

Hana Jirásková; Josef Jirásko

Generalized projectivity

*Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, Vol. 28 (1978), No. 4, 632–646

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/101564>

## Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1978

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



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

## GENERALIZED PROJECTIVITY

HANA JIRÁSKOVÁ, JOSEF JIRÁSKO, Praha

(Received January 10, 1977)

Throughout this paper,  $R$  stands for an associative ring with unity and  $R\text{-mod}$  denotes the category of all unitary left  $R$ -modules. A submodule  $A$  of  $B$  is *small* in  $B$  if  $A + K = B$  implies  $K = B$  for every submodule  $K \subseteq B$ . If  $f$  is an epimorphism from  $A$  to  $B$  ( $\text{Ker } f$  is small in  $A$ ) then we shall say that  $(A, f)$  is a *coextension* (a cover) of  $B$ . This fact will be denoted by  $A \leq_f B$  ( $A \leq_f^s B$ ).  $(A, f)$  is said to be a *proper coextension* of  $B$  provided  $f$  is not an isomorphism. It is easy to see that  $A \leq_f^s B$  and  $B \leq_g^s C$  iff  $A \leq_{g \circ f}^s C$ . A pair  $(P, \varphi)$  is a *projective cover* of the module  $M$  if  $(P, \varphi)$  is a cover of  $M$  and  $P$  a projective module. If  $M$  has a projective cover then all projective covers of  $M$  are canonically isomorphic and we can choose one of them and denote it by  $(C(M), \varphi_M)$ . A ring  $R$  is said to be *left perfect* if each of its left modules has a projective cover. A module  $C$  is said to be a *cogenerator* for the  $R\text{-mod}$  if for every  $M \in R\text{-mod}$  there is an index set  $A$  and a monomorphism  $f : M \rightarrow \prod_{a \in A} C_a$ , where  $C_a = C$  for all  $a \in A$ .

### 1. GENERAL THEORY

In the class  $\mathcal{M}$  of all  $\langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle$  where  $A, B, P \in R\text{-mod}$ ,  $A \leq_h B$  and  $g \in \text{Hom}_R(P, B)$ , define the quasi-order  $\leq$  in the following way:  $\langle A', h', B', g', P' \rangle \leq \langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle$  if and only if  $A = A'$ ,  $P = P'$  and there exists an epimorphism  $f : B' \rightarrow B$  such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{h'} & B' & \xleftarrow{g'} & P \\
 \downarrow h & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\
 & & B & & 
 \end{array}$$

commutes.

In this paper  $\mathcal{L}$  always denotes a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$ . We shall say that  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies the condition

- (α) if  $\langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $\langle A, h', B', g', P \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\langle A, h', B', g', P \rangle \cong \langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle$  implies  $\langle A, h', B', g', P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$ ,
- (β) if  $\langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $P' \cong_f P$  implies  $\langle A, h, B, g \circ f, P' \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$ ,
- (β') if  $\langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $P' \cong_f^s P$  implies  $\langle A, h, B, g \circ f, P' \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$ ,
- (γ) if  $\langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $f : P' \rightarrow P$  an isomorphism implies  $\langle A, h, B, g \circ f, P' \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$ ,
- (δ) if  $\langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $f \in \text{Hom}_R(P', P)$  implies  $\langle A, h, B, g \circ f, P' \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$

For every  $\langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$  let us define  $r_{\mathcal{L}}(A, h, B, g, P)$  ( $s_{\mathcal{L}}(A, h, B, g, P)$ ) to be an intersection of all such  $\text{Ker } f, f \in \text{Hom}_R(A, M)$  to which there exists a commutative (push-out) diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & N \\
 f \uparrow & & \uparrow v \\
 A & \xrightarrow{h} & B \\
 & & \uparrow g \\
 & & P
 \end{array}$$

with  $\langle M, \lambda, N, v \circ g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$ .

For every  $\langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$  we define

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_{\mathcal{L}}(A, h, B, g, P) &= A / (r_{\mathcal{L}}(A, h, B, g, P) \cap \text{Ker } h), \\
 D_{\mathcal{L}}(A, h, B, g, P) &= A / (s_{\mathcal{L}}(A, h, B, g, P) \cap \text{Ker } h).
 \end{aligned}$$

We also use the following abbreviation:  $r_{\mathcal{L}}(A, h, B, 1_B, B) = r_{\mathcal{L}}(A, h, B)$ . Similarly for  $s_{\mathcal{L}}, C_{\mathcal{L}}, D_{\mathcal{L}}$ .

**Lemma 1.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  and let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{h} & B & \xleftarrow{g} & P \\
 k_1 \uparrow & & k_2 \uparrow & & k_3 \uparrow \\
 C & \xrightarrow{h_1} & D & \xleftarrow{g_1} & S
 \end{array}
 \quad (**) \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 M & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & N \\
 f \uparrow & & \uparrow v \\
 A & \xrightarrow{h} & B
 \end{array}$$

be commutative diagrams, where  $h, h_1, \lambda$  are epimorphisms. If for every diagram (\*\*)  $\langle M, \lambda, N, v \circ g \circ k_3, S \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$  whenever  $\langle M, \lambda, N, v \circ g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$  then  $k_1(r_{\mathcal{L}}(C, h_1, D, g_1, S)) \subseteq r_{\mathcal{L}}(A, h, B, g, P)$ . In particular,  $k_1(r_{\mathcal{L}}(C, h_1, D)) \subseteq r_{\mathcal{L}}(A, h, B)$ .

**Proof.** Obvious.

**Definition 1.2.** A module  $P$  is said to be  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective if every diagram

$$(1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & & P \\ & & \downarrow g \\ N & \xrightarrow{h} & M \end{array}$$

with  $\langle N, h, M, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$  can be completed to a commutative one.

**Theorem 1.3.** Suppose  $P$  has a projective cover. Then the following conditions (i), (ii), (iii) are equivalent, (iii) implies (iv) and (iv) implies (v). Moreover, if  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies  $(\alpha)$  then all the following conditions are equivalent.

