

Josef Jirásko

Generalized projectivity. II.

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 20 (1979), No. 3, 483--499

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/105945>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1979

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



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

GENERALIZED PROJECTIVITY – II
J. JIRASKO

Abstract: Recently in [11] the (r,i,s,j) -projectivity (i.e. the projectivity with respect to two preradicals r and s) has been investigated. In many cases the (r,i,s,j) -projectivity is reduced to the (l,t) -projectivity for some preradical t . It is shown that a module P is (l,r) -projective if and only if $P/\text{ch}(r)(P)$ is projective in $R/r(R)\text{-mod}$. In § 2 we shall show that the concepts of (l,r) -projectivity and the strongly M -projectivity which is studied by K. Varadarajan in [18] are the same. Further, in the study $(r,2)$ -projectivity, where r is an idempotent preradical and $\tilde{\chi}$ is pseudohereditary, r can be replaced by a hereditary radical. § 3 is devoted to the study of (r,i,s,j) -quasiprojective modules. Some of these results are motivated by J.S. Golan's paper [8] on quasiprojective modules.

Key words: Generalized projectivity, generalized M -projectivity, generalized quasiprojectivity, preradicals.

AMS: Primary 16A50

Secondary 18E40

By $R\text{-mod}$ we understand the category of all unitary left modules over an associative ring with unit element. The injective hull of a module M will be denoted by $E(M)$, the direct product (sum) by $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$ ($\sum_{i=1}^{\oplus} M_i$).

First, several basic definitions from the theory of preradicals (for details see [1],[2],[3],[5] and [12]).

A preradical r for $R\text{-mod}$ is a subfunctor of the identity

functor, i.e. r assigns to each module M its submodule $r(M)$ in such a way that every homomorphism of M into N induces a homomorphism of $r(M)$ into $r(N)$ by restriction. A module M is r -torsion if $r(M) = M$ and r -torsionfree if $r(M) = 0$. We shall denote by \mathcal{T}_r (\mathcal{F}_r) the class of all r -torsion (r -torsionfree) modules.

A preradical r is said to be

- idempotent if $r(r(M)) = r(M)$ for every module M ,
- a radical if $r(M/r(M)) = 0$ for every module M ,
- hereditary if $r(N) = N \cap r(M)$ for every submodule N of a module M ,
- cohereditary if $r(M/N) = (r(M) + N)/N$ for every submodule N of a module M ,
- pseudohereditary if every submodule of $r(R)$ is r -torsion,
- faithful if $r(R) = 0$.

We shall say that a module M splits in a preradical r if $r(M)$ is a direct summand in M . If r and s are preradicals then we write $r \leq s$ if $r(M) \subseteq s(M)$ for all $M \in R\text{-mod}$. The idempotent core \bar{r} of a preradical r is defined by $\bar{r}(M) = \sum K$, where K runs through all r -torsion submodules K of M , and the radical closure \tilde{r} is defined by $\tilde{r}(M) = \cap L$, where L runs through all submodules L of M with M/L r -torsionfree. Further, the hereditary closure $h(r)$ is defined by $h(r)(M) = M \cap r(E(M))$ and the cohereditary core $ch(r)$ by $ch(r)(M) = r(R)M$. For a preradical r and modules $N \subseteq M$ let us define $C_r(N:M)$ by $C_r(N:M)/N = r(M/N)$. Let r and s be two preradicals. A preradical t defined by $t(M) = C_s(r(M):M)$, $M \in R\text{-mod}$, will be denoted by $r \Delta s$. For an arbitrary class of R -modules \mathcal{A} we define $p^{\mathcal{A}}(N) = \cap \text{Ker } f$, f ranging over all $f \in \text{Hom}_R(N, M)$, $M \in \mathcal{A}$. As it is easy to see

p^a is a radical. Further, M is a pseudo-injective module iff $p^a\{M\}$ is hereditary and M is a faithful module if and only if $p^a\{M\}$ is faithful. Let $f: R \rightarrow S$ be a ring onto homomorphism and r be a preradical for R -mod. For all $M \in S$ -mod let us define $f[r](M) = S \cdot r({}_R M)$. Then $f[r]$ is a preradical for S -mod and $f[\overline{f[r]}] = \overline{f[r]}$, $f[\widetilde{f[r]}] = \widetilde{f[r]}$. Finally, the zero functor will be denoted by zer.

