

PURE PROJECTIVES AND INJECTIVES

JOHN DAUNS

ABSTRACT. A module over a ring R is pure projective or pure injective if it has the projective or injective property relative to all pure short exact sequences. Here a more restrictive concept of purity is introduced which singles out a certain subset of the pure short exact sequences. The modules which have the projective and injective property relative only to this smaller subset are studied.

1. Introduction. For infinite cardinals μ, \aleph , $(\mu^<, \aleph^<)$ -pure submodules, and their derivatives, $(\mu^<, \aleph^<)$ -pure exact sequences (see Definitions 1.2 and 1.3), were first introduced in [2]. The $(\mu^<, \aleph^<)$ -pure projective modules are new and appear here for the first time in this full generality. The special case when $\mu = \aleph_0$ and $\aleph = \aleph_0$ is the usual well-known case of pure submodules, pure exact sequences, pure injectives and pure projectives. In this special case the pure projectives appear in [7]. A module that has a presentation with fewer than μ generators and fewer than \aleph relations is said to be $(\mu^<, \aleph^<)$ -presented. Here Section 2 ends with a satisfactory characterization (Theorem 2.4); a module M is $(\mu^<, \aleph^<)$ -pure projective if and only if it is a direct summand of a direct sum of $(\mu^<, \aleph^<)$ -presented modules.

A module D is $(\mu^<, \aleph^<)$ -pure injective by definition if D has the injective property relative to all $(\mu^<, \aleph^<)$ -pure short exact sequences. There is a satisfactory theory in the finite $\mu = \aleph = \aleph_0$ case for (ordinary) pure injectives [5, Vol. 1, pp. 158–174] and/or [4, pp. 118–122]. However, in contrast to the projective case, so far the author has been unable to develop a theory of $(\mu^<, \aleph^<)$ -pure injective modules. Here Section 3 gives all that can be said in the special case $\mu = \aleph_0 \cdot \aleph$ in which case an $(\aleph_0 \cdot \aleph^<, \aleph^<)$ -pure injective module is simply called $\aleph^<$ -pure injective. One of the main results here is Theorem 3.1. Its proof is very different from the known finite case $\aleph = \aleph_0$. The author is unable to prove it for the general $(\mu^<, \aleph^<)$ -case, and it is not clear

2000 AMS *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 16D10, 16D40, 16D50.

Received by the editors on July 16, 2001, and in revised form on October 8, 2001.