- (i) for every epimorphism  $N \xrightarrow{h} P$ , where  $N$  has a coextension  $(Q, q)$  with  $r_{\mathcal{L}}(Q, h \circ q, P) \cap \text{Ker } h \circ q \subseteq \text{Ker } q$ , there is a homomorphism  $\psi : P \rightarrow N$  with  $h \circ \psi = 1_P$ ;
- (ii)  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$ ;
- (iii) every diagram (1), where  $N$  has a coextension  $(Q, q)$  with  $r_{\mathcal{L}}(Q, h \circ q, M, g, P) \cap \text{Ker } h \circ q \subseteq \text{Ker } q$  can be made commutative;
- (iv)  $P$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective;
- (v)  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq s_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$ .

*Proof.* (i) implies (ii). It suffices to put  $N = C_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$  and set  $h = \bar{\varphi}_P$ , where  $\bar{\varphi}_P$  is induced by  $\varphi_P$ . Since  $(N, h)$  is a cover of  $P$ ,  $h$  is an isomorphism by (i) and consequently  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$ .

(ii) implies (iii). Consider the diagram (1). Then there is  $f : C(P) \rightarrow Q$  with  $h \circ q \circ f = g \circ \varphi_P$ . By Lemma 1.1,  $f(r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)) \subseteq r_{\mathcal{L}}(Q, h \circ q, M, g, P)$  and the inclusions  $f(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) = f(r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P) \subseteq r_{\mathcal{L}}(Q, h \circ q, M, g, P) \cap \text{Ker } h \circ q \subseteq \text{Ker } q$  complete the proof.

(iii) implies (i). Obvious.

(ii) implies (iv). Easy.

(iv) implies (v). Consider the push-out diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C(P) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_P} & P \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ A & \xrightarrow{h} & B \end{array}$$

where  $\langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$ . Then  $g = h \circ f_1$  for some  $f_1 : P \rightarrow A$  and  $f = f_1 \circ \varphi_P$  since  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P + \text{Ker } (f - f_1 \circ \varphi_P) = C(P)$  as is easily seen. Therefore  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq \text{Ker } f$ .

Finally, if  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies  $(\alpha)$  then  $r_{\mathcal{L}} = s_{\mathcal{L}}$ .

**Corollary 1.4.** Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $(\beta)$  and  $P, Q \in R\text{-mod}$  with projective covers  $(C(P), \varphi_P), (C(Q), \varphi_Q)$ , respectively. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C(Q) & \xrightarrow{C(f)} & C(P) \\ \varphi_Q \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi_P \\ Q & \longrightarrow & P \end{array}$$

where  $f$  is an epimorphism. Then  $P$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective provided

$$\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq C(f)(r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(Q), \varphi_Q, Q)).$$

**Proof.** We have  $C(f)(r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(Q), \varphi_Q, Q)) \subseteq r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$  by Lemma 1.1 and  $P$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective by Theorem 1.3.

**Definition 1.5.** For any ordinal  $\alpha$  and any epimorphism  $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$  let us define sequences  $C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(A, \varphi, B)$  of modules and epimorphisms  $\varphi_{\alpha} : A \rightarrow C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(A, \varphi, B)$  inductively as follows:

$$C_{\mathcal{L}}^0(A, \varphi, B) = B, \quad \varphi_0 = \varphi;$$

$$C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha+1}(A, \varphi, B) = C_{\mathcal{L}}(A, \varphi_{\alpha}, C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(A, \varphi, B)), \quad \varphi_{\alpha+1} \text{ is a natural epimorphism and}$$

$$C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(A, \varphi, B) = A / \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} \text{Ker } \varphi_{\beta}, \quad \varphi_{\alpha} \text{ is a natural epimorphism, } \alpha\text{-limit.}$$

Further put  $\bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(A, \varphi, B) = C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(A, \varphi, B)$ ,  $\bar{r}_{\mathcal{L}}(A, \varphi, B) = \text{Ker } \varphi_{\alpha}$ , where  $\text{Ker } \varphi_{\alpha} = \text{Ker } \varphi_{\alpha+1}$ ,  $\alpha \geq 1$ .

**Corollary 1.6.** For every module  $P$  with a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$  the module  $\bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective.

**Proof.** Denote  $Q = \bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P) = C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$ . Then  $\text{Ker } (\varphi_P)_{\alpha} = \text{Ker } (\varphi_P)_{\alpha+1} = r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), (\varphi_P)_{\alpha}, Q) \cap \text{Ker } (\varphi_P)_{\alpha} \subseteq r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), (\varphi_P)_{\alpha}, Q)$  and apply Theorem 1.3.

**Lemma 1.7.** Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $(\gamma)$ ,  $N, P \in R\text{-mod}$  and let  $h : N \rightarrow P$  be an epimorphism. If  $f : N_1 \rightarrow N_2$  is a canonical isomorphism of two projective covers  $(N_1, g_1), (N_2, g_2)$  of  $N$  then  $f_{[\alpha]}(C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(N_1, h \circ g_1, P)) = C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(N_2, h \circ g_2, P)$ , where  $f_{[\alpha]}$  is an isomorphism induced by  $f$  for  $\alpha \geq 1$ ,  $f_{[0]} = 1_P$ .

**Proof.** By transfinite induction and Lemma 1.1.

**Lemma 1.8.** Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $(\beta')$  and let  $P$  be a module having a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$ . If  $C(P) \leq_g Q \leq_f P$  where  $f \circ g = \varphi_P$  then  $\text{Ker } g_{\alpha} \subseteq \text{Ker } (\varphi_P)_{\alpha}$  for every ordinal  $\alpha$  under the notation from 1.5.

**Proof.** It follows easily by transfinite induction using Lemma 1.1.

**Remark 1.9.** If  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies  $(\gamma)$  then the class of all  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective modules is abstract.

**Definition 1.10.** Let  $A, B$  be modules and let  $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$  be an epimorphism. A pair  $(A, \varphi)$  is said to be an  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective cover of the module  $B$  if  $A$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective,  $A \leq_f C \leq_g B$  with  $g \circ f = \varphi$  and  $C$   $\mathcal{L}$ -projective implies  $f$  is an isomorphism.

**Theorem 1.11.** Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $(\alpha)$ ,  $(\beta')$  and let  $P$  be a module with a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$ . Then  $(\bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$ , where  $\bar{\varphi}_P$  is an epimorphism induced by  $\varphi_P$ , is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective cover of  $P$ .