§ 1. (r, i, s, j) -projective modules. We start with some definitions which are introduced in [11]. Let s be a preradical for R -mod. An epimorphism $A \xrightarrow{h} B$ is said to be:

- $(s, 1)$ -codense if there exist $C \in R$ -mod and $g: C \rightarrow A$ an epimorphism with $s(g^{-1}(\text{Ker } h)) \subseteq \text{Ker } g$,
- $(s, 2)$ -codense if $s(\text{Ker } h) = 0$,
- $(s, 3)$ -codense if $\text{Ker } h \cap s(A) = 0$.

Further if $N \subseteq M$ is a submodule and $M \rightarrow M/N$ is a natural epimorphism which is $(s, 1)$ -codense, then we write $N \subseteq (s, 1)_M$. Similarly $N \subseteq (s, 2)_M$ ($N \subseteq (s, 3)_M$).

Let r, s be two preradicals, $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $M \in R$ -mod. A module P is said to be (r, i, s, j, M) -projective if every diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & P \\ & & \downarrow g \\ M & \xrightarrow{h} & N \longrightarrow O \end{array}$$

with exact row, $\text{Ker } h \subseteq (r, i)_M$ and $h^{-1}(\text{Im } g) \subseteq (s, j)_M$ can be completed to commutative one.

We say that a module P is (r, i, s, j) -projective if it is (r, i, s, j, M) -projective for all $M \in R$ -mod.

A module P is said to be (r, i, s, j) -quasiprojective if it is (r, i, s, j, P) -projective.

A module P is said to be (r,i,M) -projective ((r,i) -quasi projective), if it is $(r,i,zer,1,M)$ -projective ($(r,i,zer,1)$ -quasi projective).

A module P is said to be (i,r,M) -projective ((i,r) -quasi projective), if it is $(zer,1,r,i,M)$ -projective ($(zer,1,r,i)$ -quasi projective).

As it is noted in [11] a module P is (r,i,s,j) -projective, iff it is (r,i,M) -projective for all $M \in R\text{-mod}$ with $M \subseteq {}^{(s,j)}M$, $i, j \in \{1,2,3\}$.

Let A, B be modules and let $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ be an epimorphism. A pair (A, φ) is said to be an (r,i,s,j,M) -projective ((r,i,s,j) -quasi projective) precover of the module B if A is (r,i,s,j,M) -projective ((r,i,s,j) -quasi projective), $A \xrightarrow{f} C \xrightarrow{g} B$ with $g \circ f = \varphi$, f, g epimorphisms and C (r,i,s,j,M) -projective ((r,i,s,j) -quasi projective) implies f is an isomorphism. An (r,i,s,j,M) -projective ((r,i,s,j) -quasi projective) precover (A, φ) which is a cover (i.e. $\text{Ker } \varphi$ is superfluous in A) is said to be an (r,i,s,j,M) -projective ((r,i,s,j) -quasi projective) cover.

It is shown in [11] that (r,i,s,j,M) -projective ((r,i,s,j) -projective) cover of a module B exists whenever B has a projective cover.

Proposition 1.1. Let r, s be preradicals for $R\text{-mod}$, $j \in \{1,2\}$ and $P \in R\text{-mod}$. Then

- (i) if P is projective and $K \in \mathcal{J}_r$ then P/K is $(r,1)$ -projective,
- (ii) if P is $(r,2,s,j)$ -projective and $K \in \mathcal{J}_r$ then P/K is $(r,2,s,j)$ -projective.

(iii) if P is $(r,3,s,j)$ -projective and $K \in r(P)$ then P/K is $(r,3,s,j)$ -projective.

Proof: Obvious.

Proposition 1.2. Let r,s be preradicals for R -mod and $f:R \rightarrow R/s(R)$ be a natural ring homomorphism. Then

(i) if r is idempotent then a module P is $(r,2,s,1)$ -projective if and only if $P/\text{ch}(s)(P)$ is $(f[r],2)$ -projective in $R/s(R)$ -mod,

(ii) if r is a radical then a module P is $(r,3,s,1)$ -projective if and only if $P/\text{ch}(s)(P)$ is $(f[r],3)$ -projective in $R/s(R)$ -mod.

