {}_{\omega}\{K, L\}$ by P2 and hence $\{K, L\}/L$ is ω-flat by hypothesis and 1,13 from [2]. Then $K/K \cap L \cong \{K, L\}/L$ is ω-flat. The definition of ω-flat modules implies that $K \cap L \subseteq {}_{\omega}K$. Now it suffices to use P1.

Theorem 3.2. *Let ω be an arbitrary purity such that any submodule of an ω-flat module is ω-flat. Then any submodule of an ω-flat module B has in B the uniquely determined ω-pure closure if and only the following condition is satisfied*:

(3) *For any decreasing chain $B = B_0 \supseteq B_1 \supseteq \ldots \supseteq B_\alpha \supseteq \ldots \supseteq B_\Omega$ of submodules of B satisfying $B_{\alpha+1} \subseteq {}_{\omega}B_\alpha$ and $B_\alpha = \bigcap_{\gamma<\alpha} B_\gamma$, α a limit ordinal, there is $B_\Omega \subseteq {}_{\omega}B$.*

Proof. Let B be an ω-flat module, $A \subseteq B$ a submodule and let the condition (3) hold. Using the Zorn's lemma one can easily get the existence of ω-pure closures of A in B. For the proof of unicity it suffices to use Lemma 3.1.

Conversely, let us have an descending chain $B = B_0 \supseteq B_1 \supseteq \ldots \supseteq B_\alpha \supseteq \ldots \supseteq B_\Omega$ of submodules of B satisfying the conditions stated in (3). It is easy to see that we can restrict ourselves to the case $B_\alpha \subseteq {}_\omega B$, $\alpha < \Omega$, where Ω is a limit ordinal. If B_Ω is not ω-pure in B, it has an ω-pure closure $\tilde{B}_\Omega \supsetneqq B_\Omega$. There exists an ordinal $\alpha < \Omega$ with $B_\alpha \cap \tilde{B}_\Omega \subsetneqq \tilde{B}_\Omega$ because the converse leads to the contradiction $\tilde{B}_\Omega = B_\Omega$. By Lemma 3.1 it is $B_\alpha \cap \tilde{B}_\Omega \subseteq {}_\omega B$ – a contradiction with the minimality of $\tilde{B}_\Omega$. Consequently $\tilde{B}_\Omega = B_\Omega \subseteq {}_\omega B$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let r be a radical in the category of Λ-modules and let ω be any purity such that the class of ω-flat Λ-modules coincides with the class of r-semisimple Λ-modules. Then any submodule of an r-semisimple Λ-module B has in B the uniquely determined ω-pure closure.*

Proof. Clearly, the class of ω-flat modules is closed under taking submodules and direct products by 2.12 from [2]. To prove (3) it suffices to show that for α limit, $B_\gamma \subseteq {}_\omega B$, $\gamma < \alpha$ it is $B_\alpha \subseteq {}_\omega B$. However, B/B_α can be selected, in the natural way, in the direct product of B/B_γ, $\gamma < \alpha$ and hence following the arguments mentioned above B/B_α is ω-flat. Thus $B_\alpha \subseteq {}_\omega B$ owing to the definition of ω-flat modules.

Remark. From the above proof it immediately follows that the condition: "The class of ω-flat Λ-modules is closed under taking submodules and direct products" is sufficient for the existence and uniqueness of an ω-pure closure of any submodule of an ω-flat module.

References

[1] *L. Fuchs:* Abelian groups, Budapest 1966.
[3] *А. П, Мишина, Л. А. Скорняков:* Абелевы группы и модули. Москва 1969.
[2] *С. Маклейн:* Гомология. Москва 1966.

Author's address: Praha 8 - Karlín, Sokolovská 83, ČSSR (Matematicko-fyzikální fakulta UK).