*Proof.* The module  $N = \bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P) = C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective by Corollary 1.6. Let a module  $Q, N \leq_h Q \leq_g P, g \circ h = \bar{\varphi}_P$ , be  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective. From Theorem 1.3 we get  $\text{Ker}(h \circ (\varphi_P)_{\alpha})_1 = \text{Ker}(h \circ (\varphi_P)_{\alpha})_{\alpha}$  and Lemma 1.8 yields  $\text{Ker}(h \circ (\varphi_P)_{\alpha})_{\alpha} \subseteq \text{Ker}(\varphi_P)_{\alpha}$ . Therefore  $r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), h \circ (\varphi_P)_{\alpha}, Q) \cap \text{Ker}(h \circ (\varphi_P)_{\alpha}) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\varphi_P)_{\alpha}$  and  $h$  is an isomorphism by Theorem 1.3 (i).

**Theorem 1.12.** Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $(\alpha)$ ,  $(\beta)$  and let  $P$  be a module with a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$ . Then all  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective covers of the module  $P$  are canonically isomorphic provided at least one of the following two conditions holds:

- (i) Every  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective module has a projective cover.
- (ii) There is a natural number  $n \geq 1$  such that  $C_{\mathcal{L}}^n(C(P), \varphi_P, P) = C_{\mathcal{L}}^{n+1}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$ .

*Proof.* The existence of an  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective cover of  $P$  follows from Theorem 1.11. Let  $(\tilde{P}, g)$  be an arbitrary  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective cover of  $P$ .

(i) There is an epimorphism  $\tilde{g} : C(\tilde{P}) \rightarrow C(P)$  with  $g \circ \varphi_{\tilde{P}} = \varphi_P \circ \tilde{g}$ . For every ordinal number  $\alpha \geq 1$ ,  $\tilde{g}$  induces an epimorphism  $\tilde{g}_{[\alpha]} : C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(C(\tilde{P}), \varphi_{\tilde{P}}, \tilde{P}) \rightarrow C_{\mathcal{L}}^{\alpha}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$ . By Theorem 1.3,  $\bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(\tilde{P}), \varphi_{\tilde{P}}, \tilde{P}) = C_{\mathcal{L}}(C(\tilde{P}), \varphi_{\tilde{P}}, \tilde{P}) \cong \tilde{P}$ . Hence  $\bar{\varphi}_{\tilde{P}} \circ h = g$  for an epimorphism  $h : \tilde{P} \rightarrow \bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$  and  $h$  is an isomorphism since  $(\tilde{P}, g)$  is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective cover of  $P$ .

(ii) Put  $P_k = C_{\mathcal{L}}^k(C(P), \varphi_P, P), g_{[0]} = g$  and suppose that  $g_{[i]} : \tilde{P} \rightarrow P_i$  is an epimorphism. From  $\text{Ker}(\varphi_P)_{i+1} = r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), (\varphi_P)_{i+1}, P_{i+1}) \cap \text{Ker}(\varphi_P)_i$  we obtain  $r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), (\varphi_P)_i, P_i, g_{[i]}, \tilde{P}) \cap \text{Ker}(\varphi_P)_i \subseteq \text{Ker}(\varphi_P)_{i+1}$  by Lemma 1.1 and  $g_{[i]}$  factors through a homomorphism  $g_{[i+1]} : \tilde{P} \rightarrow P_{i+1}$ . As is easy to see,  $g_{[i+1]}$  is an epimorphism. The proof is completed similarly as in (i).

**Definition 1.13.** A coextension  $(N, h)$  of a module  $P$  is said to be  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense if there are  $Q \in R\text{-mod}$  and an epimorphism  $q : Q \rightarrow N$  such that  $r_{\mathcal{L}}(Q, h \circ q, P) \cap \text{Ker}(h \circ q) \subseteq \text{Ker } q$ .

Suppose now that  $N$  has a projective cover  $(C(N), \varphi_N)$ . As is easy to see,  $(N, h)$  is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense coextension of  $P$  if and only if  $r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(N), h \circ \varphi_N, P) \cap \text{Ker } h \circ \varphi_N \subseteq \text{Ker } \varphi_N$ .

An  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense coextension which is a cover is said to be an  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover.

**Theorem 1.14.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfy  $(\alpha)$  and let  $P$  be a module having a projective cover. Then  $P$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective iff  $P$  has no proper  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover.*

*Proof.* The “if” part of the proof follows from Theorem 1.3 since every  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense coextension of an  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective module splits. For the “only if” part  $(C_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$ , where  $\bar{\varphi}_P$  is an epimorphism induced by  $\varphi_P$ , is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $P$  so that  $P$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective by Theorem 1.3.

**Definition 1.15.** Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $(\gamma)$  and let  $N$  be a module having a projective cover. A coextension  $(N, h)$  of a module  $P$  is said to be *weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense* if  $\bar{r}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(N), h \circ \varphi_N, P) \subseteq \text{Ker } \varphi_N$ . A weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense coextension which is a cover is said to be a *weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover*.

**Theorem 1.16.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfy  $(\alpha), (\gamma)$  and let  $P$  be a module having a projective cover. Then  $P$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective iff it has no proper weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover.*

*Proof.* It follows easily from Theorem 1.14.

**Lemma 1.17.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $(\beta')$ , let  $A$  be a module having a projective cover,  $B, C \in R\text{-mod}$  and  $A \leq_f B \leq_g C$ . Then*

- (i) *if  $(A, g \circ f)$  is a weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $C$  then  $(A, f)$  is a weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $B$ ,*
- (ii) *if  $(A, f)$  is a weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $B$  and  $(B, g)$  a weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $C$  then  $(A, g \circ f)$  is a weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $C$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Obvious, since Lemma 1.8 yields  $\bar{r}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(A), f \circ \varphi_A, B) \subseteq \bar{r}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(A), g \circ f \circ \varphi_A, C)$ .