Proof: (i). Suppose P is $(r,2,s,1)$ -projective and $0 \rightarrow K \hookrightarrow Q \xrightarrow{g} P/\text{ch}(s)(P) \rightarrow 0$ is a projective presentation of $P/\text{ch}(s)(P)$ in $R/s(R)$ -mod. Then $0 \rightarrow K/\widetilde{f[r]}(K) \rightarrow Q/\widetilde{f[r]}(K) \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} P/\text{ch}(s)(P) \rightarrow 0$ (\bar{g} induced by g) is a $(f[r],2)$ -projective presentation in $R/s(R)$ -mod by Proposition 1.1(ii). Consider the following diagram in R -mod

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & P & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow \pi & & \\
 0 & \rightarrow & K/\widetilde{f}(K) & \hookrightarrow & Q/\widetilde{f}(K) & \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} & P/\text{ch}(s)(P) \rightarrow 0 \quad (\pi \text{ natural})
 \end{array}$$

As it is easy to see $Q/\widetilde{f}(K) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ch}(s)}$ and $K/\widetilde{f}(K) \in {}^{(r,2)}Q/\widetilde{f}(K)$.

Now P is $(r,2,s,1)$ -projective and $\bar{g} \circ v = \sigma$ for some $v \in \text{Hom}_R(P, Q/\widetilde{f}(K))$ which induces $\bar{v}: P/\text{ch}(s)(P) \rightarrow Q/\widetilde{f}(K)$ with $\bar{g} \circ \bar{v} = 1$. Thus \bar{g} splits in $R/s(R)$ -mod and consequently $P/\text{ch}(s)(P)$ is $(f[r],2)$ -projective in $R/s(R)$ -mod.

Conversely, if

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & P & & \\
 & & \downarrow h & & \\
 M & \xrightarrow{g} & N & \longrightarrow & 0
 \end{array}$$

is a diagram in $R\text{-mod}$ with exact row, $\text{Ker } g \subseteq (r, 2)_M$, $M \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ch}(s)}$ and if $P/\text{ch}(s)(P)$ is $(f[r], 2)$ -projective in $R/s(R)\text{-mod}$, then

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & P/\text{ch}(s)(P) & & \\
 & & \downarrow \bar{h} & & \\
 M & \xrightarrow{g} & N & \longrightarrow & 0
 \end{array}$$

(\bar{h} induced by h) is a diagram in $R/s(R)\text{-mod}$ with $\text{Ker } g \subseteq (f[r], 2)_M$, and hence $g \circ v = \bar{h}$ for some homomorphism $v: P/\text{ch}(s)(P) \rightarrow M$. Thus $g \circ (v \circ \sigma) = h$ ($\sigma: P \rightarrow P/\text{ch}(s)(P)$ is a natural homomorphism) and consequently P is $(r, 2, s, 1)$ -projective.

(ii) Similarly as in (i).

Corollary 1.3. Let s be a preradical. Then a module P is $(1, s)$ -projective if and only if $P/\text{ch}(s)(P)$ is projective in $R/s(R)\text{-mod}$.

Proposition 1.4. Let r be a preradical for $R\text{-mod}$ and $P \in R\text{-mod}$. Then

- (i) if r is idempotent then P is $(\tilde{r}, 1)$ -projective if and only if it is $(r, 2)$ -projective,
- (ii) if r is idempotent and \tilde{r} is pseudohereditary then P is $(r, 2)$ -projective if and only if it is $(1, \tilde{r})$ -projective,
- (iii) if r is a radical then P is $(r, 3)$ -projective if and only if it is $(1, r)$ -projective,
- (iv) P is $(3, r)$ -projective if and only if it is $(2, r)$ -projective if and only if it is $(1, \tilde{r})$ -projective.

Proof: (i). It suffices to prove the "only if part".