(ii) By assumption  $\bar{r}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(A), f \circ \varphi_A, B) \subseteq \text{Ker } \varphi_A$  and  $\bar{r}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(A), g \circ f \circ \varphi_A, C) \subseteq \text{Ker } f \circ \varphi_A$ . Hence  $C(A) \leq_{\pi} \bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(A), g \circ f \circ \varphi_A, C) \leq_{\bar{f} \circ \varphi_A} B$ ,  $\bar{f} \circ \varphi_A \circ \pi = f \circ \varphi_A$ ,  $\pi$  is a natural epimorphism and Lemma 1.8 gives  $\bar{r}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(A), g \circ f \circ \varphi_A, C) = \bar{r}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(A), \pi, \bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(A), g \circ f \circ \varphi_A, C)) \subseteq \bar{r}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(A), f \circ \varphi_A, B) \subseteq \text{Ker } \varphi_A$ .

**Definition 1.18.** A cover  $(N, h)$  of  $P$  is said to be a *minimal weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover* of  $P$  if it holds:  $(N, h)$  is a weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $P$  and  $M \leq_g N \leq_h P$ , where  $(M, h \circ g)$  is a weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $P$ , implies  $g$  is an isomorphism.

**Theorem 1.19.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $(\alpha), (\beta)$  and let  $P$  be a module with a projective cover such that at least one of the conditions which are given in Theorem 1.12 holds. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i)  *$(N, h)$  is a minimal weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $P$ ,*
- (ii)  *$(N, h)$  is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective cover of  $P$ ,*
- (iii)  *$N$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective and  $(N, h)$  is a weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $P$ .*

Proof. (i) implies (ii). The  $\mathcal{L}$ -projectivity of  $N$  follows from Theorem 1.16 and Lemma 1.17. If  $N \leq_g M \leq_f P$ ,  $f \circ g = h$  and  $M$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective then Theorem 1.16 and Lemma 1.17 imply that  $g$  is an isomorphism.

(ii) implies (iii). It follows from Theorem 1.11 and Theorem 1.12 that there is an isomorphism  $f : N \rightarrow \bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)$  such that  $\bar{\varphi}_P \circ f = h$  and it suffices to use Lemma 1.17 (ii), since  $(\bar{C}_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is a weakly  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense cover of  $P$ .

(iii) implies (i). By Theorem 1.16 and Lemma 1.17 (i).

**Proposition 1.20.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $(\alpha)$ ,  $(\delta)$  and let  $P$  be a module with a projective cover. Then  $P$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective if and only if every diagram (1) with  $(N, h)$  being  $\mathcal{L}$ -codense coextension of  $M$  can be made commutative.*

Proof. If the condition is satisfied then  $P$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective by Theorem 1.3. Conversely,  $r_{\mathcal{L}}(Q, h \circ q, M) \cap \text{Ker } h \circ q \subseteq \text{Ker } q$  for some  $Q \in R\text{-mod}$  and an epimorphism  $q : Q \rightarrow N$  and it suffices to use Theorem 1.3 (iii), since  $r_{\mathcal{L}}(Q, h \circ q, M, g, P) \subseteq r_{\mathcal{L}}(Q, h \circ q, M)$  by Lemma 1.1.

We can use the following notation. For every  $C \in R\text{-mod}$  let us denote by  $\mathcal{L}_C$  the class of all  $\langle N, h, M, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$ , where  $N = C$ .

**Definition 1.21.** A module  $C$  is said to be a *test module for  $\mathcal{L}$ -projectivity* if every  $\mathcal{L}_C$ -projective module is  $\mathcal{L}$ -projective.

**Theorem 1.22.** (Test criterion for  $\mathcal{L}$ -projectivity.) *Let  $R$  be a left perfect ring and  $\mathcal{L}$  a subclass of  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying the following condition  $(\varepsilon)$ :*

( $\varepsilon$ ) If

$$(2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & & P \\ & & \downarrow \pi \\ C(P)/r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P) & \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}_P} & P/\varphi_P(r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P)) \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ C & \xrightarrow{h} & D \end{array}$$

is a push-out diagram then  $\langle C, h, D, g \circ \pi, P \rangle \in \mathcal{L}$ . ( $\pi$  is a natural epimorphism.)

Then every cogenerator for the  $R\text{-mod}$  is a test module for  $\mathcal{L}$ -projectivity.

Proof. Suppose that  $C$  is a cogenerator for the  $R\text{-mod}$  and  $P$  is  $\mathcal{L}_C$ -projective. With respect to Theorem 1.3, it suffices to prove that  $K = \text{Ker } \bar{\varphi}_P = 0$ , where  $\bar{\varphi}_P : C(P)/r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P) \rightarrow P/\varphi_P(r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P))$  is an epimorphism induced by  $\varphi_P$ . Suppose on the contrary that  $K \neq 0$ . Then there are  $k \in K$  and a homomorphism  $f : C(P)/r_{\mathcal{L}}(C(P), \varphi_P, P) \rightarrow C$  with  $f(k) \neq 0$ , since  $C$  is a cogenerator. Consider the push-out diagram (2). By the assumption, there is  $p : P \rightarrow C$  with  $h \circ p = g \circ \pi$ .



Since

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C(P) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_P} & P \\
 f \circ \pi_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow g \circ \pi \\
 C & \xrightarrow{h} & D
 \end{array}$$

( $\pi_1, \pi$  are natural epimorphisms) is a push-out diagram and  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P$  is small in  $C(P)$ , we have  $f \circ \pi_1 = p \circ \varphi_P$ . Further,  $k = \pi_1(k')$  for some  $k' \in \text{Ker } \varphi_P$ . Therefore  $f(k) = (f \circ \pi_1)(k') = (p \circ \varphi_P)(k') = 0$ , a contradiction.

## 2. APPLICATIONS

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a subclass of the class  $\mathcal{R}$  of all couples  $(M, N)$ ,  $M \subseteq N$ . We say that  $\mathcal{P}$  satisfies the condition (a) if  $(M, N) \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $M' \subseteq M \subseteq N$  implies  $(M', N) \in \mathcal{P}$ .

**Remark 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}$  be subclasses of  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  a class of all  $\langle A, h, B, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ , where  $(\text{Ker } h, A) \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $(h^{-1}(\text{Im } g), A) \in \mathcal{X}$ . Obviously  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies (b). Moreover, if both  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  satisfy (a) then  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies (a) and (d).

We start with some basic definitions from the theory of preradicals (for details see [4] and [5]).

A *preradical*  $s$  for  $R$ -mod is any subfunctor of the identity functor, i.e.,  $s$  assigns to each module  $M$  its submodule  $s(M)$  in such a way that every homomorphism of  $M$  into  $N$  induces a homomorphism of  $s(M)$  into  $s(N)$  by restriction. A preradical  $s$  is said to be

- *idempotent* if  $s(s(M)) = s(M)$  for every module  $M$ ,
- *a radical* if  $s(M/s(M)) = 0$  for every module  $M$ ,
- *cohereditary* if  $s(M/N) = (s(M) + N)/N$  for every submodule  $N$  of a module  $M$ ,
- *hereditary* if  $s(N) = N \cap s(M)$  for every submodule  $N$  of a module  $M$ .

A module  $M$  is an *s-torsion* if  $s(M) = M$  and *s-torsionfree* if  $s(M) = 0$ . If  $r$  and  $s$  are preradicals then we write  $r \leq s$  if  $r(M) \subseteq s(M)$  for all  $M \in R$ -mod. The zero functor is denoted by  $\text{zer}$  and the identity functor by  $\text{id}$ .

For every  $M \in R$ -mod we define  $r^{(M)}(N) = \bigcap \text{Ker } f$ ,  $f$  ranging over all  $f \in \text{Hom}_R(N, M)$ . It is easy to see that  $r^{(M)}$  is a radical and, in fact, the largest preradical for which  $M$  is a torsionfree module. The *idempotent core*  $\bar{s}$  of a preradical  $s$  is defined by  $\bar{s}(M) = \sum K$ , where  $K$  runs through all  $s$ -torsion submodules  $K$  of  $M$ , and the radical closure  $\tilde{s}$  is defined by  $\tilde{s}(M) = \bigcap L$ , where  $L$  runs through all submodules  $L$  with  $M/L$   $s$ -torsionfree. Further, the cohereditary core  $ch(s)$  is defined by  $ch(s)(M) = s(R)M$ .

For a preradical  $s$  and modules  $N \subseteq M$  let us define  $C_s(N : M)$  by  $C_s(N : M)/N = s(M/N)$ .

Let  $s$  be a preradical for  $R\text{-mod}$ . A coextension  $(A, h)$  of a module  $B$  is said to be:

- $(s, 1)$ -codense if there exist  $C \in R\text{-mod}$  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  $(M, \pi)$  is an  $(s, 1)$ -codense coextension of  $M/N$  where  $\pi$  is a natural epimorphism, then we shall write  $N \subseteq^{(s,1)} M$ . Similarly  $N \subseteq^{(s,2)} M$  ( $N \subseteq^{(s,3)} M$ ).

A preradical  $s$  is said to be *cobalanced* if  $A \subseteq B$ ,  $C \subseteq D$ ,  $A \cong C$  and  $A \subseteq^{(s,1)} B$  implies  $C \subseteq^{(s,1)} D$ .

It is easy to prove the following assertions for a preradical  $s$ :

- (i) if  $P \leq_g A$ ,  $P$  projective then  $(A, h)$  is an  $(s, 1)$ -codense coextension of  $B$  iff  $s(g^{-1}(\text{Ker } h)) \subseteq \text{Ker } g$ ;
- (ii) if  $N \subseteq M$  are modules then  $N \subseteq^{(s,3)} M$  implies  $N \subseteq^{(s,2)} M$  and  $N \subseteq^{(s,2)} M$  implies  $N \subseteq^{(s,1)} M$ ;
- (iii) if  $s$  is a cohereditary preradical and  $N \subseteq M$  are modules then  $N \subseteq^{(s,1)} M$  implies  $N \subseteq^{(s,2)} M$ ;
- (iv) if  $s$  is a hereditary preradical and  $N \subseteq M$  are modules then  $N \subseteq^{(s,2)} M$  implies  $N \subseteq^{(s,3)} M$ ;
- (v)  $M \subseteq^{(s,1)} M$  iff  $M$  is  $ch(s)$ -torsionfree,  $M \subseteq^{(s,2)} M$  iff  $M \subseteq^{(s,3)} M$  iff  $M$  is  $s$ -torsionfree;
- (vi) if  $K \subseteq N \subseteq M$  are modules then  $N \subseteq^{(s,i)} M$  implies  $K \subseteq^{(s,i)} M$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ;
- (vii) every cohereditary preradical is cobalanced;
- (viii) if  $R$  is left hereditary then every preradical is cobalanced.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $r, s$  be two preradicals,  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $M \in R\text{-mod}$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}_i$  be the class of all couples  $(N, M)$  of modules with  $N \subseteq^{(r,i)} M$  and let  $\mathcal{K}_j$  be the class of all couples  $(N, M)$  with  $N \subseteq^{(s,j)} M$ . Now let  $\mathcal{L}_{i,j}$  be the class of all  $\langle M, h, B, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $(\text{Ker } h, M) \in \mathcal{P}_i$  and  $(h^{-1}(\text{Im } g), M) \in \mathcal{K}_j$ . We say that a module  $P$  is  $(r, i, s, j, M)$ -projective, if it is  $\mathcal{L}_{i,j}$ -projective. A module  $P$  is said to be  $(r, i, s, j)$ -projective, if it is  $(r, i, s, j, N)$ -projective for all  $N \in R\text{-mod}$ .