Let P be $(r,2)$ -projective and $0 \rightarrow K \hookrightarrow Q \xrightarrow{g} P \rightarrow 0$ be a projective presentation of P . Then $0 \rightarrow K/\tilde{r}(K) \rightarrow Q/\tilde{r}(K) \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} P \rightarrow 0$ (\bar{g} induced by g) is a $(\tilde{r},1)$ -projective presentation of P with $K/\tilde{r}(K) \in \mathcal{F}_r$ by Proposition 1.1(i). Thus \bar{g} splits and consequently P is $(\tilde{r},1)$ -projective.

(ii) See Rangaswamy [14] Theorem 8 and Corollary 1.3.

(iii) With respect to Corollary 1.3 it suffices to prove that P is $(r,3)$ -projective if and only if $P/\text{ch}(r)(P)$ is projective in $R/r(R)$ -mod. Let P be $(r,3)$ -projective, $f: R \rightarrow R/r(R) = \bar{R}$ be a natural ring homomorphism and $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{g} P/\text{ch}(r)(P) \rightarrow 0$ be a projective presentation in \bar{R} -mod. Then $Q \in \mathcal{F}_r$ since $f[r](Q) = f[r](\bar{R}) Q$, and hence $g \circ v = \pi$ ($\pi: P \rightarrow P/\text{ch}(r)(P)$ natural) for some $v \in \text{Hom}_R(P, Q)$ by the $(r,3)$ -projectivity of P . Thus v induces $\bar{v}: P/\text{ch}(r)(P) \rightarrow Q$ with $g \circ \bar{v} = 1$, hence g splits in $R/r(R)$ -mod and consequently $P/\text{ch}(r)(P)$ is projective in $R/r(R)$ -mod.

We shall prove the sufficiency by modifying of the proof of Theorem 8 in [14]. Let $P/\text{ch}(r)(P)$ be projective in $R/r(R)$ -mod and $0 \rightarrow K \hookrightarrow Q \xrightarrow{g} P \rightarrow 0$ be a projective presentation of P . Then by Proposition 1.1 (iii) $0 \rightarrow K/(r(Q) \cap K) \rightarrow Q/(r(Q) \cap K) \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} P \rightarrow 0$ is a $(r,3)$ -projective presentation of P with $K' = K/(r(Q) \cap K) \in {}^{(r,3)}\mathcal{Q}/(r(Q) \cap K) = Q'$ (\bar{g} induced by g).

Consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & K' & \longrightarrow & Q' & \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} & P & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_1 & & \downarrow \pi_2 & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & (K' + \text{ch}(r)(Q'))/\text{ch}(r)(Q') & \longrightarrow & Q'/\text{ch}(r)(Q') & \xrightarrow{\bar{g}'} & P/\text{ch}(r)(P) & \longrightarrow & 0
 \end{array}$$

where π_1, π_2 are natural epimorphisms.

As it is easy to see the right hand square is a pullback. Now \bar{g}' splits since $P/\text{ch}(r)(P)$ is projective in $R/r(R)\text{-mod}$, and hence \bar{g} splits. Thus P is $(r,3)$ -projective.

(iv) With respect to Proposition 2.9 in [11] it suffices to prove that P is $(2,r)$ -projective implies P is $(1,r)$ -projective for a radical r . It can be proved similarly as the necessity in (iii).

Corollary 1.5. Let r,s be preradicals for $R\text{-mod}$ and $P \in R\text{-mod}$. Then

- (i) if r is idempotent and every submodule of $\tilde{r}(R/s(R))$ is \tilde{r} -torsion then P is $(r,2,s,1)$ -projective iff it is $(1,s\Delta\tilde{r})$ -projective,
- (ii) if r is a radical then P is $(r,3,s,1)$ -projective iff it is $(1,s\Delta r)$ -projective. *

Proposition 1.6. Let r,s be preradicals. Then every submodule of $\tilde{r}(R/s(R))$ is \tilde{r} -torsion, provided at least one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- (i) r is hereditary,
- (ii) s is idempotent and $s\Delta\tilde{r}$ is pseudohereditary.

Proof: Obvious.