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

**Proposition 2.3.** Every module  $P$  having a projective cover has an  $(r, i, s, j, M)$ -projective cover ( $(r, i, s, j)$ -projective cover),  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . If at least one of the

conditions which are given in Theorem 1.12 holds, then all the  $(r, i, s, j, M)$ -projective covers  $((r, i, s, j)$ -projective covers) of  $P$  are canonically isomorphic,  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

Proof. Apply Theorems 1.11, 1.12 and Remark 2.1.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $r, s$  be preradicals for  $R$ -mod,  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and let  $(A, h)$  be a coextension of a module  $B$ . Consider a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\psi} & Y & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ f \uparrow & & \uparrow v & & \\ A & \xrightarrow{h} & B & & \end{array}$$

with an exact row, where  $\text{Ker } \psi \subseteq {}^{(r,i)}X$  and  $\psi^{-1}(\text{Im } v) \subseteq {}^{(s,j)}X$ . Then the following implications hold:

- (i) if  $i = 1, j = 1, A$  projective then  $r(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A) = C_{ch(s)}(r(\text{Ker } h) : A) \subseteq \text{Ker } f$ ;
- (ii) if  $i = 1, j = 2, A$  projective then  $C_3(r(\text{Ker } h) : A) \subseteq \text{Ker } f$ ;
- (iii) if  $i = 2, j = 1$  then  $\tilde{r}(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A) = C_{ch(s)}(\tilde{r}(\text{Ker } h) : A) \subseteq \text{Ker } f$ ;
- (iv) if  $i = 2, j = 2$  then  $C_3(\tilde{r}(\text{Ker } h) : A) \subseteq \text{Ker } f$ ;
- (v) if  $i = 3, j = 1$  then  $ch(s)(A) + C_r(ch(s)(A) : A) \cap \text{Ker } h = C_{ch(s)}(C_r(ch(s)(A) : A) \cap \text{Ker } h : A) \subseteq \text{Ker } f$ ;
- (vi) if  $i = 3, j = 2$  then  $C_3(C_r(\tilde{s}(A) : A) \cap \text{Ker } h : A) \subseteq \text{Ker } f$ .

Proof. Easy.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let  $r, s$  be preradicals for  $R$ -mod,  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and let  $(A, h)$  be a coextension of a module  $B$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}_{i,j}$  be the class of all  $\langle M, f, N, g, P \rangle \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\text{Ker } f \subseteq {}^{(r,i)}M$  and  $f^{-1}(\text{Im } g) \subseteq {}^{(s,j)}M$ . Then the following implications hold:

- (i) if  $i = 1, j = 1, s = \text{zer}$  then  $r_{\mathcal{L}_{i,j}}(A, h, B) \subseteq r(\text{Ker } h)$ ;
- (ii) if  $i = 1, j = 1, r$  is cobalanced then  $r_{\mathcal{L}_{i,j}}(A, h, B) \subseteq r(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A)$ ;
- (iii) if  $i = 2, j = 1, s = \text{zer}$  then  $r_{\mathcal{L}_{i,j}}(A, h, B) \subseteq \tilde{r}(\text{Ker } h)$ ;
- (iv) if  $i = 2, j = 1$  and  $\text{Ker } h / (\tilde{r}(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A) \cap \text{Ker } h)$  is  $\tilde{r}$ -torsionfree then  $r_{\mathcal{L}_{i,j}}(A, h, B) \subseteq \tilde{r}(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A)$ ;
- (v) if  $i = 1, j = 2, r$  is cobalanced then  $r_{\mathcal{L}_{i,j}}(A, h, B) \subseteq C_3(r(\text{Ker } h) : A)$ ;
- (vi) if  $i = 2, j = 2$  and  $\text{Ker } h / (\text{Ker } h \cap C_3(\tilde{r}(\text{Ker } h) : A))$  is  $\tilde{r}$ -torsionfree then  $r_{\mathcal{L}_{i,j}}(A, h, B) \subseteq C_3(\tilde{r}(\text{Ker } h) : A)$ ;

- (vii) if  $i = 1, j = 1$  and  $B$  is  $ch(s)$ -torsionfree then  $r_{\mathcal{E}_{i,j}}(A, h, B) \subseteq r(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A)$ ;
- (viii) if  $i = 1, j = 2$  and  $B$  is  $s$ -torsionfree then  $r_{\mathcal{E}_{i,j}}(A, h, B) \subseteq C_{\mathfrak{s}}(r(\text{Ker } h) : A)$ ;
- (ix) if  $i = 3, j = 1$  and  $r$  is a radical then  $r_{\mathcal{E}_{i,j}}(A, h, B) \subseteq C_r(ch(s)(A) : A)$ ;
- (x) if  $i = 3, j = 2, r$  is a radical and  $A/C_r(\mathfrak{s}(A) : A)$  is  $\mathfrak{s}$ -torsionfree then  $r_{\mathcal{E}_{i,j}}(A, h, B) \subseteq C_r(\mathfrak{s}(A) : A)$ .

Proof. (i) By (vii).

(ii) and (vii) Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A/(r(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A)) & \xrightarrow{\bar{h}} & B/h(ch(s)(A)) \\
 \pi_1 \uparrow & & \uparrow \pi_2 \\
 A & \xrightarrow{h} & B
 \end{array}$$

where  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  are natural epimorphisms. It is easy to see that  $\text{Ker } \bar{h} \subseteq {}^{(r,1)}A/(r(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A))$  and  $(\bar{h})^{-1}(\text{Im } \pi_2) \subseteq {}^{(s,1)}A/(r(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A))$ .

(iii) By (iv).

(iv), (v), (vi), (viii). Similarly.

(ix) Consider the natural epimorphism  $A \rightarrow A/C_r(ch(s)(A) : A)$ .

(x) Similarly.

**Corollary 2.6.** Let  $r, s$  be preradicals for  $R\text{-mod}$  and let  $P$  be a module possessing a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$ . Then the following implications hold:

- (i) if  $r$  is cobalanced then  $P$  is  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective iff  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq s(C(P)) + r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P)$ ;
- (ii) if  $r$  is cobalanced then  $P$  is  $(r, 1, s, 2)$ -projective iff  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq C_{\mathfrak{s}}(r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) : C(P))$ ;
- (iii) if  $P$  is  $s$ -torsionfree then  $P$  is  $(r, 1, s, 2)$ -projective iff  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq C_{\mathfrak{s}}(r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) : C(P))$ ;
- (iv) if  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P / (\tilde{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P)$  is  $\tilde{r}$ -torsionfree then  $P$  is  $(r, 2, s, 1)$ -projective iff  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq \tilde{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P))$ ;
- (v) if  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P / (\text{Ker } \varphi_P \cap C_{\mathfrak{s}}(\tilde{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) : C(P)))$  is  $\tilde{r}$ -torsionfree then  $P$  is  $(r, 2, s, 2)$ -projective iff  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq C_{\mathfrak{s}}(\tilde{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) : C(P))$ ;
- (vi) if  $r$  is a radical then  $P$  is  $(r, 3, s, 1)$ -projective iff  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq C_r(s(C(P)) : C(P))$ ;

(vii) if  $r$  is a radical and  $C(P)/C_r(\tilde{s}(C(P)) : C(P))$  is  $\tilde{s}$ -torsionfree then  $P$  is  $(r, 3, s, 2)$ -projective iff  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq C_r(\tilde{s}(C(P)) : C(P))$ .

Proof. It follows from 1.3, 2.4 and 2.5.

**Proposition 2.7.** Let  $r, s$  be preradicals for  $R\text{-mod}$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $P \in R\text{-mod}$ . Then

- (i) if  $K \subseteq \text{ch}(s)(P)$  then  $P$  is  $(r, i, s, 1)$ -projective iff  $P/K$  is so,
- (ii) if  $P$  is  $(r, i, s, 2)$ -projective and  $K \subseteq \tilde{s}(P)$  then  $P/K$  is  $(r, i, s, 2)$ -projective.

Proof. Use the fact that  $P$  is  $(r, i, s, j)$ -projective iff it is  $(r, i, M)$ -projective for all  $M \in R\text{-mod}$  with  $M \subseteq^{(s,j)} M$ ,  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

**Corollary 2.8.** Let  $r, s$  be two preradicals and  $P$  a module such that  $\bar{P} = P/\text{ch}(s)(P)$  has a projective cover  $(C(\bar{P}), \varphi_P)$ . Then  $P$  is  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective iff  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq s(C(\bar{P})) + r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P)$ .

Proof. By 2.5 (vii), 2.4, 1.3 and 2.7(i).

**Proposition 2.9.** Let  $r, s$  be preradicals,  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $P \in R\text{-mod}$ . Then the following assertions hold:

- (i)  $P$  is  $(r, i, s, 2)$ -projective iff it is  $(r, i, s, 3)$ -projective;
- (ii)  $P$  is  $(r, 2, s, i)$ -projective iff it is  $(\tilde{r}, 2, s, i)$ -projective;
- (iii)  $P$  is  $(r, i, s, 2)$ -projective iff it is  $(r, i, \tilde{s}, 2)$ -projective;
- (iv)  $P$  is  $(r, i, s, 1)$ -projective iff it is  $(r, i, \text{ch}(s), 1)$ -projective;
- (v) if  $P$  has a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$  and  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P / (\tilde{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P)$  is  $\tilde{r}$ -torsionfree then  $P$  is  $(r, 2, s, 1)$ -projective iff it is  $(\tilde{r}, 2, s, 1)$ -projective;
- (vi) if  $P$  has a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$  then  $P$  is  $(r, 1)$ -projective iff it is  $(\tilde{r}, 1)$ -projective;
- (vii) if  $r$  is cobalanced then  $P$  is  $(r, 1, s, i)$ -projective iff it is  $(\text{ch}(r), 1, s, i)$ -projective;
- (viii) if  $r$  cobalanced and  $P$  has a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$  then  $P$  is  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective iff it is  $(\overline{\text{ch}}(r), 2, s, 1)$ -projective.

Proof. (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (vii) are obvious.

(vi) follows from 2.8.

(v) With respect to (ii) we can assume that  $r$  is a radical. Since  $\tilde{r} \subseteq r$ , the  $(\tilde{r}, 2, s, 1)$ -projectivity implies the  $(r, 2, s, 1)$ -projectivity. Conversely, consider a diagram (1) with  $\text{Ker } h \subseteq^{(\tilde{r}, 2)} N$  and  $N \subseteq^{(s, 1)} N$  and suppose that  $P$  is  $(r, 2, s, 1)$ -projective.

Then  $h \circ \bar{g} = g \circ \varphi_P$  for a homomorphism  $\bar{g} : C(P) \rightarrow N$ . Further, let  $K_0 = \text{Ker } h$ ,  $K_{\alpha+1} = r(K_\alpha)$  for every ordinal  $\alpha$  and  $K_\alpha = \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} K_\beta$  if  $\alpha$  is limit. Then  $0 = \bar{r}(\text{Ker } h) = = K_\gamma$ , for an ordinal  $\gamma$ . By (2.6) (iv)  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P))$ , and therefore  $\bar{g}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) \subseteq K_\alpha$  for every ordinal  $\alpha$ . Hence  $\bar{g}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) = 0$  and so  $P$  is  $(\bar{r}, 2, s, 1)$ -projective.

(viii) By (vii) and (v).

**Proposition 2.10.** *Let  $r, s$  be two preradicals and  $P$  a module with a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$ . Then the following assertions hold:*

- (i) *if  $r$  is a cobalanced idempotent preradical then  $(C(P)/(r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective cover of  $P$ ;*
- (ii) *if  $r$  is a cobalanced idempotent preradical then  $(C(P)/(C_{\bar{s}}(r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) : C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 1, s, 2)$ -projective cover of  $P$ ;*
- (iii)  *$(C(P)/\bar{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 1)$  projective cover of  $P$ ;*
- (iv) *if  $R$  is left perfect and  $r$  cobalanced then  $(C(P)/(\bar{ch}(r)(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective cover of  $P$ ;*
- (v) *if  $R$  is a left perfect left hereditary ring then  $(C(P)/(\bar{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective cover of  $P$ ;*
- (vi) *if  $r$  is an idempotent preradical and  $\bar{P} = P/\text{ch}(s)(P)$  has a projective cover  $(C(\bar{P}), \varphi_{\bar{P}})$  then  $(C(P)/(\text{Ker } \varphi_P \cap \pi^{-1}(r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(\bar{P}))))$ ,  $\bar{\varphi}_P$ ), where  $\pi : C(P) \rightarrow C(\bar{P})$  is an epimorphism with  $\varphi_{\bar{P}} \circ \pi = v \circ \varphi_P$ ,  $v : P \rightarrow \bar{P}$  natural, is an  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective cover of  $P$ ;*
- (vii)  *$(C(P)/\bar{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 2)$ -projective cover of  $P$ ;*
- (viii) *if  $r$  is an idempotent preradical and  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P/(\bar{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P)$  is  $\bar{r}$ -torsionfree then  $(C(P)/(\bar{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 2, s, 1)$ -projective cover of  $P$ ;*
- (ix) *if  $r$  is an idempotent preradical and  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P/(\text{Ker } \varphi_P \cap C_{\bar{s}}(\bar{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) : C(P)))$  is  $\bar{r}$ -torsionfree then  $(C(P)/(\text{Ker } \varphi_P \cap C_{\bar{s}}(\bar{r}(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) : C(P))), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 2, s, 2)$ -projective cover of  $P$ ;*
- (x) *if  $r$  is a radical then  $(C(P)/(C_r(s(C(P)) : C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 3, s, 1)$ -projective cover of  $P$ ;*
- (xi) *if  $r$  is a radical and  $C(P)/C_r(\bar{s}(C(P)) : C(P))$  is  $\bar{s}$ -torsionfree then  $(C(P)/(C_r(\bar{s}(C(P)) : C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 3, s, 2)$ -projective cover of  $P$ .*