§ 2. (r,i,s,j,M) -projective and strongly (r,i,s,j,M) -projective modules

Definition 2.1. Let r,s be preradicals, $i,j \in \{1,2,3\}$ and $M \in R\text{-mod}$. A module P is said to be strongly (r,i,s,j,M) -projective if it is (r,i,s,j,M^I) -projective for every index set I .

If $r = s = \text{zer}$, then we obtain the strongly M -projecti-

vity in the sense of K. Varadarajan (see [18]).

Let r, s be preradicals, $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. For any $P \in R\text{-mod}$ let us denote $C_{(r, i, s, j)}^P(P) = \{M \in R\text{-mod}, P \text{ is } (r, i, s, j, M)\text{-projective}\}$. Further the class of all (r, i, s, j, M) -projective modules will be denoted by $C_P^{(r, i, s, j)}(M)$.

Due to G. Azumaya an epimorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ is called an M -epimorphism if there exists $h: A \rightarrow M$ with $\text{Ker } f \cap \text{Ker } h = 0$.

These two following propositions are motivated by the results of G. Azumaya (see [18] Propositions 1.3 and 1.5). We include them here without the proof.

Proposition 2.2. Let r be a preradical and s be a cohereditary radical. Then the following are equivalent for a module P :

- (i) P is $(r, 2, s, 2, M)$ -projective,
- (ii) given any M -epimorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ and any homomorphism $g: P \rightarrow B$ with $r(\text{Ker } f) = 0$ and $s(f^{-1}(\text{Im } g)) = 0$, there exists a homomorphism $v: P \rightarrow A$ such that $f \circ v = g$.

Proposition 2.3. Let r, s be preradicals and $P, M \in R\text{-mod}$. Then

- (i) $C_P^{(r, i, s, j)}(M)$ is closed under arbitrary direct sums and direct summands $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$,
- (ii) $C_{(r, 2, s, 2)}^P(P)$ is closed under submodules,
- (iii) if r, s are idempotent $K \in \mathcal{F}_r \cap \mathcal{F}_s$ and $M \in C_{(r, 2, s, 2)}^P(P)$ then $M/K \in C_{(r, 2, s, 2)}^P(P)$,
- (iv) if r, s are both cohereditary then $C_{(r, 2, s, 2)}^P(P)$ is closed under the formation of finite direct sums. Moreover, if P has a projective cover then $C_{(r, 2, s, 2)}^P(P)$ is closed under the formation of arbitrary direct products.

Proposition 2.4. Let r, s be preradicals. Then a module P is strongly $(r, 2, s, 2, M)$ -projective if and only if it is $(r, 2, s \Delta p^{\{M\}}, 2)$ -projective.

Proof: Obvious.

Corollary 2.5. Let $M \in R\text{-mod}$. Then the following are equivalent for a module P :

- (i) P is strongly M -projective,
- (ii) P is $(1, p^{\{M\}})$ -projective,
- (iii) P is $(2, p^{\{M\}})$ -projective,
- (iv) P is $(p^{\{M\}}, 3)$ -projective,
- (v) P is $(3, p^{\{M\}})$ -projective,
- (vi) $P/(0:M)P$ is projective in $R/(0:M)\text{-mod}$.

Moreover, if M is pseudo-injective then the above stated conditions are equivalent to:

- (vii) P is $(p^{\{M\}}, 2)$ -projective,
- (viii) P is $(p^{\{M\}}, 1)$ -projective.

Proof: By Proposition 1.4 and Corollary 1.3.

Corollary 2.6. Let r be a preradical. Then there is a $\text{ch}(r)$ -torsionfree module M such that a module P is $(1, r)$ -projective if and only if it is strongly M -projective.

Proof: By [11] Proposition 2.9 (iv) P is $(1, r)$ -projective iff it is $(1, \text{ch}(r))$ -projective. Now by [2] Proposition 4.6 $\text{ch}(r) = p^{\{M\}}$, where $M = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A$, \mathcal{A} is a representative set of $\text{ch}(r)$ -torsionfree cocyclic modules and Corollary 2.5 finishes the proof.

Theorem 2.7. Let r be an idempotent preradical such that \tilde{r} is pseudohereditary. Then there is a hereditary radical s such that a module P is $(r, 2)$ -projective if and only if it is

$(s,2)$ -projective.

Proof: By Proposition 1.4 (ii) and [11] Proposition 2.9 P is $(r,2)$ -projective iff it is $(1, \text{ch}(\tilde{r}))$ -projective. Now by [12] Proposition 1.5 $\text{ch}(\tilde{r}) = \text{ch}(p^{\{Q\}})$ where $Q = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} E(A)$, \mathcal{A} is a representative set of cyclic r -torsion-free modules. It is enough to put $s = p^{\{Q\}}$ and use [11] Proposition 2.9 (iv) and Corollary 2.5 (vii).

Proposition 2.8. Let r, s be preradicals. If M is a cogenerator for $R\text{-mod}$ then a module P is strongly $(r, 2, s, 2, M)$ -projective if and only if it is $(r, 2, s, 2)$ -projective.

Proof: By Proposition 2.4.

M.S. Shrikhande calls a module cohereditary if every its factormodule is injective (see [15]).

Proposition 2.9. Let M be an injective module. Consider the following conditions:

- (i) Every submodule of a strongly M -projective module is strongly M -projective.
- (ii) Every submodule of a projective module is strongly M -projective.
- (iii) M^I is cohereditary for every index set I .
- (iv) $R/(0:M)$ is a left hereditary ring.

Then conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) are equivalent and imply (iv).

Moreover, if $\text{ch}(p^{\{M\}})$ is hereditary then (iv) implies (i).

Proof: (i) is equivalent to (ii) and (ii) is equivalent to (iii). It immediately follows from [15] Theorem 3.2'.

(i) implies (iv). By Corollary 2.5 (vi).

(iv) implies (i). Use Corollary 2.5 (vi) and the fact

that $\text{ch}(p^{\{M\}})$ is hereditary.

Corollary 2.10. R is a left hereditary ring if and only if $E(R)^I$ is cohereditary for every index set I .

The next Proposition is a modification of the well-known Theorem on test modules for projectivity (see [4] Theorem 10). We include it here without the proof for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 2.11. Let $M \in R\text{-mod}$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) every strongly M -projective module is projective,
- (ii) $(0:M) = p^{\{M\}}(R)$ is a ring direct summand of R and it is completely reducible ring.

Proposition 2.12. Let r be an idempotent cohereditary radical, s be a preradical and let P be a module possessing an $(r,2)$ -projective cover $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{\varphi} P \rightarrow 0$. Then

- (i) P is $(r,2,s,1)$ -projective if and only if $\text{Ker } \varphi \subseteq \text{ch}(s)(Q)$,
- (ii) P is $(r,2,s,2)$ -projective if and only if $\text{Ker } \varphi \subseteq \tilde{s}(Q)$.

Proof: (i). By Proposition 1.1 (ii) $r(K) = 0$. Let P be $(r,2,s,1)$ -projective. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Q & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & P \\ \downarrow \pi_1 & & \downarrow \pi_2 \\ Q/\text{ch}(s)(Q) & \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}} & P/\text{ch}(s)(P) \end{array}$$

where π_1, π_2 are natural epimorphisms. Then $\bar{\varphi} \circ v = \pi_2$ for some $v: P \rightarrow Q/\text{ch}(s)(Q)$ since $\text{Ker } \bar{\varphi} \in \mathcal{F}_r$, $Q/\text{ch}(s)(Q) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ch}(s)}$ and P is $(r,2,s,1)$ -projective. Now, $\pi_1 = v \circ \varphi$ since $\text{Ker } \varphi + \text{Ker } (\pi_1 - v \circ \varphi) = Q$ as is easily seen. Therefore $\text{Ker } \varphi \subseteq \text{ch}(s)(Q)$.

The converse implication is obvious.

(ii) Similarly as in (i).

Proposition 2.13. Let r be an idempotent cohereditary radical, s be a preradical and let P be a module possessing an $(r,2)$ -projective cover $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{\varphi} P \rightarrow 0$. Then

(i) $(Q/(\text{ch}(s)(Q) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi), \bar{\varphi})$ where $\bar{\varphi}$ is induced by φ is an $(r,2,s,1)$ -projective cover of P ,

(ii) $(Q/(\bar{s}(Q) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi), \bar{\varphi})$ where $\bar{\varphi}$ is induced by φ is an $(r,2,s,2)$ -projective cover of P .