Proof. (i), (ii), (iii), (vii), (viii), (ix), (x), (xi) Apply 2.4, 2.5 and 1.11.

(iv), By (i) and 2.9 (viii).

(v) It follows from (iv).

(vi) By 2.4 (i), 2.5 (vii) and 1.11,  $(C(\bar{P})/(r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(\bar{P}))), \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective cover of  $\bar{P}$ . Put  $Q = C(P)/(r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P \cap \pi^{-1}(K)) + s(C(\bar{P})))$ , where  $K = r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(\bar{P}))$ . Obviously  $Q/ch(s)(Q) \cong C(\bar{P})/K$  and  $Q$  is  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective by 2.7 (i). Now, let  $\text{Ker } \varphi_P \cap \pi^{-1}(K) \subseteq L \subseteq \text{Ker } \varphi_P$  and let  $C(P)/L$  be  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective. Then  $(C(P)/L)/ch(s)(C(P)/L)$  is  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective by 2.7 (i) and so  $L = \text{Ker } \varphi_P \cap \pi^{-1}(K)$ , since  $(C(\bar{P})/K, \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective cover of  $\bar{P}$ .

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $r$  be a cobalanced preradical and  $s$  a preradical for  $R$ -mod. If  $(A, h)$  is a coextension of  $B$ ,  $M \in R$ -mod,  $f \in \text{Hom}_R(A/(r(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A)), M)$  then there is a pushout diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & D \\ f \circ \pi \uparrow & & \uparrow g \\ A & \xrightarrow{h} & B \end{array}$$

with  $\text{Ker } \sigma \subseteq {}^{(r,1)}M$  and  $\sigma^{-1}(\text{Im } g) \subseteq {}^{(ch(s),1)}M$  ( $\pi$  is a natural epimorphism).

**Proof.** If

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & D \\ f \uparrow & & \uparrow \xi \\ A/(r(\text{Ker } h) + ch(s)(A)) & \xrightarrow{\bar{h}} & B/h(ch(s)(A)) \end{array}$$

is a push-out diagram then the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & D \\ f \circ \pi \uparrow & & \uparrow \xi \circ \pi_1 \\ A & \xrightarrow{h} & B \end{array}$$

is a push-out diagram with  $\text{Ker } \sigma \subseteq {}^{(r,1)}M$  and  $\sigma^{-1}(\text{Im } (\xi \circ \pi_1)) \subseteq {}^{(ch(s),1)}M$  ( $\pi_1$  is a natural epimorphism).

**Theorem 2.12.** *Let  $R$  be a left perfect ring and  $C$  a cogenerator for the  $R$ -mod. If  $r$  is a cobalanced preradical,  $s$  a preradical then a module  $P$  is  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projective iff it is  $(r, 1, ch(s), 1, C)$ -projective. In particular, if both  $r$  and  $s$  are cobalanced then every cogenerator for the  $R$ -mod is a test module for the  $(r, 1, s, 1)$ -projectivity.*

**Proof.** See 2.9 (iv), 1.22 and the proof of Lemma 2.11.

**Corollary 2.13.** *Let  $r, s$  be two cobalanced preradicals,  $P$  a module possessing a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$  and  $M \in R\text{-mod}$ . Then  $P$  is  $(r, 1, s, 1, M)$ -projective iff*

$$\text{Ker } \varphi_P \subseteq C_{r(M)}((r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P))) : C(P)).$$

*Proof.* By 1.3, 2.4 (i) and 2.11.

**Corollary 2.14.** *Let  $r$  be a cobalanced idempotent preradical,  $s$  a cobalanced preradical,  $P$  a module with a projective cover  $(C(P), \varphi_P)$  and  $M \in R\text{-mod}$ . Then  $(C(P)/(C_{r(M)}((r(\text{Ker } \varphi_P) + s(C(P))) : C(P)) \cap \text{Ker } \varphi_P, \bar{\varphi}_P)$  is an  $(r, 1, s, 1, M)$ -projective cover of  $P$ .*

*Proof.* Apply 2.4 (i), 2.11 and 1.11.

#### References

- [1] *H. Bass:* Finitistic dimension and homological generalization of semi-primary rings, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 95 (1960), 466—488.
- [2] *J. A. Beachy:* A generalization of injectivity, *Pacif. J. Math.* 41 (1972), 313—328.
- [3] *L. Bican:* Preradicals and injectivity, *Pacif. J. Math.* 56 (1975), 367—372.
- [4] *L. Bican, P. Jambor, T. Kepka, P. Němec:* Preradicals, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae* 15 (1974), 75—83.
- [5] *L. Bican, P. Jambor, T. Kepka, P. Němec:* Hereditary and cohereditary preradicals, *Czech. Math. J.* 26 (101), (1976), 192—206.
- [6] *L. Bican, P. Jambor, T. Kepka, P. Němec:* Composition of preradicals, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae* 15 (1974), 393—405.
- [7] *J. Jirásko:* Generalized injectivity, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae* 16 (1975), 621—636.
- [8] *A. P. Mišina, L. A. Skornjakov:* Abelevy grupy i moduli, Moskva 1969. (Russian.)

*Authors' address:* 186 00 Praha 8, Sokolovská 83, ČSSR (Matematicko-fyzikální fakulta Karlovy university).