Proof: Use Proposition 2.12.

Proposition 2.14. Let r be an idempotent cohereditary radical and s be a cohereditary radical. If a module P possesses an $(r,2)$ -projective cover $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{\varphi} P \rightarrow 0$ then P is $(r,2,s,2,M)$ -projective if and only if it is strongly $(r,2,s,2,M)$ -projective.

Proof: Let P be $(r,2,s,2,M)$ -projective. With respect to Propositions 2.4 and 2.12 it suffices to prove $\text{Ker } \varphi \subseteq s \Delta P^{iM}(Q)$. If $f: Q/s(Q) \rightarrow M$ is arbitrary and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Q/s(Q) & \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}} & P/s(P) \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ M & \xrightarrow{h} & N \end{array}$$

is a push-out diagram ($\bar{\varphi}$ induced by φ), then $\text{Ker } h \in \mathcal{F}_r$ and $h^{-1}(\text{Im } g) \in \mathcal{F}_s$. Now consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Q & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & P \\ \downarrow f \circ \pi_1 & & \downarrow g \circ \pi_2 \\ M & \xrightarrow{h} & N \end{array}$$

where π_1, π_2 are natural epimorphisms. In the same way as in

the proof of Proposition 2.12 we obtain $\text{Ker } \varphi \subseteq \text{Ker } f \circ \pi_1$, and hence $\text{Ker } \varphi \subseteq s \Delta p^{\{M\}}(Q)$.

Corollary 2.15. Let r be an idempotent cohereditary radical, s be a cohereditary radical, $M \in R\text{-mod}$ and P be a module possessing an $(r,2)$ -projective cover $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{\varphi} P \rightarrow 0$. Then $(Q/(s \Delta p^{\{M\}}(Q) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi), \bar{\varphi})$ where $\bar{\varphi}$ is induced by φ is an $(r,2,s,2,M)$ -projective cover of P .

Proof: By Propositions 2.13, 2.14 and 2.4.

§ 3. (r,i,s,j) -quasiprojective modules

Proposition 3.1. Let r,s be two cohereditary radicals and $Q_i \in R\text{-mod}$ $i \in \{1,2,\dots,n\}$. Then $Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \oplus \dots \oplus Q_n$ is $(r,2,s,2)$ -quasi-projective if and only if Q_i is $(r,2,s,2)$ -quasiprojective and $(r,2,s,2,Q_j)$ -projective for every $i,j \in \{1,2,\dots,n\}$, $i \neq j$.

Proof: It follows immediately from Proposition 2.3 (i), (iv).

Proposition 3.2. Let r,s be two idempotent preradicals and Q be an $(r,2,s,2)$ -quasiprojective module. If K is a characteristic submodule of Q such that $K \in \mathcal{F}_r \cap \mathcal{F}_s$ then Q/K is $(r,2,s,2)$ -quasiprojective.

Proof: Obvious.

Proposition 3.3. Let r be an idempotent cohereditary radical and s be a cohereditary radical. If a module P possesses an $(r,2)$ -projective cover $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{\varphi} P \rightarrow 0$ then $(Q/(s \Delta p^{\{P\}}(Q) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi), \bar{\varphi})$ where $\bar{\varphi}$ is induced by φ is an $(r,2,s,2)$ -quasiprojective cover of P .

Proof: Use Propositions 2.4, 2.13 and 2.14.

Corollary 3.4. Let r be an idempotent cohereditary radical, s be a cohereditary radical and $P \in R\text{-mod}$ possessing a projective cover $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{\varphi} P \rightarrow 0$. Then $(Q/(C_{sAp} \downarrow P] (r(\text{Ker } \varphi) : Q) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi), \bar{\varphi})$ where $\bar{\varphi}$ is induced by φ is an $(r, 2, s, 2)$ -quasi projective cover of P .

Proof: By Proposition 3.3 and [11] Proposition 2.10 (vii).

Following closely the ideas of J.S. Golan (see [8]) we obtain Propositions 3.5 - 3.8 which are included here without the proof.

Proposition 3.5. Let r be an idempotent cohereditary radical. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) Every (finitely generated) R -module has an $(r, 2)$ -projective cover.
- (ii) Every (finitely generated) R -module P has an $(r, 2)$ -quasi-projective cover $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow Q \rightarrow P \rightarrow 0$ with $K \in \mathcal{F}_r$.

Proposition 3.6. Let r be a cohereditary splitting radical (i.e. every module splits in r). Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) Every finitely presented R -module has an $(r, 2)$ -projective cover.
- (ii) Every finitely presented R -module P has an $(r, 2)$ -quasi-projective cover $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow Q \rightarrow P \rightarrow 0$ with $K \in \mathcal{F}_r$.

Proposition 3.7. Let r be an idempotent preradical for $R\text{-mod}$. Then $\bar{R} = R/\tilde{r}(R)$ is a completely reducible ring if and only if for every simple \bar{R} -module P $\bar{R} \oplus P$ is $(2, r)$ -quasiprojective in $R\text{-mod}$.

Proposition 3.8. Let r be an idempotent preradical such that \tilde{r} is pseudocohereditary. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) Every R -module is $(r,2)$ -projective,
- (ii) every R -module is $(r,2)$ -quasiprojective,
- (iii) every finitely generated R -module is $(r,2)$ -quasiprojective.
- (iv) The class of all $(r,2)$ -quasiprojective R -modules is closed under the formation of finite direct sums.
- (v) $R/\tilde{r}(R)$ is a completely reducible ring.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks Professors K.M. Rangaswamy and K. Varadarajan for sending him the articles [14] and [18] which motivated the present paper.

R e f e r e n c e s

- [1] L. BICAN, P. JAMBOR, T. KEPKA, P. NĚMEC: Preradicals, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 15(1974), 75-83.
- [2] L. BICAN, P. JAMBOR, T. KEPKA, P. NĚMEC: Hereditary and cohereditary preradicals, Czech. Math. J. 26(1976), 192-206.
- [3] L. BICAN, P. JAMBOR, T. KEPKA, P. NĚMEC: Composition of preradicals, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 15(1974), 393-405.
- [4] L. BICAN, P. JAMBOR, T. KEPKA, P. NĚMEC: A note on test modules, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 17(1976), 345-355.
- [5] L. BICAN, P. JAMBOR, T. KEPKA, P. NĚMEC: Preradicals and change of rings, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 16 (1975), 201-217.
- [6] P.E. BLAND: Divisible and codivisible modules, Math. Scand. 34(1974), 153-161.
- [7] P.E. BLAND: A note on divisible and codivisible dimension, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 12(1975), 171-177.

- [8] J.S. GOIAN: Characterisation of rings using quasiprojective modules, I, Israel J. Math. 8(1970),34-38.
- [9] J.S. GOLAN: Localization of noncommutative rings, Marcel Dekker 1975.
- [10] J. JIRÁSKO: Generalized injectivity, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 16(1975), 621-636.
- [11] H. JIRÁSKOVÁ, J. JIRÁSKO: Generalized projectivity, Czech. Math. J. 28(1978), 632-646.
- [12] J. JIRÁSKO: Pseudohereditary and pseudocohereditary pre-radicals (to appear).
- [13] K. NISHIDA: Divisible modules, Codivisible modules, and quasi-divisible modules, Comm. Alg. 5(1977), 591-610.
- [14] K.M. RANGASWAMY: Codivisible modules, Comm. Alg. 2(1974), 475-489.
- [15] M.S. SHRIKHANDE: On hereditary and cohereditary modules, Canad. J. Math. 25(1973), 892-896.
- [16] Bo STENSTRÖM: Rings of quotients, Springer Verlag 1975.
- [17] M.L. TEPLY: Codivisible and projective covers, Comm. Alg. 1(1974), 23-38.
- [18] K. VARADARAJAN: M-projective and strongly M-projective modules, Illinois J. Math. 20(1976), 507-515.

Matematicko-fyzikální fakulta

Universita Karlova

Sokolovská 83, 18600 Praha 8

Československo

(Oblatum 21.3. 1979)